MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF
TRUSTEES OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
HELD
APRIL 27, 1992
AT THE BOARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
535 EAST 80TH STREET – BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:45 P.M.

There were present:

James P. Murphy, Chairperson
Edith B. Everett, Vice Chairperson

Herman Badillo
Blanche Bernstein
Sylvia Bloom
Gladys Carrion
Louis C. Cenci
Michael J. Del Giudice
Stanley Fink

William R. Howard
Harold M. Jacobs
Susan Moore Mouner
Calvin O. Pressley
Thomas Tam

Robert A. Picken, ex officio

Secretary Genevieve Mullin
Robert E. Diaz, General Counsel and Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs
Lillian W. Phillips, Executive Assistant

Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds
Deputy Chancellor Laurence F. Muccolo
President Raymond C. Bowen
President Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.
President Josephine Dunbar Davis
President Leon M. Goldstein
President Matthew Goldstein
President Bernard W. Harleston
President Frances Degen Horowitz
President Augusta Souza Kappner
President Paul LeClerc
President Gerald W. Lynch

President Isaura S. Santiago
President Kurt R. Schmeller
President Edmond L. Volpe
Sr. Vice Chancellor Donal E. Farley
Vice Chancellor Ira Bloom
Vice Chancellor Joyce F. Brown
Acting Vice Chancellor Allan H. Clark
Vice Chancellor Jay Hershenson
Acting Vice Chancellor Marcia V. Kelzsa
Vice Chancellor Richard F. Rothbard
Dean Haywood Burns
Dean Stanford R. Roman, Jr.

The absence of Mr. LaMarre was excused.
A. TRUSTEE HONORS - GLADYS CARRION: Trustee Carrion will be one of three recipients of the Catholic Interracial Council of New York's 1992 John LaFarge Award for Interracial Justice at its Fifty-seventh Anniversary Dinner on Monday, May 11 at the Sheraton Center Hotel. Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds will be the keynote speaker at this event.

B. PRESIDENTIAL HONORS - BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE: President Augusta Souza Kappner was among six honorees at a Women's History Month celebration sponsored by Councilmember Una Clarke. The event was held at Brooklyn Borough Hall in March.

C. FACULTY HONORS:

1) Fulbrights: 13 members of the City University instructional staff have received Fulbright Scholar awards. The following are the scholars, their college, and the country where they are teaching or doing research:

   b. Silvio V. Dobly, adjunct assistant professor of behavioral sciences, Hostos Community College - Argentina.
   c. Jacob E. Goodman, professor of mathematics, City College - Sweden.
   d. Arif A. Hoogenboom, professor of history, Brooklyn College - Germany.
   e. Steven A. Jervis, professor of English, Brooklyn College - Nepal.
   g. Cecilia Macheski, professor of English, LaGuardia Community College - New Zealand.
   h. Nishan Parkalian, professor of speech and theatre, John Jay College - Armenia.
   i. Elliott M. Roth, teacher in the English Language Center, LaGuardia Community College - Italy.
   j. James W. Roth, staff development coordinator, CUNY Office of Academic Affairs - Italy.
   k. Stanley A. Waren, professor emeritus theatre, The Graduate School and University Center - India.
   l. Donex Xiques, associate professor of English, Brooklyn College - Canada.
   m. Mary E. Yepez, instructor of academic skills, Hunter College - Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

2) Meryl Sussman, associate professor of computer information systems at LaGuardia Community College was among twelve educators named an outstanding freshman advocate by the Freshman Year Experience.

3) Elizabeth Roistacher, professor of economics at Queens College, has been named a fellow of the American Council on Education.

4) Judith Lorber, professor of sociology at Brooklyn College and The Graduate School and University Center, has been appointed to the editorial board of the Journal of Women's Health, a new publication devoted to research on disease prevention and clinical care of women.

5) Joyce Zaritsky, associate professor of communication skills at LaGuardia Community College, received the 1992 Award for Outstanding Service to Students in the Field of Developmental Education from the New York College Learning Skills Association.

6) Dixie J. Goss, professor of chemistry at Hunter College, is one of 100 outstanding female science and engineering professors to receive a National Science Foundation Faculty Award for Women. She will receive a grant of $50,000 per year for five years to support her research on the regulation of protein synthesis and protein-nucleic acid interaction.

7) Irene Deitch, associate professor of psychology at The College of Staten Island, has been named a fellow of the American Psychological Association.

8) Somdev Bhattacharji, professor of Geology at Brooklyn College, received the Outstanding Educator Award of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

9) Renee Epstein, adjunct lecturer in English, has been selected as a participant in the National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar for College Teachers at Yale University for Summer 1992. The seminar is entitled, "The Historian as Detective."
D. STUDENT HONORS: 1) Peter Aronoff of Queens College and Patrice Paul Rankine of Brooklyn College, both majoring in Classics, have received Mellon Fellowships in the Humanities.

2) 106 Borough of Manhattan Community College students have been selected for the 1992 Who's Who among Students in American Junior Colleges. This is a record number of students selected for this honor in the history of the college.

E. COLLEGE CEREMONY: York College: York College celebrated its first annual Founders' Day Celebration on April 9 with a formal procession through Jamaica Center. Trustees Tam and Picken attended.

F. GRANTS: The Chairman presented for inclusion in the record the following report of Grants $100,000 or above received by the University since the last Board meeting:

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

a. $233,184 New York City Department of Employment, to The Office of Continuing Education, for program to provide customer service and patient representative job training for dislocated workers residing in the Bronx and Manhattan.

b. $108,725 New York State Division of Youth, to The Office of Continuing Education, for program to serve homeless youth who live in temporary housing.

THE CITY COLLEGE:

a. $108,000 DOE to H. Cummins, Physics, for "Dynamics and Pattern Selection at the Crystal-Melt Interfaces."

b. $163,000 DOE to S. Lindenbaum, Physics, for "Experimental Investigation of Strong Interactions in the Non-Perturbative QCD Region (Task A)."

c. $132,000 NASA to W. Pierson, IMAS, for "Studies of Radar Backscatter as a function of Wave Properties and the Winds in the Turbulent Marine Atmosphere."

d. $103,171 New York City Board of Education to A. Posamentier, Education-Admin., for staff training in science and mathematics (CSD #3)

e. $1,126,064 NIH to B. Harleston, Administration, for "Cellular/Molecular Basis of Development Research Center."

f. $101,584 NSF to C. Maldarelli, Chemical Engineering, for "IPA Assignment."

g. $173,516 NSF to M. Weiner, Chemistry, for a "Program for Teacher Preparation in Secondary School Science and Mathematics."

h. $100,000 Stone & Webster to J. Fillos, Civil Engineering, for "Rapid Thermal Conditioning of Partically Digested Sludge."

GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER:

a. $106,456 ED to Professor David Katz, for "Parents as Transition Helpers."

JOHN JAY COLLEGE:

a. $183,518 U.S. Department of Education to Lillian Masters, for a Student Enrichment Program to provide supportive services to 55 disadvantaged John Jay students to increase their retention and graduation rates.
LA GUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

a. $372,343 The City of New York to Shirley Miller, Continuing Education Division, for the Correctional Consortium LaGuardia Substance Abuse Intervention Division Program.

b. $327,589 State Education Department to Jane Schulman, Continuing Education Department, for the EDGE II/ACCESS Program.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE:

a. $128,776 National Institutes of Health to R.M.S. Nair and Dominick Basile, Principal Investigators, for "Production of Artemisinin by Cell Cultures."

At this point Mrs. Carrion joined the meeting.

F. ORAL REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR: Chancellor Reynolds reported that Freshman admissions for the Fall of 1992 were up 12% University-wide. At the senior colleges admissions were up 9.3% despite the University's very severe budget difficulties. At the community colleges they were up 18.4%. The timely adoption of the State Budget has provided the University with the opportunity to continue in its efforts to work to seek further assistance in Albany. There is the real recognition throughout the State, by the media and certainly by this Board and all of our constituents in the University, that higher education in this State is not receiving the support it deserves, and needs. In the final day of negotiations before adoption of the on-time budget the University did receive a restoration of $13.1 million dollars for New York City Technical College and John Jay College of Criminal Justice, which was an immense relief. She acknowledged the help of the Trustees, as well as that of Presidents Merideth and Lynch, who helped push that restoration. Support was also received from the State and, most critically, from the Mayor's office.

The Chancellor reported that the Administration is again working very hard in Albany. An Early Retirement Incentive initiative is the top priority and staff will continue working hard on that issue through the remaining weeks of the legislative session, as well as attempting to get additional restoration dollars. The other top priority for the University is the Capital outlay budget which is very much needed on the campuses. Now is a really good time to do rehabilitation and other types of projects in the City, because of the need for that type of work at this time, and also the favorable competitive process for bids which lets us get much more work done for the same dollar than we would be able to in other times.

Chancellor Reynolds reported that Mayor Dinkins released his 1992-93 Executive Budget this morning and it did contain a cut. However, the University does have a commitment from the City to keep it at certain levels of funding for next year. The budget also highlights the conversion of Medgar Evers College to senior college status as a priority of the Mayor's initiative in restructuring the City-State relationship.

Chancellor Reynolds then noted that the annual Board of Trustees' Breakfast with the City Council will take place on Thursday, May 21st and she hoped that as many Board members as possible would attend.

Chancellor Reynolds reported that on the Washington front, the Administration is working hard on several major issues. Reauthorization of the Higher Education act is now coming under reconciliation between the Senate and the House. The entire New York State Congressional delegation has signed a letter to Secretary Lamar Alexander to provide an additional two million dollars in Federal funds for the University's Work Study Programs. Work Study dollars were exhausted early this year, presumably, in large part, because of the recession in the City and the dependence of more CUNY students on Work Study dollars.

The Chancellor said there is happily a lot of good news that comes forth both from CUNY's students and the academic achievements of the faculty. The University is pleased when the faculty has success in what is called the "popular press." CUNY faculty have been well represented recently in the pages of The New York Times Book Review.

On April 19, Blanche Weisen Cook's book, Eleanor Roosevelt, was reviewed on the front page. She is a professor of history and women's studies at John Jay College and the Graduate School and University Center.

On March 18, Andrew Hacker's book, Two Nations, Professor Hacker teaches political science at Queens College.
On March 18, John Patrick Diggins' book, *The Rise and Fall of the American Left*. He is a distinguished professor of history at the Graduate School and University Center.

On February 23, the Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. book, *The Disuniting of America*. He is Schweitzer professor at the Graduate School and University Center.

Chancellor Reynolds announced Vice Chancellor Ira Bloom's resignation. On behalf of everybody in the Central Office, she expressed extraordinary gratitude for his long-standing and exemplary service. She said that there would be future occasions for all to gather to thank him in person. The Chancellor said that Vice Chancellor Bloom had effectively served the University in so many ways, including Chief of Staff to the Board Committee on Faculty, Staff and Administration, and that she was pleased that he would, at least for the foreseeable future, be back with the University as a member of the faculty at Lehman College after an appropriate study leave.

Mr. Howard spoke of having worked very closely with Vice Chancellor Bloom for some time, and questioned who would be replacing him in the handling of the early retirement incentive, for which the legislation is presumably moving ahead rapidly, and the tuition increase. Chancellor Reynolds responded that Vice Chancellor Bloom's decision was so recent that she had not yet had a chance to make that determination. She said she would work through a few options with the Board Chairman, the Vice Chairperson, and with the Chairman of the Faculty Staff Committee, and then bring this to the full Board at the May meeting. However, in the interim, Vice Chancellor Bloom's deputy, University Dean Judith Bronstein, who is cognizant of that area, would help with the data and information needed.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted (Calendar Nos. 1 through 8)

**NO. 1. UNIVERSITY REPORT: RESOLVED, That the University Report for April 27, 1992 (including Addendum Items) be approved.**

**EXPLANATION:** The University Report consists of the highlights of the personnel actions and other resolutions of a non-policy nature which require approval by the Board of Trustees.

**NO. 2. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT: RESOLVED, That the Chancellor's Report for April 27, 1992 (including Addendum Items) be approved.**

**EXPLANATION:** The Chancellor's Report consists of standard resolutions and actions of a non-policy nature which require approval by the Board of Trustees.

**NO. 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: RESOLVED, That the minutes of the regular Board meeting and executive session of March 23, 1992 be approved.**

Mr. Cencl thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to make the following statement:

The media have reported that the United States Department of Labor is investigating charges that The City University has discriminated against employees of Italian-American decent. Italian-American employees of The City University were declared a protected class for affirmative action purposes by the late Chancellor Robert Kibbee on March 17, 1976. Since that time the percentage of Italian-American professors has remained at approximately 5.5%, the same as it was dating back as far as 1960. Discrimination is wrong, regardless of the ethnic group affected. It is in that spirit, as well as in concern for Italian-American employees that I urge cooperation with the investigators to determine whether the individual claims have merit and following their report, corrections as may be indicated. I make this statement not only as an American of Italian descent but as a Trustee of a University whose policies deplore discrimination in any form.

Chancellor Reynolds thanked Trustee Cencl for his sensitive statement, indicating that she joined with him and the other Trustees in deploiring discrimination in any form. She assured him that the University has been, and will continue to cooperate fully with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. As part of the University's communication with that Office, Vice Chancellor Diaz has advised them that in 1985 the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of
Board of Trustees

Education, after a lengthy investigation, cleared the University of charges that it had discriminated against Italian-American faculty and professional staff. The Chancellor added that, since the current matter involves individual claims, further comment has to be reserved, but she assured Mr. Cencl that this matter has the Administration's full attention. Vice Chancellor Diaz will keep the Chancellor up-to-date as the investigation advances.

At this point Calendar No. 7 was considered.

**NO. 7. COMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING: RESOLVED, That the following item be approved:**

**A. COLLEGE PREPARATORY INITIATIVE: The resolution was moved and seconded.**

Chairman Murphy stated that the Committee on Long Range Planning had held a meeting earlier this month on the College Preparatory Initiative. He called the initiative a positive and hopeful development for the University, for the young people of the City, and for the City of New York. The Chairman submitted for the record a memorandum to the Trustees from Board of Education Chancellor Joseph A. Fernandez, in support of the collaborative effort:

> I want to take this opportunity to express my commitment to the CUNY College Preparatory Initiative that you will consider at this month's Board meeting. I further support the commitment of CUNY to its policy of open access and equity for the high school students of our city.

Soon after beginning her tenure at CUNY, Chancellor Reynolds met with me and described her plans for the College Preparatory Initiative to improve the preparation of students coming to CUNY. The Initiative complements a series of efforts presently underway at high schools throughout the city, particularly our efforts to improve instruction in mathematics, sciences and foreign language.

Soon after I assumed the Chancellorship of the New York Public Schools, I commissioned Task Forces to study curriculum, pedagogy and assessment in high school mathematics and science. The Task Force on Mathematics has issued its reports and we are in the process of implementing the high school mathematics requirement from two to three years and instituted a provision that will require students to take an increasing share of those units in academic mathematics courses. My expectation is that the Task Force on science will follow suit and recommend that students take enhanced courses in the sciences, including a laboratory component. These important changes in high school course requirements parallel the changes recommended in the College Preparatory Initiative and give them added credence as the preparation necessary to success in college. We are already seeing the results of these initiatives in increasing enrollments in academic courses throughout the city.

In addition to our complementary work on curriculum reforms, the College Preparatory Initiative has opened many new and fertile areas for cooperation between the City University and the public schools. The two conferences between high school and college faculty were instrumental in developing a comprehensive statement on academic goals and expectations in six academic disciplines. This work has established a strong foundation to pursue cooperative efforts in faculty development and explore innovations in pedagogy and assessment. We have shared information and cooperated in writing grants to fund new teacher education initiatives. Our new collaborative efforts in teacher education were recently recognized by a generous grant from the AT&T Foundation. There is much work to be done, but CPI has already been immeasurably helpful in focusing our attention on the issues.

There is a confluence of interest between the goals that I enunciated for the public schools and those championed by Chancellor Reynolds. It is vital that CUNY clearly and unequivocally state its preparatory expectations for entering students. This is the measure that will encourage students to undertake the challenge of a more demanding curriculum and secure a successful transition from high school to college.

The Chancellor noted that a great deal of time had been put into the College Preparatory Initiative, and that it had been very carefully reviewed by the Committee. She acknowledged the efforts of Dr. Picken in his capacity as Chairman of the University Faculty Senate for his support of the Initiative, and his help in molding the Initiative over the last two years. She described the conception of the Initiative as a collegial process in which the presidents, faculty, and many students had been involved. Hearings on the College Preparatory Initiative were held on each campus. Two major retreats were also held. The Initiative is a partnership between Chancellor Fernandez, the Board of Education, and The City University of New
York. University faculty in appropriate subject matter fields have been put together with teachers from the public schools to define the level of skills high school graduates should possess. The entire process is moving forward, and efforts will continue in the years ahead. Support for the Initiative has come from Chancellor Fernandez and from N.Y.S. Commissioner of Education, Thomas Sobel. Chancellor Reynolds indicated that more time will be spent in the coming year with the Board of Regents since many of their efforts, and those of the Board of Education and the City University are running together on this major Initiative. Good support has been received from the UFT and the PSC. She expressed special gratitude to Vice Chancellor Joyce Brown who chaired CUNY’s major committee on the CPI, and Dean Ron Berkman who has served yeoman duty on the staff work behind it. The Chancellor emphasized that the Initiative is very important and that efforts around the nation show real changes in science and math-taking nation-wide from similar initiatives. There are pushes for future initiatives in many other states as well, and it is important that The City University be part of this.

Vice Chairperson Everett stated that a yearly report on the CPI would be welcome because there will be a great deal of interest on the part of the Board in learning what changes the University will be making, as well as what changes will be made at the Board of Education. Mrs. Everett referred to the public hearing that took place on April 23rd, where some very serious objections had been raised by the faculty. She noted that these matters had not been missed by those who worked on developing the CPI. She assured the concerned parties that the Board was listening, and that the Board would watch for possible problems that might arise. She said she had gotten the sense from all of the speakers, however, that if the CPI worked they would be thrilled with it. She was very much in favor of trying it and making it work because it would be for the benefit of everyone in this City.

Ms. Carrion noted that the CPI resolution does provide that the Chancellor make a yearly report to the Board on the impact of enrollment as well as access and diversity at each college.

Trustee Picken made the following statement on the College Preparatory Initiative:

I have spoken to the Board on a number of occasions concerning the College Preparatory Initiative. Like the vast majority of the faculty of our University, I have always supported the goals of the Initiative: to work in collaboration with public schools to improve the opportunities for and preparation of students entering our colleges. Personally, I have always believed that the Initiative, if properly implemented, will make real the promise of open access by turning the assurance of a seat in a CUNY college into meaningful opportunities for success for that significant number of students currently insufficiently prepared to succeed in college-level work.

Large numbers of CUNY faculty have been involved in the planning of the Initiative from the very first. As you know, at the request of the Chancellor, an advisory committee of the University Faculty Senate drafted the initial academic framework for the Initiative just a year ago. The Faculty Senate and the Professional Staff Congress were represented, and represented very effectively, on the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on School System Collaboration, chaired by Vice Chancellor Brown, which elaborated the plans for implementation. Scores of CUNY faculty from all units, representing the disciplines envisaged in the Initiative participated in the conferences jointly held with high school personnel in June and October. I might say that those of us who participated in these conferences found them particularly gratifying because of the degree of enthusiasm with which our high school colleagues welcomed the Initiative and the warm working relationships which were established between them and us.

