Office of the Hunter College Senate
Room 1018 East Building   Phone: 772-4200

MINUTES
Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
3 December 2003

1   The 434th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:10 PM in Room W714.
2
3   **Presiding:**   Joan Tronto, Chair
4
5   **Attendance:**   The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those listed in Appendix I.
6
7   **Agenda:**   The agenda was adopted as presented.
8
9   **Report by the**   The Chair presented the report as follows:
10 **Administrative**
11 **Committee:**   **Special Election to fill vacant seats on the Senate**
12   She presented the following nominations in accordance with Article IV.2.H.i & ii of the *Charter for a*
13   *Governance of Hunter College*
14   Students: Keith Zelniker (Economics Major)
15   Byrnetta Bailey (English Major)
16
17   It was moved that the nominations be approved. The motion carried by voice vote.
18
19   **Approved Curriculum Changes**
20   The following curriculum changes as listed in the two-part Report dated 3 December 2003 were
21   approved as per Senate resolution, and were submitted for the Senate's information: Items UE-1322
22   (Women's Studies), UE-1333 (Film & Media Studies), UE-1337 (Psychology), US-1292 (Curriculum
23   & Teaching), US-1319 (School of Nursing), US-1321 (Philosophy), US-1325 and US-1326 (Anthro-
24   pology), US-1320/GS-597 (School of Nursing), GS-603, GS-595, GS-596 and GS-598 (School of
25   Nursing).
26
27   **Report by Chair**
28   Professor Tronto informed the Senate that the Administrative Committee meets with the President on a
29   regular basis to discuss issues of importance to the Senate. During the last meeting the President
30   requested that the Senate establish a committee to consider the restructuring of the School of Arts and
31   Sciences. The consultants that were hired by the President have submitted their report to her. She will
32   circulate it to all of us, and then we will create a committee and widely consult the community and try
33   to create a consensus about how to proceed. Senators should forward any thoughts or suggestions
34   about how the new committee might be structured to the Administrative Committee. This is the work
35   the Administrative Committee will be doing between now and the beginning of the Spring semester.
36   This item will be on the agenda for the first meeting in the Spring and will involve important
37   deliberations throughout the Spring Semester.
38
39   Professor Tronto yielded the floor to President Raab.
40
41   **Report by the**   A summary statement of President Raab's report is as follows. She said:
42   **President:**
43   "Hi everyone, and Happy Holidays. First, I want to thank everybody who helped us to get the
44   message out about the CUNY Capital Budget, which is generous and helpful to Hunter. There is
45   probably enough money in the budget for Roosevelt House to do almost the full restoration. One
46   of the major initiatives is to find a site for a new science building, and to have the money in the

47   budget in the next few years. $90M has been allocated with the expectation that more would be
48   added in the second phase. In addition, $130M dollars will be allocated over five years for the

49   **Minutes**   **Page 5058**
50   **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
51   **3 December 2003**

52
53
54

55   Arts building, for which we are also looking for a site. We are actually in a fortunate situation and
56   the fact that the money was not allocated in this year's budget cycle is not detrimental to us,
57   because we are in the design stage for Roosevelt House and we are looking for sites for the other
58   two projects. However, it is extremely important to get the message out about the incredible need
59   for capital projects at CUNY in general and for Hunter in particular. I testified in the morning, and
60   the Assembly people were really shocked to find out that Roosevelt House was closed, and that
61   CUNY actually had a piece of property that is so dilapidated we can not even use it.   Although
62   there is no money in the budget for renovations at Thomas Hunter Hall, I did testify about the need
63   for space where students can congregate, have clubs and social events. It is an important priority,
64   as we are looking again at the Master Plan.   It is very important for all of us to continue to lobby
65   for this budget to be passed. If the Legislature does not come back into special session within the
66   next few weeks it is going to slip into the next year, and at some point last year's budget not being
67   passed becomes this year's budget. That is a concern. But as I said, since we already have the
68   design money for Roosevelt House it is not really going to negatively impact us.

69
70   I also want to thank the faculty for helping us with web attendance, which is very important for
71   compliance with Financial Aid and the TAP rules. We did extraordinarily well.   We got up to
72   over 88%, and we are going for 100% next year.

