

The Graduate Student Advocate

City University of New York

SUMMER 1992

Volume 3
Number 6

Editorial:

Gate(s)keeping, from South Central to CUNY Central

The LA riots or *intifada* are the return of the oppressed on the US social landscape. US cities, long starved by disinvestment, withdrawal of social spending and the desiccation of social services, have been propelled into the collective consciousness of TV networks. The LA suburbs were forced to recognize their doppelganger in South Central, while the flight from New York on May 1st was a crude acknowledgement of the injustice and structural violence on which "America" is founded.

Predictably, after the shock and horror of TV news reports, bandaid solutions and malign neglect have already supplanted the necessary process of acknowledging and addressing social problems, particularly those of the cities. Endemic poverty, massive and permanent unemployment, inadequate housing, all coupled with institutional racism produced the series of uprisings across the country. These root causes are willfully ignored until the next unleashing of rage and panic-stricken evacuation of our cities tells the world that this country is fundamentally unjust, and that the American dream is only a tired cynical joke.

...the cities mask business as usual, and is a continuation of the '80s assaults on any remnants of New Deal and Great Society programs. Malnourished cities were put on starvation diets by Reagan and Bush. But what Bush told us the other night was that this diet was really low-fat, and therefore for our own good — part of the daily recommended allotments of privatization that would keep the cities from producing welfare queens and their looting offspring.

A proposed 'Free Enterprise Zone' in South Central Los Angeles is only a codification of privatization ideology and a formal acknowledgement of the cozy relations Mayor Bradley has established with corporate moguls, particularly real estate interests, during his more than 15 year tenure. While relatively high-paying manufacturing jobs hemorrhaged from LA (as in NYC) and the recession further devastated Black and Latino communities, public re-development money was directed towards a downtown Renaissance. Housing stock for LA's poor, already overcrowded and inadequate, was bulldozed to make way for profitable corporate towers. The only benefits the residents of South Central and East LA have seen is the proliferation of mini-malls built with public monies and given tax breaks (public/private "partnerships") where some can get minimum wage jobs. One of the bitterest contradictions of the 'riots' is that these were guarded by the LAPD, leaving smaller fish to fry.

Weed and seed is Dr. Bush's primary cure for the malaise of the cities. Despite the word *seed* this program is not curative or nourishing for the body politic, and deepens the rhetoric of criminalizing the lumpen-proletarian inner-city poor. *Weed and seed* seems to be a reference to the US Army's strategic use of the defoliant napalm in Vietnam, to facilitate surveillance. Thus, after the LAPD attacks a "crack house", and after the requisite neighborhood siege and sweeps (mass arrests), *seeding* will be accomplished with the construction of mini-mall strategic hamlets and checkpoint charlies at public housing. So much for schools and social spending. In the highly-publicized and vaunted LAPD sweeps thousands are arrested and charged with drug and gang related crimes. Charges are later dropped against the vast majority due to insufficient evidence. The war on drugs means martial law for the poor residents of these neighborhoods. Like the mass arrests of "communist" villagers in Vietnam this process generates a database of military information for surveillance purposes. Notably, the current Secretary of HUD, Jack Kemp, would like to exclude all, including the families, of those who have only been charged with selling drugs.

Cure #2 on Dr. Bush's list is the Thatcherite privatization project known as HOPE. As an acronym, Home ownership and

continues on p. 6

\$3.17 Million in Graduate School Cuts to Financial Aid and Faculty Hiring

The Graduate Center is implementing cuts of \$3.17 million for next year, which will impact student services, financial aid, faculty and staff. The amount of financial aid available to students will continue to decline. Vacant faculty and staff positions will not be filled. Administrative offices, the Mina Rees Library, and the Computer Center will limit services. The \$3.17 million cut to the Graduate School budget is disproportionately large compared to other larger CUNY schools. According to The Daily News (4/30/92), Queens College, which has 18,251 students will suffer \$5.21 million in cutbacks; and Hunter College (18,854 students) was cut by \$5.53 million. Curiously, York College in Queens, which has 5,505 students, (approximately) 1,500 more than the Graduate School, was cut by \$1.74 million, \$1.43 million less than GSUC.