During the past few months, as you have heard, forums have been held on every campus at which faculty and others have been briefed on the initiative, have raised questions, expressed concerns and debated provisions. I should like to commend the Chancellor for having undertaken this unprecedented University-wide consultation. Never has a University-wide academic proposal received such thorough scrutiny and discussion. The process has been a model of how this University should proceed with major new academic undertakings. As a result of this consultation and as a result of discussions held at the March meeting of the University Faculty Senate, I proposed a series of modifications in the original draft resolution which addressed the major concerns of the faculty. These were accepted by the Chancellor and the Long Range Planning Committee and are incorporated in the resolution you have before you.

I would be less than candid, however, if I did not report that many faculty are still skeptical about the Initiative and a few, totally opposed, as was apparent at the Public Hearing held last Thursday. I would say that there are two major areas of concern. Many faculty feel that the Initiative will somehow result in a limitation of access to the University. The Board unequivocally states its commitment to open access in the first “Resolved” of this Resolution, and I am certain the Board
will spare no effort in seeing that this commitment is honored. The second area of major concern is that, already mentioned, of the availability of resources, particularly in the Public Schools. In the present resolution the Board undertakes to cooperate with the Chancellor of the Public Schools and the Board of Education to ensure that resources are committed to meet the goals of the Initiative. I am certain the Board will likewise spare no effort in honoring this commitment. In this connection, I would add that Chancellor Fernandez’s memorandum to the University Trustees of April 14 is most welcome.

A large role has been reserved for the faculties of the various colleges in the implementation of CPI. I am pleased to report that the University Faculty Senate voted overwhelmingly at its plenary meeting of April 14 “to continue to provide leadership to the constituent units of the University to ensure that the College Preparatory Initiative improves the preparation of students graduating from high school without endangering open enrollment.” In February, 1991, when I recommended that the Board adopt the policy resolution calling for increased collaboration with the Board of Education and the development of a college preparatory curriculum, I said I was confident that we were embarked on a renewal and revitalization of the educational enterprise within our City and that the resolution marked the beginning of an auspicious new chapter in the history of City University’s service to all New Yorkers. Today’s resolution spells out the magnitude of the University’s commitment to that renewal and revitalization and provides a beacon of hope in an hour which is otherwise very dark indeed.

Mr. Badillo indicated his concern that Chancellor Fernandez’ letter of April 14th specifically speaks only about his having commissioned Task Forces to study mathematics and science, without reference to the other disciplines. He questioned whether there would be enough budgetary resources to comply with this mission in the timetable laid out. For that reason, he agreed with Vice Chairperson Everett that close monitoring of the CPI was necessary.

Dean Ron Berkman stated that the Task Forces on math and science had completed their work and that the Board of Education is now preparing an implementation plan. The third task force to be commissioned would be the Task Force on foreign languages. The Board of Education is moving ahead incrementally with each of the six disciplines using the same model of a task force and implementation plan.

Chancellor Reynolds responded that Chancellor Fernandez had included the math progress in his letter because that Task Force had completed its work this year. However, there is a timetable for implementing all the rest of the schedule. She emphasized that the University was involved in each of the Task Forces, and that the Administration would continue to inform the Board as the process moves along.

Rev. Pressley spoke in support of the plan to increase the course requirements and the standards for admission to the City University, and the commitment to access and excellence. He said he was involved with a significant aspect of this community’s population and he did not know of any parents who were not looking for the elementary school, at K through 12, to perform at the highest level for the benefit of their offspring. These parents would certainly be encouraging the Board of Education, as well as all in the City who have some responsibility for that education, to do it in the most efficient and effective way. In the same vein, these parents and community leaders are interested in the University performing at the highest level and producing the most qualified students that it can. If the University moves to stimulate the Board of Education to do a better job at K-12, and if we are committed to doing a better job at the community, senior and University level, we will have a healthier City in which young people and old alike can perform at a more efficient and effective level. Rev. Pressley supported the effort.

Dr. Tam stated that he would also like to support the CPI. He had attended the Public Hearing, and even though there was some apprehension about the proposal from some faculty members, he thought the majority of the people who spoke had a lot of expectations for the Initiative. He commended the architects of the Initiative. He said the CPI was a very important initiative, and that working together with the Board of Education to implement it was very important for the future of the youngsters.

Chairman Murphy commented that, clearly, everyone involved desires to see a partnership that’s real and meaningful between the University and the public schools, with the resultant full realization of the talents of all the young people in this City. Just articulating that which has not been articulated ever, although it may have been implicit and forgotten in some respects, and, having the State Commissioner of Education, and the Chancellor of the Board of Education
resoundingly supporting this, and our affirmation of this, is very special. This is a great initiative that our Chancellor has been urging upon us and has brought to this point. But the Board will have to keep monitoring this constantly, because what we are really doing is making explicit a noble goal, and the only way noble goals are achieved is by constant vigilance and support. It is very very important for the University to take this step, assuming the Initiative is passed, to run counter to the fiscal realities and the fiscal environment. He urged the Board to support the Initiative.

The following resolution was approved unanimously.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York reaffirms its policy to offer admission to a college of the University to all New York City high school graduates; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects expected of entering students shall include four years of academic units in English, three years in mathematics, four years in social science, two years in natural science with laboratory, two years in foreign language, and one year in fine or performing arts; and be it further

RESOLVED, That high school curricula that constitute academic units will be determined by a committee designated by the Chancellor, including, but not limited to, high school and University faculty from the appropriate disciplines; and be it further

RESOLVED, That beginning in the Fall of 1993, all students entering the University directly from high school, except those enrolling in certificate programs or as non-degree students, will be expected to have completed nine academic units when enrolling in associate degree programs and eleven academic units when enrolling in bachelor's degree programs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the unit expectation shall be increased two units every two years until full implementation. The Chancellor shall provide the Board with an annual report that includes impact on enrollment as well as access and diversity at each college; and be it further

RESOLVED, That students who have not completed the academic unit expectation prior to enrolling in the University be required to demonstrate a level of knowledge and skills in the disciplines in which they lack units. College governance bodies will determine the modalities by which deficiencies may be satisfied. Levels of knowledge and skills shall meet the general standards of competency contained in the Collaborative Conference Report; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a deficiency in a high school unit expectation satisfied at any CUNY college by completing a designated course or examination will be recognized as satisfying the expectation for all CUNY colleges; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the appropriate governance body at each college submit a implementation plan to the Office of Academic Affairs no later than December, 1992. This plan shall contain a list of college courses and other modalities that compensate for unit deficiencies. Colleges plans may include requests for specific exemptions to prevailing unit expectations in cases in which compliance would significantly affect the length of time needed for a student to complete specific majors. The CUNY Chancellor will work closely with the Chancellor of the Board of Education to insure that opportunities are available for high school students to complete the designated number of academic units; and be it further

RESOLVED, That at the conclusion of the 1996-97 academic year, the Chancellor will provide the Board with a comprehensive report, including data on high school compliance, as well as the impact on the University's enrollment profile; and be it further

RESOLVED, That ultimately, at full implementation, both community college and senior college entrants will be expected to have completed the full pattern of sixteen units; and be it further

RESOLVED, That all associate and bachelor's degree students will be required to satisfy the prevailing unit expectations before graduation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That special provisions will apply to the following categories of students:

Students who have graduated from high school prior to 1993 will be exempt from unit expectations regardless of when they subsequently enter the University;
Students who have received a General Equivalency Diploma (GED) prior to September, 1993 will be exempt from these expectations regardless of when they enter the University;

Students who have received GED's in 1993 and thereafter will be required to meet prevailing unit expectations; the University will develop an index to award academic units based upon GED scores;

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the University's faculty and staff shall continue its fruitful collaboration with the faculty and staff of the New York City public schools in the implementation of this Initiative, and that the Chancellor and Board of Trustees shall undertake to cooperate with the Chancellor of the public schools and the Board of Education to insure that resources are committed to meet the goals of the Initiative; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the University and the Board of Education undertake a comprehensive and aggressive public information and education campaign designed to promote awareness of the critical importance of high school academic preparation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Chancellor issues such guidelines as may be necessary to implement this resolution.

THE COLLEGE PREPARATORY INITIATIVE GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

The City University of New York, with 200,000 students from every social, cultural, economic, racial, religious, and ethnic group in the city, is the largest urban university in the nation. The mission of the University is to provide access to a quality education, regardless of financial means. The University has been the main avenue for improved socioeconomic and personal achievement for the city's poor, its working class, its newly arrived immigrants and its citizens of all backgrounds.

In recent University budget and planning documents, CUNY has identified three special responsibilities:

1) to define and develop programs which will provide its entering students with the fullest potential to succeed in their pursuit of a college education;

2) to ensure that its graduates, who form a substantial part of the work force of New York City and New York State, are prepared to meet the evolving challenges of an increasingly complex society;

3) to prepare a large proportion of the teachers for the New York public schools with bachelors and masters degrees, and advanced certificates. If we are to fulfill our mission and responsibilities, it is essential that students entering the University are prepared academically to complete college level courses successfully. Most of our students come to us directly from the New York City public schools. Our plan is to intensify our ongoing partnership with the Board of Education and to work collaboratively on curriculum and faculty development programs, as well as issues related to improved teacher education programs.

COLLEGE PREPARATORY INITIATIVE (CPI)

The preeminent goal of CPI is to improve the preparation of students entering the University, thereby enabling them to undertake college level work upon admission and to achieve their educational goals in a timely manner. The most effective mechanism to ensure the realization of this goal is for students to take a recommended series of college preparatory courses in high school. Such a curriculum will not only improve the likelihood of succeeding in college, but will better prepare students to find rewarding work.

Faculty from the high schools and from the University have already developed an impressive set of statements outlining the level of skills and knowledge that students graduating from high school should possess. This provides an important foundation for the development and translation of these expectations into high school and University curricula.
**NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF ACADEMIC UNITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty Senate Optimum Preparation</th>
<th>Joint Faculty Report</th>
<th>Chancellor's Adv. Comm. Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Ed. Requirement</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Represents distribution by discipline, not necessarily academic unit
** 3 units of Math will be required for Graduation in 1996
*** Projected to increase to 2 units

The chart above indicates the recommendations of the various groups that considered the question of unit distribution. While the "optimum" preparation suggested by the University Faculty Senate and the 18-19 unit recommendation developed at the Joint Faculty Conference provide an enriched preparation, the 16 unit expectation recommended by the Chancellor's Advisory Committee will provide the essential preparation for student success. Further, this will maintain the students' option to take 4 units of elective credit in the high school curriculum.

**HOW ACADEMIC UNITS ARE DETERMINED**

Each of the units recommended are academic units whose content is, in preliminary fashion, defined by the competency statements developed by the CUNY/Board of Education discipline committees.

The University Application Processing Center (UAPC) historically has been responsible for maintaining a record of those high school courses that are considered academic units for purposes of calculating a student's cumulative average. The courses designated as academic units will be reviewed by a committee appointed by the Chancellor that will include faculty representation from both systems to assure compliance with the established expectations.

Using the database presently maintained by UAPC, which contains academic courses presently offered in high schools, a CPI transcript will be produced for each student which indicates high school academic units completed and the units which must still be taken for the student to complete the prevailing unit expectation. This record will facilitate student advisement regarding the courses needed to satisfy the prevailing expectation.

**PHASED IMPLEMENTATION**

Implementation of CPI will begin in September, 1993. At the first stage of implementation, the number of units designated - 11 for bachelor degree entrants and 9 for associate degree entrants - are targets that have already been reached by a substantial majority of the students graduating from New York City high schools.

Unit expectations will be raised by 2 units every two years based on satisfactory progress towards the goals of the Initiative. Thus, in 1995 the unit expectation would be 13 at senior colleges and 11 at community colleges. Full implementation is targeted for the year 2000 when students entering senior and community colleges will be expected to have 16 academic units. All students who have graduated high school after 1993, except those seeking certificates or non-degree status, will be expected to meet the prevailing unit expectations.
As the unit thresholds increase, a student's College Admission Average (CAA) will be calculated on the basis of completed academic units. Currently, the calculation of the CAA is based upon a minimum of 5 academic units. In 1993, when the senior college expectation is 11 units, the CAA will be calculated on the basis of at least 6 units. In 1995–96, the CAA will be calculated on the basis of 8 units and will continue in this fashion until full implementation. At full implementation, the CAA will be calculated on the basis of 12 units.

The Chancellor will report to the Board each year on the impact of the Initiative. At the end of the 1996–97 academic year, a comprehensive study of the impact of the increased expectations will be presented to the Board.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

CUNY and Board of Education officials will continue to work together to communicate the distinct advantages for students who elect to take a stronger high school curriculum. Specifically, better prepared students may:

a) gain increased access to programs and opportunities for advanced placement study during their high school career;

b) benefit from opportunities to take college courses while in high school;

c) more rapidly accumulate college credit and potentially eliminate the need for remedial work in college;

d) be prepared to pursue a full range of majors, particularly in programs that require proficiency in mathematics and science.

MAKE-UP OPTIONS

It is critical for students currently in high school to complete the unit expectations. Some entering students, however, will not have taken these courses.

All colleges will provide opportunities for students lacking preparatory units to remedy deficiencies. All students should be counseled to take equivalent preparatory courses early in their college career. These courses will often be part of the college's general education requirement and typically carry college credit. In some instances, however, courses may be remedial in nature. Specific decisions concerning the courses designated as alternatives and the credits awarded for the completion of the courses will rest with the campus governance units.

Courses and examinations that are used to satisfy preparatory requirements will be geared to the skills and knowledge contained in the joint faculty statements of subject competency. Deficiencies in student preparation may be remedied by:

1. Successful completion of a college course designated as an equivalent. [Note: a semester course generally will be considered equal to a full year high school academic course (1 unit).]

2. In certain instances, students may take an examination to demonstrate competency. Students who are fluent in another language would take a competency examination to demonstrate proficiency. Passage of this examination would satisfy the foreign language expectation.

Any course or examination completed in lieu of a high school unit at any college will be recognized as satisfying the preparatory expectation for all CUNY units.

GRADUATION AND TRANSFER

All associate and bachelor's degree students will be required to complete the prevailing requirements before graduation. Prior to 1996, associate degree students desiring to transfer will be required to complete CPI expectations in English and acquire, at least, one additional CPI unit in mathematics if needed. After 1996, students will be required to complete all deficiencies in mathematics and English before transfer.
UNIT DISTRIBUTION

During the implementation period, the following minimum distribution requirements will obtain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Expectation</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Foreign Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE IMPACT OF MAKE-UP REQUIREMENTS ON THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

Students enrolled within Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Associate of Arts and Associate of Science programs should be able to remedy deficiencies in high school preparation by fulfilling distribution requirements and taking electives within each program.

The completion of academic unit recommendations may, however, be problematic for some students enrolled in certain Associate of Applied Science degree programs. While completion of CPI equivalents in English, science, mathematics and social science should pose no problems, more highly structured A.A.S. programs may provide limited opportunities for students to make up units in foreign language and fine arts. This should not be an issue until the community college expectation levels rise to 13 or 15 units. At that point, A.A.S. programs that cannot, for example, accommodate a foreign language or fine arts elective may have an option to petition the local governance unit for an exemption. All exemptions must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs.

SPECIAL CATEGORIES OF STUDENTS

GENERAL EDUCATION DIPLOMA (GED)

Students who received GED degrees prior to September, 1993 will be exempt from CPI expectations.

After September, 1993, students seeking admission with a GED will be encouraged to submit transcripts of any high school experience that may be used to satisfy unit requirements. An index that permits students who score above a certain threshold on the test to receive academic units in mathematics and English will be established. Students who intend to use the GED to pursue further study at a college should be encouraged to take a college preparatory GED program. Such programs, now being offered at several CUNY campuses and at a number of labor education sites and community based organizations, are designed to prepare students for passing the examination and to cultivate the skills students will need to succeed.

A joint CUNY/Board of Education Task Force on the GED is presently reviewing GED preparation programs and the transition from GED to college.

FOREIGN SECONDARY SCHOOL GRADUATES

Students who have graduated from a foreign high school prior to 1993 will be exempt from CPI expectations.

There are existing mechanisms in the University Application Processing Center to evaluate the number of academic units a student has taken as part of a high school program in a high school outside the United States.

While some foreign students will be lacking units in English, their total unit count will be enhanced by the two units in foreign language they may receive for demonstrating fluency in their native language.
READMITS AND PRIOR GRADUATES

All students who graduated from high school prior to 1993 or were admitted to any CUNY college prior to 1993 will be exempt from the CPI expectations.

TRANSFER STUDENTS

Students transferring to CUNY from another college outside CUNY will be required to meet prevailing expectations. CUNY colleges will determine those college courses taken at other institutions that may satisfy CPI unit expectations.

ESL STUDENTS

The University will continue to offer ESL courses to students as needed. Those ESL students who are either GED recipients or foreign school graduates, will be covered by the provisions previously described. All ESL students will be required to meet the new curricular expectations, except to the extent that they fall under other special categories.

A CUNY/Board of Education faculty committee will study issues relevant to the ESL population.

SEEK/CD

The prevailing admissions and program standards for SEEK and College Discovery remain in effect.

CPI REVIEWS

The Chancellor will periodically provide the Board of Trustees with reports on the impact of the Initiative. The review scheduled for the 1996-97 academic year will be a comprehensive review of the first four years of the Initiative, including an examination of the compliance of the New York City high schools. This report shall include data concerning the number of academic units presented by the incoming classes and the scores on the skills tests, GPA, credits accumulated and retention rates for students who entered the University since the implementation of CPI. Data on the impact on special student populations will be included. These data have been collected and analyzed for the years preceding the Initiative as part of the University's enrollment and retention studies, providing "baseline" data as a basis for comparison.

EXPLANATION: The College Preparatory Initiative (CPI) was endorsed by the Board of Trustees at its February 25, 1991 meeting: The Chancellor was asked to prepare a plan which phased-in stronger curricular expectations for incoming students. The Initiative is a collaborative effort of The City University of New York and the New York City Board of Education designed to strengthen the academic preparation of high school students in order to enhance their opportunities for success in higher education and/or employment.

There is an obvious relation between the completion of academic courses in high school and subsequent success in college. Research studies have demonstrated that for each additional academic course taken in high school, a student's college grade point average increases; and, college grade point average is the most important indicator of student retention and graduation. In addition, academic preparation in a broad range of subject areas expands student opportunities to pursue the full range of college degree programs. The University recognizes the influence of other academic, social, and economic factors on student performance; CPI complements the University's efforts to provide instructional and non-instructional supportive services for students requiring them.

The primary goal of CPI is to increase the number of high school academic courses taken by students coming to the University. Students who have not fully satisfied the University's preparatory curriculum expectations prior to graduation from high school will be admitted to a college of the University, where they will be expected to demonstrate stated levels of knowledge and skills in subject areas they lack. The mechanisms by which this may be done are to specified by the appropriate campus governance body. These may include, but not be limited to, a college course which incorporates the levels of knowledge and skills set forth in the general standards of competency contained in the Collaborative Conference Report, a nationally recognized discipline-specific competency test or one designed by departmental faculty.
The CPI plan also contains provisions for students who do not enter the University directly from high school. Non-traditional students -- GED recipients, non-recent high school graduates, foreign high school graduates, transfers, and students in special programs and disabled students -- will continue to have access to the University, and the University will continue its commitment to provide appropriate support services.

