

MINUTES

Meeting of the Hunter College Senate 13 December 2006

- 1 The 475th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 3:45 PM in Room W714.
2
- 3 **Presiding:** Richard Stapleford, Chair
4
- 5 **Attendance:** The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those listed in Appendix I.
6
7 Alternate Senators were formally seated in accordance with the procedures approved by the Senate,
8 and clickers were distributed to them.
9
- 10 **Agenda:** The agenda was adopted as distributed.
11
- 12 **Report by the** The Chair informed the Senate that the President would report later in the meeting.
13 **President:**
14
- 15 **Report by the** The Chair presented the report as follows:
16 **Administrative**
17 **Committee:** Special Election to fill vacant seats on the Senate
18 In accordance with Article IV.2.H.i & ii of the *Charter for a Governance of Hunter College* the
19 Administrative Committee presented the names of all nominees received to date:
20
- 21 Student
22 Ricardo Jute (Film)
23
- 24 It was moved that nominations be closed. The motion carried by voice vote without dissent.
25
- 26 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee. The
27 motion carried by voice vote without dissent.
28
- 29 Approved Curriculum Changes:
30 The following curriculum changes as listed in the Report dated 13 December 2006 were approved as
31 per Senate resolution and were submitted for the Senate's information: Items US-1481 (Philosophy),
32 US-1482 (Economics), GS-692 (Film & Media Studies), GS-691, GS-677, GS-678, GS-679, GS-680,
33 GS-681, GS-682, GS-683, GS-684, GS-685, GS-686, and GS-690 (Curriculum & Teaching/
34 Educational Foundations), GS-687 (Special Education), GS-688 Educational Foundations), and GS-
35 689 (Education).
36
- 37 List of Candidates for Diplomas and Degrees
38 Professor Stapleford moved for the ceremonial adoption of the list of candidates for diplomas and
39 degrees to be awarded in January 2007. The motion was approved by hand vote.
40
- 41 **Committee** Nominating Committee
42 **Reports:** The Chair presented the report dated 13 December 2006 on behalf of the committee as follows:
43
44 Undergraduate Course of Study Committee:
45 Students: Dorothy Wing In Ng (SEEK)
46 Siobhan Cawley (Psychology)
47

51
52
53 Grade Appeals Committee

54 Student Alternates: Ezra Serrur
55 Shira Hon (Psychology/Sociology)

56
57 Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee

58 Student: Siobhan Cawley (Psychology)

59
60 Standing Committee on Academic Freedom

61 Student: Oluwatobi Jalyesimi

62
63 GER Appeals Committee

64 Student Alternate: Shira Hon

65
66 Charter Review Committee

67 Student: Ezra Serrur

68
69 Select Committee on Academic Integrity

70 Student: Oluwatobi Jalyesimi

71
72 It was moved that nominations be closed. The motion carried by voice vote without dissent.

73
74 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of each nominee. The
75 motion carried by voice vote without dissent.

76
77 Departmental Governance Committee

78 Professor Jill Gross, Chair of the Committee, presented the report dated 13 December 2006 with the
79 revised By-laws of the Psychology Department as submitted.

80
81 The revised By-laws were approved by voice vote without dissent.

82
83 Master Plan Committee

84 Professor Barbara Sproul, Chair of the Committee, presented the following report dated 13 December
85 2006, as distributed:

86
87 In 1999, the Master Plan Committee of the Hunter Senate cited a new science building in the
88 neighborhood as the most pressing need facing the College. The shortage of space was then
89 listed as 177,000 square feet, our facilities were outdated and ill-designed for modern needs
90 (having been constructed in 1939) and our science and health science programs were separated
91 by two miles—the science program mostly in the North Building and the health science
92 program at the Brookdale campus.

93
94 In the spring of 2006, a reconstituted Master Plan Committee reiterated this need,
95 simultaneously stating our concern that as we planned for such a new building ‘no one in the
96 Hunter community would be left behind’. Our concern was not only the growth and betterment
97 of the sciences and health sciences, but also for the arts, humanities and social sciences
98 programs which would greatly benefit by the expansion of our usable space.