Soon after the state legislature approved a tentative budget agreement stipulating funding cuts to CUNY in mid-April, the Board of Trustees voted to declare the senior colleges, "in a state of financial exigency." The main features of declaring financial exigency is to further tip the balance of decision making power towards the Chancellor's office. As Chancellor, Ann Reynolds can now determine the direction budget cuts will take, and make it easier to fire tenured faculty, renegotiate staff contracts, and close academic departments and programs. It is unclear which, if any, of the campuses will use the option of retrenchment. Rita Rodin, of the Office of University Relations, said, "There are no final plans yet," about retrenchment. The President and Deans at the Graduate School say it is unlikely that GSUC will retrench this year. President Frances Degen Horowitz hopes that most of the cuts can be made in the OTPS (other than personnel services) sector of the budget.

If an early retirement option for CUNY staff and faculty under review is approved, certain long-term faculty and staff will have the option to retire early, but will have to make a decision before September 1. CUNY projects 900 faculty and staff would be eligible for early retirement. Rodin did not know if early retirement would offset retrenchment, as the college presidents have the say on the administration of budget cuts. It is unlikely that many of these retirees would be replaced, because of the freeze on hiring.

Compounding the shrinkage of Graduate Center fac-

continues on p. 9

Tuition Raised \$600 for New Students CUNY Declares Financial Emergency

... Ken Stein ...

In an 8-3 vote, the Trustees of the City University of New York approved a tuition hike of \$600 per year for first-year and transfer students at the senior colleges. Returning CUNY undergraduates and all students at the junior colleges will pay \$350 more per year in tuition. Level One grad students will pay a yearly increase of \$746.

The tuition plan, approved by the Board of Trustees, will not fill the University's budget gap. The state legislature, as part of its decreased funding package for CUNY, required that CUNY make up \$52.7 of the budget shortfall through new revenues, which translated to a \$500 tuition increase per student. The Chancellor's approved proposal will bring CUNY's budget shortfall down to \$40 million from a proposed \$90 million cut.

A year's Level I tuition at the Graduate School will now be \$3350 for in-state students and \$5850 for out-of-state and international students. Senior college tuition will be \$2450 yearly for incoming students and \$2200 for returnees. Tuition will be \$2100 a year for Junior College students.

As part of the Chancellor's differential tuition increase, incoming students to the senior colleges may have the chance to attend CUNY tuition-free during their last semester — if they make it that far. Less than 40% of all CUNY students graduate. This tuition plan, being hailed by some educators as innovative, was criticized by some Albany lawmakers and Trustees who thought the plan unfairly put an extra burden on incoming freshmen and violated state education law. Spokesperson for the University, Rita Rodin said that the tuition relief for the last semester is designed to, "encourage students to finish." Rodin explained, "Financial aid is front-loaded. Incoming and full-time students have more access to financial aid, placing heavy financial burdens upon part-time and remedial students who take longer to graduate.

The Trustees and Chancellor hope changes in the 1993 Pell Grant structure will give students greater access to federal financial aid, thus relieving them of some of the added burden.

To close the remaining \$40 million budget gap, the Board declared "a state of fiscal exigency." This declaration is the first stage towards retrenchment, and allows college presidents to dismiss tenured faculty. The Board of Trustees also revised its fiscal exigency guidelines at

continues on p. 9



GSUC students Eliot Weininger and Julie Ford at 3/31 anti-budget cut rally at Lehman College.

CONTENTS:

DSC Stipends Cut.....	2
Bryant Park Blues.....	3
Censorship at Queens College.....	3
Letters & Commentary.....	4
Board Bios & Pics.....	5
Koreans in the 'Hood.....	6
LA Stories.....	7
Brave New World of Eastern European Bands.....	10
Summer Music.....	10
DSC News & Updates.....	11

CUNY NEWS

DSC Co-Chair
Stipends Cut by 44%

Next year the stipends for the three DSC Co-Chairs will be cut from \$5000 to \$2800. Dean Moreland stated that this action was taken in order to abide by a recent audit of the DSC and to meet the stipend guidelines set in the Student Accountability Handbook. According to Moreland the handbook stipulates that no elected student leader may earn more than \$2882 per-year. This amount was increased from \$2200 in a 1989 Board ruling.