The Chancellor will report to the Board annually regarding the progress of the Initiative and will indicate whether the increases in the unit expectation are to proceed as planned after consultation with the presidents and the faculty. At the end of the fourth year, the 1996-97 academic year, the Chancellor will furnish the Board with a comprehensive review of all aspects of the Initiative.

CPI reflects extensive and comprehensive consultation with a broad range of constituent groups within and outside the University. Approximately 200 faculty from the University and the New York City Board of Education participated in the process of defining student competencies in each of the disciplines and developing a program for faculty collaboration. An Advisory Committee of the University Faculty Senate produced comprehensive statements of expected levels of student competency in the six disciplines included in the Initiative. A Chancellor's Advisory Committee, composed of college presidents and administrators, faculty members, and students, developed a plan for implementation. The proposal of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee's was the subject of forums held on every campus, attended by students, faculty and staff. Thousands of members of the University community took the opportunity to offer insights and recommendations.

Through every step of the process, the University also consulted with the New York City Board of Education, which is a full partner in the Initiative. This collaboration has significantly strengthened the University's relationship with the Board of Education and the relationships between faculty of the University and the public school system.

At this point Calendar No. 5. was considered.

NO. 5. COMMITTEE ON FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATION: RESOLVED, That the following items be approved:

A. HUNTER COLLEGE - AMENDMENTS TO GOVERNANCE PLAN:

RESOLVED, That the following proposed amendments to the Hunter College Governance Plan be approved.

1. A New Section 14 is added to Article VIII to read as follows:

The Senate shall establish a standing Committee on Charter Review, consisting of one faculty member from each division; an equal number of students; one member of the Administration to be designated by the President who shall serve ex-officio; and a Chair elected by the Senate.

The Committee shall be empowered to review the composition, structure and functions of the Hunter College Senate and to propose to the Senate amendments to the Governance Plan in accordance with the provisions of Article XIV, Section 2.

2. Subdivision A of Section 2 of Article XIV is amended to read as follows:

An amendment may be proposed by the Charter Review Committee or by written petition to the Administrative Committee bearing the signatures of not less than 20% of the Senate members or 200 members of the Hunter College community.

Note: Matter Underlined is new

EXPLANATION: The proposed amendments to the Hunter College Governance Plan have been approved by the Hunter College Senate and are recommended by the College President. The amendments establish a Charter Review Committee as a standing committee of the Hunter College Senate. The Charter Review Committee will have the responsibility to review the composition, structure, and functions of the Hunter College Senate, and the authority to propose amendments to the Governance Plan to the Hunter College Senate. Currently, amendments may be proposed to petition of 20% of the College Senate members or 200
members of the Hunter College community. The Charter Review Committee will consist of five faculty members representing the existing five divisions of the College, five students, an administrator designated by the college president, and a chair elected by the College Senate. The Hunter College Senate is composed of 200 members, consisting of 114 faculty members, 76 students, and 10 representatives of the administration. Proposed amendments are required to be approved by a three-fourths vote of the members of the Hunter College Senate.

NOTE: The revised governance plan is at the end of the April 27, 1992 minutes.

B. PROPOSED REVISIONS OF THE GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF PERSONNEL MANDATED BY FINANCIAL EXIGENCY: The resolution was moved and seconded.

Dr. Jacobs explained that the proposed amendments to the 1983 Guidelines and Procedures were recommended for the purpose of clarification of the provisions.

Trustee Picken made the following statement on Revisions to the Retrenchment Guidelines:

There are several members of this Board who were serving in 1983 when the Retrenchment Guidelines, of which this proposal is a revision, were adopted after a process of lengthy and arduous negotiation between the Board, and the faculty as represented by the Professional Staff Congress and the University Faculty Senate. They will recall that the University had been under censure by the American Association of University Professors since 1976, because of the way in which a large number of faculty were retrenched during the first New York City Fiscal Crisis. It was because the 1983 Retrenchment Guidelines were in accord with AAUP personnel standards, which are the generally accepted standards of the American academic world, and that the University undertook to abide by these guidelines that censure was removed from our University. Censure by the AAUP is an extremely serious matter in the academic world. There are many academics, probably a majority of the profession – and if I may say so, I include myself among them – who would not willingly take a job at a college or university under censure. It is because of this history that the faculty of our University takes any revision of the 1983 retrenchment guidelines extremely seriously.

The proposal before you, as has been stated, contains mainly semantic revisions with a number of clarifications covering categories of staff which did not exist in 1983. The Professional Staff Congress is not opposing these revisions, nor is the leadership of the University Faculty Senate. I believe I should mention that an earlier version of this proposal contained provisions which were totally unacceptable to the faculty as represented by the Faculty Senate, the PSC, and the Council of Local Campus Governance Leaders. These objectionable provisions were removed in last minute negotiations, and I wish to thank the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor Bloom for their willingness to arrive at a solution which is acceptable to the faculty leadership.

The following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the proposed amendments to the Guidelines and Procedures for Discontinuance of Instructional Staff Personnel Mandated by Financial Exigency be approved:

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF PERSONNEL MANDATED BY FINANCIAL EXIGENCY

These retrenchment guidelines and procedures apply only to discontinuances of instructional staff personnel whose appointments are in effect, and they are intended to protect the rights of affected personnel. They do not apply to the normal processes for the non-reappointment of instructional staff persons.

A financial exigency, for the purpose of these guidelines, is an imminent fiscal crises which will cause great and irreparable harm to the academic programs of The City University of New York or one of its constituent colleges if it is not alleviated. The discontinuance of instructional staff personnel shall be implemented as a last resort only after the pursuit of other less drastic means to alleviate the impact of a financial exigency.
Discontinuance of personnel shall be undertaken only after other measures to avoid discontinuances have been explored and implemented to the extent practicable, consistent with the Board of Trustees' and the Chancellor's responsibilities to govern the University, to carry out the academic program of the University and to provide a safe and appropriate environment for the faculty, students and staff.

Discontinuances of personnel may be necessitated when the fiscal resources of the University or its constituent units are insufficient to meet the operating costs required to maintain the educational mission of the University or its constituent units (i.e., the condition of [fiscal] financial exigency). Discontinuances of personnel may be necessitated for institutional reasons as described in Section 6212.8 of the Education Law of the State of New York. In the former situation, the discontinuances may occur within a relatively brief period of time. [In the latter situation, the discontinuances may occur within a relatively brief period of time.] In the latter situation, the discontinuances would generally occur over a longer span of time. In either circumstance, affected persons will be notified as early as possible, but in no foreseeable event would the notification time be less than:

- twelve months for tenured [Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Instructors, persons in the College Laboratory Technician series, Registrars and Lecturers with Certificates of Continuous Employment] faculty members and other tenured instructional staff personnel and Lecturers with Certificates of Continuous Employment;

- six months for non-tenured and non-certificated faculty members, [Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Instructors, persons in the College Laboratory Technician series, Registrars and Lecturers with Certificates of Continuous Employment];

- sixty (60) days for persons in the Higher Education Officer series, for persons in the Business Manager series, for Research Assistants, Research Associates and Substitutes (full-time) serving in all other full-time instructional staff titles, except titles in the Executive Compensation Plan;

- thirty (30) days for persons serving in adjunct instructional Staff titles;

- fifteen (15) days prior to the effective date of appointment for persons who have received letters of appointment for full-time or annual-salaried positions on the instructional staff but whose appointment date is in the future.

Instructional staff serving in titles in the Executive Compensation Plan shall be discontinued in accordance with The Terms and Conditions of Employment for Members of The Executive Compensation Plan.

Adjunct instructional staff with appointments who have not yet started to work may be notified on or before the effective date of the appointment.

Decisions regarding Graduate Assistants and adjuncts who are CUNY doctoral candidates shall take into consideration their status as students in a CUNY doctoral program, as well as instructional needs.
Discontinuance of personnel on grounds of financial exigency may be required at one or several units rather than at all of them. These guidelines are intended to be followed in either case.

I. THE CHANCELLOR'S CONSULTATION, RECOMMENDATION, AND THE BOARD DETERMINATION TO DISCONTINUE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF IN THE UNIVERSITY OR ANY CONSTITUENT UNIT

A. CONSULTATION BY THE CHANCELLOR

When the President of a college, in consultation with her or his appropriate faculty committee(s) foresees budgetary and/or financial difficulty the magnitude of which suggests the possibility that these guidelines may need to be invoked, then she/he shall so inform the Chancellor. The Chancellor, having determined in consultation with college President(s) that financial exigency is likely to necessitate retrenchment of members of the instructional staff, shall consult with the Council of Presidents, officials of the University Faculty Senate, of the Professional Staff Congress, and of the University Student Senate.

B. THE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Following this process of consultation, the Chancellor shall report to the Board of Trustees on his/her findings and on the [consultative] process[es conducted by him/her] of consultation. The report shall also include the Chancellor's recommendation [that] as to whether the discontinuance of instructional staff personnel whose appointments are in effect in the University or any of its constituent colleges1 should be authorized by the Board of Trustees.

C. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ACTS UPON THE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

The Board of Trustees shall review and consider the Chancellor's report and recommendations[.] at a regular or special meeting. Authorization for the implementation of the Chancellor's recommendations regarding the discontinuance of personnel whose [contracts] appointments are in effect is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees.

D. THE CHANCELLOR INFORMS THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Following the Board's authorization [for] of the discontinuance of personnel, the Chancellor shall inform the University community through notice to the Presidents, the Professional Staff Congress, the University Faculty Senate, and the University Student Senate. The Chancellor shall also transmit to the President of each of the affected colleges the [Chancellor's] determination that the University's retrenchment guidelines shall be invoked at that institution.

II. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RETRENCHMENT PLANS AT THE CONSTITUENT COLLEGES OF THE UNIVERSITY

A. THE PRESIDENT CONVENES AN AD HOC COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEE

Following Chancellor and Board action[s] as outlined in I. above, the President of each affected college shall convene an ad hoc College-wide Committee, the members of which shall be designated by the President and shall include representatives of appropriate constituent groups including the College-wide Personnel and Budget Committee[s]2, other teaching and non-teaching members of the instructional staff, including those currently serving as elected members of existing college bodies, members of the [non-instructional] classified staff, students, the Affirmative Action Officer, and administrators of the College. It shall be the responsibility of this ad hoc Committee to make recommendations to the President for the development of a Retrenchment Plan for the College. Each member of the Committee is expected to participate fully in its deliberations; the President shall chair the Committee.

1 The term "constituent colleges" as used throughout these Guidelines is meant to include the seventeen colleges, the Graduate School and University Center and the Central Office.

2 The term College-wide Personnel and Budget Committee as used throughout these guidelines is meant to include the College-wide Committee which recommends personnel actions, other than appeals, directly to the President.
Final decision-making with respect to the Plan rests with the President.

B. THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEE CONSULT WITH THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY

The President of each affected college, with the members of the College-wide Committee, separately or collectively, shall consult with representative groups on campus. The President is responsible for determining what programs or activities are to be curtailed or terminated. In making those determinations, she/he shall take into consideration the views expressed by appropriate faculty, staff, and student representatives.

C. THE PRESIDENT DEVELOPS [AND DISTRIBUTES] THE RETRENCHMENT PLAN

The President is then responsible for developing a written College Retrenchment Plan to be distributed to the college community through department chairpersons and other academic and non-academic officers of the college responsible for recommending the appointment of persons in the HEO, Business Manager and other non-academic titles, personnel actions. The Plan shall be amended from time to time as required.

D. APPROVAL AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE COLLEGE RETRENCHMENT PLAN

The President's completed plan shall be circulated to the College-wide Committee, with opportunity for comment, before being submitted to the Chancellor. The President shall transmit the Plan to the Chancellor along with a report on the process of participation and consultation with respect to the development of the Plan. The Plan shall not become effective until ten working days after submission to the Chancellor, unless the effective date of the Plan is delayed by direction of the Chancellor.

III. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The Board of Trustees has evidenced its commitment to the principles of affirmative action in policy statements adopted in December, 1970, and November, 1971, and May, 1985. These statements reflect an awareness of and adherence to the federal laws and regulations which both govern and define affirmative action programs at the colleges of the University. Although cognizant of the need for reductions in personnel during a time of financial exigency, the Board of Trustees nevertheless reaffirms its commitment to these laws and regulations to ensure nondiscrimination in the treatment of affected classes. The Board stresses the importance of following affirmative action principles in the implementation of these Guidelines, and requires that:

3* References to the President and to the College shall be deemed references to the Deputy Chancellor and the University Staff, respectively, in the case of the Central Office.
A. Each President shall consult with his/her [Affirmative Action Officer regarding the President's completed plan before any proposed retrenchment actions are implemented]. It is submitted to the Chancellor. Specifically, the President shall provide to his/her [Affirmative Action Officer a list of persons proposed to be discontinued. The Affirmative Action Officer shall immediately, in turn, submit to the President a comprehensive, statistical assessment of the College's work force which reflects the proposed retrenchment actions. The purpose of this consultation is to assure that the President is informed of the potential effect of these proposed actions upon the College's work force. The President shall consider the impact of the proposed retrenchment actions upon the College's work force.

B. Within three weeks of implementing retrenchment decisions, each [college] President shall submit to the Chancellor an impact statement analyzing the College's new work force profile. Specifically, this impact statement shall reflect the work force inventory of the College, the impact of discontinuances upon women and minorities, [by [a] number and percent], within that work force, and the rate at which each [affected class] University designated protected group has been retrenched. This statement shall have appended to it the college's [revised] utilization analysis including and, wherever so indicated by the statistical analyses, a set of goals and timetables [for promotions and/or new hires] by appropriate affirmative action units.

C. Upon receipt of these College impact statements, the Chancellor shall report to the Board concerning the University's affirmative action work force profile by College in the light of retrenchment. This University statement shall be supported by the data presented in the College impact statements. If the Chancellor determines that any retrenchment action is contrary to principles of law relating to affirmative action, he/she shall advise the President of his/her decision and [of] the action the President must take to remedy the defect.

IV. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF PERSONNEL—GENERAL PRINCIPLES

A. THE DEPARTMENT (OR OTHER UNIT) FOR RETRENCHMENT PURPOSES

Pursuant to the Board of Trustees Bylaws, the basic unit for retrenchment purposes within the University is the academic department of the college. Where a college has a divisional or program organization, the divisional or program organization characterized by its own personnel and budget or other equivalent personnel committee, may be the appropriate unit. For other than academic departments, the appropriate unit may be an administrative department, office, or functional unit, such as a center, institute, program, or unit funded for the purpose of implementing a legislative initiative. Each college must identify its units of retrenchment for its instructional staff.

B. GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL

Once the unit or function to be retrenched has been identified, and it has been determined that personnel must be separated from service, then the following general principles for discontinuance of individuals obtain. In making decisions as to which member or members of a [department] retrenchment unit should be separated from service, individual tenure status assumes primacy according to the State Education Law and the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees. Within a given [department] retrenchment unit, any staff member with tenure, regardless of other academic considerations, must be retained over a person who does not have tenure. However, a tenured employee in one retrenchment unit may be discontinued while a non-tenured employee in a different [department] retrenchment unit may be retained.

Non-tenured employees who may be affected by retrenchment may have received prior notices of appointment or reappointment. Appointments or reappointments rescinded or shortened as a result of retrenchment do not indicate or suggest that these specific discontinuances were the result of negligence lack of competence or unprofessional conduct.

C. CRITERIA TO BE APPLIED FOR THE DISCONTINUANCE OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

Retrenchment among instructional staff members holding the same or similar positions should take place in the following order within the [department (or other] retrenchment unit]. Whenever the length of service of two or more persons is the same, the ordering among them rests with the judgment of the President.
1. ADJUNCT STAFF

a. [Individuals] Persons with initial appointments who have not yet started work.

b. [Individuals] Persons scheduled to teach class sections which have been withdrawn, for which full-time employees have been rescheduled, for which there is insufficient registration, or for which the determination has been made that the course is not necessary for the fulfillment of any [undergraduate] degree program.

c. [Individuals] Persons who [additionally] have full-time employment outside the University in the inverse order of length of service.

d. [Individuals] Persons who [additionally] have full-time employment with the University in the inverse order of length of service.

e. [Other individuals] Persons who are not CUNY doctoral candidates and who have no additional employment in the inverse order of length of service.

f. Persons who are CUNY doctoral candidates in good standing and are receiving other financial support in inverse order of length of service.

g. [Individuals] Persons who are CUNY doctoral candidates in good standing and are receiving no other financial support in inverse order of length of service.

The foregoing notwithstanding, adjunct or hourly employees teaching courses deemed by the department to be educationally essential so as to merit continuance may be retained over non-tenured full-time personnel or other adjunct or hourly employees with greater length of service. However, the abolition of the position of a tenured or certificated employee and the retention of adjunct personnel should be undertaken for only the most compelling educational reasons.

2. RESIDENT SERIES

Persons employed in titles in the Resident Series shall be discontinued in inverse order of length of service in the Resident Series, except for special educational reasons. 4*

3. NON-TENURED AND NON-CERTIFICATED INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF - ALL TITLES

a. Persons who have received letters of appointment for full-time annual salaried positions for initial hire but who have not started their [terms] period of employment [are not covered by the notification provisions as set forth in these guidelines.] shall have their appointments revoked prior to the discontinuance of full-time non-tenured or non-certificated instructional staff who have commenced their employment, except for special educational reasons.

b. Persons employed in titles on the instructional staff not holding tenure or Certificates of Continuous Employment shall be discontinued in inverse order of length of full-time continuous service 5* on the instructional staff, except for special educational reasons.

4. LECTURERS [(FULL-TIME)] WITH CERTIFICATES OF CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT

Full-time instructional staff members holding Certificates of Continuous Employment shall be discontinued in accordance with Article 6.12 of the Bylaws before any employee holding statutory tenure[,] in the retrenchment unit.

4*The term "special educational reasons" as used throughout these Guidelines means a reason which is non-discriminatory against a person and is related to the educational, programmatic, functional, or administrative needs of the retrenchment unit or college.

5*Continuous service shall be deemed to include periods of continuous service prior to and following approved leaves of absence without pay, but the period[s] of leaves of absence without pay shall not be counted.
5. TENURED INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

Tenured members of the instructional staff shall be discontinued after the discontinuance of all non-tenured persons, including persons holding Certificates of Continuous Employment, in the department retrenchment unit. The provisions of subdivision (1) of Section 6212 of the Education Law, and Section 6.9 of the Bylaws of The Board of Trustees, and Rules and Procedures for Preferred Eligible Lists are applicable to these titles.

D. PERSONS IN EXCLUDED TITLES AND FUNCTIONS

The discontinuance of persons in excluded titles or functions shall be made on the basis of managerial or functional needs without regard to date of initial appointment or length of service. A person discontinued from an excluded title or function who holds tenure or who prior thereto held a position in a tenure-bearing title shall return to the department in which tenure was held, or service toward tenure earned. A tenured person appointed to an excluded title or function in a retrenchment unit other than the department in which he or she holds tenure shall retain his/her tenure rights during the period in which he or she is serving in such excluded title or function. A non-tenured person appointed to an excluded title or function in a department or unit other than the department in which his/her service toward tenure was earned shall retain such service credit during the period in which he or she is serving in such excluded title or function.

