

Office of The Hunter College Senate

M I N U T E S

Regular Meeting of The Hunter College Senate
8 October 1974

	The forty-fourth ⁹⁴⁴ meeting of The Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:50 p.m. at the Hunter College Playhouse.	1 2
Presiding:	Charles M. Sherover, Chairman	3
Attendance:	The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those noted by the Secretary as listed in Appendix I.	4 5
Minutes:	The Chair stated that it was not possible for the Senate staff to prepare the Minutes of the last meeting in time for the mailing, but that they would be available at the Overflow Meeting this month.	6 7 8 9
Report by the President:	President Wexler addressed the Senate, and the following is a summary statement of her Report:	10 11
	President Wexler's remarks to the Senate concerned the necessity of seriously studying all the ramifications of any decision about the academic program before the Senate legislates any long-range modifications in the curriculum. This necessity has become a priority in light of the steady state of student enrollment in the University and at Hunter College. It has become increasingly important to take a special look at budget consequences of new programs before we legislate.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
	Hunter has a wide diversity of departments, both in numbers and in content and in approaches. The President described each department as both (1) a collegium of persons addressed to a focused, cognitive body of knowledge and concern, and (2) a set of offerings called a major. A major sequence should put a student into intellectual dialogue with a reasonably rich number of faculty members.	20 21 22 23 24 25 26
	There is, of necessity, a tremendous duplication of courses within C.U.N.Y. But there is no way profitably for each component to present every offering to every student. We are at a point of choices--how many things can we do reasonably well? The possibility of any serious increment in teaching, instructional lines at Hunter within the next 2 to 10 years is miniscule. Any addition of faculty positions in one area must be seen in terms of decreasing faculty positions in another.	27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34
	The President proposed that the Senate Administrative Committee and other appropriate committees sit down with the administration to devise systematic ways that the Senate can have reliable information on the budget consequences of a particular legislation before the members vote.	35 36 37 38 39
	President Wexler suggested that students reading a Hunter College catalogue should expect to complete a course of a major sequence listed therein within their student lifetime. To achieve this goal, we must seriously close the present gap between the academic legislation of the Senate and the budgetary appropriations available.	40 41 42 43 44 45
	Within this rationale, President Wexler strongly urged that the Senate table consideration of this item on the Agenda until the budgetary consequences could be carefully examined.	46 47 48
Report by the Ombudsman:	Ombudsman Louis Massa addressed the Senate along the lines outlined in this summary statement:	49 50
	In my last report to you I indicated my intention of meeting with the leadership of various constituency groups in the college. The purpose of the meeting was to help generate a consensus on two	51 52 53

Regular Meeting of The Hunter College Senate
8 October 1974

controversial issues that have arisen in the first draft of the governance charter, i.e. apportionment and representation base. The meeting was held on Friday, September 27, 1974 and was attended by Professor Charles Sherover, Chairman of the Hunter College Senate, Professor Evelyn Handler, President of the General Faculty, Mr. Ron Rizzuto, President of the Day Session Student Government, Mr. Thom Burns, President of the Evening Session Student Government, and Ms. Doris Chee, President of the Graduate Student Association. Judged in terms of tangible results, the meeting was not very successful. It may have served a useful purpose in establishing a communications network among the constituency groups that will ultimately each play an important role in any referendum approval of a new charter.

I still believe in the idea of convening this leadership group for the purpose of working towards consensus on the two issues mentioned above which are now preventing further progress. I have asked all of these people to meet again to make another attempt at generating new ideas for resolving these problems. Most of the individuals concerned are willing to meet again and I am still waiting for final word from others.

In spite of the above difficulties, the Charter Review Committee is of course continuing its work on revising the new Charter. My personal projection is that it will be possible for them to submit their report to you by December.

