

MINUTES

**Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
9 December 1992**

	The 285th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:30 PM in Room W714.	1 2
Presiding:	Kenneth S. Sherrill, Chair	3
Attendance:	The elected members of the Senate, with the exception of those listed in Appendix I.	4 5
Report by the President:	The following is a summary statement of President LeClerc's report to the Senate:	6 7
	He said: "It seems that the University makes the local newspapers at least every other week. I had meant to call the attention of the Senate to an old brouhaha at the last meeting, but I forgot to do so and I apologize for that. Let me begin with an old story and then talk about the most recent story. The old story has to do with a piece the <u>Post</u> ran, that was quickly picked up by local television and radio stations, having to do with salaries for executives within the University. I want you all to know that Hunter was not on the list of colleges and was not involved in that story. In fact, as everyone in the College ought to know by now, we have significantly cut back the size of senior levels of the administration of the College, and so we are exempt from any imagined or real issues having to do with that particular story.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
	Relative to the news that broke yesterday, and this is the report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning, I would like to make several points. First of all, it is a report that was done by eleven individuals— four presidents, six distinguished professors, and 1 staff person. The individual campuses and the individual campus presidents really made no input into that process. We were not asked to recommend any members of the committee, we were not given the option to recommend any members of the committee, and we did not recommend any members of the committee. All the data that was used in the report came from 80th Street. Those data did not come from the campuses, so that the individual campus involvement in the deliberative process that went on within the committee relative to this report, the level of involvement of campuses in the drafting of this report, was nil. It is important because there are rumors going around that we must have proposed some names and that we must have given them the data—none of that is the case. This is a committee that worked very intensively over the space of several months to come up with a report that addresses a series of issues having to do with what some people believe are under-enrolled programs at the University, and a series of other programs that should be developed more aggressively than they appear now to be developed.	20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39
	The presidents received the report at the tail end of a meeting of the Council of Presidents at 80th Street at 11:45 on Monday morning. I got back to the College at about 12 noon. Ken Sherrill was the first person I saw here. He was the first person at Hunter to touch the report, and I think that he was the first governance head within the university system to have gotten a copy of it. He had his copy I believe by 4:00 Monday afternoon. As soon as I got back we sent the report over to the Duplicating Center at Hunter. We had 100 copies made with broad distribution. Almost all of those copies were picked up from my office by noon yesterday. There was no way that we could get copies out before the <u>Times</u> article appeared, but we tried to get copies in the right hands as quickly as possible. The distribution of the report from my office was to the following individuals at Hunter: the Vice Presidents, the Deans, the FP&B, Program Heads; the Chairs or Presidents of the Hunter College Senate, the Faculty Delegate Assembly, the PSC Chapter, the three Student Governments. Copies were also distributed to the Strategic Planning Committee and to the <u>Shield</u> and the <u>Envoy</u> . In addition, we are placing	40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56

copies of the report at the reference desks of the Libraries of the College, so that those having difficulty seeing them in student government offices or faculty departmental offices will have a chance to see them in the Library. 57
58
59
60

Attached to the report I appended the letter of transmittal from the Chancellor to the Presidents that outlines the history of this particular initiative, and that calls for a response by the campuses to the Chancellor on the report and its contents by March 31 of 1993. I also attached a cover memorandum from me to all the recipients of the report in which I outlined the process that I believe is best for us to follow at Hunter in the period between today and March 31st. It is basically a simple one and is as follows: By March 10th of 1993 I am asking that the responses of the Senate, the FDA, the Deans, the FP&B, Program Heads, Student Governments, and other local constituency groups be due in my office. On March 12th I will then turn over all of those internal responses from various sectors of the campus to the Strategic Planning Committee. I think you all know about the Strategic Planning Committee. It is a cross-sectional group that includes Vice Presidents, Deans, Department Chairpersons, the Head of the Senate, the Head of the FDA, the Chairs of the Senate's long-range planning committee, a representative of the Gittle-sons, a representative of the HEOs, a representative of the doctoral programs, and the three student government presidents. So, on March 12th I will transmit to the Strategic Planning Committee all of the internal responses to the report, and will ask that the Strategic Planning Committee come up with its responses by March 28th, should they differ in any way from those that have come in. That gives me two days in which to draft my own cover memorandum to the Chancellor so that we meet the March 31st deadline. 61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84