E. PERSONS IN EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PLAN TITLES

Persons serving in titles in the Executive Compensation Plan shall be discontinued in accordance with The Terms and Conditions of Employment for Members of the Executive Compensation Plan.

F. [E.] CONTINUING EDUCATION TEACHERS

[Employees with assignments] Persons in the title Continuing Education Teacher shall be discontinued as and when the specific courses which they are teaching are abolished. In the event that there are simultaneous sections or classes in the particular subject, employees shall be discontinued in inverse order of seniority within the Continuing Education Program at the affected college in CUNY in the title Continuing Education Teacher.

G. DISTINGUISHED AND UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Persons in titles with the designation Distinguished Professor or University Professor, or other named or specially-funded "chairs" shall be discontinued in the order in which their names appear on the tenured or non-tenured seniority list in accordance with their base titles without the Distinguished Professor or University Professor or named chair designations and shall receive notice of discontinuance in accordance with the provisions applicable to the base titles.

H. GRADUATE ASSISTANTS A AND B

Decisions regarding Graduate Assistants shall take into consideration their status as students in a CUNY doctoral program, as well as instructional needs.

I. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF IN THE HUNTER COLLEGE CAMPUS SCHOOLS

Instructional staff employed in the Hunter College Campus Schools shall be discontinued in accordance with these guidelines. The President of Hunter College shall identify the units of retrenchment within the High School and the Elementary School in accordance with Section IV. A. above.

V. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLEGE RETRENCHMENT PLAN - NOTIFICATION OF INDIVIDUALS TO BE DISCONTINUED

A. The President, in accordance with the College Retrenchment Plan and the criteria for discontinuance of appointments set forth above, having determined the number of positions to be abolished in each department (or other) retrenchment unit, shall notify the persons whose appointments are to be discontinued.
B. If an entire function, office, or department is to be abolished, or if the number of positions to be abolished is exactly equal to the number of non-tenured or non-certificated personnel in the unit, the President shall notify the affected persons of the discontinuance of their appointments in accordance with the provisions of the College Retrenchment Plan. The President shall also notify the affected persons of the effective date of discontinuance and indicate that the action resulting from the need for retrenchment was not the result of negligence, lack of competence, or unprofessional conduct. Discontinuances within the circumstances described in this section require no further justification.

C. If paragraph B is not applicable, the President shall notify each person whose appointment is to be discontinued of such discontinuance and the justification therefor, which shall be either length of service or a special educational reason. If discontinuance is based on a special educational reason, the special educational reason shall be stated in the letter of notification.

D. Notification of discontinuance of appointment shall be by certified mail. If the certified letter is returned undelivered, simultaneously by regular first class mail, shall be used, and the notification date determined by the certified letter shall obtain.

E. Discontinued individuals shall have notice mailed not later than fifteen working days after the submission approval of the college's Plan by the Chancellor unless the effective date is delayed by the Chancellor. In the latter case, notice shall be mailed not later than fifteen days after the effective date of the Plan established by the Chancellor.

For tenured and certificated members of the instructional staff, discontinuance of appointment shall be effective not less than twelve months including annual leave after the date of mailing of notification or such date as specified in the letter, whichever is later; or if the departments in which they hold appointment are being abolished, on the date specified in the letter of notification in accordance with the provisions set forth above.

For non-tenured and non-certificated faculty members, persons in the College Laboratory Technician series and the Registrar series of the instructional staff serving in full-time titles, discontinuance of appointment shall be effective not less than six months including annual leave after the date of mailing of notification, or such date as specified in the letter, whichever is later; or if the departments in which they hold appointment are being abolished, on the date specified in the letter of notification in accordance with the provisions set forth above.

For persons serving in the Higher Education Officer Series, and the Research Assistant, Research Associate, and Substitute (full-time) titles, discontinuance of appointment shall be effective not less than sixty (60) days including annual leave after the date of mailing of notification or such date as specified in the letter, whichever is later.

For members of the instructional staff serving in adjunct titles whose employment has commenced, discontinuance of appointment shall be effective not less than thirty (30) days after the date of mailing of notification or such date as specified in the letter, whichever is later.

For persons who have received letters of appointment for full-time or annual salaried positions on the instructional staff but whose appointment date is in the future, revocations of the offer of appointment shall be effective not less than fifteen (15) days after the date of mailing of notification.

In the event a person has received or is scheduled to receive a notice of reappointment or non-reappointment, the earlier of the dates of either non-reappointment or discontinuance pursuant to these Guidelines shall prevail.

VI. REVIEW AND APPEALS PROCEDURE

A. [Upon request, a] A person who has been discontinued pursuant to these Guidelines may request a review of the decision within twenty calendar days of the certified mailing of the date of the letter of notification. Such request shall be filed with the Office of the President of the College.
B. After consultation with the ad hoc College-wide Committee, [A] special retrenchment review committee or committees shall be established by the President [after consultation with the ad hoc College-wide Committee] to consider [all retrenchment] appeals timely submitted. Each such committee shall be composed of no [less] fewer than three tenured members of the instructional staff of the college.

No member of a department P & B Committee, the ad hoc Committee, or other person who has formally participated in the recommendation of the discontinuance of an individual to the President shall participate in the consideration of, or decision on, the appeal of such person.

In the Central Office, the Staff Review Committee shall be the special retrenchment review committee, except that no Vice Chancellor shall participate in the consideration of or decision on the appeal of a person within the area of his or her jurisdiction.

C. The affected individual may appeal [and present evidence] to the retrenchment review committee [on one or more of the following grounds:] and has the burden of establishing through the presentation of evidence that:

1. Where the determination was made on the basis of length of service, that the P & B Committee or party making the decision did not correctly compute the length of service in accordance with these Guidelines.

2. Where the determination was made on the basis of special educational reasons, that the reason given was [applied in an arbitrary and capricious manner.] unsupported by the stated educational, programmatic, functional, or administrative needs of the retrenchment unit.

3. That the applicable [department (or other unit) for] retrenchment unit was arbitrarily and capriciously [determined.]

D. [Persons whose appointments have been discontinued pursuant to these Guidelines and Procedures] An appellant may request to meet with the committee, present relevant evidence and be represented by counsel or a representative [from within the University.] of the certified collective bargaining agent if the appellant is covered by a collective bargaining agreement.

E. At the request, and at the expense, of the appellant, a stenographic record of the appeal hearing shall be made.

F. The Committee shall make a report and recommendations to the President for transmission to the Chancellor or his or her designee who shall make the final decision and notify the appellant [by certified and regular mail], and shall also notify the President. The Chancellor's designee shall not be chosen from the college from which the appellant was discontinued.

VII. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING GRIEVANCE AND ARBITRATION PROVISIONS

Nothing in these guidelines shall impair any rights which may exist concerning grievance and arbitration provisions of collective bargaining agreements.

VIII. GENERAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

A. A person whose position is discontinued shall receive the value of his/her remaining accumulated annual leave in a lump sum after the effective date of discontinuance. [In the event there is sufficient time] [b]Between the date of notice and the effective date of discontinuance, the employee may be required to use [up] accumulated annual leave.

If a person whose position is discontinued meets the requirements for retirement leave as set forth in Section 13.3 of the Bylaws and notice of intent to retire is provided to the college not less than thirty days prior to the effective date of discontinuance, such leave shall be provided.

[Membership on retrenchment review committees shall be drawn from faculty and staff who have been elected to and are currently serving on standing college bodies, such as a college faculty council or senate.]
B. Persons being discontinued may be entitled to a range of benefits. The colleges and the Central Office will provide such information and be prepared to assist discontinued personnel in understanding their rights.

C. There are no priorities preferences for veterans, volunteer firemen or physically handicapped personnel on the instructional staff. [Such provisions apply to personnel in classified civil service positions only.]

D. Persons whose services are discontinued pursuant to these Guidelines and Procedures cease to be employees of the University as of the date of discontinuance, unless such employees have rights to revert to other Instructional Staff or Classified Service positions. Notice[s] of non-reappointment in the discontinued position for future periods should not be sent to such persons. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a person discontinued pursuant to these Guidelines and Procedures may be appointed for a future period pursuant to the normal appointment procedures or pursuant to the Rules and Procedures for Preferred Eligible Lists.

E. The rights of recall as specified in Sections 6.11 and 6.14 of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees shall remain applicable, [to any individual whose position is discontinued as a result of the application of these Guidelines.]

NOTE: Matter underlined is new; matter in brackets to be deleted.

EXPLANATION: On May 23, 1983, the Board of Trustees revised the Guidelines and Procedures for Discontinuance of Instructional Staff Personnel Mandated by Financial Exigency which govern discontinuances of appointments in effect for reasons of financial exigency and which had been in effect since 1976.

During 1991-92 the University has faced a severe financial crisis because of repeated mid-year budget reductions in addition to funding cutbacks already mandated in the University's adopted 1991-92 budget. The adopted 1992-93 New York State Budget, approved by the Governor and the New York State Legislature, contains additional severe cutbacks, continuing the trend of the past few years. Financial exigency within the senior colleges will necessitate, among other cost saving measures, the discontinuance of Instructional Staff Personnel whose appointments are in effect. It is recommended that the Board of Trustees amend "The Guidelines and Procedures for Discontinuance of Instructional Staff Personnel Mandated by Financial Exigency" in order that provisions in the 1983 Guidelines be clarified and that, where discontinuance is necessary, the budget savings realized as a result may more significantly ameliorate and financial exigency during the 1992-93 fiscal year.

At this point Calendar No. 4 was considered.

NO. 4. COMMITTEE ON FISCAL AFFAIRS, FACILITIES AND CONTRACT REVIEW: RESOLVED, That the following items be approved.

A. QUEENS COLLEGE - UNIFORMED GUARD SERVICE:

RESOLVED, That The Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Queens College to execute a contract with the lowest responsible bidder after advertisement and procedures in accordance with CUNY regulations for Uniformed Guard Service as required by Queens College for the period 7/1/92 to 6/30/93 at a total estimated cost of $1,700,000 chargeable to code 2-348/243-01-409, said agreement shall contain options to renew for four additional consecutive one year terms at the same cost, and provision for justified escalation reflecting increases as permitted by law but in no event to exceed 10% per annum. The contract shall be subject to approval by the University Director of Security, and as to form, by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: Guards are utilized to prevent entrance of unauthorized vehicles; to patrol the campus and rented property; and to protect against theft, vandalism, illegal parking and other illegal or improper deportment.

B. THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER - ELEVATOR MAINTENANCE SERVICE:

RESOLVED, That The Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract on behalf of The Graduate School and University Center to purchase elevator maintenance service. The contract shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder after public advertisement and sealed bidding by the college pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $100,000 for the annual period from July 1, 1992 to
June 30, 1993, chargeable to FAS code 217703400. The contract shall include up to four annual options for the college to renew in its best interest with provisions for escalation reflecting increases as permitted by law, but in no event to exceed 15% per annum. The contract shall be subject to approval as to form, by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: This service is essential and is required to maintain the safety of all the college elevators.

C. THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER – AIR MANAGEMENT MAINTENANCE SERVICE:

RESOLVED, That The Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract on behalf of The Graduate School and University Center to purchase air management maintenance service (HVAC) from The Trane Company without competitive bidding for the annual period from July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993. The total estimated cost is $100,000 chargeable to FAS code 217703400. The contract shall include up to four annual options for the College to renew in its best interest with provision for escalation reflecting increases as permitted by law but in no event to exceed 10% per annum. The contract shall be subject to approval as to form by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: The system and controls are approximately 95% Trane dependent on patented Trane Co. designed equipment. Service must be performed by engineers trained by the company to maintain peak operational efficiency of this critical equipment essential to the health of faculty, staff and students.

D. CENTRAL OFFICE - UNIVERSITY-WIDE AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE:

RESOLVED, That The Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract on behalf of the senior and the community colleges to purchase automobile liability insurance. The contract shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder after public advertisement and sealed bidding by the University pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $300,000 for the annual period from July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993, chargeable to the appropriate college FAS codes. The contract shall include up to four annual options for the University to renew with provision for escalation reflecting increases as permitted by law but in no event to exceed 15% per annum. The contract shall be subject to approval as to form by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: This action will permit the purchase of a single policy to cover all the vehicles owned and operated by both the senior and the community colleges. Heretofore, a blanket policy was in place for the senior colleges only while each community college obtained its own insurance coverage independently. It is anticipated that this action will result in substantial savings.

Dr. Jacobs asked the Chancellor if oversight was ongoing to reduce the number of automobiles and assure proper automobile usage. He indicated he was glad that the automobile insurance contract would provide coverage for both the community and senior colleges. However, he inquired as to whether, given that these cars are marked as official cars and carry official plates, the $300,000 could be put under the City's umbrella coverage for all of its moving vehicles. Chancellor Reynolds responded that the University was becoming very abstemious. The usage of cars had been reviewed with the presidents and that several memos had gone out regarding car usage, particularly personal usage and the assignment of cars which she felt had been thinned down markedly. Vice Chancellor Rothbard stated that any requests for vehicles have to be reviewed centrally before they are advanced to the Fiscal Affairs Committee for consideration. Last year the colleges were given a goal of making a 10% fleet reduction. The University as a whole had exceeded that goal, with each college at least meeting their individual goals. The $300,000 cost estimate for insurance is for the entire senior and community college fleet. This is the first time the University has done a consolidated contract, consistent with efforts to get University-wide contracts in many areas. The Vice Chancellor stressed that Counsel has advised that the University needs insurance coverage for the fleet, rather than relying upon insurance through the City of New York. Also, the City will not cover the senior college fleet. The University procured a volume discount by including both senior and community colleges in the coverage, at a cost not substantially more than what would otherwise be paid yearly for the senior colleges. The insurance is for liability. It can assure uniform coverage and also protect the University if a vehicle is transferred from one campus to another. The Board will be advised of the specific amount of the coverage.

At this point Ms. Carrlon left the meeting.
Vice Chairperson Everett asked which individuals, other than the presidents, the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellors, have been assigned cars. Vice Chancellor Rothbard indicated that, to his knowledge, none. The policy that the Chancellor issued pursuant to discussion with the Board and the Committee on Fiscal Affairs restricts personal use of vehicles to the Chancellor and the Chancellor and the Presidents. Any other vehicles were assigned to the departments by the presidents or by the Campus Vehicle Control Officer.

Mr. Fink emphasized that the members of the Fiscal Affairs Committee were not as concerned with the number of cars as with the policy for use of the vehicles. While there were probably very good reasons for a certain number of cars to be assigned to each campus, several months ago the Committee on Fiscal Affairs had discussed the practice of staff, other than the presidents, using the cars overnight. The reason for this concern was that the Committee did not wish to have a situation where some member of the staff, other than the president of the unit, could conceivably be involved in an accident which would call attention to a practice which is not generally permitted. His real concern was whether there had been an effort to limit that practice, rather than the number of cars on the campus. Vice Chancellor Rothbard responded that both the number of cars, and the way in which they are used are spoken to in the policy, and the presidents have sent memorandums out to the departments indicating permissible usage. Mr. Fink suggested that there ought to be a memorandum indicating that any other use is a violation of the penal code section called "theft of services." The Chancellor indicated that legal counsel would look into that and another memorandum would be sent out.

At this point Ms. Carrion rejoined the meeting.

E. CENTRAL OFFICE - UNIVERSITY-WIDE LIBRARY BOOK BINDING CONTRACT:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract on behalf of the senior and community colleges to purchase library book binding services. The contract shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder after public advertisement and sealed bidding by the University pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $250,000 for the annual period July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993, chargeable to the appropriate college FAS codes. The contract shall include up to four annual renewals which the University may choose to exercise at its own option with provision for escalation reflecting increases as permitted by law but in no event to exceed 10% per annum. The contract shall be subject to approval as to form by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: This action will permit the writing of a University-wide contract for library book binding. It is anticipated that a University master contract will result in lower per-volume charges.

F. BROOKLYN COLLEGE - REPAIR SERVICES FOR THE CONDENSATE SYSTEM:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract on behalf of Brooklyn College to purchase the services necessary to repair the condensate return system in various buildings. The contract shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder after public advertisement and sealed bidding by the College pursuant to law and University Regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost $150,000 from the New York State Capital Construction Fund Project # BY-021-889 chargeable to Code 21-351419-89-71070. The contract shall be subjected to approval as to form by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: It is imperative the College upgrade its condensate system in order to preserve health and safety, safeguard our heating system equipment, and thus maintain cost-efficiency. Currently, 80% of the heat condensate is being dumped into pits for cool down and drained into the sewers. During the cool down phase some of our personnel have been subjected to burns from hot water in the condensate pits. Since we are dumping our condensate water, we are precluded from chemically treating the water running through our heating equipment, which severely shortens the equipment life span. Those chemicals which may be introduced in safe levels and still permit us to dump the condensate are being wasted due to the lack of a closed loop condensate system.

G. KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE - CONSTRUCTION OF PARKING FACILITIES:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract on behalf of Kingsborough Community College for the construction necessary to provide small to medium size parking areas within the Kingsborough Community College Campus. The contract shall be awarded to lowest responsible bidder after
advertisement and sealed bidding by the College pursuant to law and university regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $300,000 chargeable to City Capital Construction Budget HN-250, Project No. KG 023-091. The contract shall be subject to approval as to form by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: This project is necessary in order to reduce the shortage of much needed parking on the campus and to reduce labor costs for maintenance of underutilized grounds.

H. CENTRAL OFFICE - UNIVERSITY-WIDE IMMUNIZATION SERVICES:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract on behalf of The City University of New York to purchase immunization administration services. The contract shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder after public advertisement and sealed bidding by the Central Office pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $180,000 for the annual period from July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993, chargeable to FAS code 238801250. The contract shall include up to four annual options for the University to renew in its best interest with provision for escalation reflecting increases as permitted by law but in no event to exceed the Consumer Price Index or 3%, whichever is the least amount per year. The contract shall be subject to approval as to form by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: Pursuant to New York State law requiring proof of immunization for all entering college students, CUNY launched its immunization program for the spring 1991 semester. To date, well over 45,000 students have been immunized.

The University has committed $180,000 each year of tax-levy monies to cover the costs of supplies and the licensed practitioners required to administer the immunizations. Significant other costs are absorbed by central office and the campuses, including overall administration and support of the program, hiring of support staff at campus-run and regional clinics, delivery of vaccines, and mailings to students.

Dr. Bernstein asked whether students who needed immunization would receive it at point of entry or two to four weeks after entry? She also asked which diseases were of concern that necessitate immunization, and questioned why flu vaccinations are not given since it also occurs every year.

Chancellor Reynolds indicated the need for immunization was a changing issue, however, nation-wide studies show that measles, though it was conquered in the 1970's, has again become a problem. Because of changing populations, especially recent immigration, there are a lot of people who did not get the routine immunizations as children, who are now coming into the colleges. She explained that measles is especially dangerous for adults, because it can often lead to encephalitis which can result in death. Measles has been a problem on campuses nationwide, and The City University had fallen behind in its measles vaccination. Former State Health Director, Dr. David Axelrod, was very very helpful to the University in getting the vaccination program up and running so that the colleges could survey students who did not have evidence of recent vaccination. There are different programs on different campuses. Some have high compliance, some do not. Different teams of health care professionals, such as off-duty residents and interns, and nurses, give the vaccinations. It varies from campus to campus. Mumps and rubella vaccinations are available as well. Chancellor Reynolds anticipated that in a year or so, it might become necessary to test for tuberculosis. She also foresaw the eventuality of the University's getting out of the business of measles, mumps, and rubella vaccinations, just as it has the business of polio vaccinations, when the Department of Health's communicable disease unit gets caught up nationwide. The Chancellor advised that it has been shown that flu vaccinations are not given on a regular basis because while they are helpful to senior citizens, they are not particularly helpful to young people. Furthermore, the side affects are more dangerous in children to young adults than the risk of the disease itself.