Former officials of the Doctoral Student's Council claim that the Board granted a waiver for the DSC which allowed its officers to earn more than the designated amount. Dean of Student Affairs Floyd Moreland told *The Advocate* that the stipend difference had been paid from the Presidential Discretionary Fund, and disputed that a waiver was ever granted to the DSC, as was thought. Still, Moreland acknowledged that President Proshansky had argued on behalf of the students for a waiver and that the late president maintained that the Board had actually granted one.

Though the history of the waiver request, and whether it was granted is unclear, the student government chair was paid \$9600 in 1982. When the student government was later rearranged, the three co-chairs earned \$6600. According to former Co-Chair Vincent Tirelli, this latter amount was meant to be commensurate with a grad-B fellowship, one of the better fellowships which the school awards. The \$6600 figure was gradually cut down to \$5000; and now, if student government opposition is un-

successful, it will be \$2882.

The GSUC administration has offered to fund a \$6600 college associate position to provide assistance to the DSC. Jonathan Lang, the new Co-Chair for Business is opposed to this arrangement for it requires that whomever is hired must meet the income limits of work-study. Others also point out that the new arrangement skirts the principle of student autonomy, and that one person cannot handle the burden of student advocacy work. Though it is unclear if there are also limits on the scope of the work which a college associate can legally perform, Moreland stated that the DSC will be free to define the job description and to hire whomever they want. He also stated it was "no problem" if the DSC asked this person to perform student advocacy functions.

Moreland denied that 80th St. has ever ordered the GSUC to clamp down on DSC stipends though he acknowledged that they have consistently asked that the Graduate School meet all guideline requirements. In the Summer of 1991, just after the CUNY strikes, Moreland stated that he notified the newly appointed President Horowitz of the audit and the guideline stipulations. He added

that Horowitz decided to wait until the conclusion of her first year in office to make this move.

The GSUC administration's move to limit the DSC stipends comes on the heels of the CUNY Board's sweeping attack on student power. First, there were changes in the disciplinary code which ensured anti-protest decisions, and which were passed despite widespread student and faculty dissent. This move was quickly followed by the freezing of USS assets, which virtually gutted that organization. Finally, the Board passed changes to the College Associations which stipulated that college administrations, which have recently been subservient to all 80th St. demands, would have absolute power over student activity fee monies. As students at the colleges have pointed out, the CUNY college administrations have not revealed any financial malfeasance at any of the colleges, while the USS spending scandal involved Lamarre's political betrayal of his fellow students, not illegal expenditures (only \$9000 was determined by the Board to be "improper" expenditures). Meanwhile, students such as Hunter College Day Student Government President Kim Rae have pointed out that the Presidential Auxiliary Funds, with which administrators have free play, are financially derived from student activity fees.

The immediate impact of the GSUC move will be to dissuade the Co-Chairs and other DSC representatives from assuming a professional and political obligation to

continues on page 6

Discrimination and Harassment Are
Problems at the Graduate Center

A DSC Advocacy Pamphlet

In the fall of 1990, the Office of the Dean for Student Affairs distributed a brochure entitled "Addressing Issues of Pluralism, Diversity and Community," which stated the University's position on discrimination or bias actions and set forth disciplinary measures against those who carry out such actions. The Doctoral Students Council (DSC) welcomes this effort to promote respect and tolerance and to eliminate incidents of discrimination and bias at the Graduate Center. The DSC believes, however, that this brochure did not go far enough in addressing the issues of discrimination and harassment (in fact, from the title, one would not guess that it treated these issues at all), that the brochure was worded too weakly, and that no effort was made to raise consciousness around these issues. Our critique of the administration's brochure is not meant as a personal attack. The point of making this criticism public is to use it to further discussion of these issues and to further our understanding of the overt but often subtle ways in which bias is carried out and institutionalized.