Professor Evelyn Handler, President of the General Faculty, explained to the Senate that as a representative of the General Faculty her powers are limited in that she must receive a mandate from the faculty in order to negotiate any binding decisions. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Delegate Assembly received a copy of the first draft of the revised Charter and has completed its report in response to it. At the October 18, 1974 meeting of the Faculty Delegate Assembly, the members will be presented with the report and will either accept or reject it. The report will then be brought to Professor Massa and to the Charter Review Committee. Professor Handler concluded that for her to assume negotiating power would be an undemocratic procedure.

President Wexler called attention to the Charter language calling for review by an impartial committee. If the members of the review committee perceive themselves as negotiators, as protagonists of constituency groups, then the very nature of the Charter which mandates into self perpetuation that there be an impartial committee may have been violated. The President called for discussion within the Senate which would more clearly direct the Ombudsman as to what is the sense of the Senate re: definition of "impartial review committee;" when the Ombudsman should cull all opinions and positions; when he should come together with a group which represents impartiality; and when he should write a document in which there is reasonable hope that there will be consensus in voting.

Professor Massa commented on the notions of what is being "negotiated" and the requirement of impartiality. The leadership of the constituencies has no power to negotiate any final decisions. This leadership group was called together at the request of Professor Massa to conduct a brainstorming session. It was not intended for this group to assume the authority possessed by the Charter Review Committee or to undercut the work of that committee. He maintained that impartiality of the Charter Review Committee does not mean that its members may not belong to a constituency; it does not mean that they may not have definite views on the revision. What is important, however, is that the committee allows all views to come into play and that it allows the evidence to sway them in their decisions. The minutes of the Charter Review Committee meetings and Open Hearings will attest to the fairness with which the committee has proceeded in their task.

Dean Eisenberg raised the suggestion of having someone from outside the College--from a nationally known organization--help

conduct a review of the existing Charter to prevent possible 121
conflict of interest. 122

Speaking on impartiality, Professor Basquin mentioned that there 123
are two ways of abiding by the mandate. On the one hand, the 124
College could go outside the community for help; but on the other 125
hand, from the point of view that the Charter Review Committee is 126
experienced with the Senate and working within the Senate, it 127
nonetheless appears to be acting with as much impartiality as 128
possible. 129

Professor Comito explained to the Senate that the Charter Review 130
Committee is trying to improve the weaknesses of the current 131
Charter and as a member of that Committee does not think that it 132
at this point in time needs help from the outside to do its work. 133

After further discussion, it was moved and voted: 134

"that the Charter Review Committee distribute its latest 135
draft proposal for informational purposes to the members of 136
the Senate within one month and that a copy of the present 137
Charter be attached thereto for reference purposes." 138

After the Ombudsman agreed that this could be useful, the motion 139
was passed. 140

Report of the Administrative Committee: Prof. Elie de Comminges, Secretary of the Senate, presented the 141
following report: 142

1. Informed the Senate that the overflow meeting scheduled for 143
October 22nd must be held as scheduled, as there are a number 144
of Committee Reports scheduled for this meeting. He an- 145
nounced that it might not be possible to have all of these 146
reports ready in time for the mailing. 147

2. Added to item 8 of the Agenda: Reports by the Graduate 148
Course of Study Committee, Calendar & Budget Committee, 149
Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee. 150

3. Proposed the following resolution: 151

"BE IT RESOLVED, that there be continued and conjoined member-152
ship and meetings of the Committee on Student Standing and 153
the Committee on Undergraduate Academic Requirements for the 154
duration of this academic year." 155

After discussion, Mr. Fink moved, and it was seconded, that 156
the resolution be amended by adding: 157

"that if there is such a joint membership and meetings, 158
student members be allowed to attend." 159

After further discussion Dean Eisenberg moved, and it was 160
seconded that the resolution be tabled. 161

The motion to table carried by hand vote. 162

Special Report on "Project Awareness" The Chair asked Mr. Daniel Brennan to make an explanatory 163
statement about the City University Ad-hoc Committee to work 164
on a special project--"Project Awareness." He explained that 165
this project is devoted to exposing issues of vital concern 166
to CUNY; that "Project Awareness" is an attempt to educate 167
the university community and candidates for elective office 168
on the major governmental issues facing CUNY. 169