Mr. Howard said the Mayor has indicated that the City of New York will be providing health care through small centers around the City. He asked if it might be prudent for the University to send those individuals who require shots or updated shots to those centers. In response, the Chancellor said the matter would be looked into to see whether the City would have a fall immunization program. She noted that the University has vaccinated over 45,000 people. The University's interest is in making sure that the immunizations are given, as economically as possible. Mr. Howard indicated that it was his understanding that at one time the City of New York gave the medicine required for the shots to the University for free, but now sends the University a bill for the medicine. He asked if that could be reversed. Chancellor Reynolds responded that his understanding was correct. Because of the incredible demand precipitated by the nation-wide measles epidemic in
the fall of 1991, the vaccine supply dipped and wasn’t available to the University. The then Health Director, Dr. David Axelrod, helped the University get access to vaccine and the program was set up.

I. THE COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND - PURCHASE OF DUPLICATION EQUIPMENT:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract on behalf of The College of Staten Island to purchase one Eastman Kodak Model 1575 Copier-Duplicator with Finisher, one Eastman Kodak Model 2120 Duplicator with VIEW Digital Printing, Finisher and Sorter accessories and one Xerox Model 5100 Duplicator under existing State of New York requirements contract #PO39574 (Kodak) and State of New York blanket purchase agreement BPA0483400 (Xerox) pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $205,000 chargeable to FAS Code 229601300 or such other funds as may be available.

EXPLANATION: This equipment will replace existing equipment which is exhibiting signs of extreme machine fatigue in the Reprographics Department duplicating centers at both of the College’s campuses. The basic Kodak Model 2120 copier-duplicator will replace an existing high volume, high speed, duplicator which the College has been renting. The State Bureau of Expenditures has asked us to discontinue this rental by the end of this fiscal year and to replace it with a machine to be acquired through an outright purchase. In addition, the new equipment will feature certain modern technological features that will enable the College’s Reprographics Department to produce several large printing jobs in-house that are presently being done by outside contractors.

J. THE COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND - PURCHASE OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute contracts on behalf of The College of Staten Island to purchase microcomputers, printers and local area network hardware from various vendors exclusively through existing Board of Education of The City of New York, City of New York, State of New York, Federal General Services Administration and/or The City University of New York contracts pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $200,000; chargeable to FAS Code 259601309 and/or FAS Code 221201309. The contract shall be subject to approval as to form by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: Equipment is needed to upgrade and replace existing outdated instructional equipment in student computer laboratories throughout the College. Some of the existing equipment is mechanically unreliable due to frequent breakdowns and some of the existing equipment is not compatible with the present advanced software needs for students in the various academic disciplines. In addition, equipment is needed for various academic and administration offices to upgrade and replace existing outdated computer equipment and to provide computer capabilities where none presently exist.

K. HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE - PURCHASE OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract or contracts on behalf of Hostos Community College for the acquisition and installation of personal computers, printers and other equipment with the lowest responsible bidder or bidders after advertisement and public bidding by the College pursuant to law and University Regulations, or to purchase the same through existing, State, City or Board of Education of the City of New York contracts pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $130,000 chargeable to Capital Project HN-X001 (CUNY Project HS019-960, CP# 31550) or such other funds as may be available. This new equipment will automate various aspects of student information processing, including registration, record keeping, testing, admissions, financial aid and counseling.

EXPLANATION: Capital Project HN-X001 provides the sum of $130,000 for the acquisition and installation of equipment to improve a student information management the College's ability to meet continually changing student needs in program offerings and to provide the college with the types of information not manageable through manual efforts.

Mr. Howard made the following statement:

On April 13, the Committee held a special meeting to consider two issues of great concern, both of which are in response to the State budget adoption process. In the weeks and months between the release of the Governor's executive budget recommendations in late January, and final adoption by the Legislature earlier this month, the Committee has been continuously briefed and updated on the content of the budget and its consequences for the colleges.
Although the final budget represented substantial gains, especially in the funding of NYCTC and John Jay, three major issues were left to be resolved by the University: First, there was the requirement that the senior colleges increase revenue in 1992-93 by $52.7 million. Second, there was an expenditure reduction for the senior colleges of nearly $40 million -- even after an assumed tuition increase. Furthermore, the budget failed to meet mandatory requirements, such as contractual salary increments and staffing of new facilities, as well as high priority program needs of the Board and Chancellor, such as our security initiative. This failure adds an additional shortfall to the $40 million. Third, there were substantial cuts to community college funding that, when combined with proposed cuts by the City, place those institutions in serious jeopardy for 1992-93.

For several years now, both the senior and community colleges have not only begun the fiscal year with sharp reductions, but on April 13, the Committee held a special meeting to consider two issues of great concern, both of which are in response to the State budget adoption process. In the weeks and months between the release of the Governor's executive budget recommendations in late January, and final adoption by the Legislature earlier this month, the Committee has been continuously briefed and updated on the content of the budget and its consequences for the colleges.

Although the final budget represented substantial gains especially in the funding of NYCTC and John Jay, three major issues were left to be resolved by the University:

- First, there was the requirement that the senior colleges increase revenue in 1992-93 by $52.7 million.
- Second, there was an expenditure reduction for the senior colleges of nearly $40 million -- even after an assumed tuition increase. Furthermore, the budget failed to meet mandatory requirements, such as contractual salary increments and staffing of new facilities, as well as high priority program needs of the Board and Chancellor, such as our security initiative. This failure adds an additional shortfall to the $40 million.
- Third, there were substantial cuts to community college funding that, when combined with proposed cuts by the City, place those institutions in serious jeopardy for 1992-93.

For several years now, both the senior and community colleges have not only begun the fiscal year with sharp reductions, but have had to tighten their belts even further in the middle of the year -- often several times. It has become evident that the magnitude of the cuts called for at the senior colleges next year can no longer be met by reducing library hours, eliminating equipment purchases, and foregoing vital maintenance activities. Most of the savings that were available in these areas were used to meet previous reductions. The point has now been reached where substantial additional savings can only be met through a reduction in staff.

In Albany, The University is pursuing aggressively legislation to authorize us to offer another retirement incentive program. Success, however, is far from assured. The only alternative to a retirement program that would result in sufficient savings is a reduction of staff through involuntary separations from payroll. While the University will continue to work for passage of the retirement legislation, timing and prospects are such, that a declaration of financial exigency is required at this time for the senior colleges.

Evident, also, is that revenue must be increased at both the senior and community colleges if we are to preserve access and some reasonable level of services to our 200,000 degree students and 150,000 continuing education students.

These two resolutions call for strong and bitter medicine for the University. However, in fully considering all the alternatives, the Chancellor and her staff have formulated a program, regarding both tuition and financial exigency, that will minimize the negative impact to the greatest extent possible, while maintaining this Board's commitment to educational opportunity for all New Yorkers.
L. REVISED TUITION AND FEE SCHEDULE:

RESOLVED, That The City University of New York adopt the revised schedule of student tuition and fee charges effective for the first full semester following June 1, 1992, including summer session; and be it further

RESOLVED, That such revised schedule shall increase full-time undergraduate resident tuition from $925 per semester to $1,100 per semester for those students enrolled at the senior colleges at any time prior to the 1992-93 academic year, from $925 per semester to $1,225 per semester for those students who enroll at the senior colleges as first-time freshmen or non-CUNY transfer students on or after June 1, 1992, and from $875 per semester to $1,050 for all full-time resident students at the community colleges. Part-time undergraduate rates, non-resident rates, non-degree rates, master's rates, doctoral student rates, law school rates, and other fees shall also be increased or established in accordance with the attached revised schedule; and be it further

RESOLVED, That all resident senior or community college first-time freshmen who enroll in any CUNY undergraduate degree program on or after June 1, 1992, shall be entitled to a waiver of 100 percent of all resident tuition charges for the final semester of study culminating in a baccalaureate degree, on a one-time basis only, regardless of original CUNY college or program of enrollment, subject to verification of completion of baccalaureate degree requirements at any CUNY college; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes the Chancellor to make such administrative revisions as may be necessary to The City University Tuition and Fee Manual to implement the tuition and fee schedules, policies, and regulations adopted by the Board in an appropriate and efficient manner.

REVISED TUITION AND FEE SCHEDULE FOR RESIDENT STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate (enrolled prior to 6/1/92)</th>
<th>SENIOR</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time matriculated</td>
<td>1,100/semester</td>
<td>1,050/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time matriculated</td>
<td>92/credit</td>
<td>85/credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate (enrolled as first-time freshmen or non-CUNY transfer students for semesters or sessions beginning on or after 6/1/92)

| Full-time matriculated                 | 1,225/semester | 1,050/semester |
| Part-time matriculated                 | 100/credit | 85/credit |

Undergraduate (all)

| Non-degree                             | 125/credit | 100/credit |
| Senior citizen fee*                    | 50/semester or session | 50/semester or session |

Masters (excluding Graduate School students)

| Full-time                              | 1,675/semester | n.a. |
| Part-time                              | 145/credit | n.a. |
| Excess hours                           | 50/hour | n.a. |

Masters (at the Graduate School)

| Level I full-time                      | 1,675/semester | n.a. |
| Level I part-time                      | 777/semester | n.a. |
| Level I one course                     | 145/credit | n.a. |
| Level II                               | 520/semester | n.a. |
| Level III                              | 290/semester | n.a. |

*enrollment on a "space available" basis only
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

**Doctoral**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Full-time (semester)</th>
<th>Part-time (credit)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Level full-time</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Level part-time</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second level</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Level</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Law School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Full-time (semester)</th>
<th>Part-time (credit)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All Students (including non-degree and senior citizens)**

Consolidated Services fee: 2/semester or session

**NOTE:** all fees effective 6/1/92

---

**REVISED TUITION AND FEE SCHEDULE FOR NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>SENIOR</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (enrolled prior to 6/1/92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time matriculated</td>
<td>2,400/semester</td>
<td>1,338/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time matriculated</td>
<td>202/credit</td>
<td>104/credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (enrolled as first-time freshmen or non-CUNY transfer students for semesters or sessions beginning on or after 6/1/92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time matriculated</td>
<td>2,525/semester</td>
<td>1,338/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time matriculated</td>
<td>210/credit</td>
<td>104/credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree</td>
<td>250/credit</td>
<td>150/credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters (excluding Graduate School students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>2,925/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>250/credit</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess hours</td>
<td>65/hour</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters (at the Graduate School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I full-time</td>
<td>2,925/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I part-time</td>
<td>1,950/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I one course</td>
<td>250/credit</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>1,270/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>640/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Doctoral**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Level</td>
<td>2,925/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Level part-time</td>
<td>1,950/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course</td>
<td>250/credit</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second level</td>
<td>2,150/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Level</td>
<td>640/semester</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Law School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>3,590/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>300/credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All Students (including non-degree and senior citizens)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Services fee</td>
<td>2/semester or session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: all fees effective 6/1/92**

**EXPLANATION:** The 1992–93 State Adopted Budget requires an increase in revenue from tuition of approximately $53 million at the senior colleges, mandates expenditure reductions of nearly $40 million, and fails to fund contractual obligations and University priorities of several million dollars more.

At the community colleges, a State base aid cut of $80 per student and elimination of various categorical programs total $8.3 million. In addition, the City's January 30 Financial Plan calls for cuts in City support to the community colleges in 1992–93 of $8.1 million.

The State and City cuts follow several years of dramatic reductions in tax-levy support for the senior and community colleges. Massive additional cuts would threaten the University's commitment to access, quality, and public service.

The revised tuition schedule would fulfill the 1992–93 revenue requirements, yet lessen the impact on currently enrolled students. By providing new students with an opportunity for a semester of study without tuition charges, the revised schedule will encourage retention in the University and degree attainment.

Chancellor Reynolds said that the issue of a tuition increase was the most difficult and disliked item to come before any Board of Trustees, and that she wished it had not been necessary to put it before this Board for three years running. She reminded the Board that a year ago, faced with the proposal from the Governor's Office for a very major tuition increase, the University lobbied the issue very strongly and in July did get a $13 million restoration, which the Board elected to be used to defray a portion of the recommended tuition increase. She also reminded the Board that the proportional restoration that SUNY got at that time was used instead for programmatic concerns in order to keep class sections open. The University had to enact a $400 increase at that time. This year the Governor's recommended budget and the budget ultimately adopted by the Legislature contained a $53 million cut to be made up for by a tuition increase. In addition, it contained many other cuts equivalent to roughly $40 million in other parts. For that reason a Declaration of Financial Exigency, as well as some modifications and changes in the Retrenchment Guidelines were before the Board. The Chancellor pledged to the Board her uniring efforts in the two months remaining of the current legislative session to get an early retirement plan and more restorations. Any restorations received, she believed, should go to keeping the faculty hired and to containing the major enrollment increase in the University. Class sizes have never been as high and the commitment being made to take care of all the students who wish to come to get a fine CUNY education, is a major one. The budgetary packet provided for the Trustees represented budgetary discussions which the Administration has had with the Legislature this spring. The tuition plan is an effort to cushion the $350 tuition increase for community college students, to keep an equivalent increase for continuing students, and to avoid further displacement from the senior colleges to the community colleges. The Administration felt that, in the face of very high enrollments such as the University is dealing with right now, if the tuition increase differential between the community colleges and the senior colleges were greater than proposed, it could cause even higher increases in the community colleges and a thinning-down of the enrollments in the senior colleges.
Chancellor Reynolds also reported that the Administration is continuing to work very hard in Washington. She will be there later this week to meet with New York Congressmen on the Higher Education Re-authorization. She felt that the outcome of the Higher Education Re-authorization deliberations would yield more money for CUNY students, and that there was a very real determination on the parts of the Senate, House, and the Bush Administration to increase PELL Grant Awards. There is also a struggle for an increase in the family income limit at which students receive awards. Those accomplishments in federal financial aid will kick in in the fall of ’93, so that students who come to CUNY next fall and remain through the nineties will have the benefit of higher levels of federal financial aid than did the students who came in the late seventies and remained into the early eighties. Thus a bipartisan arrangement is being recommended to the Board that would provide for a $350 increase for currently enrolled students in the senior colleges, and for a $600 increase for the entire year (or $300 per semester) for new freshmen in the senior colleges next year. The Fiscal Affairs Committee is recommending to the Board that new students who have to pay the higher increase be entitled to a free semester in their graduating year, as an incentive to finishing a little sooner. The presidents have advised the Chancellor that many CUNY students who work and have family responsibilities often have an attenuated graduation. This happens for another reason as well, both PELL grant assistance and TAP assistance ends after five years. Therefore, sometimes students run out of federal and state support and have to continue on their own, fully supporting their education for two or three semesters thus taking only a very small number of hours in order to get through. It is believed that giving them a free final semester will enable many of our students to complete their educations earlier. The Chancellor then brought to the attention of the Chairman the supportive letter on this tuition matter from Mayor Dinkins’ Office.

Chairman Murphy directed that the following letter from the Mayor’s Office, in support of the tuition increase, be incorporated into the record:

Dear Chancellor:

I write to let you know of the Mayor’s support for CUNY’s tuition proposal and especially for your proposal to offer an incentive to college students to complete their baccalaureate degree education.

Your proposal would waive 100 percent of tuition charges for the final semester of study culminating in a baccalaureate degree for first-time freshmen who enroll in any CUNY degree program on or after June 1st of this year.

We know that individuals who have a college degree have greater career and employment opportunities and make more money than those who do not. This creative proposal provides an extra incentive for our young adults to achieve their goals. I hope that the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York will approve this important proposal.

Although it pains the Mayor and me to see a tuition increase for CUNY students, CUNY’s fiscal situation leaves you no alternative. This is a creative proposal that deserves passage.

Sincerely,

Norman Steisel
First Deputy Mayor

Mr. Howard indicated that he had discussed this item with the entire Committee on Fiscal Affairs, and received many reactions to the thought that the University was at a point where it would be closed to a certain number of individuals who would want to come here for some part, if not all, of their education. The Committee is going to depend on the Chancellor to seek ways to reduce the cost of education in this Institution. Mr. Howard also said, as he has at other meetings, that when the University reaches the point where 50% or 60% of the faculty is non full-time, there will be little or no commitment on the campuses from these individuals, either to that community or to the institution as a whole, since adjunct professors move from campus to campus, and to campuses outside the City University. He felt that the University could get to a point where the excellence established at many of the campuses would dry up. He said he did not want to be a part of the destruction of this institution, therefore, it would be very very hard to vote another tuition increase for next year. He was not sure how to move forward but believed that the days of hoping for Albany and the City of New York to come up with a considerable amount of money to help the University continue its move forward were over for a while. We’ve got to come up with another way to support the faculty and the students of this institution, he said, noting that at one time the Board and the Administration were going to make some attempts to raise funds, other than the grants it now
has from within the University and from private sources. He urged the Chancellor to move forward in that direction because the later the decision to start to raise funds, the more serious the University’s problems will be. The Fiscal Affairs Committee members did not readily vote for this; and next year it is not certain that the Chancellor, nor the Board, nor the Chairman will vote for another Increase. He then questioned where the University would put students in the event of a 12% increase in the enrollment this year. He concluded that he was very saddened by this increase but would support it.

Mr. Badillo made the following statement:

Tuition policy in this State and City starts at the top. If the Governor and the Mayor wanted to keep tuition as low as possible, they would instruct their aides to prepare budgets to accomplish that purpose. They have not done this and the students of the University bear the burden of the consequences of their actions.

We have been handed a tuition increase by the Governor and the New York State Legislature because of their abysmal failure to raise the necessary revenues to support public higher education at CUNY and SUNY, other than by raiding the wallets and pocketbooks of students. The handout we got today confirms that, when it says “New York State is ranked 50th in a measure of ‘State Budget Priority’ for higher education.” We can’t get any lower than that. It shows very clearly that neither the Governor, the Mayor, nor the State legislature gives any high priority to The City University.

There is no substitute for low tuition. Financial aid programs such as the Tuition Assistance Program still discriminate against part-time students since only $11 million is appropriated statewide for every public and private college in New York. 43% of all CUNY students attend part-time — not by choice but because of economic necessity and family responsibility. The so-called safety net on tuition increases has a big gaping hole in it.

I commend the Board Committee on Fiscal Affairs and the Chancellor for advancing a graduation award program and for seeking to soften the impact of the tuition increase on current students. But we should still call upon the Governor to do more to meet his responsibilities and upon the Mayor to target some of the City’s budget surplus to keep tuition down.

Regrettably, we are faced with the requirement that $53 million in revenue be raised to close the gap in the University’s budget that was created by the State. If we do so with this warning; if we continue to raise tuition every time the Governor and mayor fail to act, higher education will become a haven for the rich and the mission of CUNY will be the subject of the obituary page, not the editorials.

