

MINUTES

**Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
5 November 1986**

	The 113th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:05 p.m. in Room W714.	1 2
Presiding:	F. Fulton Ross, Chair	3
Attendance:	The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those listed in Appendix I.	4 5
Report by the Administrative Committee:	Prof. Ruth Sidel, Secretary of the Senate, presented the report as follows:	6
	a. Yielded the floor to Prof. Jack Caravanos for a report concerning the Asbestos Watch. Prof. Caravanos informed the Senate that the Environmental Safety Committee would be meeting once a month, and that he is planning to report to the Senate after each meeting. He informed the Senate that the equipment for training maintenance personnel had been delivered in time for the scheduled training session.	7 8 9 10 11 12
	b. Presented the additional nominations for vacant seats on the Senate as distributed, and moved for approval of the slate as a package.	13 14
	The motion carried by voice vote and the following were elected to membership on the Senate:	15 16
	<u>Students:</u> Karen L. Jacoby (Education/Sociology) Day Rosa Nunez (Undeclared) Day Michael Richman - Day Sonia S. Tirado - Day	17 18 19 20
	c. Opened the floor for nominations to fill the vacant seat on the Nominating Committee for a Student Alternate.	21 22
	There were no nominations.	23
	d. Moved that the Agenda be changed so that item #3.b. (report by the Committee on Evaluation of Academic Administrators) and item #5 (Old Business) be moved ahead of item # 3.a. (Discussion of Senate-Sponsored Open Hearings).	24 25 26 27
	The motion was approved by voice vote.	28
	e. Yielded the floor to Vice President Fishman. Vice President Fishman informed the Senate that evening students are needed to serve on the Student Elections Committee for student government elections. She requested that interested evening student senators submit their names to her office before next Wednesday.	29 30 31 32 33
Committee Reports:	<u>Committee on Evaluation of Academic Administrators</u> Prof. Tom Mader, Chair of the Committee presented the following report as distributed:	34 35 36
	The Standing Committee on Evaluation of Academic Administrators has met with the Senate's Administrative Committee and with Provost LeMelle regarding the Committee's report on the evaluation of Dean Hugh Scott, who heads the Division of Programs in Education. In both meetings the topics discussed were the Committee's objectives, its methodology, and the dissemination of its report. Subsequent to those meetings, the Committee has prepared this report on its objectives and the dissemination of its report on academic administrators. In regard to the Committee's methodology, Professor Peter Tuckel will explain the rationale for our approach to gathering useful and valid information.	37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46
	Regarding objectives, the Committee views the evaluation of academic administrators as a positive, constructive process, having the potential	47 48

to (1) enhance the effectiveness of academic administrators, (2) provide an objective review and record of performance for higher administrators, (3) affirm the principle of accountability, and (4) provide faculty and staff with a formal vehicle to express their opinions on how academic administrators influence their functions within the college. These objectives are in line with the May 19, 1981 report of CUNY's University Faculty Senate and with the AAUP's December 1980 statement on the evaluation of administrators (Strohm, P., "Toward an AAUP Policy on Evaluation of Administrators," December 1980, 406-412).

Regarding the dissemination of the Committee's evaluation reports, the Senate News Bulletin of January 6, 1982, says: "The Ad-hoc Committee shall submit its final report to the Standing Committee which shall then report to the Senate. The final report will be submitted to the administrator under evaluation and the superior of the administrator by the Administrative Committee of the Senate, and a copy shall be kept on file in the Senate Office." Up to this point, the Committee has evaluated three administrators, and in each case, it has submitted a report that has been distributed to all members of the Senate.

Some of the central issues that were recognized originally by the committee, such as confidentiality, accountability, and dissemination necessitate a general review of the procedures to be followed in making a report to the Senate. The Committee now asks the Senate to make its pleasure known for future reports.