99
100 In June 2006 and again in September and November, President Raab came to discuss with us
101 the possible acquisition of such a science building. Details emerged as negotiations with
102 relevant parties (the Department of Education—current holder of the property, the CUNY
103 Chancellor, etc.) continued. We are very pleased the President has now submitted to us her
104 proposal for the

105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160

Minutes
Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
13 December 2006

science building and we are herewith presenting it to the Senate and the wider Hunter community.

The Master Plan Committee will continue to monitor the development of this project and looks forward to a full Senate discussion of the proposal. Our obvious immediate concerns include making sure that, if the purchase and development of the project go forward, the most directly affected people—the science and health science faculty and students—have full participation in determining the nature of interim space (where any might be needed) so their research and teaching can continue unabated as well as, of course, in the design and allocation of space in the new facility itself. (We see our role here in assuring that the right people make the decisions, not in being the deciders.) Later, we will be making sure that appropriate committees are formed to decide on reconfiguring the space at Hunter North, East and West to better accommodate the remaining faculty, staff and students. In all instances, we look forward to hearing from you with your comments and suggestions.

The President’s Report to the Master Plan Committee is attached as Appendix II.

The floor was open for discussion.

After discussion the Chair yielded the floor to President Raab. The following is a summary statement of the President’s report. She said:

“I was just at Brookdale talking about the timing. The process stage that we are in right now is that we are putting the final touch on what will be in our RFEI, which is the “Request for Expression of Interest.” That is the document that will be released in early January. It will have a number of points, and it will say that the Brookdale site is available for sale, but if you are to buy it you need to replace the schools at Julia Richmond; your developer needs to work with the community in Julia Richmond now to help design the buildings for the schools that reflect what their needs and wants are; it will say you must keep the dorms or you can come with a proposal that would replace rooms or beds for 612 students in the current \$3,000 range; it will ask the developer to suggest how they can help us with swing space. One of the biggest challenges of this project is to make sure that we give adequate attention and care to the Brookdale community. We don’t know if any program has to be displaced. It is possible that a developer will hold this property for a while. But there is also a real possibility that the developer wants to get going and build residential or commercial buildings, and some part of Brookdale at different stages will need to be relocated. So, we are asking the developers as part of their bid, what they could offer us in terms of swing space. Someone perhaps would pay less but would be able to provide good swing space for the Brookdale community, and we would take a lower purchase price. We will start a series of meetings with our real estate advisors, and we hope that the RFEI will be ready by late spring.

The other piece that is very important to us is of course securing of financing. The very good news is that the Board of Trustees voted about two weeks ago on the budget that has significant money for what they are still calling a Science building. The proceeds of selling Brookdale make it possible for us to actually build a new Public Health Building. You will see it listed as a Science Building in the next years, but there is a significant commitment by CUNY. They have said to the Budget people in the State Budget Office that it is CUNY’s priority to build a new Hunter Science Building. This is what we want next as the big chunk of the Capital Budget. So, they are very much behind us, and once the Governor puts out his Executive Budget at the end of January, we will know if we are really in that budget. I feel very optimistic; I think the new

161
162
163 **Minutes**
164 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
165 **13 December 2006**
166
167

Governor is a great supporter of Education and of Public Higher Education. Both of his parents are CUNY graduates, and his mother has been a part of our “Friends of Hunter” for the last few

168 years. She comes to many events, and she is actually now teaching here in our Continuing
169 Education Program. Then the next step is that the Executive Budget goes to the State
170 Legislature. We are aggressive about keeping our money in the Budget, and we are going to be
171 asking for help from anyone in this room to keep lobbying.
172

173 I have asked the Provost to start thinking about a sensible planning process to talk about what
174 these new buildings should look like. How do we best create a great state-of-the-art Health and
175 Science facility? We have asked the Brookdale community to start thinking about how to best
176 begin a planning process for their programs. Up here we have the issue of what is science in
177 departments such as Psychology where there are social scientists and lab-based scientists. How
178 does that get defined, and who moves. We have a very big planning process ahead of us, and the
179 Provost is thinking about some type of a Steering Committee that could go into smaller
180 committees. It will be preliminary planning because there are a lot of uncertain things that we
181 don't know, but I think it is time to start planning. It is an exciting time. I was just talking to
182 people at Rockefeller University who are in the process of building eight major new
183 laboratories. They have offered to have some of their architects show us some of the things
184 they are building. We will be happy to take them up on that and we are going to have some
185 good exploratory work to do ahead of us. We will need everyone's cooperation, and then the
186 next phase is deciding who is staying in the North Building and who may be interested in a
187 property that is being vacated in the North building. I am sure, the Provost will be hearing from
188 you as well.”
189