Dr. Tam stated that he, too, reluctantly supported this measure. He agreed with Mr. Badillo that the people want a better education, which will lead to better jobs, which will lead to better competition and a better economy, therefore, something must be done to provide this education. This has to come from the City University, as well as from the City and State legislators. Dr. Tam said that the tuition model which was being advanced was a creative one, as well as a fine attempt to solve the problem of retention and getting students to graduate. Therefore, he supported it.

Mr. Fink agreed with his colleagues who had spoken before him but indicated that he wished to approach the situation from a slightly different perspective. He said he did not know anybody on the Board who would support this measure enthusiastically. He then noted that condemnations of the governments of the State of New York, its chief executives, and its legislators had been heard, but notwithstanding the fact that he certainly was not happy with the way the two governments who primarily fund the institution have reacted to higher public education in this State, the public policy with regard to education is rightfully set by the governments of the State, whether we agree with that policy or not. They have the responsibility, and they do it by a very specific process – the allocation of assets. Although he may not agree that they are correct in the manner in which they are setting this public policy, that is their stated mission. On the other hand, the Board has its stated mission, which to his understanding is to safeguard the mission of this University -“access and excellence in a multi-ethnic setting with a student-focused approach.” He noted that some of his colleagues had referred to the fact that the tuition increase would constructively cut off access to this University for a certain segment of the population who would find it impossible to pay it. However, he was happy to hear that, in terms of the impact on the present aid programs, the University has not reached a point were it is constructively denying access in terms of the support programs we have - TAP and others, although we are rapidly getting to that point. He did not feel that there was going to be any dramatic turnaround in terms of the financial situation effecting the State and City of New York in the foreseeable future, notwithstanding a newly found budget surplus. The public policy of the State and City governments was not changing, therefore, the University would continue to raise tuition to maintain excellence. Otherwise, there would
be mediocrity in terms of the things that go out, in terms of staff and facilities, and all the pedagogical things that any University needs to have. And if the University keeps raising tuition to maintain excellence, then it is going to be cutting off constructively, access, and will not be able to carry out its mission. He said he understood the government's responsibility to carry out its public policy, and the Board's responsibility to carry out the public policy set by the two governments, whose executive leaders appoint all the members of this Board. But he did not know how the Board was going to continue to maintain its responsibility to see that the mission of this University is kept in place — access and excellence, — not access or excellence. Clearly the University has some major thinking and some major prioritizing to do. It is assumed that the University's Administration is doing everything it can to be frugal in all things other than having to do with the academic end of the Institution. Likewise, the people in government have this public policy which they set, and are doing their duty to the best of their ability. They have lots of other problems, there's no question about that. There is an enormous demand for available dollars from all walks of life. And everybody will come and articulate for that which they are patriots of. The Board is not unmindful of other requirements, nevertheless, we are patriots of education by virtue of our service here. And we are going to have to say to them that we can't maintain excellence and complete access with the dollars they give to us. Mr. Fink said he and other Trustees would support the Chancellor and the Chairman in such an action. Or the Board could start taking some hard looks and lay before the people who have the ultimate responsibility, just what the ultimate consequences are. The essence of this University is the faculty, our reason for existence is the student body, and the people in whom we entrust the responsibility of running the University, the presidents, senior administration and staff. He did not feel that as a member of the Board of Trustees, he would be doing right by any one of those three groups if he listened to what other people think is the way to go, who's toes not to step on, who's sensitivities and sense of duties to be concerned about. Therefore, he stated unequivocally and clearly on the record that he will not vote for any more tuition increases for this University, unless the Administration can prove to him that he was not cutting off access to this University and at the same time reducing it from excellence to mediocrity. He stressed that he was making the statement publicly because he wanted to hold himself to it, so that he would not lose faith with himself. He concluded that he would not vote any more tuition increases that would cut off access to a group of students because he believed there were as many diamonds out there waiting to be polished in the City of New York today as there were in 1920, 1930, 1940 and 1950. He did not want to be part of a system that was unwilling to polish those diamonds.

Rev. Pressley advised the Chairman that if the Board was forced to vote on this issue today, he would vote against it, not as a grandstand play to garner support from the public or the community, but because he did not think the Board had taken a comprehensive look at the proposed tuition plan from all of its aspects. He said he had taken his position prior to the April 23 Public Hearing on this issue, which he described as "a non-hearing" because it was held when school was in recess. He felt the Board was doing itself a disservice by not trusting the students and the community, and that the Board was bigger than that. He did not want anyone to get hurt or any smoke bombs to be set off to try to prohibit constructive dialogue. The safety of the Board and the members of the community who come to testify ought to be protected. But clearly there ought to be a hearing where there is a comprehensive discussion of this issue. He agreed with Trustee Fink that it is the State administration's responsibility and the Legislature's responsibility to set fiscal policy for the University. The members of the Board have been appointed as Trustees to the University because they have determined that private citizens could best set educational policy as in the present process. The tuition plan has three tiers, two of which he felt were justifiable. In spite of the actions on the part of those persons who are writing the legislation, he thought that an effective cap on the community college tuition up to $2100 was fair. He supported that. However, any effort to adjust the senior college tuition, particularly when incoming students are told that it will cost them more, begins to speak to the access question in a negative manner. Incoming students are being sent a negative message — that it will cost them more to participate. It was noted that any new public assistance from the federal level does not begin to trigger until September 1993. He stressed that the federal transfer payments come in connection with poor students, and rightfully so. Therefore, he was comfortable with the belief that the poor, the majority of whom are minorities, would not be run out of the system, because they are needed to support it. The State has an obligation to try to get as much of the federal money into this system as any other state or any other persons with the responsibility for fiscal policy. The Board has the responsibility to make sure that it is fair and equitable, and that it doesn't discourage incoming students. Rev. Pressley said he was opposed to the tuition increase because it did not represent sound educational policy. It could not be demonstrated that financial assistance acts as an incentive to learning. To illustrate his point he stated that of the 13,000 freshmen, going into the senior colleges roughly 55% of them are eligible for full TAP and full PELL. Nevertheless, more than 40% of those eligible will be out of the system after the first year. He felt those statistics suggested that within its educational policy...
development, the University is playing into some sinister shell game that it will lose. He concluded that he would support
the establishment of a fair and equitable tuition for all CUNY students. Rev. Pressley moved that the tuition increase
resolution be deferred back to the Committee on Fiscal Affairs and that the matter be put on the Board's May calendar for
consideration, after having had an appropriate hearing that the public is notified to attend. The motion failed.

Chancellor Reynolds indicated that she had met with Trustee Pressley on two occasions to discuss this policy and to make
sure that he was aware of the considerable level of deliberation by the Administration and the Trustees. She said there
were two reasons why setting tuition policy on this date was late. First, it would be very helpful for people to be able to
plan for what they've got to deal with. And what has perhaps been even grimmer is, because of the very late Board
meetings at which it has enacted tuition increase in the past, families and students did not have knowledge of what the
tuition levels were going to be in the future. Secondly, the Board's action today will mean that the University will be able to
recover tuition. At this time the City and State will allow campuses to retain more tuition money than they did in the past
in an effort to try to help them through this difficult time. So Board action today will enable the University to have the tuition
revenue that is much needed by these campuses for summer terms. She stressed that the agony was shared by all. She
then noted her letter to the Chronicle of Higher Education in which she discussed the growing concept in this nation that a
lot of people can pay the full tuition level and then that can help the others who cannot. She disagreed with this concept,
pointing out that CUNY and public higher education in the nation were founded on the notion that support for its bright
talented students was a right, and something that should be there for them. She remarked that she had received her
education through State Institutions, and conjectured that most of people around the table had done the same. Chancellor
Reynolds said she believed there had been a floundering in the will to provide adequate public support, and agreed with
the sentiments expressed by the Board of Trustees. Her concern, and that of the presidents, she said, was to deal with the
hand that was dealt and to take this enrollment for the summer and the fall. She pledged to the Board her untiring efforts to
work towards a better fiscal resolution to support this magnificent University.

At this point Mr. Fink left the meeting.

Trustee Picken made the following statement regarding Tuition:

Certainly no one around this table wishes to increase tuition, least of all me. The University Faculty Senate has historically
been opposed to any increase in tuition. However, I recognize the position in which the University finds itself and
applaud a number of the features that are built into the proposal that is before this Board.

I appreciate the interest in mitigating the effect of the increase authorized by the Governor and the Legislature for
continuing students. For senior-college students, this will be the second year in a row that the University has undertaken
to lessen the impact of the proposed increase as it affects them. This is certainly to be commended.

For new entrants to the University, the increase in tuition appears an especially heavy blow. However, I have listened to
the Chancellory's explanation of the changes in the availability of Federal aid and am persuaded that this will lessen the
impact of the increase for those students least able to afford it. I also admire the free semester provision, both as a cost
savings to students who may have outstayed their aid eligibility and as a reward for completing their baccalaureate
program.

I am impressed with the thoughtfulness that has gone into the preparation of the proposal that is before you, and I
commend its unique and responsive elements to you.

At this point Mr. Fink rejoined the meeting.

Dr. Bernstein remarked that the discussion concerning the tuition increase had been a very interesting but a very difficult
one in which to participate. She stressed that the situation was not so grave and that she did not believe that the University
would reach Armageddon in the near future. She did not discount the possibility of things getting better next year or two
years from now, and the country coming out of the recession. Therefore, she felt it was a mistake to talk in catastrophic
terms. No one likes to raise tuition but one does it when one has to, for next year and for perhaps the year after, in order to
keep the Institution and the services it provides for the thousands of students whose numbers always increase, even when
there have been tuition increases. With the fairly modest increase in tuition which is being proposed, it is hoped that the
University will have enough money to promote programs, without imposing great stress on students. She then commented
on one aspect of the proposal – that it will be more expensive at the beginning and less expensive at the end of the five year period for getting a degree. Many CUNY students drop out long before they come to the last year, or the last two years, so they wouldn't get any benefit from the decline in tuition during the last years. She said she would prefer to see some standard figure for tuition in each of the semesters from beginning to end. The University does not know how many will drop out and not get the benefit of the free tuition in the last semester. The graduation rate is somewhere around 27%–28% in the senior colleges after five years. The rate does go up if the student stays on or continues his studies several years beyond that. She concluded that she hoped the Board could pass something like the proposed increase and that the University could get on with its work.

Chancellor Reynolds said she had communicated with the college presidents who believed that the graduation rate would be increased by providing the free final semester. Also, if enough time is allowed for the students – eight to nine years – the graduation rate is about 45%, which compares favorably with the nationwide graduation rates of 44%. It is believed that this can be boosted with the College Preparatory Initiative, which the Board ratified today, and some of the other things being done towards better retention and graduation. Dr. Bernstein indicated that she was aware that the results are better when looked at nine to ten years after the student entered, however, nine years is a very long time. She acknowledged that while it is known that every student will not graduate in four years, it is hoped that they would graduate within five or six years. She felt that the type of education received by students who took as long as nine years, probably leaving and reentering, was not the standard. In response to Mr. Howard's question of whether the percentage of graduates mentioned included full-time and part-time students, the Chancellor said that the number represented all students who begin their studies with the intention of getting a baccalaureate degree; 45% have achieved the degree at the end of nine years, which she reiterated, compares favorably with the nationwide average of 44%.

Ms. Carrlon commended the Chancellor and her staff for endeavoring to come up with ways to mitigate a tuition increase to try to deal with the students now in the system and to ease the burden. She said the Chancellor's approach was novel and innovative, and illustrative of the reason the Board had brought this Chancellor in. Nevertheless, she was opposed to the tuition increase and joined with Trustee Fink in his eloquent expression of sentiments. The Board can no longer disregard the clear message it is getting from State and City legislators that there isn't a real commitment to education, particularly an affordable, quality education. It appears that our leaders no longer see access to a free or affordable college education as a governmental objective. With this tuition increase, she felt strongly that the Board was avoiding, once again, the tough issues and questions that the University must grapple with. The University has to respond to what is clearly a lack of public support for this institution. She declared that she would vote against the tuition increase.

Mr. DeGiudice said that over the years the Board had talked about making some basic changes to try to affect the revenue and expenditure pattern, but somehow always got into a different cycle which has led, at least over the last three years, to tuition increases. Drawing from his experience in public life, he felt that the way to affect institutions was to let the policy makers know what the boundaries are. He suggested that after this tuition increase the Board should, in the fall, have a consideration by the Fiscal Affairs Committee and the Board to adopt a resolution then and there about what its policy is vis-a-vis tuition, to lock in that revenue source. That may not be a good message as far as the colleges, the Administration, the union, faculty, Governor or Mayor is concerned, but the Board's position will be clear. Then the University will have to face the consequence of that decision, either limit access or make some changes in excellence. This will not be pretty, but it may be better than eliminating opportunities for people who otherwise might not have them. He emphasized that the Board needed to give some early framework to the decision-making.

Vice Chairperson Everett felt that while raising the tuition is a terrible thing to do, she must do it to avoid the alternative. She was not sure how the University could move forward without the increase. She said she could not tolerate the cynicism that the Board has been experiencing and was disturbed by politicians who speak about supporting education and decreased budgets in the same sentence. Perhaps, she said, it was time the Board started revolting and saying it was not going to vote this way anymore. As a person who went to Brooklyn College and did not pay for that education, it grieved her particularly that people from the middle and the lower economic classes, faced with reduced income, would find it difficult to afford this University anymore. It's a disgrace and we have got to do something very soon to stop this, she concluded.

Mr. Cencl reiterated the sense of sadness, reluctance, and discouragement, Indicating that he too had been on the Board for a number of years, having to vote on tuition increases, and having always been saddened by the It. He warned that a script was beginning to develop. Mr. Cencl agreed with Trustee Fink that the time has come to take a stand and to build in
the policy that Trustee Del Guidice just described. Following the vote, whatever direction it takes, he said the Board must meet, and reason, and take a stand, and convince Albany that education is not only a priority for the City of New York or The City University, but for a country which has a very serious part to play globally. He shared a comment he heard a leading economist make, referring to a strike "What the American worker has to realize is that they are in competition with the Third World." Mr. Cencel continued that the country had to learn to educate its people, teaching them not only how to work properly and productively, but to come up with creative ideas. These ideas come out of the youth. We can't cut that off. State government, ours and others, must make education a priority or we are going to be loosing that creative pool that we generate in The City University. He stated that he would vote for this proposal because he thought the University was at a point where not much else could be done. But he urged preparation by moving beyond the vote to the near future, by taking some kind of a strong stand that will convince Albany that this cannot continue. In conclusion he said, It is wrong for our Administrators, It is wrong for our students, and It is hurting the City of New York because we are Its University.

Chairman Murphy submitted the following letter from Trustee Jean LaMarre, Chairman of the Student Senate, for inclusion in the record:

Dear Fellow Members of the CUNY Board of Trustees:

I would like to thank you, particularly Chairman Murphy and Vice Chairperson Everett, for allowing my comments to be read publicly and included in the record of today's meeting. I apologize for not being in attendance to personally deliver these remarks. I hope that after this statement has been read, however, that the student body of this University will understand why I have chosen not to participate in this sad proceeding.

This is the third time, during my brief tenure as a trustee, that I have been invited to a meeting to vote on an increase of tuition. For some around this table, it is perceived as an unfortunate exercise in fiduciary responsibility, but for me, and the constituency that I represent -- the students of the City University, the victims of these actions -- it seems more like an exercise in masochism.

Moreover, this is the fourth straight month that there has been at least one item on the Board's calendar that was designed to have a taxing impact on the rights and/or the wallets of our students.

Last month, I expressed the collective frustration of the student leadership of this University in opposition to a plan to restructure the college associations, the student activity fee allocating bodies at each CUNY unit. This frustration was misconstrued as something else entirely by all other trustees, and rather than discuss the issue on the merits, a proposal that had absolutely no documentation to support it was brought to an immediate vote and passed with only one objection, my own.

Today, my level of frustration and anger is even greater. So rather than say something I might regret, even though I'm sure that a good number of students would like to see the student trustee take the University to task, I would prefer that this statement be read into the record.

At my designated seat at the table, flowers have been placed in memory of the unknown CUNY students that won't be able to attend college because of these tuition hikes, or who will have been deterred from enrolling at CUNY because of the University's college preparatory initiative. Today is a day of mourning.

Before concluding, however, I'd like to make some brief comments about the University's plan for tuition.

First, while a $350 tuition hike for continuing students is preferable to a $500 tuition hike, it is still $350 too much...so please, no curtain calls.

Secondly, the free tuition component to the proposal is particularly interesting. Last summer, as you may recall, the Board of Trustees adopted my resolution calling for an eventual return to free tuition. Although today's action can hardly be called a step in the right direction, quite the contrary, the policy does allow for public discourse on the idea of free tuition...and provides a glimmer of hope for free tuition advocates.
I find it ironic, however, that on the same day we're supposedly rewarding timely graduation, we're also considering the fate of the college preparatory initiative, which will lengthen the college careers of many students.

Moreover, unless the tuition hike plan is coupled with a moratorium on tuition hikes, the two tier system could pose a huge problem.

In conclusion, I urge the Secretary of the Board to record my opposition to the following items.

Item 4L the tuition hike measure; Item 5B, the plan for financial exigency at the Senior Colleges; and Item 7A, the college preparatory initiative.

To my colleagues on the Board, I can only suggest that you allow your conscience to be your guide.

Have a nice day.

Respectfully,
Jean C. LaMarre

Chairman Murphy stated that there is so much pain in this City and State because of the fiscal crises we've had in the last couple of years. He did not know when we would exit from it but suspected that a lot of time could be spent grappling with the problem. He hoped that the coming presidential campaign would help the nation to set its priorities and provide a cleansing and re-invigoration. Each of the Board members is a patriot to a number of concerns and causes, and that pain he spoke of is being experienced not only at the University, but also at other places – human service, social service, health service. He indicated that he thought the Trustees' discussion had been good, but it was understood that it could not be business as usual going beyond today. In the period ahead, the Trustees must attempt to make the case for higher education very emphatically. Clearly the demand for access to this University is demonstrated in the enrollment numbers. Clearly, this University for 145 years has functioned admirably and has academic strength. It delivers. It accommodates the kaleidoscope of people here in New York, as it keeps changing before our eyes. The Trustees have a lot of things to consider during the next few months. The Chairman described himself as a cautious optimist, indicating that he thought the fiscal situation would improve at the margins a little bit, giving the University some room to maneuver and do some things for the next fiscal year and beyond. However, not being a Pollyanna, he was aware that the recovery would be a very long and painful one. He felt that with their vote today, the Trustees were acting in the best interest of this University and this City. He voted neither reluctantly nor with enthusiasm for the motion, but with the sense that it was the right thing to do at the moment. With that, he indicated that he would vote the motion.

Mrs. Bloom, Ms. Carrlon, and Rev. Pressley voted "NO."

M. DECLARATION OF FINANCIAL EXIGENCE -- THE SENIOR COLLEGES AND CENTRAL OFFICE:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York hereby declares that a state of financial exigency exists for the senior colleges and the central office for the 1992-93 fiscal year; and be it further

RESOLVED, That in accordance with the declaration of financial exigency, implementation of The Guidelines and Procedures for Discontinuance of Instructional Staff Personnel Mandated by Financial Exigency, as approved at the time of implementation, is hereby authorized at the senior colleges and the central office.