Prof. Mader then yielded the floor to Prof. Peter Tuckel. Prof. Tuckel provided the following overview of the methodology that was employed in the evaluations of the Deans of the Division of Programs in Education and the School of Social Work:

Prof. Tuckel stated that he had been invited by Prof. Mader to work with the Committee to try and improve the questionnaire that was used in the evaluation of the Dean of Social Sciences. After joining the Committee, the first thing that was done was to investigate what other surveys had been conducted to evaluate academic administrators. The Committee then patterned their survey after a model questionnaire found in a text devoted to the topic of evaluation of academic administrators, which was published by the University of Illinois Press. The next step was to solicit from the faculty of the Division of Programs in Education their views on what they felt was important in terms of the criteria upon which to base an evaluation of a dean, and those views were incorporated in the questionnaire. The Committee then showed the questionnaire to two other experts in the field of survey design, and both concurred that the survey was sensitive and was a good questionnaire. The questionnaire was then pilot-tested. People who participated in the pilot-testing informed the Committee that the questionnaire covered all bases and was easy to fill out. Finally, the questionnaire was administered to the entire faculty in the Division of Programs in Education. The response rate achieved among full-time faculty was close to 85%—a phenomenally high response. Prof. Tuckel stated that the response rate is important for two reasons. First, if the response rate is low there can't be much confidence in the findings. It would not be known if the opinions of people who filled out the questionnaire differ from those who did not. Second, if a high response rate is not achieved, it is usually an indication that the questionnaire is poorly constructed. With the questionnaire that was used in the evaluation of the Dean of Programs in Education the Committee received a response rate among full-time faculty of 85% as compared to well below 50% with the questionnaire used for the evaluation of the Dean of Social Sciences.

Prof. Tuckel pointed out that the survey is probably the most pervasive data-gathering tool there is in the social sciences. Despite the prevalence of this data-gathering technique, there is no way of measuring the validity of results. The only measurement available is what is called "face validity", i.e. whether or not the results coincide with expectations which is a very crude measure of validity. However, the Committee also conducted in-depth interviews with several faculty members of the Division of Programs in Education. Each interview was conducted in the presence of at least

two Committee members and lasted anywhere from 45 minutes to an hour. 112
The Committee found a total convergence of results between the in-depth 113
interviews and the survey. When the results of two independent methodo- 114
logies confirm each other, as they did in this case, this provides an acid 115
test of the validity of a methodology. 116

Prof. Tuckel then addressed two specific issues which were raised by the 117
Senate. One issue raised dealt with the way the data were collapsed. People 118
responded to a seven point item scale and what the Committee did was 119
to collapse the top two categories, the bottom two categories, and the 120
middle three categories. This is a perfectly valid and legitimate way of 121
analyzing data. To make sure that no biases intruded because of the way 122
the data were collapsed, the Committee also collapsed the data in several 123
other ways. But it always came up with the same substantive findings. 124
Another question raised by the Senate was the question as to why the Com- 125
mittee highlighted Academic Skills in the report. Prof. Tuckel informed 126
the Senate that it was the data, and not the Committee, that highlighted 127
Academic Skills. Faculty members of the Department of Academic Skills 128
as a whole answered the questions in a different way than faculty members 129
in other departments. That distinction emerged from the data and was 130
noted. The Committee did not impose the distinction on the data. Similar- 131
ly, the Committee found that the younger faculty members answered the 132
questions differently as a whole than the older faculty members, and that 133
distinction was noted. 134

Prof. Tuckel concluded his report by saying that the methodology was a 135
rigorous undertaking and that the members of the Committee took a great 136
deal of pride in the way the methodology was carried out. 137

During discussion, and in response to a question from the floor concerning the 138
status of the 1985 Charter Amendments, Provost LeMelle informed the Senate 139
that the Amendments are still under review by the Legal Office of the Board 140
of Trustees. The Provost said that Michael Solomon, Legal Affairs Officer, 141
will be requesting clarification and consultation with Senate representatives 142
and the Provost. The Amendments would then be scheduled for approval at 143
the Board meeting of January 6 or March 10. 144