The administration's brochure concentrated on how to file a complaint, listing as the only two options, the Office of the Dean for Student Affairs and the Psychological Counseling Center. The present pamphlet is the result of efforts by the DSC to produce an alternative measure that attempts to correct the shortcomings of the administration's approach. It is our hope that this pamphlet will not only provide additional options in fighting discrimination, but also serve an educational purpose. For this reason, we have asked various student organizations to describe how they view discrimination and its effects.

Discrimination at the Graduate Center

The purpose here is to point out all the ways in which individuals in the university can take advantage of power due to the position they occupy in the hierarchy of society as a whole. The DSC has been working on a procedure to handle all complaints by individual students against unfair treatment within the university, a procedure that is sensitive to the varying needs and extenuating circumstances of individual students while still taking into account that discrimination does not occur in a vacuum. Racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of oppression are prevalent in our society and don't stop at the doors of the ivory tower.

We have been pushing for an independent panel to

investigate charges of discrimination and harassment along the lines of the panel that exists at Hunter College. At present, all formal complaints at the Graduate Center must be made to the Dean for Student Affairs. The DSC feels that this procedure only intimidates students and discourages them from filing complaints. The Hunter model provides an independent venue for pressing charges, separated from the administration. Although there are problems with this model (for example, its verdicts are not binding, it has no power to discipline those found guilty of discrimination), it represents a move in the right direction. Thus far, the administration has refused to set up such a panel. If students want to fight discrimination at the Graduate Center, we must be prepared to do so independently of the administration.

The Graduate Center's policy on discrimination

The following text is quoted from the administration's brochure:

Specific federal, state, and city laws and regulations, as well as City University of New York and GSUC administrative rules and regulations, prohibit actions of discrimination or bias involving sex, race, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, ethnicity, political belief, age or handicap. Anyone who violates the rights of members of the GSUC community to be free of such discriminatory practices, including harassment, will be subject to full disciplinary action in accordance with the applicable laws, rules, and regulations of the bodies.

As indicated above, and as seen by the attached copy of the administration's brochure, there is at present no adequate procedure to handle and enforce bias harassment cases.

Options for students and the role of the DSC ombudsperson

Currently, the DSC Co-Chair for Student Affairs serves as a student ombudsperson to represent individual students before the administration and help students press their cases. This role has been underused partly because of lack of publicity, partly because of lack of organization. The administration is also on the verge of hiring a Graduate Center Ombuds Officer to represent and serve all members

of the Graduate Center community (faculty, students, staff).

In the midst of budget cuts, tuition hikes, and increasing pressure to decrease enrollment, the DSC is in the process of strengthening, clarifying, and expanding the position of the DSC student ombudsperson so that any member of the steering committee can serve as an ombudsperson to advocate for individual students, or the steering committee can appoint another ombudsperson in consultation with the individual student. This expansion of the role will allow students seeking the assistance of an ombudsperson to choose from a diverse group. The success of this new model, of course, will depend on electing a diverse steering committee.

Although the administrative ombudsperson's job will be to help students file complaints, we want to stress the importance of involving a DSC student advocate in the grievance process from the very beginning, before the filing of a complaint is made. Involving a student ombudsperson certainly doesn't rule out the involvement of the administration's ombudsperson. We stress this procedure only because, in our past experience, students filing complaints alone to an administrator have been told things or promised things that were denied in later meetings with the same administrator. The presence of the ombudsperson as witness in dealings of individual students with administrators (including executive officers) reduces the likelihood of this sort of retraction. We would like to encourage all students to discuss their cases with a trained DSC student ombudsperson before meeting or filing a complaint with the administration, with the purpose of using the DSC ombudsperson as witness and advocate in some or any of the procedures the student wishes to pursue.

We would also like to stress that the option of seeking psychological counseling has nothing to do with filing a complaint. This option was presented in the administration's brochure in a manner seen as offensive by many students. It is a personal issue, an entirely individual choice, and will not be discussed any further here.

What are the options?

A student wishing to press a complaint and coming to the DSC office to seek assistance can expect that any member of the steering committee will be able to examine the available options and assist in the selection of an ombudsperson to continue the complaint. We would like to point out that there are alternative ways of viewing discrimination and harassment against individuals. Some students may wish to quietly make an informal complaint. Others

continues on page 9