190 President Raab concluded her report by answering questions from the floor. The following is a
191 summary of the responses:
192

193 “We are still waiting for the perfect number. It is our current estimate that at least 150,000
194 square feet will be available in the North Building. The new building under current zoning
195 would be 500,000 square feet, with 325,000 net usable square feet. But we don't know how that
196 will shift as things become more concrete. Hopefully, we will have that figure by the end of the
197 year. I am actually waiting for it myself.”
198

199 “We are going to be creating capital for the CUNY system by this sale, that is point one. Point
200 two is that new facilities for a Public Health Building that includes Nursing and Health Sciences
201 were never anticipated in a CUNY budget, or the CUNY Master Plan, or the Hunter Master
202 Plan. Therefore, the working model is a public-private partnership, you sell to a private
203 developer, they build the schools for Julia Richmond, and contribution number one is that we
204 get that site. Then we give them the rest of the site minus the dorms issue and they pay us. We
205 don't really know what that number will be. I don't know if it will equal what it will actually
206 cost to make the new building a Public Health Building, but the concept that we are contributing
207 private capital has been enough to get a commitment from CUNY to move forward. There is not
208 going to be all the money in the world but there is a great understanding at 80th Street that this is
209 going to be a very expansive building and they are going ahead with that. As you know, the
210 Chancellor went public and he announced that we are having a new School of Public Health,
211 and the Brookdale building does not scream “New School of Public Health.”
212

213 “The BoE does not want a hole in the ground if there is no CUNY money, but the CUNY
214 money will be evident once the Budget gets through and gets passed with the State Legislature.
215 So, they are working with us; they are negotiating with us, they are looking at this document
216 that we are going to send out, which will say that we are going to be working to build the new
217 schools. So, they are committed to doing this. Do I have a piece of paper that signed off on that

218 at the moment? No, because you don't get to that until there is a transaction. But they are very
219 much in support of this and they have said this in public. They said that we are doing this and
220 they have told every community group that has talked to them that we are doing this, and the
221 Chancellor

222 **Minutes**
223 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
224 **13 December 2006**

Page 5349

225
226
227 has looked at me and said that we are doing this, and we are. They sat at the table with us last
228 week at City Hall; we had economic development people, there, BoE people, and legislative
229 people, and everybody was talking about what the next steps are and how to move this project
230 forward.”

231
232 “The BoE is not going to give us this site if they can not relocate everybody at Julia Richmond
233 to the Brookdale site. They are signed on, and we have a letter from them saying that they
234 intend to negotiate with us.”

235
236 “BoE is giving us numbers because of the way we are going out to the market and we are telling
237 developers that they have to build this many square feet of a school. So, BoE gave us numbers
238 that they want us to fulfill. They know how many square feet are in the current building and
239 they know what they want. As you know, there are a couple of different schools in the Julia
240 Richmond Building with totally different philosophies. The schools came in at different times. It
241 is not so clear that all of them want to be in exactly the special arrangement they have right now.
242 There are people in Julia Richmond right now that want very specialized facilities and we want
243 to accommodate them. There is a very good Performing Arts School with different needs, and
244 the other schools are more academic. But they have told us what they require us to do.”

245
246 It was moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 4:30
247 PM.