After further discussion, Prof. Polsky moved that discussion on the report be 145
closed and that the Committee on Evaluation of Academic Administrators be 146
requested to review the procedures and submit their recommendations for Se- 147
nate approval. 148

After further discussion the question was called and carried. 149

The motion carried by voice vote. 150

Old Business:

Prof. Ross presented the Administrative Committee's response to Prof. Brick's 151
resolution passed by the Senate on October 22nd, 1986. The following is a trans- 152
cript of that response: 153

"That resolution states: RESOLVED that the Senate Administrative Committee 154
report to the Senate concerning the Senate's relationship with the "Committee 155
on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights" newly announced by the Professional 156
Staff Congress, which Committee, according to the PSC announcement, "has 157
been endorsed by the Academic Senate and the Faculty Delegate Assembly." 158
The resolution details requests for specific information which I shall give in 159
the order listed in that resolution. 160

1. "What Consent was given?" 161

Let me say first that the Administrative Committee did not endorse the 162
Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights on behalf of the 163
Senate. Towards the end of the Spring term, 1986, Prof. Beverly Sowande 164
in her capacity as Chairperson of the Hunter Chapter of the Professional 165
Staff Congress, met with the Administrative Committee to discuss Senate 166
recognition of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights. 167
At that meeting, it was made clear that the AdministratievCommittee 168
was not empowered to endorse the new Committee on behalf of the Senate. 169
The Administrative Committee did agree, however, to acknowledge the 170

Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights in the absence of full Senate endorsement. The exact term used in acknowledgment by the Administrative Committee was reached by consensus, but at a meeting of the Administrative Committee of last year's composition held on October 30, 1986, what wording was used could not be agreed on. At that meeting were Professors Gropper, DeSalvo, myself and Renate Murray.	171 172 173 174 175 176
2. The relationship between the Senate and the PSC's new Committee in terms of the Charter for a Governance of Hunter College, Article II, Section 1, which states that "The Senate shall have policy making powers in ...E. Safeguarding the academic freedom of ALL members of the Hunter College community."	177 178 179 180 181
It is the belief of the Administrative Committee that the Hunter College Senate does not have exclusive rights over the safeguarding of academic freedom at Hunter College. At least two other organizations make reference to guarding of those rights in their governing by-laws.	182 183 184 185
3. The role of the Chairperson in serving on the PSC Committee, in relation to the present PSC announcement's listing of "Professor Fulton Ross, Chair of the Academic Senate;" for example, does he represent the Senate in this role?	186 187 188 189
I was asked to be a member of that committee and I accepted. The use of my title is for purposes of identification and not for purposes of representing the Senate.	190 191 192
4. The significance of the PSC adopted term "Academic Senate."	193
Dr. Sowande explained on October 22nd that she thought that that was the official name of the body. She apologized at that time for her mistake. In this regard it should be noted that in order to avoid being confused with the Student Government Senate, the term Hunter College Academic Senate has been used in the past by the Senate Office.	194 195 196 197 198
5. The relationship with the Faculty Delegate Assembly, a non-governance organization, named in the PSC announcement as co-endorser with the Senate. In this regard it should be noted that "Professor David Hodges, President of the Faculty Delegate Assembly" is thus listed as a Committee member. Does he represent the FDA in this role, in parallel manner to the Senate Chairperson representing the Senate?	199 200 201 202 203 204
I have already said that I do not represent the Senate on the Committee. I cannot speak for Prof. Hodges.	205 206
I want to stress as strongly as I know how, on behalf of the Administrative Committee, that all parties involved in this matter acted in good faith and in honesty, and we sincerely hope that relations between the Professional Staff Congress and the Senate continue on the very high level of cooperation that has existed in the past.	207 208 209 210 211
The Administrative Committee, as part of its response to the resolution, has agreed to invite Prof. Beverly Sowande to speak on this matter at this time."	212 213
Prof. Sowande's presented the following statement:	214
"Let me begin by saying that my recollection differs from that of the Administrative Committee and reported by Prof. Ross as to two important matters in the document under discussion.	215 216 217
I met with the Administrative Committee on 5/15/86. I asked the Administrative Committee for the term "recognized" so that the opening statement would have read: "A Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights... and recognized" by the Senate and the FDA. Early in the discussion the Administrative Committee made it quite clear in the most unambiguous terms that it did not have the authority to agree to the original term requested, but that it could take some lesser action, I assumed on	218 219 220 221 222 223 224

