

MINUTES

**Meeting of the Hunter College Senate  
7 May 1986**

	The 207th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:40 p.m. in Room W714.	1 2
<b>Presiding:</b>	F. Fulton Ross, Chair	3
<b>Attendance:</b>	The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those listed in Appendix I.	4 5
<b>Minutes:</b>	The Minutes of April 2nd were approved as distributed.	6
<b>Report by the President:</b>	There was no report.	7
<b>Report by the Ombudsman:</b>	The following is a summary statement of Ombudsman Bennick's report to the Senate:	8 9
	The general breakdown of complaints to the Ombudsman's Office has not changed significantly this year from what it was in the past. Most cases come from students, although there are a few from faculty and staff.	10 11 12
	There are three major categories of student problems. The first is complaints about the quality of teaching. This is a difficult area to deal with. In most cases the problem is brought to the attention of the Chair of the department, sometimes to the Dean of the division, and sometimes a discussion is held with the instructor involved depending on the nature of the complaint. Much depends on the willingness of the Chair to take action on the complaints, and that usually depends on the number of students complaining as well as which department is involved.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
	The second area involves students having problems with various college regulations. In cases where there is some technical violation but where justice is on the side of the student, the Ombudsman has had good success in getting the problem solved. People in authority in Student Services, the Registrar's Office, the Bursar's Office, and various other administrative departments have shown themselves to be sensitive to legitimate complaints of students.	21 22 23 24 25 26 27
	The third major area is grading practices and grade appeals. Although the Ombudsman is removed from this process (since there is an established grade appeals procedure), many students come to him to find out what their rights are in this matter. The system established by the Senate seems to work pretty well in general. However, there are a few departments which violate time deadlines and other requirements of the established procedures. Some students have still not gotten the final results of their grade appeal from their departments and the semester is almost over. In one case the Senate committee sent the case back to the department because of several errors in procedure and it now seems that there will not be a final decision until sometime this summer at the earliest. This leaves the students feeling powerless and frustrated. Under the current regulations there is no penalty against a department which violates the procedures and so nothing can be done about this issue, unless the regulations are modified to put some enforcement power into them.	28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42
<b>Report by the Administrative Committee:</b>	<u>Approved Curriculum Changes</u> The following changes, as listed in the report dated 7 May 1986, have been approved as per Senate resolution and were submitted for the Senate's information: Items UR-620 (Classics), UR-621 (Biological Sciences), UR-622 (Anthropology), US-598 (Health Sciences), US-605 (Black & Puerto Rican Studies), US-614 (Classics), GS-242 (Health Sciences).	43 44 45 46 47 48
<b>Committee Reports:</b>	<u>Undergraduate Course of Study Committee</u> Prof. Ross presented the following statement:	49 50

As we move into item #5, I would like to exercise the option of the chair by taking a few moments to review the context through which the resolutions you have before you were arrived at for your consideration today. I think it is important to re-look at the long arduous and sometimes tedious process which brought us to this point. In May 1985 the Senate passed a set of resolution, which were recommended by the Select Committee on the Distribution Requirement, which directed the divisional curriculum committees to examine the courses in their divisions which currently fulfill the distribution requirement and to determine which courses they wished to certify or re-certify as suitable. The divisional committees were to then transmit their decisions to the Senate Undergraduate Course of Study Committee no later than February 1986.

In a letter which I sent to divisional deans, deans of schools and department chairs I noted that in accordance with the Senate resolution, beginning in the Fall of 1986 only those courses that have been submitted and approved under these procedures would be accepted for fulfillment of the distribution requirement. Those courses will appear in the new undergraduate catalogue.

Concurrent with the review of the courses acceptable for fulfillment of the distribution requirement, the Senate passed a resolution that the college consider as a matter of urgent priority the ensuring that students entering Hunter move through remedial and college level skills requirements in a timely manner, and that the college enforce the regulations which require that remedial courses be successfully completed by the time the student has accumulated 36 credits at Hunter. It was further resolved that sufficient numbers of sections of courses be provided and that the Provost's office oversee this process.