EXPLANATION: During 1991-92 the University has faced a severe financial crisis because of repeated mid-year budget reductions in addition to funding cutbacks already mandated in the University's adopted 1991-92 budget. The adopted 1992-93 New York State Budget, approved by the Governor and the New York State Legislature, contains additional severe cutbacks, continuing the trend of the past few years. Financial exigency within the senior colleges will necessitate, among other cost saving measures, the discontinuance of Instructional Staff personnel whose appointments are in effect. After consultation with senior college presidents, and the other appropriate University-wide officials and bodies, it is recommended that the Board of Trustees declare a condition of financial exigency at the senior colleges and the central office for the 1992-93 fiscal year.
Mr. Howard stated that at the Fiscal Affairs Committee meeting there was some concerns from faculty that procedurally, staff to the presidents had not met with the appropriate committees on the campus. However, to date he had been advised, that all of this was done and that everybody on the senior campuses was very much up-to-date on what the declaration means.

In response to Mr. Howard's request that the Committee on Fiscal Affairs and the Board be advised of the status of the New York City Technical and John Jay College issue and of any long-term commitment for these colleges, Chancellor Reynolds said that this year, within the additional funds that the City received from the State $13 million was earmarked for the colleges. However, she has spoken with Mr. Patrick Bulgaro, First Deputy Director, N.Y.S. Division of the Budget, and several others to indicate that this was still, in her view, although helpful and solving the problem for this year, not a continuing solution. So the resolution of that matter in the State's budget is at the top of the agenda. Some of the Trustees who are particularly concerned with this issue have been helpful. This is a State funding obligation and she felt there was some willingness to look at it again, in the context of the State's budget, for a permanent solution.

Trustee Pickens made the following statement:

Unfortunately, the Board would seem to have no alternative to the measure under consideration. The State's failure, which has been so often alluded to this evening, to fund the senior colleges at a level which would allow them to fulfill their mission has brought us to this sorry state of affairs. After the repeated cuts in the operating budgets of the past several years, there is now nothing left to cut but personnel, and that will probably include discontinuing personnel whose appointments are in effect. Access will be diminished, classes will become even more crowded, student completion rates will decline.

The faculty of City University have heroically faced their ever worsening working conditions. Through dedicated effort and enormous sacrifice, they have succeeded in giving an ever increasing number of students the quality education they deserve and for which our University has been noted. This, despite an almost total lack of supplies and support services. But maintaining the quality of the academic program is becoming increasingly difficult. As we consider the impact of the next reductions in University funding, we can expect:

- Fewer sections and larger class sizes,
- Increased difficulty in registering for required introductory courses and finding needed courses to meet graduation requirements, lengthening the stay for many students,
- Teaching load increases, under contemplation at some colleges, will lead to a diminution in the research and scholarly productivity of the faculty; the sine qua non for national consideration as an institution of consequence,
- All these factors may combine to make it more difficult to recruit the best young faculty,
- The degrees students earn may become less valued; certainly the ultimate irony for students who have labored so long and hard to achieve their degree.

A critical element in developing plans under conditions of financial exigency that have the understanding, if not the approval, of the faculty is the quality of the consultation process on the campuses. Consultation is the role assigned most faculty governance bodies, including the University Faculty Senate. My dictionary defines "consult" as "to seek advice or information of; to exchange views; to confer." Nowhere included in the definition is a model which permits the convening of a group of people, telling them what you propose to do, and then dismissing them.

Over the past four months, the University Faculty Senate has been engaged with the Chancellory and the members of the Board of Trustees in "consultation" on a number of important policy matters. Revisions to the Bylaws on student disciplinary procedures and on the college associations, the implementation plan for the College Preparatory Initiative, and the newly proposed retrenchment guidelines have all benefitted from the appropriate involvement of elected faculty
representatives. The benefit is twofold. Not only are the policies enhanced, but they come to this Board with the participation of the faculty rather than active opposition. I submit that the model that has worked so well for this Board should be the model expected to be undertaken as the consultation process on the development of a retrenchment plan goes forward at the colleges.

I would appeal to the presidents to follow scrupulously the provisions for consultation outlined in the retrenchment guidelines during the difficult days ahead, both as a practical matter -- in that only the instructional staff collectively, through its elected representatives, has the depth and breath of knowledge of the institution to come up with a workable plan -- and also because of the fact that any other course of action will have a devastating effect on morale.

At this point Dr. Bernstein, Dr. Jacobs, Mrs. Carrion, Mr. Badillo, Mrs. Everett, and Mr. Fink left the meeting.

NO. 6. COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS: RESOLVED, That following items be approved.

A. HIGH PRIORITY TAX PROVISIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION:

WHEREAS, Both House and Senate passed tax bills containing high priority provisions that could significantly benefit higher education; and

WHEREAS, In 1992 a House–senate Conference Agreement will be negotiated and enacted into law; and

WHEREAS, Two key positions are currently being considered, including a permanent authorization for Section 127, Employer Educational Assistance; and allowing the deduction of interest on student loans; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That we urge the N.Y. members of Congress to support these provisions in any final tax legislation agreed to in the 102nd Congress; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That we recommend that a copy of this resolution be sent to all offices of members of the N.Y. congressional delegation.

At this point Mrs. Everett and Mr. Fink rejoined the meeting.

Mrs. Bloom reported that this resolution was intended to express the Board's support for the maintenance of key benefits that aid the University's students, including employer educational assistance benefits and allowances for the deduction of Interest on student loans. The Committee on Public Affairs recommended that this public policy resolution be adopted in time for appropriate conference discussions on higher education.

Mrs. Bloom commended Chancellor Reynolds for her appearances on two important television shows this past weekend: "The Wall Street Journal Report" and "The CNN Newsmakers," which focused on the costs and the value of college education and provided important opportunities for viewers to appreciate CUNY's prominence and place in higher education. Mrs. Bloom then called attention to the annual presentation of the Salk Awards, which will take place on Wednesday, May 27, 9:30-11:30 A.M. in Room 1700 of the Graduate School and University Center. She urged all Trustees to attend this important event. Finally, she congratulated Vice Chairperson Edith Everett and the CUNY community on the success of the recent CUNY job fair, which served almost 4,500 students. The Committee on Public Affairs will report back to the Board on how many CUNY students were interviewed and secured employment. The fact that so many corporate and agency employers were present was a tribute to the hard work of the event organizers and the high quality of CUNY's graduates.
NO. 8. HONORARY DEGREES: RESOLVED, That the following honorary degrees, approved by the appropriate faculty body and recommended by the Chancellor, be presented at the commencement exercises as specified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE:</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROOKLYN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Burns</td>
<td>Doctor of Humane Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther M. Conwell</td>
<td>Doctor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CITY COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman Knapp</td>
<td>Doctor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE SCHOOL &amp; UNIVERSITY CENTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Friedan</td>
<td>Doctor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN JAY COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Collins Snow</td>
<td>Doctor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW SCHOOL AT QUEENS COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Abzug</td>
<td>Doctor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz W. Alexander</td>
<td>Doctor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Jackson</td>
<td>Doctor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Tso</td>
<td>Doctor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEHMAN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Weaver</td>
<td>Doctor of Humane Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDGAR EVERS COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrlie Evers Williams</td>
<td>Doctor of Humane Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT SINAI MEDICAL SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon M. Lederman</td>
<td>Doctor of Humane Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret E. Mahoney</td>
<td>Doctor of Humane Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor A. McKusick</td>
<td>Doctor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph G. Perpich</td>
<td>Doctor of Humane Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon E. Rosenberg</td>
<td>Doctor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENS COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rosenblum</td>
<td>Doctor of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henryk M. Wisniewski</td>
<td>Doctor of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 P.M.

SECRETARY GENEVIEVE MULLIN
GOVERNANCE PLAN OF HUNTER COLLEGE

ARTICLE I

Section 1

The Hunter College Senate shall be established as the legislative body of the College with authority to determine College policy on all matters not reserved now or hereafter by Education Law or Board of Trustees Bylaws to the President of Hunter College, to other officers or duly constituted bodies of the College or The City University, or the Board of Trustees.

Effective as of the first meeting of the Senate, the Present Hunter College Faculty Council is to be considered dissolved and its powers assumed by the College Senate under terms of this Plan.

ARTICLE II

Section 1

As the College legislative agency, the Senate shall have policy making powers in the following areas:

A. Curriculum and related education matters.
B. Academic requirements and standards of academic standing.
C. College development, review and forward planning of facilities, staff, and fiscal requirements.
D. Instruction and the evaluation of teaching.
E. Safeguarding the academic freedom of ALL members of the Hunter College community.
F. Other matters which may be subsequently assigned to the legislative prerogatives of Hunter College.

In addition to its legislative powers, the Senate shall have the right to express itself formally as an advisory body in any area it considers important, and to transmit its recommendations to the cognizant authorities.

There shall be completed, no later than by the end of the third year, a thorough and impartial review of the composition, structure, and functions of the College Senate by a group empowered to propose, should it so deem necessary, a new version of the governance plan or major revisions thereof in the form of amendments for referendum (Article XIV) and submission to the Board of Trustees, if required. In the meantime, the Senate will use the latitude afforded it under this Plan for continued development of organization and procedures in order to fulfill its mandated functions effectively.

ARTICLE III

Section 1

The Hunter College Senate shall have 200 members, all of them with full voting rights in the Senate, being composed of 57% faculty members, 38% students and 5% representatives of the administration, with seats reserved in the following proportions:

Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors on full-time appointments .................. 44%
Lecturers (full-time), Lecturers (part-time), Adjunct Lecturers, and all other part-time members of the teaching faculty who are not also serving in full-time appointments .................................................. 13%
Undergraduate students - Day Session, other than Department of Academic Skills .................................... 14%
Undergraduate students - Evening Session .................................................................................................. 11%
Undergraduate students - Department of Academic Skills .......................................................................... 2%
Graduate students ........................................................................................................................................ 11%
Administration .......................................................................................................................................... 5%
The College Senate shall schedule regular nominations and elections (other than the initial one—See Article X) once a year during the last four weeks of classes in the spring semester; and it shall convene following such elections no later than June 1. The faculty and the student bodies shall be responsible, through duly constituted organizations, for conducting the elections of their respective representatives in accordance with the terms of this Plan.

ARTICLE IV

Section 1

A. Hunter College is a multifaceted institution which has offerings organized into programs, departments, professional schools, and divisions, the structure and titles of which may change as the needs of its students change. It also has an administrative structure and administrative officers which change in title and function as the college develops. Therefore, wherever the Plan refers to a specific administrative officer (e.g. Dean, Registrar, etc.), or academic unit (e.g. department, school, division, etc.), or academic position (e.g. instructor, lecturer, etc.) such language should be construed to include any equivalent officer, academic unit, or academic position regardless of the particular language that is currently in use. In all such instances not fixed by the Plan, the equivalencies shall be determined by the Administrative Committee of the Senate and approved by the Senate.

B. For the purposes of the Plan, the following equivalencies shall apply:

(i) The word "department" shall mean any unit of the college which elects members to its Personnel & Budget Committee. In addition, for purposes of Article IV, Student Services shall be included as a department.

(ii) The word "division" shall mean any unit of the college which has a P & B Committee consisting of representatives of more than one department but fewer than all the departments. The divisions include: Humanities and the Arts, Programs in Education, Schools of Health Professions, Sciences and Mathematics, and Social Sciences.

Section 2

A. The 88 Senate seats reserved to representatives in the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor on full-time appointments shall be filled as follows:

(i) All departments shall be rank-ordered by the number of such faculty in the department. Each department shall be allocated 2 seats, and the remaining seats shall be allocated by assigning one additional seat to each department from the top of the list down, until the available number is exhausted.

(ii) Each department will fill its allocated seats by nominations from and elections by its faculty members in the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor on full-time appointments.

B. The 56 Senate seats reserved to representatives in the ranks of Lecturer (full-time), Lecturer (part-time), Adjunct Lecturer, or in any other part-time teaching appointment while not also on full-time appointment, shall be filled as follows:

(i) All departments shall be rank-ordered by the number of the department's faculty members in such positions. Each of the first 10 departments in this list shall fill 1 seat by nominations and election from among and by these faculty members.

(ii) In each of the remaining departments that include faculty members in these ranks, the latter shall make nominations for, and elect from among their number, one nominee for one of the 16 remaining Senate seats.

(iii) The remaining seats shall then be filled by an at-large election from among the nominees selected according to paragraph B(ii) above. In this election, votes shall be cast only by the faculty members of the departments to which B(ii) applies who are in the ranks of Lecturer (full-time), Lecturer (part-time), Adjunct Lecturer, or on any other part-time appointment while not also serving on a full-time appointment.
C. The 28 Senate seats reserved to undergraduate students of the Day Session, other than students in the Department of Academic Skills, shall be filled as follows:

(i) Of these seats, 17 shall be reserved to Day Session departmental majors. Towards their election, each department will elect, from nominations made within its own ranks, 2 nominees for these seats. All Day Session Seniors, Juniors, and Sophomores who have declared their major will elect the required number of representatives by an at-large vote among these nominees.

(ii) The remaining 11 Senate seats shall be reserved to Day Session Freshmen and Sophomores who have not as yet declared their major. Candidacy at-large shall be declared by filing a petition meeting the requirements established by the Senate. From the pool of such candidates, the Day Session Freshmen and non-major Sophomores will elect the required number of representatives by an at-large election.

D. The 22 Senate seats reserved to undergraduate students of the Evening Session shall be filled as follows:

(i) All departments shall be rank-ordered by the number of full-time equivalent undergraduate students enrolled in their courses scheduled after 5:00 p.m. In each of the top 10 departments on the list, the Evening Session students affiliated with such a department shall make nominations and elect from their ranks 1 representative.

(ii) Within the terms of this Plan, the Bylaws of the Evening Session Council (Article IX) shall specify procedures for the nomination of candidates in such a fashion as to insure the inclusion of at least one nominee from every department that schedules courses in the Evening Session, and shall provide for the subsequent election of the remaining 12 representatives by an electoral college that consists of the student members of the Evening Session Council.

(iii) For these purposes, any degree or non-degree undergraduate student, more than half of whose program is scheduled after 5:00 p.m., shall have the right to opt for the status of Evening Session student. Doing so shall preclude eligibility to be nominated, or elected to the Senate, or to vote in Senate elections in any other category. An Evening Session student taking a course in a department and who has taken at least one previous course in a department may affiliate with it, but not with more than one department.

E. The 22 Senate seats reserved to graduate students shall be filled as follows:

(i) 15 seats shall be filled by graduate students matriculated in programs offered in the various divisions and the School of Social Work; one seat to each division and the School of Social Work and the remainder shall be allocated in proportion to the total number of matriculated students enrolled. Such allocations shall be recalculated every January, starting in 1982.

(ii) There shall be 4 representatives who are matriculated graduate students and are elected by the matriculated graduate students in an at-large election.

(iii) There shall also be 3 non-matriculated graduate student representatives, elected by the non-matriculated graduate students in an at-large election.

F. Four Senate seats shall be filled by nominations and elections from among and by the students in the Department of Academic Skills. Students may opt for this status, provided they have not yet chosen their major and are taking work in the Department. Doing so precludes their voting or serving in the at-large categories of the Day Session Freshmen and non-major Sophomores.

G. The 10 representatives of the administration shall be appointed by the President of Hunter College.

H. (i) A Senate seat reserved for faculty members with specific rank, or other qualifications (as outlined in Article IV, Sections 2A and B), that remains vacant after the elections scheduled for such seats, shall be filled for the remainder of the regular term by a faculty election conducted by a process approved by the Senate.

(ii) A Senate seat reserved for students with specified sessional, major-non-major, graduate-undergraduate or other qualifications (as outlined in Article IV, Sections C, D, E and F) that remains vacant after the elections scheduled for such seats, shall be filled for the remainder of the regular term by a student election conducted by a process approved by the Senate.
Section 3

For each of the constituencies, defined by the election procedures of Article IV, Section 2, the eligibility to serve and the right to vote shall be based on the same qualifications:

A. For every such category, eligibility to be nominated or elected to the Senate, or to vote in Senate elections, shall require one full semester of service in the specified rank, position, and/or status preceding the semester in which such nominations are made or the elections take place.

B. Students shall be in good standing and, if enrolled — whether matriculated or not.

(i) In the Graduate Program, shall have completed at least 3 hours of credit.

(ii) In the Evening Session, shall have completed at least 6 hours of credit.

C. Those holding appointment to the instructional staff while enrolled in a graduate program at Hunter College under the conditions that make them eligible to stand for election to the Senate and to vote in Senate elections as graduate students shall not be eligible for nomination or election to the Senate or to vote in Senate elections as faculty members. If ineligible to vote as graduate students, enrollment in graduate courses shall not affect eligibility as faculty members.

Section 4

In College-wide referenda and other votes conducted among all members of the instructional staff combined, a ballot cast by a faculty member in the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, or Lecturer (full-time) on full-time annual appointment shall be tallied as a full vote. A ballot cast by a faculty member in the ranks of Lecturer (part-time), Adjunct Lecturer, or any other part-time member of the teaching faculty not also serving on a full-time appointment shall be tallied as a half vote.

Section 5

Certification as to class, status, and standing of students shall be made by the Registrar. Certification as to rank, position, and status of faculty shall be made by the Chief Academic Officer. Appointed representatives of the administration shall be certified to the Senate by name and administrative title.

ARTICLE V

Section 1

At each of its first annual meetings following the new elections, the Senate shall elect from among its members a Chair, a Vice-Chair, a secretary, and such other officers as it deems necessary. Their term of office shall be one year, and the Chair and Vice-Chair shall not serve in their respective offices for more than three consecutive terms.

Section 2

The Chair may, if he or she so desires, appoint a recording secretary with the responsibility for preparing the minutes and keeping the papers of the Senate in order.

Section 3

The Chair, Vice-Chair, and secretary of the Senate, together with the Chair of the Evening Session Council, if an elected officer (Article IX), shall constitute the Administrative Committee of the Senate. The Chair of the Senate shall be the Chair of this Committee which will:

A. Prepare the agenda for regular and special meetings, causing it to be published in the College no less than 10 days before the meeting.
B. Be responsible for having prepared an Administrative Report, presenting the recommendations of the various Senate Committees that are considered routine, this report to be distributed to the representatives 10 days in advance of the meeting. Unless exceptions are taken, this Report will be handled as a single item of the agenda.

C. Assure continuity of the Senate's business between meetings.

ARTICLE VI

Section 1

The regular term of office for representatives shall be 2 years, extending from May 15 of the first year to May 14 of the second year. From the members, elected in the initial election, however, one-half shall be selected by lot in each category to serve a single year only. Hence, in the future, one-half of the Senate seats will be filled by the annual elections. Unexpired terms shall be filled at the next scheduled elections.

Section 2

A vote for recall of a representative may be petitioned either by one-half or by 20 members of the representative's constituency, whichever is smaller. For this purpose, the constituency shall be defined as consisting of no less than the number of votes cast in the election of the representative. Seats vacated by recall shall be filled at the time of the next election for whatever portion may remain of the unexpired term.

ARTICLE VII

Section 1

The Senate shall be empowered to regulate the conduct of its business, including the establishment of a schedule for regular meetings and procedures for calling special meetings. The calendar of regular meetings shall be established sufficiently far in advance to permit its publication in the Registrar's annual College Calendar. The Senate shall develop practical election provisions with a view towards keeping itself as nearly as possible at full strength. It shall have the right to extend the mandated committee structure (Article VIII) by establishing additional standing, special or ad hoc Committees; and it shall set its own rules of procedure and operation, being governed until it does so by Robert's Rules of Order, latest edition.