behalf of the Senate. We discussed the use of terms that would be narrower in meaning, less broad in implication. We agreed on a term, I recall that it was "endorsed," in the sense of acknowledged or approved, and referring to the existence of the committee. In retrospect, we all agree that we should have chosen the word acknowledge. As obvious as it may seem now, none of us thought of it at the time.	225 226 227 228 229 230
During the meeting on May 15th, we discussed the basis of the committee's legitimacy, which is the PSC/CUNY contract, especially its <u>Preamble</u> and the PSC/AAUP affiliation.	231 232 233
We discussed the committee's function and its procedures.	234
There were three objections raised by one Administrative Committee member. The first objection was based on a misconception that the committee would be engaged in judicial or quasi judicial activities which would give rise to law suits. This is simply not the case and was explored fully. The objection was then removed.	235 236 237 238 239
The second objection was to the committee's plan to accept inquiries from students. This Administrative Committee member feared that students would use this as an opportunity to complain about, to report things about or 'get at' particular members of the faculty. We discussed the appropriateness of receiving inquiries from students and whether students might attempt to or be able to misuse the Committee. It was agreed that there was no reason to anticipate any extraordinary problems. Students have a right to academic freedom, too.	240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247
The third objection was to the attribution of the concept of Academic Freedom, as known in the United States, to European origin. This objection, too, was discussed at length.	248 249 250
With these initial objections resolved and in the absence of further objections, a consensus was reached to support the Committee on Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights.	251 252 253
Now to another matter. Yes, I did ask Prof. Ross to serve on the committee because he is Chair of the Senate. His participation is not in a representative capacity. I asked him because I recognize the importance of his office in this community and the importance of the perspective one in his office has. Were Fulton not Senate Chair, I would have asked him to serve on the committee anyway and I would have invited the then current Senate Chair, too.	254 255 256 257 258 259 260
As to the question raised about the use of "Academic Senate" as opposed to Hunter College Senate: This was purely the result of my ignorance. It was not and is not, referring to item 4 of Prof. Brick's Resolution, "a PSC adopted term." Over the years I have often heard the Senate referred to as the "Academic Senate" and by Senators. This was no veiled attempt to accomplish any foul deed. And, again, if I have offended this body you have my sincere apology, for I have no wish to offend you.	261 262 263 264 265 266 267
But, if I understand all of Prof. Brick's objections, it seems that their focus is around an old question, that of Senate and FDA co-existence on this campus.	268 269 270
Debate on this issue began shortly after I joined this faculty 16 years ago. I thought the question was settled. The Senate is by law the governance body of Hunter College.	271 272 273
Yet it appears that some of us believe that the debate should continue. Some of us believe that the Senate and the FDA must maintain an adversarial relationship if the Senate is to survive. Some of us would invest still more years in keeping old grievances alive. I do not hold this view.	274 275 276 277
It is sometimes important and necessary for people to express disagreement. Perhaps it was even unavoidable many years ago that this faculty would	278 279