He reported that there is a serious need for some preliminary 170
coding work, and that the only way to accomplish this is with 171
volunteer help. This clerical work will be done on Saturday, 172
October 19th, starting at 10 a.m. He then asked for 173
volunteers for this project which needs all the help it can 174
get. 175

Barrett-Jaworskyj Resolution:	Prof. Jaworskyj, after pointing out that Dean Barrett was called out of town and unable to participate in drafting the joint resolution, proposed the following resolution in his own name:	176 177 178 179
	"Taking into account the past practices of introducing technological innovations for their own sake, it is the Senate's resolution that before introducing any computerized technological innovations an attention should be given to the question whether they do in fact serve human needs. Consequently, <u>be it resolved</u> that the introduction of computerized technology, whose use would affect a considerable segment of the Hunter Community, be subject to Senate approval."	180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188
	After discussion the motion was seconded.	189
	After further discussion, the question was called and seconded.	190
	The motion was defeated by hand vote.	191
	Mr. Rizzuto requested that his objection, as follows, be recorded in the Minutes:	192 193
	"that there has not been an Undergraduate Day Session student on the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee at the meetings held during the month of September."	194 195 196
Nominating Committee Report:	<u>Nominating Committee</u>	197
	Prof. Josephine Comito, Chairman of the Committee, presented its report as distributed. In each case the floor was opened to nominations. Run-off elections by hand vote were held for those seats for which there were more than one nominee.	198 199 200 201 202
	The following were elected:	203
	<u>Undergraduate Course of Study Committee</u>	204
	<u>Students:</u> Joan Robinson - Nursing - Day	205
	Barbara Jackson - Social Sciences-Day	206
	Virginia Marshall - Classics - SGS	207
	Mark Spector - Day	208
	<u>Graduate Course of Study Committee</u>	209
	<u>Faculty:</u> Alex Szogyi - Romance Languages	210
	<u>Student:</u> Thomas Kearin - Graduate - At-large	211
	<u>Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee</u>	212
	<u>Faculty:</u> Jane Matthews - Mathematics - SGS	213
	<u>Student Standing Committee</u>	214
	<u>Faculty:</u> Barbara Behr - Economics - SGS	215
	<u>Committee on Evaluation of Teaching</u>	216
	<u>Faculty:</u> Sam Korn - Psychology	217
	Esther Flashner - Economics	218
	<u>Students:</u> Michael Randall - Social Sciences - Day	219
	Leslie Brooks - Humanities - Day	220
	Jose Moreno LaCalle - Humanities - SGS	221
	Elizabeth Presky - Sciences & Math. - Day	222
	Carolyn Tilman - Education - Day	223
	<u>Master Plan Committee</u>	224
	<u>Chairman:</u> Prof. George Gourevitch - Psychology	225
	<u>Students:</u> Barbara Adams - SEEK	226
	Carolyn Tilman - Day	227
	<u>Committee on the Budget</u>	228
	<u>Chairman:</u> Thomas Burke - Health & Physical Education	229
	<u>Student:</u> Marie Mannio - Day	230