73
74   As Joan was saying earlier, with the help of the Chairs in the School of Arts & Sciences and other
75   people from various constituency groups in the school we have spent the last couple of months
76   talking about the issue of how to go forward to look at the structure of the School of Arts and
77   Sciences. It is very clear that those involved in the School have had this on the agenda for a long
78   time.   I brought in a consultant to interview people involved and find out what is working and
79   what has not worked.   I do not want to come forward with a concept paper saying here is the
80   solution, but I want to create a framework so that the committee that I have asked Joan to create
81   through the Senate can begin to evaluate the various options -- a three-dean model, a two-dean
82   model, a one-dean model -- in terms of dividing it by divisions or departments of sustentative
83   areas, or whether there should be other types of divisions, i.e. an Undergraduate and/or a Graduate
84   Dean. We expect the report to be available by the beginning of next semester, and at Joan's
85   suggestion we are planning to distribute it to the whole community, or make it available through
86   the Web.   The committee would then be formed and the report will be the framework for discus-
87   sion in the Spring Semester. I feel that we are making great progress, and I am trying to take
88   enough time to make sure that the process is open and allows wide input and contemplation of
89   what have become important issues. One request I made is that committee membership includes
90   representation from more than just Arts and Sciences, because it is very clear that restructuring
91   impacts other areas. For example, there may be a great impact on the delivery function of Student
92   Services if there are three divisions and three deans. The same is true for Budget, Finance and
93   Administration if there are three deans to interact with versus one dean. It is clearly much of an
94   Arts and Sciences issue, but it does have a school-wide impact and I would like that to be reflected
95   in the discussions."

96
97   The President concluded the report by answering questions from the floor.

98
99   **Report by Chair (continued):**
100   Professor Tronto also informed the Senate that as Chair she attends meetings of the University Faculty
101   Senate and the Council of College Governance Leaders, and that she will report anything that is
102   important to the work of the Hunter College Senate. In this regard, 80th Street has issued a Report on
103   Academic Integrity. Vice President Ayravainen served on the committee that produced the report, and
104   there is likely to be action on the report during the Spring semester.

105
106

110
111
112   **Committee**   <u>**Nominating Committee**</u>
113   **Reports:**   Professor Marilyn Rothschild, Chair of the Committee, presented the following nominations for seats
114   currently vacant on Senate Committees:
115
116   <u>Master Plan Committee</u>
117   Student: Brian Gaun (undeclared**)**
118
119   <u>Budget Committee</u>
120   Student: Alex Lalmansingh (Economics)
121
122   <u>Charter Review Committee</u>
123   Faculty from Health Professions: David Kotelchuck (Health Sciences)
124
125   <u>Committee on Computing & Technology</u>
126   Student: Oleg Terenchuk (Computer Science Major)
127
128   <u>Select Committee on Performance Measures & Outcomes Assessment</u>
129   Student: Alex Lalmansingh (Economics Major)
130
131   <u>Undergraduate Course of Study Committee</u>
132   Student: Byrnetta Bailey (English)
133
134   It was moved that the nominations be approved. The motion carried by voice vote.
135
136   <u>**Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee Progress Report**</u>
137   Professor Jason Young, Chair of the Committee, informed the Senate that in addition to academic
138   integrity and CPE the Committee is considering whether non-degree credits should count towards
139   graduation, and it is reconsidering the course repeat rule and the withdrawal policy. The Committee
140   expects to submit a report for consideration by the Senate in the Spring semester.
141
142   He then presented the following interim report on ways to address academic integrity at Hunter College
143   as distributed:
144
145   This fall, the UARC has been examining the issue of Academic Integrity on several fronts. We
146   have been greatly aided by a number of well-developed web sites on this topic, including the
147   following:
148
149   >   The Center for Academic Integrity at Duke University: www.academicintegrity.org
150
151   >   The University Of Pennsylvania site on Academic Integrity: www.upenn.edu/osc/faculty.html
152
153   >   Baruch College site for its Task Force on Academic Honesty:
154   www.baruch.cuny.edu/facultyhandbook/taskforce.htm
155
156   >   California State University at Fullerton site for Academic Integrity and Disruptive Behav-
157   ior: fdc.fullerton.edu/teaching/resources/Academic_Integrity
158
159   Additional college web sites consulted for this review include California State University at Full-
160   erton, Cleveland State University, The University of Maryland, The University of Virginia, as well
161   as The University of Hong Kong
162
163   The primary issues we have explored thus far include:
164
165

1) What specific elements should be included in a formal statement on Academic Integrity?

The UARC has surveyed the web sites of several academic institutions, particularly those noted above, to determine the range and depth of information to be included in spelling out the issues related to Academic Integrity. While varying across the institutions to minor degrees, the following items consistently appear:

> Specifying what exactly constitutes a violation of Academic Integrity (e.g., cheating, plagiarism, obtaining unfair advantage, falsification of records)
> Steps for reporting a violation of Academic Integrity
> Descriptions of the ranges of punishments facing students found guilty of academic dishonesty
> Strategies for promoting Academic Integrity

It should be noted that, concurrent with our own investigation of this issue, the CUNY Central Administration has convened its own system-wide committee, chaired by Otis Hill, to examine this issue. Hunter College is represented on this committee by Acting Vice-President for Student Services Eija Ayravainen. A preliminary report of this committee=s findings may be found online at www.soc.qc.edu/ufs . While 80th Street is expected to make system-wide recommendations on this issue (possibly as early as Spring 2004), it is anticipated that each college may nevertheless choose to tailor the recommendations according to local concerns.