Now, this is a report that will arouse a great deal of debate—not to mention controversy—and that debate is already going on in many quarters in the City, and we are reading about it in the newspapers. It is appropriate that there be full, and extensive, and exhaustive debate at Hunter as well as elsewhere, about the things that are mentioned in this report and, in particular, the recommendations that are made. If there is a disadvantage to the report from my perspective, it is that it does not explain in any way what implementation of these recommendations really means. The Presidents were told that if any campus gives up a program, that campus gets to keep the resources that have been allocated to the program, which makes it difficult to understand how campuses benefit if they are on the receiving end of the program. Provost Struminger was at a meeting this morning of all the Provosts with the Academic Vice Chancellor at 80th Street. She raised the question, and I am pushing for them to come up with some good working definitions before the debate really engages at Hunter, because our response has to be qualified by the extent to which we have a clear sense of what implementation means. What does it mean if a campus consolidates a program, if a campus receives portions of a program, if a campus gives up a program? How are the savings realized, and who benefits from them? It is of vital consequence for us that we respond. We have no option but to respond. But it is also of vital consequence for us at Hunter to have a response that is coherent academically, and coherent politically. 85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107

I am very, very proud of the openness that we have had at this College for the last 4¼ years—I speak only of my time—about issues, about information, about data. We have not always agreed with each other, but we have moved through a very difficult time in the College's fiscal history in a series of processes that I think are profoundly democratic in nature. I think that you all know in the Senate that this Administration has the highest regard for the governing body of the College, has sought to work closely with it, and we have produced a number of successes for us as an academic community in the past. In this instance as well, it is very important that everyone has a chance to read what is in the report, to think about the implications for us as a college, and to talk about them. It is important as well that the duly constituted organs and organizations of the College have a chance in formal kinds of ways to express their views, to raise questions, to make corrections, but to deliberate as we in the academy know it is our responsibility to do, and as we know how to do at 108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122

Hunter very well, indeed. Political coherence to our own process is essential to our sense of integrity and purpose as a community, and we should not lose sight of the value of that for us as a community. In terms of the academic coherence of the process we have to be very, very clear about the implications for us, the advantages and disadvantages of being in the position that the report proposes, which is a real leadership position within the City University in terms of the breadth, the extent, and the diversity of our curricula. I am not, as you could tell from these comments, passing judgment at this point on the report and on its contents. I am very, very anxious to hear the thinking of the Senate, and to see in writing the responses of the Senate to the report. Ken Sherrill and I have had a number of discussions over the last thirty-six hours on this report. He will manage the process by which the Senate and its standing committees consider this, and I know full well that this is going to be a good, clean process at Hunter—open, honest, and democratic." 123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137

President LeClerc concluded his report by answering questions from the floor. 138
139

**Report by the
Administrative
Committee:**

Report by the Chair

The following is a summary statement of professor Sherrill's report. He said: 140
141

"As President LeClerc indicated, I did indeed get a copy of this report by about 4:00 on Monday afternoon, and in fact did touch it as he was entering the building. While at first I thought this was symbolic and charming, I later discovered that it really was wonderful, because I may well have been the only governance head of any college in the university to have seen it on Monday, and to have had an opportunity to try to read it between its release and the meeting with the Chancellor at the University Faculty Senate last night. At many campuses of the university the report has been embargoed. Chairs of faculty and of college-wide governance bodies have been denied access to the report. There is an atmosphere of secrecy and of protection of information which continues at much of the university and which is scandalous. I feel very uncomfortable ever supporting any president of any organization, but I really think that we have to be extremely appreciative of the atmosphere of openness that President LeClerc is fostering here. I don't think he should get used to these compliments from me, but I really do appreciate it. I didn't realize until last night how rare it was in this university for faculty and students to have an opportunity to see information of this sort. What is normal here should be normal at other places. 142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160

I want to say that I think that it is an absolute scandal that students, faculty, staff, and most administrators, learned of the contents of this report from the New York Times rather than being involved in the process of writing it. I also want to say that a report of this sort, which attempts to shape the future of a university without widespread input and participation from those people who are the lifeblood of the university has very little moral standing—no matter how many barrels of guns may accompany it. At some point we are going to have to say something about the process that was followed in writing this report. 161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169

Copies of the report will be in the Senate Office. The President is placing some on reserve, thus sparing our xerox budget. Copies will also go to members of the Administrative Committee, the Master Plan Committee, the Budget Committee, and other appropriate Senate committees. As soon as people have a chance to read and respond in a fashion other than outrage over the process, we will have, I fear, lengthy conversations about the content. 170
171
172
173
174
175
176

There are a couple of points that have to be made about this report. One is that it makes no academic judgements. It was kind of funny last night at the University Faculty Senate. When I got a chance to ask the Chancellor a couple of questions, I began by saying that the report made no academic judgements, and she readily concurred. I then told her that one of my problems with it is that it has a distinctly anti-intellectual tone. What passes for evidence in this report is often based purely on numbers 177
178
179
180
181
182
183

not placed in any meaningful contexts—enrollments, degrees granted, and so on. Second there is not one word in the report about implementation. I asked the Chancellor last night whether or not we have the option of refusing some of the generous gifts of programs that the report recommends giving to us. There are serious questions as to whether or not we have the space to accommodate them, whether or not we have adequate faculty and staff to do these things, whether or not they fit within our academic judgement as to the appropriate role and function of this college, whether or not we want to offer these courses, whether or not we think them appropriate for our students, and so on.

