

The Graduate Student Advocate

City University of New York

Volume 2
Number 6

EDITORIAL:

No More Lip Service

The Free Academy is now to go into operation. The experiment is to be tried, whether the highest education can be given to the masses; whether the children of the whole people can be educated; and whether an institution of learning, of the highest grade, can be successfully controlled by the popular will, not by the privileged few, but by the privileged many.

1849 Mission of the Free Academy (City College)

A close reading of all of the press releases issued by the Chancellor's office and the CUNY Board of Trustees will not reveal even the faintest resistance to Governor Mario Cuomo's proposed \$500 tuition hike and \$92 million budget cuts, only the kind of political lip-service now made famous by our "Education President", George Bush. That is, though these two entities, which ostensibly represent our interests, always announce their opposition, at no point do they ever detail a plan to oppose the assault on our university. For example, in an April 18 letter to the CUNY community, James Murphy and Ann Reynolds state in the opening paragraph, that the Board of Trustees, College Presidents, and Central Administration, "advocate the lowest possible tuition for our students." What does their advocacy entail? A tuition increase of only \$200? Where are their principles and their dedication to the long-standing mission of the City University of New York. Indeed, the fence-straddling character of their public rhetoric suggests that they are prepared to actually accede to the mechanics of a narrowly determined legislative process (defined by the Governor) which will include a vote to mask the decidedly undemocratic assault on a public institution. Nowhere do Murphy and Reynolds state that

continued on page 9

Planned Shrinkage of the CUNY System by Tom Smith

The process of offering CUNY students less education for more tuition is once again accelerating. Mid-year, tuition went up \$200/year throughout CUNY, while the budgets and course offerings of many departments, especially in the arts, were slashed. Now Cuomo is proposing another \$92 million cut in state aid, along with another \$500/year tuition hike.

The plan being put forth from the CUNY administration to deal with Cuomo's austerity cuts is planned shrinkage. What is "shrunk" in planned shrinkage is the commitments of city governments and public universities to working and poor people. Planned shrinkage is the managerial strategy to selectively target shrinking resources towards attracting greater revenues. In New York City, money for hospitals and fire companies is cut to make way for an attractive downtown area. Revenues are spent to competitively attract new, greater revenues from a corporate and middle class clientele. New York City uses its funds to make Times Square an attractive place for corporate directors and yuppies to do business and have fun in, thereby hoping to encourage corporations and banks to invest in the New York City economy rather than in L.A. or in Miami. CUNY is attempting to do likewise; for CUNY this will mean the planned reduction of the student body, closing campuses and drastically raising tuition. The administration will attempt to spend its shrinking revenues on creating a "higher quality" education which will attract middle class students who can pay higher tuitions. The justifications and arguments that will be used for doing away with

campuses, services and what remains of open admission and low tuition will be "trimming the fat" and the need to maintain academic "standards."

Leading the pack in recession budgeting is the Hunter plan, designed by the chairman of the Hunter College Senate Budget Advisory Committee, Dr. Randy Filer, a professor here at the Graduate Center as well, which recommends that the Hunter College student body be cut by 20 percent, while tuition and fees increase over the next three years from \$1450 to \$2,259 per year—nearly double Cuomo's figure! According to the Committee's statement, these steps are necessary "to reverse recent trends that are undermining the college's ability to meet its mission and provide the quality of education our students deserve."

Which students does Filer mean? When 20% of the students would be dropped and the other 80% would have to nearly double their already Herculean efforts to pay for their tuition while still studying during the remaining hours of the week, how is CUNY made better able to fulfill its mission? In Filer's spoken presentation, his and the Hunter Committee's real purpose became clearer. Filer was

continued on page 8

CONTENTS

PTU Interview.....	2
Levin & Jeffries Off the Hook.....	3
Latinos at CUNY.....	5
CUNY Budget Cuts.....	8
Graduate School Takeover.....	9
80th Street Takeover.....	10

Dr. Frances Degen Horowitz Is Named President Of The Graduate School

Editor's note: The following text is an edited version of an April 30th CUNY press release.

