

HUNTER COLLEGE
City University of New York
OFFICE OF THE HUNTER COLLEGE SENATE

MINUTES

**Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
24 March 1993**

	The 290th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:30 P.M. in Room W714.	1 2
Presiding:	Ken Sherrill, Chair	3
Attendance:	The elected members of the Senate, with the exception of those listed in Appendix I.	4 5
	The Agenda was adopted as submitted.	6
Minutes:	The Minutes of February 24th and March 3rd were approved as distributed.	7
Report by the President:	A summary statement of President LeClerc's report to the Senate is attached as Appendix II.	8 9
Report by the Administrative Committee:	Professor Sherrill presented the report as follows:	10
	<u>Approved Curriculum Changes</u>	11
	The following curriculum changes, as listed in the report dated 24 March 1993, were approved as per Senate resolution, and were submitted for the Senate's information: Items GR-356 (Sociology), GS-354 (Educational Foundations).	12 13 14
	<u>Report by the Select Committee on the College Preparatory Initiative</u>	15
	Professor Sandra Clarkson, Chair of the Committee, presented the report as distributed at the door.	16 17
	Discussion focused on the necessity of additional funding if the recommendations were to be implemented.	18 19
	It was moved that the report be approved with the proviso that it be revised to reflect Senate discussion, and that the following statement be added to each area of the report: "It should be understood (from the outset) that none of the recommendations can be implemented without sufficient and additional funding and personnel."	20 21 22 23 24
	The question was called and carried.	25
	The Report was unanimously approved by hand vote.	26
	<u>UARC Report Re: CR/NC Grading System</u>	27
	After brief discussion, it was moved that further discussion be postponed to the next meeting.	28 29
	The motion carried by voice vote.	30
	The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 P.M.	31

Respectfully submitted,



Khursheed Navder,
Secretary

APPENDIX I

The following members were noted as absent from the meeting:

FACULTY:

Academic Skills:	Mary Yopez Janice Montague	Special Education:	Marsha Lupi Marsha Smith-Lewis
Anthropology:	William Parry Thomas McGovern	Student Services:	Reva Cohen "E" Richard Kalb Madlyn Stokely
Art:	Ulka Bates Andrea Blum	Theatre & Film:	Patricia Sternberg Ellen Sumter
Biology:	Ed Balboni Ezra Shahn		
Black/P.R. Studies:	Pedro Lopez-Adorno "E"	Dean Evelyn Gioiella Dean Carlos Hortas Dean Judith Friedlander "E" Dean Everlena Holmes Vice Pres. Sylvia Fishman	
Chemistry:	Pamela Mills		
Classics:	Tamara Green William Mayer "E"		
Communications:	Tami Gold Serafina Bathrick Fulton Ross	STUDENTS:	
Computer Science:	Virginia Teller	David Asencio Kristine Mancenido Scott Lessard Sandra Goodrich Rita Sabini Ari Spett John Pastor Antonio Lopez Stacey Bell Josiah Klebaner Lynnette Renee Carpenter Robin Hardy Sigrid Cotto Armin Patel "E" Victoria Kern Timothy Lee "E" Melissa Uber Caroline Paddock Kathleen Geier Richard Baldwin Paul Mittelman Simon Kamara Rebecca Perez Dierdre Foudy "E" Edilberto Soriano John Geida "E" Yor-el Francis Tara Moloney Erica Petersen Arlene King Ida Borday Sean Sukal "E"	
Curriculum & Teaching:	Tony Picciano Alene Smith		
Economics:	Howard Chernick Avi Liveson "E" Terence Agbeyegbe "E"		
Educ. Foundations:	Mario Kelly Simi Linton Caroline Adkins		
English:	Karen Greenberg "E"		
Geology & Geography:	Richard Liebling		
Health Sciences:	Ida Susser		
History:	Bernadette McCauley "E"		
Library:	Pamela Wonek Steve Kowalik "E"		
Music:	Jana Feinman Paul Mueller		
Philosophy:	Sue Weinberg "E"		
Political Science:	Rosalind Petchesky		
Romance Languages:	Marithelma Costa Maria Paynter Cecile Insdorf "E"		
Social Work:	Charles Guzzetta Joann Ivry Jayne Silberman "E" Malka Sternberg		
Sociology:	Ruth Sidel Charles Green "E" John Cuddihy "E"		