248
249
250
251 Respectfully submitted,

252
253
254
255 Jill Gross,
256 Secretary

APPENDIX I

The following members were noted as absent from the meeting:

Full-time Faculty:

Art	Maria Antonella Pelizzari "E" Reiner Leist
Biological Sciences	Thomas Schmidt-Glenwinkel (A)
Chemistry	Pamela Mills "E" William Sweeney
Classics: Computer Science: Curriculum & Teaching	Rivka Friedman William Sakas (A) David Lee Carlson (A)
Economics	Jonathan Conning (A) Purvi Sevak
English	Sarah Chinn Trudy Smoke (A)
Film & Media Studies:	Peter Parisi "E" Michael Gitlin
Geography	Hongmian Gong (A)
Health Sciences	Jack Caravanis (A) Kathryn Rolland "E"
History	Angelo Angelis (A)
Music	Barbara L. Hampton (A) David Capps
Nursing	Judith Aponte "E" Leighsa Sharoff "E"
Philosophy	Alan Hausman Frank Kirkland (A)
Physics/Astronomy Political Science Psychology Romance Languages	Ying-Chih Chen (A) Joan Tronto (A) Jeffrey Parsons (A) Virginia Santos
School of Social Work	Carmen Moreno (A) Bernadette Hadden
Sociology	Juan Battle (A)

Special Education	Dona Matthews (A)
Student Services	Madlyn Stokely Reva Cohen (A) "E"
Theater :	Alan Sikes "E"
Urban Affairs	Stanley Moses (A)

Lecturers and Part-Time Faculty:

Claus Mueller (Sociology)
Joshua Grumet (Film&Media)
Robert Koehl (Classics)
William Mayer (Classics) "E"

Administration :

Dean Jacqueline Mondros (A)

Ex-Officio :

Ahmed Tigani, USG President
Sarit Levy, GSA President
Jason Ares, CLT Council President

Students:

Sonia Parrales (Psychology)
Jonathan Alexandratos (History)
Anthony McRae (Music)
Emily Bell Dinam
Nicole Odom
Sivia Naimer (Economics)
Dorothy Wing in Ng "E"
Channel Mellish
Jenny Alcaide (undeclared)
Christopher Kenny (Poli.Sci.)
Sean Kivlehan (THHP)
Alex Kohen (Poli.Sci.)
Tithi Ghosh (Math)
Danilda Abreu (Sociology)
George Ra'cz (Film & Media)
Siobhan Cawley
Sharlene Hamlet
Jian Jie Ren "E"
James Wagstaff (Graduate)
Gary Henkle (undeclared)
Marina Matatov (BA/MA)
Alexander Kipp (Grad.Theater)

APPENDIX II: President Raab's Report to the Master Plan Committee

Background

In June 1999, Hunter College released its ten-year Master Plan Amendment which outlined key priorities and development strategies to “provide adequate growth and to maintain the School of Arts and Sciences, Hunter’s largest academic unit at the 68th Street Campus.” The Master Plan was the result of a comprehensive and participatory process which involved all of the constituencies of the College community. The process was supported by a team of architects and planners that conducted forty-nine interviews with faculty, students and staff. The Hunter College Senate Master Plan Committee was integrally involved in this planning process. In addition, the consultants made presentations to the College community and solicited comments. The Master Plan Committee approved the final plan as did the Hunter College Senate. The Master Plan was then passed by the CUNY Board of Trustees.

The Master Plan described the severe shortage of space at the 68th Street campus and surveyed the deteriorating and increasingly inadequate condition of buildings on both the 68th Street and Brookdale campuses. The Plan documented a 175,000 square foot deficit in research and instructional space at the 68th Street campus.

The top priority identified by the Master Plan was the creation of a new science building as close to the 68th Street campus as possible. This finding reflected the shortage of laboratory and teaching space for the growing number of Hunter scientists. It also reflected the antiquated conditions of our science labs and teaching spaces.

The Master Plan made clear that the North Building, which houses Hunter’s science programs, was never intended to serve as a major research center or house the kinds of laboratories that today’s scientists and students require. Built in 1939, and one of the oldest structures in the CUNY system, the North Building was not designed to meet the needs of 21st century research. Its concrete structure makes it virtually impossible to retrofit. Faculty interviewed during the planning process made clear that the electrical system in the North Building was at capacity, forcing researchers to decide which piece of equipment to unplug in order to provide power to new equipment. Poor temperature control, air quality, physical deterioration, and insufficient audio-visual and technological infrastructure impeded the science faculty’s ability to teach and effectively pursue their research. Our scientists acknowledged that they were at risk of losing grant funding because of their outdated laboratories.