It was also resolved that departments specify to the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee through the divisional course of study committee for the purpose of restricting registration, the skills level to be required of students before registering for particular courses. This would be in the areas of remedial/developmental reading, writing, mathematics, problem solving in the sciences, and expository writing. To aid in achieving the examination of how departmental offerings can best be related to the college development or remedial courses which many of our students must take, Assoc. Provost Muyskens and I forwarded to department chairs and program heads requests for departments to review and to determine whether or not present skills level restrictions are adequate and to forward recommendations to the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee via the divisional curriculum committees. The Undergraduate Course of Study Committee has been assisted by, and has worked closely with, the Provost's Advisory Committee on Remediation. As guidance for departments attempting to steer a middle course between the extremes of too restrictive or too permissive course restriction codes, we sent to chairs and program heads a packet that provided examples of the sorts of tasks students who are at various levels of remediation can achieve. We thought that the material would be of considerable help for determining use of course restriction codes--already in place--to indicate whether the student is at the beginning, middle or near the completion of the remediation requirements.

Finally our February 19th letter stated that those departments wishing to make ENG 120 a pre-requisite for any of their advanced courses, should indicate this through the use of a course restriction code. That curriculum change to add ENG 120 as a prerequisite should be processed through the usual channels from department to divisional curriculum committee to Undergraduate Course of Study Committee.

On March 14, Provost Muyskens and I sent out a second letter which included information concerning ENG 120 Freshman Composition, together with an attachment from Prof. Harvey Minkoff, Coordinator of ENG 120, outlining the contents of the course and the exit criteria. Also included was a document prepared by the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs which outlines the standards of evaluation and the method of scoring used on the CUNY Writing Skills Assessment Test. We felt that you and your

colleagues would find the information helpful in deciding which of your courses should or should not be restricted to students who have completed ENG 120. We believe that the course restriction code can be an effective vehicle for guiding students of diverse abilities into the courses that are best suited for them. With the use of those codes we can serve all of our students--protecting the ill prepared student from certain failure, and channelling the well prepared students into courses that challenge them.	113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120
As all of you know, the Senate resolutions mandating the review of the distribution requirement and the remediation regulations with an eye toward tightening up the requirements was a direct result of the monumental work done over the last few years by the Select Committee on the Distribution Requirement. The resolutions represent a first step designed to develop an academically sound distribution requirement for students which will be geared to fulfilling their needs for their future lives. Departmental responses to the Select Committee report indicated wide-spread agreement that either as a goal in itself or as a necessary step toward a restructured general education requirement, the present distribution requirement offerings needed to be tightened. Participation in this major effort has been broad. Departments and divisional curriculum committees have completed their work. Prof. Raps and her Undergraduate Course of Study Committee including divisional deans have completed an incredibly arduous task working closely with divisional curriculum committees. The courses have been certified or recertified, the last group having been acted on at the Senate meeting of April 16. What remains now of this very long carefully executed narrowing down process is the passing of the four resolutions which you have before you. Those resolutions will appear as footnotes in the new catalogue. I trust that all of the senators and all of those here present have read the resolutions and the rationale and therefore understand how these resolutions fit in with the procedures that have taken place and have been approved by the Senate. Prof. Raps may have a word to say before we begin discussion and debate on these resolutions.	121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144
Prof. Shirley Raps, Chair of the Committee, then presented the four resolutions as distributed.	145 146
The question was divided, and <b>Resolution # 1 was on the floor.</b>	147
After discussion, the question was called and carried.	148
Resolution # 1 carried by hand vote with 2 opposed and 4 abstentions.	149
<b>Resolution # 2 was on the floor.</b>	150
After discussion it was moved that the second sentence be amended to read as follows:	151 152
"Exceptions to this are ENG 120 which is required of all students, and the Foreign Language Requirement..."	153 154
This amendment was accepted by the mover and became part of the main motion.	155
After discussion it was moved that the motion be further amended by deleting the following:	156 157
"which may require that a student complete up to 12 credits in one department"	158 159
The amendment was accepted by the mover and became part of the main motion.	160
After discussion the question was called and carried.	161
Resolution # 2 as amended carried by hand vote with 1 opposed.	162
<b>Resolution # 3 was on the floor.</b>	163
The motion to approve resolution # 3 carried by hand vote with 4 abstentions.	164