In a closed session of the April 29th meeting of the CUNY Board of Trustees, the Chair, James P. Murphy, announced the appointment of Dr. Frances Degen Horowitz as President of the Graduate School and University Center, effective September 1st, 1991.

Since 1978, Dr. Horowitz was Vice Chancellor for Research, Graduate Studies and Public Service and Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas. A psychologist by training, and a specialist in child development, particularly that of infants, her scholarship is nationally recognized.

Dr. Horowitz was born and raised in the Bronx and earned her B.A. in Philosophy at Antioch College, her M.Ed. in Elementary Education at Goucher College and her Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology at the University of Iowa in 1959. She joined the faculty of the University of Kansas in 1961 and steadily rose through the administrative ranks. She has held the posts of Professor in the Department of Human Development and Family Life and the Department of Psychology, as well as Senior Scientist in the Bureau of Child Research and Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Dr. Horowitz

established new research centers, increased support for the arts and humanities, strengthened interdisciplinary doctoral programs and provided resources for their development and was actively involved in the recruitment of minority graduate students. She has published more than 100 scholarly articles and has served on the editorial and advisory boards of six scholarly journals.

She has served as a Ford Foundation Fellow, and a consultant to MacArthur Foundation Fellows, and has held teaching and research posts at universities in the United States and Israel. She was also a Fellow at the prestigious Center for the Advanced Study of Behavioural Sciences at Stanford University.

Chairperson Murphy stated that, "Dr. Horowitz has a vision for graduate education, a creative approach to research and public services partnerships, and many skills and talents that will serve the Graduate School and the entire university. We are very grateful to Trustee Calvin O. Pressley who chaired the Search Committee, and all the members for their exemplary work."

Dr. Horowitz succeeds Dr. Harold M. Proshansky who died in December after serving as President of the Graduate School for 18 years. Dr. Steven Cahn has served as Acting President in the interim.

Advocate Congratulates

The selection of Dr. Frances Degen Horowitz as the next President of the Graduate School is a message of good tidings received during CUNY's darkest hour. Dr. Horowitz' experience in and dedication to public education, as well as her sincere interests in student concerns are qualities that a CUNY president should always demonstrate. However, at this time, when CUNY's future looks bleak, and rumours abound that the Graduate School might be closed as the first sacrificial victim of austerity logic, we need an administration that respects and recognizes student rights, and welcomes our attempts to defend our school. We are confident that Dr. Horowitz will bring about this necessary reconciliation and look forward to her arrival for the Fall 1991 semester.



April 1991; Student controlled NAC Building at CCNY

Around & About The Center

Student Action Halts Granting of Degree to Bush's Secretary of Education

At the March 7 meeting of the Graduate Council a proposal to award an honorary degree to Lamar Alexander, President Bush's nominee for Secretary of Education, was rejected after Graduate School student representatives Michael Glassman and Jerrod Hayes spoke against it. According to minutes of the Graduate Council, a "Doctor of Humane Letters" award, was proposed by Acting Provost Geoffrey Marshall as an incentive for Alexander to speak at the 1991 commencement ceremony.

Hayes recounted that he was perplexed when, prior to the meeting he only received Alexander's brief curriculum vita in addition to a note proposing the honorary degree. Furthermore, there was no mention of Alexander's proposed commencement speech, which was eventually revealed at the meeting. Alexander's vita did state, however, that he has been active in Republican politics, that he had worked for Republican Howard Baker's campaign for US Senate, and that thereafter he had

worked in the Nixon Administration, and later was elected Governor of Tennessee in 1978 and 1982. As a private lawyer, Alexander has "worked with groups devoted to revenue sharing and crime and delinquency control."