The Master Plan directed that all the disciplines within the School of Arts and Sciences remain together at the 68th Street campus in order to maintain the school’s integrity and support Hunter’s academic strength. The Master Plan mentioned the possibility of moving the science facility to Brookdale only if the solution of building close to 68th Street could not be achieved. This option was deemed to be a “fall back” position, to be considered only as a contingency plan to provide additional space and new facilities for the sciences – the mandate to build a new science facility near the 68th Street campus was described as “the preferred approach, since it maintains and strengthens the academic structure of the college and enables growth to occur where it is most needed.” (Master Plan)

Implementing the Master Plan

Since 2001, we have worked closely with CUNY’s central administration to begin implementation of the Hunter College Master Plan. The first challenge was to secure CUNY’s commitment to funding the capital needs outlined in the Plan. After years without significant capital investment, we were pleased when the 2003 CUNY capital budget included funds to fully restore Roosevelt House, to build a new science building, and for other capital infrastructure needs. The Governor and State Legislature then approved these expenditures.

As we have reported to the Master Plan committee and the Senate over the last year, the restoration of Roosevelt House is fully underway. We expect construction to be completed and the doors to open by January 2008.

After securing the commitment to fund the science building, our goal was to find a suitable location near the College's 68th Street campus. This was an extraordinary challenge, given that development sites on the Upper East Side are scarce and expensive.

Working closely with CUNY, we retained the services of a real estate advisor, CB Richard Ellis (CBRE), and land use counsel, Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP. We investigated many potential sites in the neighborhood—including the Fox studio building on East 67th Street, which had been identified in the Master Plan. This site was not for sale, and was also not large enough to accommodate a science building. After surveying other options with the support of CBRE, we returned to an idea that had long been discussed in the community—the site of the current Julia Richman Education Complex.

The Current Proposal

We are presently working with the Department of Education (DoE) to acquire the Julia Richman Education Complex on 2nd Avenue between 67th and 68th Streets. This site meets the parameters of the 1999 Master Plan in both location and size. DoE has agreed that if a new, state-of-the-art facility is built at the Brookdale site for the schools and programs currently located at Julia Richman, Hunter/CUNY may acquire the site at East 67th Street and Second Avenue for construction of a new science and health professions building.

We are also preparing to gauge the private sector's interest in purchasing the Brookdale site for development. Since the funds realized by the sale of Brookdale will be reinvested in the 67th Street project to build new facilities for nursing, public health, physical therapy and other allied health programs, we obviously hope to maximize our profit. In December, we will issue a "Request for Expression of Interest" (RFEI) to the real estate community. The RFEI will make clear that the purchaser is required to build a state-of-the-art building to house the schools and programs currently in the Julia Richman complex as a condition of the sale. It will also explicitly require the purchaser to commit to either maintain the Brookdale dormitory, or to provide comparable, affordable housing for 600 Hunter students.

We are pleased that for the first time in Hunter's history, our superb nursing and health professions programs will be fully integrated into the main Hunter College campus and will have new facilities commensurate with the excellence of these programs. This is even more exciting now that CUNY has selected Hunter College as the future home of the first CUNY School of Public Health. We acknowledge that the Master Plan did not anticipate the relocation of the academic programs at the Brookdale campus. However, the Brookdale community, which we consulted about this public-private development opportunity, supports the idea of moving closer to the 68th Street campus and leveraging the value of the Brookdale land for construction of new state-of-the-art facilities.

The current proposal realizes the goals of the Master Plan by providing new space for the entire college community near the main campus; creating new state-of-the-art space for science and health research and teaching; and addressing the deteriorating conditions of the Brookdale campus, which was built in the 1950s, and is not suitable for our current needs.

We will be able to meet these goals with a new building that is modest in scale and that is sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood. We will not apply for a zoning change that would allow us to build a large tower. Rather, we will propose an as-of-right project – a project that is allowed under the existing zoning, and requires no community or city approval. Although the building is not yet designed, we expect that it will be no more than fourteen stories tall plus two stories of mechanical equipment on Second Avenue. On the side streets of East 67th and East 68th, its street wall height will be no greater than sixty feet, which is actually shorter than the existing Julia Richman building. We will work with the neighborhood to minimize disruption during construction. And we will protect the adjacent St. Catherine's Park and help to support and maintain it when the project is complete.