APPENDIX II

Report by the President

He said: "A few announcements. At five o'clock today, in Room West 217, there will be the second of the Annual Schneider Lectures, a fairly new endowed lecture series. Irving Howe, a former member of the English Department, is the speaker today.

I have in front of me—for display purposes only, not for public reading by me—the volume that contains all of the responses received to date from the various groups and constituencies at Hunter relative to the Report on Academic Program Planning. I have not counted the number of pages. I have not weighed it either, but it feels like a Perdue oven-stuffer, and I estimate that there are probably a good 300 pages here. One member of the Senate called me earlier this afternoon with a certain amount of alarm in his voice, because he had looked at the copy in the Library that seemed half the size of this one. That is because I told them to print on both sides of the paper for all ensuing copies, so that we could consume less paper and fewer pages. But the copies in the libraries are an accurate reflection of the entire volume.

The response, in other words, has been exceptionally broad in its scale and, in some instances, ample in written expression. If one were to do a core sample as the geologists do and take the temperature of this book, that temperature would register rather high on the thermometer on that scale. The responses of members of the Senate and other groups at the college to the recommendations of the report have been sharp, and in main they have been critical and negative. My commitment has always been to transmit the entire tome to the Chancellor, and anyone who wishes to give me anything on paper relative to the Goldstein report has my word that that will find its way to 80th Street and, I would like to think, will be read there at some point as well.

The Strategic Planning Committee met with me for a good two hours this past Friday. Each member of the committee had received his or her own copy of the volume by last Monday. When we met on Friday just about all of the members of the committee had read it in great depth, and a number of us had read every single page prior to that meeting. We discussed the ins and outs of the content of the submissions, and the ins and outs of the overall response of the campus. Before coming over here a few minutes ago, I finished the first draft of my response to the report, which will become a public document once it is finished. It will be about 25 pages double space, and will address a number of issues that pertain to this college's needs over and above any particular comments that are made on the Goldstein Report itself. In fact, as I believe you have sensed for a number of weeks now, I have intended to use this occasion to make known in a very, very clear kind of way how damaged this college has been by the last four years of budget cuts, the increase in tuition rates for our students, and how much support we need at Hunter in order to rebuild. I have also used this as an occasion to talk about the way in which we have handled academic planning at Hunter College, and the kinds of endorsements that we have had, in particular by the Middle States Association, which are good, valid, outside objective reflections upon the way that we have done business at Hunter. I have also used it as an occasion to talk about the values that we as a community have to open debate, to governance, to the freedom of expression, and that those are essential values to our organizational culture. And I have used it, finally, as an occasion to say succinctly what the various constituency groups felt about the Goldstein report. There are nine or ten common criticisms that band across all the reports. They all have to do with the use of data, the absence of academic considerations, the implications of the recommendations for persons of color, and so on, and so forth. Those are all laid out in my response. I have also used this as a chance to basically tell 80th Street how much we need, and what my priorities for this college are. I can share them with you now in an informal matter. You will have them in a more formal matter in the very near future.

Basically, my priorities are to rebuild the faculty of this college, to reduce the overall reliance on adjunct faculty at Hunter from the present level of in excess of 50% to somewhere in the area of 40%, if not lower, within the next four years; to increase dramatically the level of support services for students, particularly undergraduates at the college, by building the support staff within Student Services; by beginning a concerted effort to renovate and refurbish Thomas Hunter Hall, the North Building, the Vorhees Campus, and the Brookdale Campus. Those are things that we have got to do for this college before the turn of the new century. I hope that the occasion that we have been given to make known our needs will