In conjunction with a student friend at the University of Tennessee, Hayes compiled several articles from *The Washington Post* which documented that while Alexander had cultivated a reputation for himself as a sponsor of educational reform, the reforms he actually championed were nebulous. These "reforms" included merit pay for teachers, which according to Hayes, "gives to a few teachers less than what they all deserve," and new standardized testing, a proposal with whose anti-democratic character CUNY students are now familiar.

By Tom Smith

Hayes noted Alexander's ambiguous reaction to claims that minority fellowships were unconstitutional made by Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Michael Williams. "He criticized Williams only for jumping the gun. He said if he became Education Secretary, things would be just like they were before [Williams' claims] but then he'd 'look into' the matter again." Alexander implies that something in Williams' findings merits consideration.

Hayes and Glassman immediately organized to protest the proposal and posted numerous flyers titled "Why Is CUNY Kissing the Hand That Strangles Us?" They also contacted other student representatives and encouraged them to attend the meeting and vote against the proposal. At the meeting, Michael Glassman

stated that many fellow students felt it hypocritical to give Alexander a degree. The Reagan and Bush Administration cuts to financial aid have made it much more difficult or impossible for students to earn their degrees. Hayes then argued that upon reading Alexander's vita, he felt that Alexander didn't deserve the degree. He added that this award could only be "a political statement". No one in the Administration spoke in favor, and the proposal was solidly voted down.

Acting President Cahn did not respond when asked for comment on the Graduate Council's rejection of the proposal. Acting Provost Marshall responded, "No comment. The process was gone through." At press time Alexander has not informed the Council as to whether he will speak at the 1991 commencement ceremony.

Tom Smith is enrolled in the Political Science program and an Associate Editor of The Advocate.

Bartlett Speaks! The PTU, CUNY Crisis, and Student Activism.

By Ron Hayduk

This spring the PTU, (The Part Timers United, an association of adjuncts and graduate assistants of CUNY), is running two candidates for office in the PSC (the Professional Staff Congress, the union for faculty and staff of CUNY). The candidates are Paul Bartlett, an adjunct member of the Department of Social Sciences at LaGuardia who is running for the PSC Vice President for Part-Time Personnel, and Susan DiRaimo, an ESL Department adjunct at City College who is running for one of the five University-wide Officers. The election will take place on April 25th. I recently interviewed Paul Bartlett about their campaign.

ADVOCATE: How did you get involved with the PTU?

PB: Last year I saw a flyer which read, "Exploited, Insulted and Angry? Then come to the next meeting of the PTU". At that meeting I found 100 people who shared many of the same grievances and feelings I had about the horrendous working conditions of part-timers at CUNY and how it adversely affects education at CUNY. At this meeting we worked to define and articulate in some detail what our problems were and what to do about them. I learned that this group was the reconstituted successor of a group formed in 1983 for similar reasons, the former PTU - The Part-Time Instructional and Research Staff Union [see articles by Vincent Tirelli and Jonathan Lang in the September 1990 ADVOCATE].

ADVOCATE: What came out of those initial meetings?

PB: Aside from a sense of solidarity and possibility, we developed some demands and strategies. Our first strategy was to get PSC union leaders to address our concerns in the upcoming contract negotiations with the University. These included equal pay for equal work, greater job security, and general improvement in working conditions. We met with representatives of the union and they heard and agreed that

conditions of adjuncts and part-time staff were very bad, and to include some of our concerns in the negotiations. But it was unclear what priority the union gave to our concerns in the contract negotiations. Moreover, we were not included in the talks (they were closed negotiations), and the union leadership discouraged us from expecting substantial fulfillment of our demands.

ADVOCATE: How did this affect the sentiment and activities within the PTU?

PB: Well, we had been recruiting and organizing part-timers on each of the various CUNY campuses and realized there was significant sentiment for pressing our concerns on different fronts. At the same time the budget crisis intensified. So we requested the union stop taking such a defensive posture around negotiations and budget cuts, and instead advocate tax equity as a position.

ADVOCATE: Tax equity? Is this the position of the PTU on the budget crisis?