Section 2

The regular meetings of the Senate shall be open to all members of the Hunter College community qualified to vote in the Senate elections, and all of such members shall have the right to be recognized under procedures to be established by the Senate.

Section 3

A quorum of the Senate and its Committees shall consist of no less than one-half of their voting membership plus one, unless otherwise prescribed in this Plan or specified under procedures established by the Senate.

ARTICLE VIII

Section 1

A. All committees of the Senate shall preserve the spirit of equity regarding sessional, divisional, and other representation of students and faculty, and in the scheduling of meetings. Committee membership shall be open to all members of the faculty and to all students who are eligible for membership on the Senate. They shall be elected by the Senate from among nominations made by a Nominating Committee (Article X) and/or nominations from the floor.

B. When a committee vacancy cannot be filled with a faculty member or student with specified qualifications, that vacancy shall be first reported to the Senate and then may be filled by a faculty member or student, respectively, without regard to the qualifications specified.
Section 2

In reorganizations of the Hunter College administration, Academic Administrators designated to serve ex-officio on standing committees of the Senate shall have responsibility, as nearly as possible, for the same functions as those who are currently designated to serve in such capacity.

Section 3

In the exercise of its responsibility for the design and modification of Hunter College curricula the Senate shall establish two Committees on Course of Study, one graduate and one undergraduate. These committees shall be constituted as follows:

A. The Graduate Course of Study Committee

Six faculty members who teach in the graduate program, at least one faculty member from each of the divisions; one graduate student from each of the divisions; and serving without vote the Deans of the divisions, and the Chief Librarian or designee.

B. The Undergraduate Course of Study Committee

One faculty representative from each of the divisions, and two from the divisions serving at-large, including one representing the Evening Session; one student from each division, at least one of whom is from the Evening Session, and one student in the SEEK program; and, serving without vote, the Chief Academic Officer, or designee, the Dean of the Evening Session, the Deans of the divisions, and the Chief Librarian or designee.

C. Both of these Committees shall be chaired by faculty members, elected by the voting members of the Committee.

D. There shall also be Divisional Committees on Curriculum, each composed of a Dean (with vote) and at least one faculty member and one student in equal numbers from each department in the Division, elected by the department as it may decree in its Bylaws (see Article XII). These Divisional Committees shall review departmentally initiated proposals or may initiate their own proposals for programs or curriculum changes, submitting such proposals for consideration to the appropriate Senate Committee on Course of Study.

In the area of undergraduate curriculum, they shall have the right to act on all changes in title, credit, and description of existing or approved new courses. Their reports to the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee on such matters shall be attached, without further review or discussion by the latter, to its report presented to the College Senate for approval. Divisional Curriculum Committee decisions may be appealed by the departments to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Course of Study. Matters on which departmental appeals are pending shall not be forwarded to the Senate, and a two-thirds majority of the Senate Committee members present and voting shall be required to override such divisional decisions.

Section 4

A. The Undergraduate Course of Study Committee shall concern itself through study and research with policies relating to the curricular organizations. All proposals pertaining to:

(i) Basic Prescriptions.
(ii) New Majors.
(iii) New Minors.
(iv) Credit and Major or Minor concentration.
(v) Degree Requirement.
(vi) Interdisciplinary Program.
(vii) Experimental courses shall be submitted to the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee for action.

Final decision on all curricular proposals is to be made by the College Senate, except in cases where final authority is vested in the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee by the Senate.
B. The Graduate Course of Study Committee shall review all Master's Programs and all graduate courses to be listed in the Hunter College Bulletin on graduate studies, whether on the Master's or the Doctoral level.

Section 5

There shall be a Committee on Undergraduate Academic Requirements consisting of 11 voting members: 6 faculty members, one faculty member from each division including three from the Day Session, two from the Evening Session and one member of the Department of Academic Skills; and 5 students of whom two shall be Day Session students, two Evening Session students, and one student in the SEEK Program. The Dean of Students, the Dean of the Evening Session or their designee, the Assistant Vice President for Administrative Services and the Assistant Dean for Advising and Counseling shall serve without vote. The Chair shall be a faculty member elected by the voting membership of the Committee. Its functions shall include the formulation of policy regarding methods of grading, requirements of student attendance, regulations relating to withdrawal from courses, and admissions not specified by Board of Trustees Bylaws.

Section 6

There shall be a Committee on Student Standing, consisting of 5 faculty members, serving with vote, and serving without vote the Dean of Students, the Dean of the Evening Session or their designees and the Assistant Dean for Advising and Counseling. The voting faculty membership shall include at least two members of the Evening Session Council and a representative of the Department of Academic Skills. The Chair of the Committee shall be elected by its voting membership. The Committee shall be responsible for the evaluation of student records, for recommending to the Senate the award of degrees to qualified students, and for formulating policy, for adoption by the Senate, on the retention of students and the maintenance of academic standards.

Section 7

In order to insure effectiveness, compatible procedures and comparable standards in the evaluation of teaching and teachers by the students throughout the departments (Article XII), and to assure the formal consideration of the results of such appraisals in the professional evaluation of members of the teaching faculty, the Senate shall establish a Committee on Evaluation of Teaching. This Committee will, among other things, be responsible for: the preparation of standard guides for an evaluation questionnaire to provide opportunities, under its supervision, for some departmental variation in the details of the evaluation procedure; continuing review of the scope, validity, content, and efficacy of the questionnaires actually utilized; and the compilation, analysis, and publication of the data produced by such questionnaires in order to facilitate widespread understanding of the purposes and results of the evaluation procedure.

The Senate Committee on Evaluation of Teaching will consist of 12 members, all with vote: 7 students and 5 faculty members. If a student has been elected to the Administrative Committee of the Senate, that student will serve as a committee member, and chair the committee.

Section 8

There shall be established a Master Plan Committee of the Senate, consisting of one faculty member from each division; an equal number of students at least one each elected from the three sessions and from SEEK, and a Chair, elected by the Senate without constraint as to category. In addition, the Chief Academic Officer and the Vice President for Administration or their designees shall serve as non-voting members. This Committee will be the general College development planning group, concerning itself with the priorities that affect long term projections as regards programs and facilities. It will make policy recommendations on these matters for adoption by the Senate, and it will be responsible for drafting the annual revision of the Hunter College portion in the CUNY Master Plan, submitting such draft for approval to the Senate.

Section 9

The Senate shall establish a Committee on the Budget, consisting of one faculty member from each division; the Director of SEEK, an equal number of students, including at least one elected from each of the three sessions; and a Chair elected by the Senate without constraint as to category. The Chief Academic Officer, the Vice President for Administration and designee will serve ex-officio without vote.
The Committee on the Budget shall annually develop the guidelines which, on review by the Senate and approval by the President of Hunter College, will be followed by the departments in the preparation of their projected budgets. It will review the resulting consolidated annual budget of the College and report on it to the Senate.

In addition, it will advise the President, at the latter's discretion, on the apportionment of instructional resources, budget, and space allocated to the College.

Section 10

The Senate shall establish a Committee on Grade Appeals, consisting of 4 faculty members and 3 students, and preserving the spirit of equity regarding sessional representation of students and faculty. The Committee on Grade Appeals will consider grade appeals in which the student or faculty member involved takes exception to the decision of the Departmental Grade Appeals Committee. The Committee on Grade Appeals shall establish guidelines for procedures to be followed in its review of grade appeals and will report its decisions in each case to the parties concerned, the department Chair, and to the Registrar. The decision of the Grade Appeals Committee is final. The Committee shall also make an annual statistical report to the Senate.

Section 11

The Senate shall establish a Committee on the Calendar, consisting of one faculty member from each of the divisions and the School of Social Work, and a faculty member teaching in the evening, an equal number of students at least one each from Day Session, Evening Session, and Graduate, and 4 ex-officio members (Dean of Students or designee, Associate Dean for the Evening Session, Assistant Vice President for Administrative Services, and Director of Financial Aid). The Committee on the Calendar will make recommendations on the College Calendar, and, in consultation with the Faculty Personnel & Budget Committee, on the Bell Schedule. The Committee will also evaluate existing registration procedures and make recommendations regarding changes in registration procedures.

Section 12

There shall be a Committee on Departmental Governance, consisting of one faculty member and one student from each division, and one member of the administration (all with vote). The Committee on Departmental Governance shall: (a) make recommendations to the Senate on standards for Departmental Bylaws; (b) review Departmental Bylaws and Amendments approved by departments and make recommendations for Senate action; (c) make recommendations to the Senate on alleged infractions of Departmental Bylaws.

Section 13

Administrative search committees shall be constituted for all administrators (full deans and above) who, because of the nature of their policy making, have a significant impact on academic affairs and on the rights and welfare of the students and the faculty. The proceedings of search committees shall be confidential.

Different search committee staffing procedures may be appropriate for administrators who have college-wide impact and those who affect primarily only their divisions. In any procedure adopted, the Senate shall be responsible for nominating the panel of search committee candidates and search committee Chairs from whom the College President will select committee and the search committee Chair.

The search committee shall have the responsibility of nominating candidates for administrative positions to the College President who shall have the final authority to make recommendations to the CUNY Board of Trustees.

Section 14

The Senate shall establish a standing Committee on Charter Review, consisting of one faculty member from each division; an equal number of students; one member of the Administration to be designated by the President who shall serve ex-officio; and a Chair elected by the Senate.
The Committee shall be empowered to review the composition, structure and functions of the Hunter College Senate and to propose to the Senate amendments to the Governance Plan in accordance with the provisions of Article XIV, Section 2.

ARTICLE IX

Section 1

There shall also be established an Evening Session Council, to operate under Bylaws and according to procedures that are devised by a faculty/student body, established for this purpose by the Dean of the Evening Session, and that are approved by the College Senate. Its membership shall include the Dean and Associate Dean of the Evening Session, at least one faculty representative from each department or its equivalent, elected where possible on the basis of nominations from the ranks of faculty who teach more than one half of their program in the Evening Session, and at least one student representative from each department or its equivalent, elected from and by the ranks of affiliated Evening Session students.

Section 2

At least one member of this Evening Session Council shall be included in every standing committee of the College Senate, with the exception of the Committee on Graduate Curriculum.

Section 3

The Evening Session Council shall have the following responsibilities:

A. To develop and recommend to the President of Hunter College required improvements in the supporting services (library, business office, registrar, etc.) during the evening hours.

B. To provide the Administrative Committee of the College Senate with agenda items of concern to the Evening Session that are not the responsibility of existing Senate Committees.

C. To organize its student membership as an electoral college in filling the 12 at-large seats on the Senate for Evening Session students, pursuant to nomination and election procedures to be specified in the Evening Session Council Bylaws.

D. To identify, review, and give focus to matters of interest to the Evening Session, with the right to express itself as an advisory body on all Evening Session matters and to transmit its recommendations to the cognizant authorities.

ARTICLE X

Section 1

It shall be the responsibility of the President of Hunter College to set the place and time of the first election within thirty days of the ratification (Article XV) of this Plan, to convene the newly elected Senate for its first meeting, and to function as its Chair until the first slate of officers has been elected.

Section 2

The next order of business shall be the review and adoption of the Evening Session Council Bylaws and the seating of the student representatives at-large, elected by the electoral college of Evening Session Council student members, provided such elections are found to have taken place in consonance with the approved Bylaws.

Section 3

The Senate shall then proceed with the election of a Nominating Committee, so that nominations for membership on the standing committees can be made. This Committee shall be composed of 4 faculty representatives, 4 student representatives, and one Chair without vote. Ties shall be reported to the Senate.
ARTICLE XI

Nothing in the terms of this Plan shall be construed to prevent the continuation, or the establishment in the future, of student governments and faculty organizations under instruments of governance which do not arrogate onto such bodies the exercise of functions properly mandated by this Plan to the College Senate, or any body or committee thereof.

ARTICLE XII

Section 1

It shall be the responsibility of the individual departments to devise, to change as required and - after approval by the Senate - to publish their own Bylaws, providing for a departmental policy committee or committees, a Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching, and such other committees as College and Board of Trustees Bylaws may require or departmental preference may indicate.

Section 2

It is the intent that departments, given the differences in their size and variations in their programs, shall have and exercise substantial latitude in devising their policy making structures, provided that they assure by representation and schedule the greatest possible opportunity for participation. Large departments may find it expedient to have separate departmental policy committees for each of the three sessions, capped by an appropriate arrangement for coordination between them. In departments which decide to staff only a single Departmental Policy Committee, this Committee shall include at least one student representative of any session in which courses are offered and, for any session in which more than two members of the department teach courses, at least one faculty representative who teaches a course in that session. It shall also schedule its meetings so as to permit as much participation as possible. Departmental policy bodies shall include equal numbers of voting faculty and student members, and there shall be one among them whose duties include that of reviewing the adequacy of departmental governance and to initiate proposals for change if deemed necessary.

Departmental Bylaws shall also provide for the review of curriculum proposals. In small departments, this may be assigned as one of its duties to the Departmental Policy Committee. In larger departments, a distinct curriculum committee, or even separate committees on the graduate and the undergraduate curriculum, may be specified.

Section 3

An important departmental function is the evaluation of faculty course work, to be governed by the following basic considerations:

A. Student evaluations of faculty teaching and course handling is to be a significant factor in the professional appraisal of faculty performance for purposes of reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

B. Student evaluations of faculty should be made routinely each semester in all college courses.

C. A standing Departmental Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching, composed almost entirely of student majors in the Department but including a single faculty member with an alternate to insure faculty/student liaison within the Department, shall be responsible for the distribution of the questionnaire and the management of the evaluation in each department. Its purview is to extend to all matters of administration and interpretation of the adopted teacher evaluation procedures.

D. Each semester's questionnaire results are to be submitted to the Department Chair by the Chair of the Committee on the Evaluation of Teachers for use in the duly constituted procedures of professional appraisal.

E. There is also to be faculty evaluation of course handling, based on observation and interview of all faculty members in the Department.
F. As to non-tenured faculty:

(i) A strongly negative student questionnaire response for a faculty member for a semester is to be the basis for discussion of the results by the Chair of the department or a designee with the faculty member before reappointment for a second year.

(ii) Strongly negative student questionnaire responses for a faculty member for 5 successive semesters are to be strongly presumptive basis for a departmental recommendation of non-reappointment of this faculty member. Such a questionnaire response record shall be the basis for a detailed review of a faculty member's prospect for further appointment by the department after consultation with the department Teaching Evaluation Committee and the faculty member.

If after such consultation the Department Personnel and Budget Committee concludes that the questionnaire responses are a valid reflection of the level of classroom competence of the faculty member, it will not recommend reappointment. If a department decides to recommend the reappointment of a faculty member with such a negative response record, the department Student Evaluation Committee shall have the right immediately to appeal this recommendation to the Divisional Dean and if necessary to the President. Pending the outcome of such appeals, any action to reappoint will be held in abeyance.

(iii) The same procedures are to be applied to untenured faculty who are being considered for reappointment with tenure.

(iv) Strongly positive questionnaire responses for a faculty member during the time periods indicated in F. (i) and (ii) above, shall be a strongly presumptive basis for reappointment of the faculty member; such reappointment may be denied by the department if it concludes that the faculty member is not demonstrating prospects of achieving professional growth within the discipline.

(v) Reappointment with tenure shall also be based on other required and significant criteria of professional accomplishments and standing.

G. As to tenured faculty:

Strongly negative student questionnaire responses for a faculty member for 5 successive semesters can be assumed to have given ample opportunity for the kind of reviews, spelled out in the preceding paragraphs of this Article.

They shall therefore be taken as a strongly presumptive basis for a departmental recommendation that the faculty member: (1) either be assigned to non-teaching duties he or she is demonstrably competent to perform; or (2) be brought up on charges of incompetence, with due recognition of all rights under law under applicable collectively negotiated contracts.

ARTICLE XIII

Section 1

The College shall establish the office of Hunter College Ombudsman, providing a full-time secretary and such assistance as the incumbent may choose to staff the operation.

Section 2

Any member of the College community eligible to serve on the Senate, may be nominated or may nominate herself or himself for the position of Hunter College Ombudsman. Such nominations shall be addressed to the Nominations Committee of the Senate which may make its own nominations as well as soliciting them from the floor of the Senate. Each candidate shall be voted on individually by a for-or-against vote, the appointment going to the candidate with the highest plurality of for-voters, provided their number exceeds two-thirds of the number of representatives present and voting.

Section 3

The appointment shall be for a term of three years, removal from office to occur only as a result of disability.

Section 4

The Hunter College Ombudsman shall consider complaints and grievances that are brought by any member of the Hunter College community, concerning a condition or problem in the College, may investigate the conditions giving rise to such complaints and may refer cases to others when the usual appeals procedures seem adequate. The Ombudsman will undertake independent investigations, in general, only if the usual procedures have proved inadequate or have been exhausted, and shall be empowered to recommend action to any officer or to any committee or organization of the College. The Ombudsman shall from time to time report on his or her work to the Hunter College Senate; and may otherwise publicize the results of investigations.
Section 5

The Ombudsman shall be responsible for causing an impartial review to be conducted of the structure and the functioning of the College Senate at the end of two years of operation, with a view to recommending such changes in structure, functions, operations, Bylaws and the like as this review of Senate experience may indicate.

ARTICLE XIV

Section 1

Amendments to the Plan may be proposed for referendum by a three-fourths majority of the Senate members present and voting at any meeting, regular or special, provided that the text of the proposed amendment has been submitted in writing to the Senate membership no less than ten days prior to such meeting. To be approved, amendments shall require a majority vote in each constituency, faculty and students, with no less than 30% of each voting.

Petition for amendment may be filed either by 20% of the Senate membership or by 10% of either the student or the faculty voting constituency.

Section 2

This section is an amendment to Section 1 of Article XIV and, preserving the spirit of equity regarding sessional representation of students and faculty, governs the possible amendment of all articles of the Plan except the total percentages of the faculty, student, and administration representations as set forth in Article III, Section 1.

A. An amendment may be proposed by the Charter Review Committee or by written petition to the Administrative Committee bearing the signatures of not less than 20% of the Senate members or 200 members of the Hunter College community.

B. Upon receipt, the Administrative Committee will schedule as the first order of business, a First Reading of the proposed amendment, not later than the second regular meeting following its submission date, for discussion without vote.

C. A Second Reading will take place at the next Senate meeting, at least 27 days later, the complete text having been mailed to all Senate members and to the chief officer of the faculty organizations and the student governments. At such meeting, the proposed Amendment shall be subject to amendment from the floor by a 3/4 vote of those present and voting. After debate on the proposed Amendment as submitted and amended, the Amendment will be formally proposed if it receives a 3/4 vote of all those present.

D. A Third Reading will be the first order of business after the election of Senate Officers at the first meeting of the Senate after the 14th of May (Article VI, Section 1). Approval by written ballot by 3/4 of all those present shall constitute adoption, which shall be certified by the Chairperson to the President.

ARTICLE XV

Ratification of this Plan will be completed when it has been:

A. Accepted by a majority of all students and a majority of the instructional staff of Hunter College; provided that at least 30% of each constituency votes.

B. Recommended by the President of Hunter College to the Board of Trustees.

C. Approved by the Board of Trustees.

***********

Adopted by the Board of Higher Education on December 28, 1970, Cal. No.23.