<u>Committee on Facilities and Services</u>	231
<u>Faculty:</u> MaryLou Prendergast - Nursing	232
<u>Committee on Registration Procedures</u>	233
<u>Student:</u> Eric Weissman - Day	234
<u>Committee on Sessional Equality</u>	235
At the recommendation of the Committee Chairman and	236
after proper notification the seat held by Robert	237
Patton, Graduate student, was declared vacant; the	238
following were elected:	239
<u>Students:</u> John Fink - Graduate	240
Lila Drake - Day	241
<u>Nominating Committee</u>	242
<u>Faculty:</u> Alfred Bennick - Physics and Astronomy	243
Prof. Comito concluded her report by urging Senators to sign up	244
for Committee vacancies, and informed the body that almost all of	245
vacant seats are for Evening Session and Graduate students. She	246
once more pointed out that it is <u>not</u> necessary to be a Senator	247
in order to serve on Senate committees.	248
Mr. Johnson informed the Senate that he had a nomination for	249
filling additional Committee vacancies.	250
The Chair proposed that because of the time factor the Under-	251
graduate Course of Study Committee be allowed to present the	252
Experimental Course proposals at this time, and that immediately	253
following this Mr. Johnson be called back to the floor.	254
There being no objection, it was so ordered.	255
<u>Undergraduate Course of Study Committee</u>	256
Prof. Nancy Dean, Chairman of the Committee, moved that the	257
report, consisting of experimental course proposal items E-65,	258
E-68, E-69, E-70 be approved as presented.	259
Prof. van Burkelow moved the following amendment which was	260
accepted by the mover:	261
"the credit allotment for E-69 "The Neighborhoods of New	262
York City" be 3 credits."	263
It was further moved that:	264
"the credit allotment for E-68 "Art and Letters in the 4th	265
Century" be established as 3 hours, 3 credits."	266
This amendment was also accepted by the mover.	267
Prof. Tannenbaum moved that E-70 not be offered again as an	268
Experimental Course, and that it should either be presented as a	269
regular course or it should be withdrawn. The motion was <u>not</u>	270
seconded.	271
After discussion the Chair stated that the motion on the floor	272
is the acceptance of the Report as amended. The question was	273
called.	274
The Report on Experimental Courses as amended was accepted by	275
hand vote.	276
The Chair then returned the floor to Mr. Johnson, who proposed	277
that additional committee vacancies be filled from the floor at	278
this time.	279
The Chair stated that in view of the fact that it was 6:30 p.m.	289
a motion to extend the meeting time was in order.	290

It was moved that the meeting be extended for 5 minutes. 291

Before it could be called to a vote a motion to adjourn was 292
moved and passed by voice vote. 293

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m. 294

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Elie de Comminges", written over a horizontal line.

Elie de Comminges,
Secretary

APPENDIX I

The following people are noted as absent from the meeting:

Alavanja, Michael	Sanchez, Jose Luis
Alicea, Hector	Savarese, John
Barrett, Edward	Schreiber, Paul
Bencsik, Gabriella	Scott, Marvin
Bertsch, Walter	Serrano, Elizabeth
Beveridge, David	
Bryar, William	Slesinsky, Theresa
Burckle, Lloyd	Smith, Carole
Brett, Richard	Sorensen, Sybil
Chace, William	Stafford, Walter
Chappell, Richard	Statwinger, Roslyn
Chee, Doris	
Chee, Jean	Turnier, Jocelyne
Chiang, Faye	Valentine, Malcolm
Chiang, Janice	Von Cseh, Irene
Chiang, Jean	Weiss, Joseph
Chin, Agnes	
Cohen, Mark	
Conant, Francis	
Connell, Roy	
Cooper, Anita	
Cunningham, Dorothy	
Danna, Robert	
De'Riesthal, Mark	
Diamant, Julia	
Diamond, Judy	
Diggs, Mary	
Dobroff, Rose	
Freund, Gerald	
Garcia, Milagros	
Gillis, Verna	
Gonchar, Ruth	
Grant, Robert	
Grevious, Carole	
Gross, Jeff	
Grossman, William	
Gutmann, Anna	
Hartley, Alice	
Hasson, John	
Hecht, Charles	
Heywood, Maurice	
Hodges, David	
Hopkins, Kevin	
Kaback, Elliot	
Kassamali, Jaffer	
Keane, Mary	
Kearin, Thomas	
Klutch, Marion	
Keisler, Elizabeth	
LaCalle, Jose Moreno	
Leoff, Eve	
Lisenco, Michael	
Ludden, Mary	
McNeil, Juanita	
Nadler, Arnold	
Nagel, Warren	
Neubart, I.J.	
Oberlin, Russell	
Piscitello, Bernadetta	
Polisky, Milton	
Quinn, Kathleen	
Robinson, Rae	
Rooks, Deborah	