We have our own rules and procedures and we must honor them. The university has an obligation, having approved our rules, to honor them as well. There was no answer on that issue. I then asked the Chancellor who is going to pay for this and there was no answer on that front, either. I would like to point out for example, that they tell us that the model for program transfers is the transfer of a technology program from CCNY to NYC Tech. This was not of an under-enrolled program, but rather of an over-enrolled program which did not coincide with City College's notion of its proper mission. NYC Tech wanted it, and City College didn't want it. City College was happy to be rid of it. New York City Tech was happy to get it. New York City Tech did get, for example, some of the library books that were part of that program. It is not at all clear whether Hunter—if we receive some of the programs that are being considered for being given to us—will receive any resources whatsoever to enable students to do the work in these courses and to enable faculty to teach these courses, much less whether we will be given the faculty to teach them. It is not clear whether we will be able to decide whether these are faculty members that we want to hire in our departments, or whether we will simply be assigned people who are currently on faculties of other departments in other colleges. Since there has been no academic consultation with the scholarly community we have no way of knowing what, if any, scholarly standards will be applied, nor do we have any way of knowing what, if any, of the traditions of academic freedom will be recognized. This is obviously a very serious issue.

The second point I want to make is that the report does not, in its current form, actually recommend getting rid of anything, nor does it actually recommend anything's being transferred anywhere. What it recommends is that there be a second level of consideration at which qualitative standards will be used. They indicate what the appropriate qualitative standards ought to be at the second level. The standards to be used in the second level review include the mission of each college, the quality of the faculty, of the courses, and of the college's resources, the results of regular outside review of programs, and measures of student success. They indicate that the measures of student success are preparation for the work force, admission to graduate school and admission to professional schools. If these are the appropriate standards, we should be the ones who decide on them. It is not for the central administration of the university to decide what the appropriate standards for academic excellence at this college, or any other college in the university, ought to be. This is not a high school system. It is very clear that the Chancellor is moving in the direction of administering the university as if it were not a university.

When you read the report, and when you read the areas where they suggest programs be deleted, it may also strike you that there is a profound racial bias to this report. The colleges which they suggest ought to consider losing majors in philosophy and foreign languages are the colleges which have the fewest white students; the colleges that are to be considered for gaining, or consolidating, those majors are the colleges that have the greatest concentration of white students. Without regard to the immorality of that position, it is my hope that that aspect of this report will result in its political death. I don't understand how this proposal is going to survive the budgetary process in the city and in the state if it remains as severely racially biased as it is right now.

Third, there is a standard political tactic which runs through this report, which is to make outrageous suggestions that will be the focus of people's

attention. People will then feel very good about having fought off the most outrageous things and won't feel so bad about having lost on the lesser things. Thus a college which succeeds in saving its French major may not feel so bad about losing German. Or a college which succeeds in saving Philosophy will not be terribly concerned about its program in Religion, or whatever. What is at issue really is the ability of a college to make academic judgements for itself. These are crucial concerns. That said, there are some real issues for the University to consider.

I think that the first half of the report raises some serious concerns that we ought to think about. I hate to say that I commend this to your reading, but I guess it is in the nature of a homework assignment. I urge you all to read it. Try to restrain your sense of rage. Try not to be suckered in. Then let us have some serious discussion —of the sort that should have taken place before this report was written."

Professor Sherrill yielded the floor to Professor Clarkson.

Report by the Select Committee on the College Preparatory Initiative

A summary statement of the report by Professor Sandra Clarkson, Chair of the Committee, is as follows:

She informed the Senate that in accordance with a request from the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs, the Committee is in the process of completing the preliminary report concerning implementation of the College Preparatory Initiative. The preliminary report is due at 80th Street in December 1992, and as soon as the report is completed, a copy will also be sent to members of the Senate. The final plan is to be submitted in April 1993, and the Senate will have an opportunity to look at the final recommendations and make a decision on those before April.