PB: In part. Let me try to explain my position this way. In the fall, the CWA [Communication Workers of America Union] made an alternative proposal [Proposal 1180] to the state and city of New York to deal with the financial crisis. Proposal 1180 states that in principle the restoration of tax equity in the tax structure of the state and city of New York could more equitably solve the budget crisis without sustaining cuts in services and layoffs which would disproportionately adversely affect the middle and working classes. State Senator Franz Leichter's office did a study on the changes in income and wealth in New York during the 1980's, and on the impact of changes in the tax law. The study found that the higher income brackets in the state are making more money and paying disproportionately less taxes than before 1980. It shows that in fact the higher income brackets in New York did better than compared

to the rest of the nation, and increased their income by 40%. By comparison, the middle and lower income brackets are making proportionately less money and paying more in taxes than previously. Between 1980 and 1988, the 4 lowest quintiles lost a substantial percentage of their incomes, the lowest quintile losing 45%, while bearing more of the burden of taxes. The top 1% of the population was receiving 10.5% of the state's income in 1980, and in 1988 was receiving 24.9%. So, now fully one quarter of the state's income goes to the top 1% of New York State's population. Regarding taxes, the top quintile pays 17% less than before, with the top 1% paying 33% less than in 1980. So, if we addressed the tax equity issue and merely bring it back to 1980 levels, then a lot of our problems are solved. Interestingly, a lot of these changes came under Governor Cuomo under the recommendation and pressure of the New York Business Council. And another big loss in tax revenue is the big decline in corporate tax collection. In New York in 1965, businesses contributed 23% of the state's general funds, and now they contribute 12% of the state's general funds. On the city level, the city continues to give massive tax breaks to real estate developers and corporations.

ADVOCATE: But, given the changes in the international economy hasn't there been more pressure on governments to provide inducements to keep businesses in the state and city?

PB: One of the most common myths perpetrated is that corporate and business decisions to invest or relocate are based purely or mostly on differential tax levels. It is common knowledge within the regional urban planning community that taxes are very far down the list for business considerations for location. One of the largest consulting firms to business told a regional meeting of economists, that taxes are one of the least important considerations regarding relocating in or out of New York City. The number one concern is the

labor force consideration. That is, the quality of labor, in terms of skill levels and availability, as well as the problem of getting executives to relocate. So, the real problem is the deterioration of the perceived quality of life and high expenses of life in New York City. The problems of transportation, housing, crime and schools are much more important in addressing business needs than taxes.

ADVOCATE: So, what does all this have to do with the PTU?

PB: It's clear that the conditions of adjuncts - low pay, low job security, increasing layoffs, etc. - are intimately connected to CUNY's budget crisis now, and actually stems from the 1975 fiscal crisis. The deterioration of adjunct's conditions coupled with the increased reliance by CUNY on adjuncts [part-timers comprise over half the CUNY faculty and over 75% in some departments], began in the 1975 crisis, and reflects the declining priority of education in CUNY and in governing circles. The present crisis exacerbates these trends, and there is also pressure now to reduce the overall number of students currently served by CUNY - that is to say, restrict access. What this means for part-timers is our natural allies in our fight for job security, pay and the like, are students, faculty and staff who perceive the crisis and prescription in similar terms. The PTU wants to reverse the trend of adjunctification of the University by asking for a proportional increase in full-time lines so adjuncts - particularly minority faculty, who are concentrated in the part-timers ranks - can move up to full time positions. Many part-time faculty are now qualified to be in full-time tenure track positions. And part-timers who prefer to remain part-time (like parents, or those with other commitments) deserve to get equal pay for equal work and greater job security.

ADVOCATE: How will better pay and greater job security improve the quality of education at CUNY?

PB: Adjuncts don't often know what their teaching until the last minute so students can't know who will be their teacher, what's required and so forth, nor do instructors have ample time to order the books they prefer in time. Moreover, ad-

continued on next page