have a conflict of opinion about governance. I don't know. But I do know that conflict without resolution, discord that is allowed to become endemic, if you will, is destructive. A divided faculty is a weakened faculty.	280 281 282
It really is time to view differences that have existed in the past as history and it is time for all of us to let the past be the past. The life and integrity of this body are not threatened by its acts of cooperation. On the contrary, such acts move us all towards the day when we can, in truth, be a community.	283 284 285 286 287
Thank you."	288
During discussion the Chair proposed that, because of the late hour and before discussing the resolution distributed by Prof. Korn, the Agenda be changed to allow the Nominating Committee to report next.	289 290 291
There having been no objection it was so ordered.	292
<u>Nominating Committee</u>	293
Dr. Marilyn Rothschild, Chair of the Committee, presented the Committee's slate to fill vacant seats on Senate Committees.	294 295
A motion to approve the slate as a package carried by voice vote, and the following were elected:	296 297
<u>Undergraduate Course of Study Committee</u>	298
Faculty: Gloria Essoka (Nursing)	299
Faculty Alternate: David Cooper (Curric. & Teaching)	300
<u>Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee</u>	301
Student Alternate: Amy Kossoy - Day	302
<u>Graduate Academic Requirements Committee</u>	303
Faculty from School of Social Work: Yvonne Asamoah	304
Faculty from School of Nursing: Josephine Kirsch	305
<u>Student Standing Committee</u>	306
Faculty: Marilyn May (Nursing)	307
Faculty Alternate: Ruth Ramsay (Communications)	308
<u>Budget Committee</u>	309
Student: Lidelfo Franco (Span.Lit/Interam.Aff.)	310
<u>Master Plan Committee</u>	311
Student: Renee Diones (Junior) Day	312
<u>Committee on Evaluation of Academic Administrators</u>	313
Faculty for term ending 12/86: Eileen Lahey (Nursing)	314
<u>Charter Review Committee</u>	315
Faculty Alternate: Edith Maldonado (Academic Skills)	316
A motion to adjourn carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.	317

Respectfully submitted,



Ruth Sidel

Secretary

Minutes
Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
5 November 1986

APPENDIX I

The following members were noted as being absent from the meeting:

FACULTY:

Anthropology: Louise Lennihan "E"
Susan Les

Biology: Ezra Shahn "E"
Robert Grant

Black & Puerto Rican Studies: Jaffer Kassamali

Chemistry: Richard Franck

Computer Science: Constantin Negoita

Curriculum & Teaching: Andre Thibodeau

Educational Foundations: Joan Buxbaum "E"
Marvin Wayne
Sherryl B. Graves

Geology & Geography: Richard Liebling
Charles Heatwole

Health & Physical Education: Tom Burke "E"

History: Edith Link

Health Sciences: Russell Sergeant
Karen O'Brien

Library: Earl Shaffer "E"

Music: Jana Feinman
Clayton Westermann

Philosophy: Virginia Held "E"

Physics & Astronomy: Sook Lee
Rodney Varley "E"

Political Science: Benedetto Fontana

Psychology: Gerald Turkewitz "E"

Romance Languages: Giuseppe DiScipio "E"

Social Work: Gary Anderson "E"
Rose Starr

Sociology: John Cuddihy "E"
Vladimir Nahirny
Carmen Hendricks "E"

Special Education: Katherine Garnett "E"

Theatre & Film: Patricia Sternberg
Joel Zucker
Sara Beilis Uttley

Administration: Dean Richard Mawe
Dean Hugh Scott "E"
Dean Everlena Holmes

STUDENTS: Roger Kennedy
Peter Gallert "E"
Tamara Barinski
R.V. Phoewhawn
Floralba Arbelo
David Eskin
Rosa Heredia
Kirk Callendar
Irene Hanna
Colleen Kojima
Lionor Alvarez
Chris Kikis
Elizabeth Petry
Christopher Seeger
Herbert Weiss
Dennis Bianco "E"
Sheila Dowling
Maryana Buneta
Lucrezia Accardo
Anthony Mancini
Susan Conrad
Cathleen Goodman
Martha Sheparce
Debra Schmitt
Beth Warshofsky
Helene Reisman
Salvatore Capalbo
Michael Kraljev
Bernie Jones "E"
Gille Peterson
Julie Harrison
Donald Morgan
Karl Rutter
Lindsay Hamilton
Renee Williams
Margit Genter
Austin McBean
Linda Flannelly
Kathleen D'Arcy
Norma Moy "E"
Anahit Djirdjirian
Barbara Hughes
Michelle Joyce
Hyacinth Wright