Professor Clarkson reminded the Senate that the College Preparatory Initiative was set up by the Board of Trustees to make sure that students coming into the colleges will have had preparation in a number of areas, including English, Mathematics, Sciences, Social Sciences, Fine Arts, and Languages. A CPI transcript will be created by U.A.P.C. for all students with high school records, indicating the number of CPI units completed in each subject area taken by the student. Thus, colleges will know whether an incoming student is lacking CPI units in certain areas. She assured the Senate of the Committee's commitment to guaranteeing total access to the college for those students without adding an additional burden. The Committee will try to make it as easy as possible for students lacking CPI units to make up those units in a meaningful way through advising and through careful designation of courses that serve as CPI substitutes and, at the same time, may fulfill other requirements as well. These students should have as many options open to them for their majors as the students that come in totally prepared. She told the Senate that the Committee has been working very hard, is a very spirited committee, and has taken a number of meetings to get to this point.

The preliminary report is to indicate Hunter's plans for building CPI advising into the academic counseling function. This is being worked out through Academic Skills and Student Services, as well as with a number of committee members who serve as academic advisors in their own areas. A tentative outline will be included in the report. For the interim academic plan the Committee has approved a tentative list of courses that would serve as CPI substitute units, using for the most part existing distribution requirement courses. A description of examinations that may be used to credit a student for CPI deficiencies will be provided later. If the need for additional courses in an area, or the need for additional support services arises, the Committee will recommend that those be initiated. The Committee has been assured of full cooperation by the Administration. A copy of the preliminary report, as submitted to 80th Street, will be mailed to senators together with an updated committee membership list.

She concluded the report by answering questions from the floor.

Items Carried	<u>Undergraduate Academic Requirements Comm. Re: CR/NC Grading System</u>	308
Over From	Professor Sam Korn, Chair of the Committee, reminded the Senate that the motion on the floor was the 3-part amendment to page 2 of the Committee Report dated 11 November 1992 (see <u>Minutes</u> of 12/2/92, lines 108 to 113).	309
Last Meeting:		310
		311
	After discussion a quorum count was requested.	312
	A quorum not having been present, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.	313

Respectfully submitted,



Khursheed Navder, *nm*
Secretary

APPENDIX I

The following members were noted as absent from the meeting:

FACULTY:

Academic Skills:	Mary Yopez Willie Wimberly	Social Work:	Charles Guzzetta Joann Ivry Jayne Silberman "E" Malka Sternberg
Anthropology:	William Parry Thomas McGovern John Oates	Sociology:	Ruth Sidel "E" John Cuddihy Martin Warmbrand
Art:	Joel Carrera Ulka Bates Andrea Blum	Special Education:	Marsha Lupi Marsha Smith-Lewis
Black & P.R. Studies:	Pedro Lopez-Adorno	Theatre & Film:	Patricia Sternberg
Chemistry:	Pamela Mills		
Classics:	Tamara Green William Mayer	Dean Evelyn Gioielli "E" Dean Carlos Hortas Dean Everlena Holmes "E" Provost Laura Struminger	
Communications:	Tami Gold Jay Roman Serafina Bathrick Fulton Ross "E"		
Computer Science:	Virginia Teller "E"	STUDENTS:	
Curriculum & Teaching:	Tony Picciano	David Asencio Kristine Mancenido Efua Morgan Sandra Goodrich Rita Sabini Ari Spett "E" John Pastor Antonio Lopez Michael Joseph Todd Smith Zoisa Simmons Rafael Hernandez Frances Goulart Lynette Renee Carpenter Robin Hardy Sigrid Cotto Armin Patel "E" Victoria Kern Timothy Lee Gina Jones Henry Sirotin Dionne DeFlorimante Susan Keogan "E" Debra Robertson Kathleen Geier Richard Baldwin Paul Mittelman Wayne Wilson Simon Kamara Lewanda Hernandez Jose Ramos Damaris Nunez Dierdre Foudy Edilberto Soriano "E" Kyle Williams Amy Fatutta George Tong Moriah Eskow Robert Elia Marc Haynes Yorel Francis Kim Ray	Helen Pouliasis Tara Moloney Dyannah Barthold Judy Smith James Painter Erica Chinzhenzva Erica Petersen Arlene King Brian Ibbotson Alicen Willis Amy Kossoy Sean Sukal
Economics:	Howard Chernick Avi Liveson "E" Terence Agbeyegbe William Tennyson		
Educational Foundations:	Joan Buxbaum Mario Kelly		
English:	Eve Leoff Peter Kirwan		
Geology & Geography:	Richard Liebling		
German:	Eckhard Kuhn-Osius "E"		
Health & Phys. Education:	Nana Koch "E"		
Health Sciences:	Ida Susser		
Library:	Julio Hernandez-Delgado Steve Kowalik "E"		
Mathematics:	Barry Cherkas		
Music:	Jana Feinman Barbara Hampton Paul Mueller Susan Kagan		
Nursing:	Marie Mosely		
Philosophy:	Gerald Press "E" Sue Weinberg "E"		
Political Science:	Rosalind Petchesky Joan Tronto		
Romance Languages:	Diana Conchado "E"		