Addressing Community Concerns

There is some understandable concern in the neighborhood about new construction. Again, it is important to note that we expect our building to be sixteen stories, significantly smaller than many of the recent institutional projects in the neighborhood, such as the forty-story Memorial Sloan Kettering tower.

Certain administrators from the Julia Richman community have also expressed their concern about relocation. However, we continue to believe that this is a win-win proposal. The Julia Richman community will move from an eighty year old building to a modern facility that they will help design. No students, faculty or staff will leave the Julia Richman Complex until their new space is ready to be occupied. The Julia Richman students, staff and faculty will not have to relocate to temporary swing space. This is in stark contrast to the other DoE "new construction" projects in this neighborhood – one on East 91st Street and one on

apartment towers above. In these cases, the schools will be displaced for years as construction proceeds. Our plan, on the other hand, is predicated on the condition that students will not leave until their new building is fully ready.

It is important to note that only thirty-three students out of the 1,666 students at the Julia Richman schools live in the school's 10021 zip code. In fact, more than fifty percent of all students attending school at Julia Richman come from boroughs other than Manhattan. (Department of Education figures as of October 2006). Moreover, a very small fraction of the current student body at Julia Richman will be affected by this project. The Julia Richman population is primarily comprised of high school students who will have graduated by 2010 – the earliest these new schools could be completed.

Moving forward

Once the new Julia Richman school facility is completed at the Brookdale site and the schools have moved in, we will begin demolition of the Julia Richman building and start construction of our new science and health professions building. We hope to complete construction by 2012 – 2013.

We want to assure the college community that the plans for Hunter's new science and health professions building have not yet been developed and that the building has not been designed. Specifically, there has been no determination as to which departments will be relocated from the North Building to the new building. Until recently – when the city's commitment to this project became clear—it was premature to begin that discussion. It is now time to ask these questions: What are the features of a state-of-the-art science and health professions building? How do we allocate space between research and teaching needs? How do we facilitate programs moving up from Brookdale partnering with their science colleagues at 68th Street? These are only a few of the myriad questions that the Hunter community must begin to explore. At the start of the new year, the Provost will convene campus groups to enter into the planning process to address these and other questions. We will continue to work closely with the Senate Master Plan Committee as this process proceeds.

Once we decide who will move from the North Building to the new site, the question of renovations and redesign of the North Building will be before us. Many of the non-laboratory scientists among us will be asked to discuss how to assign and design the approximately 150,000-200,000 or more square feet that will be available in the North Building once their colleagues move to the new facility.

There is understandable concern among the Brookdale faculty about the possibility that some programs will need to relocate temporarily before the new building is completed. We will know more about relocation needs as we move ahead with the planning phase. But, we do know that if relocation is necessary, it cannot happen without adequate swing space. We understand that our Brookdale programs must continue to thrive and meet all accreditation standards if and when they are temporarily relocated. We are committed to minimizing disruption during relocation, and to ensuring that all the activities at Brookdale receive the support and attention they need during what will certainly be a challenging period. We are certain that the Hunter community joins us in expressing great appreciation to the Brookdale community for any inconvenience they may endure as a result of this project. We hope that the opportunity to have new state-of-the-art facilities and to be integrated into the Hunter community and the East Side science corridor – all benefits that would otherwise not be possible – will be worth whatever inconvenience and challenges lie ahead.

Conclusion

Hunter College is well on its way to achieving the goals set forth in the 1999 Master Plan and to becoming an institution that will continue to excel in the next century. We look forward to a time when our faculty can perform their award-winning, cutting edge research in state-of-the-art laboratory space. We happily anticipate watching our students learn in one of the finest science and health facilities in the country.

I want to thank the Master Plan Committee for its guidance, support, and input. I am pleased with the progress we have made thus far towards implementing the Master Plan and look forward to working with the community in the near future.