<b>Resolution # 4 was on the floor.</b>	165
After discussion it was moved that the resolution be amended by deleting the words : "under special circumstances".	166 167
The motion to amend carried unanimously.	168
After discussion the question on the main motion as amended was called and carried.	169 170
Resolution # 4, as amended, carried by hand vote with 1 opposed and 2 abstentions.	171
It was requested that the resolutions be included in the new catalogue as a general preface instead of footnotes.	172 173
The resolutions as amended and approved read as follows:	174
1. RESOLVED, that courses used to satisfy the requirements for a major cannot be used to satisfy the Distribution Requirement. Foreign language majors should refer to major departments for specific distribution requirements. Correlative requirements for the major may be credited to the Distribution Requirement.	175 176 177 178 179
2. RESOLVED, that no more than two courses per department or program may be applied to satisfy the Distribution Requirement. Exceptions to this are ENG 120 which is required of all students, and the Foreign Language Requirement.	180 181 182 183
3. RESOLVED, that a course may be applied to satisfy the requirements in only one category of the Distribution Requirement.	184 185
4. RESOLVED, that students who have demonstrated mastery of lower level course material, to the satisfaction of the Chair of the department involved, or to the Chair's designee, will be permitted to apply more advanced courses to fulfill the Distribution Requirement.	186 187 188 189
Provost LeMelle expressed his thanks and gratitude to all for the hard work that was done.	190 191
<b><u>Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee</u></b>	192
Prof. Andrew Polsky, Chair of the Committee, presented the report concerning the "Revised Catalogue Language for the CR/NC Grading System."	193 194
During discussion it was moved to change the agenda so that the Charter Review Committee Report be the next item on the agenda.	195 196
The motion to change the agenda received the following vote: 22 in favor, 14 opposed.	197 198
The required number of 44 votes not having been achieved the motion was defeated.	199 200
A quorum count was requested. The required number of members not having been present, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.	201 202

Respectfully submitted,



Louise DeSalvo, *fm*  
Secretary

A P P E N D I X I

The following members were noted as absent from the meeting:

FACULTY:

Academic Skills: Vanita Vactor  
Alula Hidar "E"  
Milagros Garcia "E"

Anthropology: Rena Gropper "E"  
Susan Lees "E"

Art: Richard Stapleford "E"

Black & P.R. Studies: Jaffer Kassamali

Chemistry: Joe Dannenberg  
Jack Day

Classics: Alla Zeide

Communications: Serafina Bathrick "E"

Computer Science: Constantin Negoita

Curriculum & Teaching: Mae Gamble "E"  
Andre Thibodeau "E"

Economics: Jacqueline Nolan-Haley

English: Jane Benardete  
Richard Barickman "E"

Geology & Geography: Richard Liebling  
Keith Clarke

German: Minna Altmann "E"

Health & Physical Education: Tom Burke

Health Sciences: Russell Sergeant  
Ronald Sweitzer "E"

Mathematics: Edward Binkowski  
Barbara Barone

Music: John Davis

Physics & Astronomy: Sook Lee  
Rodney Varley

Political Science: Michael Jaworskyj

Romance Languages: Alex Szogyi

Social Work: Gary Anderson "E"  
Carmen Hendricks "E"

Sociology: John Cuddihy  
Vladimir Nahirny

Special Education: Julia Wu  
Katherine Garnett

Student Services: Bonnie Kaplan  
Reva Cohen "E"

Theatre & Film: Joel Zucker  
Sara Uttley

STUDENTS:

Norma Moy  
Linda Flannelly  
Paul Flannelly  
Luis Castro  
Colleen Kojima  
Suzanne Myrick "E"  
Rita Rose  
Karen Anderson  
Cathleen Goodman  
Debra Schmitt  
Helene Reisman  
Felicia Bonillo  
Susan Friedman  
Mikell Knights  
Dolores Sanchez  
Michelle Joyce  
Kathleen D'Arcy  
Sal Capalbo "E"  
Lois Callender "E"  
Sheila Dowling  
Maryana Buneta  
Diana Vila  
David Dion  
Rosette Capotorto  
Anahit Djirdjirian "E"  
Hyacinth Wright  
Austin McBean  
Sharon Barrett  
Roger Kennedy  
Kirk Callender "E"