2) Should Hunter implement an Honor Code or a Code of Conduct?

The implementation of a school-wide Honor Code is a long-time tradition at several universities, most notably the University of Virginia. The Honor Code, stated in its simplest form, states that, each student is charged with the responsibility to refrain from dishonorable conduct. The hallmark of such a system is that it inculcates a culture of responsibility whereby all students are essentially charged with monitoring their own and other students behavior to avoid instances of academic misconduct. Where charges of academic dishonesty are made, a student-run committee oversees the process of assessing the evidence and determining the appropriate course of action, if any, against the student. The UARC found that the Honor Code is primarily in effect at a few large universities (predominantly in the South) and several small liberal arts colleges. We did not find any instances of such an Honor Code in effect at comparable urban colleges.

In place of an Honor Code, the Code of Conduct is a much more common mode of conveying standards of academic conduct at colleges and universities. Whereas many of the academic institutions with Honor Codes emphasize the student-centered nature of both developing and enforcing academic standards, Codes of Conduct appear to be both developed and enforced through a plenary process addressing the concerns of students, faculty, and administrators.

Additionally, it seems, whereas the emphasis of Honor Codes is on adhering to a long-standing tradition of integrity at the college, Codes of Conduct tend to primarily highlight the explicit types of misconduct and the specific forms of punishment that may be used to deter them.

The UARC notes that one possible deterrent to implementing an Honor Code at many larger academic institutions is the tacit acknowledgment of the varying value systems, and thus, interpretations of Academic dishonesty, that follow from having a diverse student body. That is, it may not be feasible to expect that students with widely varying backgrounds and experiences will immediately adopt a single form of Honor Code. It is because of these divergent backgrounds that many schools have opted instead to develop explicit Codes of Conduct that spell out the nature of all types of academic standards, both those that are permissible and those that are not.

3) How should information related to academic integrity be made available to students, faculty, and administrators?

Communication on this issue is crucial in order to foster the culture of Academic Integrity in which everyone is thoroughly familiar with its standards. The UARC is exploring a number of avenues to ensure that students, faculty, and administrators are equally aware of the status of concerns regarding Academic Integrity. Among our considerations thus far:

A. A general website (perhaps similar to the format currently used by Baruch College) that would delineate all definitions, procedures, etc., with separate sections to emphasize the responsibilities of students and faculty. One variation on this theme was a specific web site on which an open forum was created to enable continuous and immediate discussions on all matters pertaining to Academic Integrity (to enable, for example, discussions about specific sources being used for plagiarism, asking colleagues for recommendations for dealing with specific forms of cheating, etc).

B. A "web test" site (similar to what is in place currently for researchers), in which all students would be required to complete an on-line course (that takes, say, an hour or so) in which the responsibilities of academic integrity are discussed, and which includes various exercises designed to involve students in an understanding of what actions are/are not appropriate. At the completion of this on-line course, students would print out a certificate that would be signed and submitted to [someone] and kept on file as a record of their expressed acknowledgment of Hunter Colleg's policy on Academic Integrity.

C. A required/recommended statement addressing Academic Integrity that would appear on *every* syllabus at the College. Several examples of possible statements may be found on the University of Pennsylvania's web site. A couple of examples from this site include:

   "The work you submit in this class is expected to be your own. If you submit work that has been copied without attribution from some published or unpublished source, or that has been prepared by someone other than you, or that in any way misrepresents somebody elses work as your own, you will face disciplinary action by the University."

   "All relevant University policies regarding Academic Integrity must be followed. This includes no cheating, no plagiarism, and reporting any knowledge thereof. Please consult the Student Handbook or the appropriate web-page: www.college.upenn.edu/responsibilities/integrity.html ."

4) Future Issues

There are a number of other items relevant to the discussion of Academic Integrity that we only begun to explore, particularly with respect to the role of the faculty in promoting academic integrity and discouraging academic dishonesty. Such measures, in addition to the above-mentioned statement included in course syllabi, may include:

   > Ensuring that students thoroughly know the criteria for evaluation of their performance on exams and papers, ideally specified as early in the semester as possible, including on the course syllabus;
   > Changing exam questions and paper assignments frequently. Based on several e-mails received by the UARC from faculty and students, some are concerned about the extent to which some paper assignments, and repeatedly used exam questions, may pose an unfair advantage to those who have connections with prior students who have taken the same course.

> Requiring students to submit early paper drafts along with a bibliography or printed copies of their references (if they are short enough).

> These and similar pedagogical matters are ripe for exploration at some point in the future.

It was moved that the Senate dissolve itself into a Committee of the Whole until 5:15 PM. The motion carried by voice vote.

The Senate reconvened in formal session at 5:20 PM.

It was moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 5:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Picciano,
Secretary