

M I N U T E S

Regular Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
5 November 1980

The 140th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:40 p.m. in the Playhouse. 1
2

Presiding: Allan Brick, Chairperson 3

Attendance: The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those listed in Appendix I. 4
5

Minutes: The Minutes of October 22nd were approved as distributed. 6

Report by the President: The following is a summary statement of President Shalala's report to the Senate: 7
8

The President reported that she had sent a memo to all of the Department Chairs and Deans in response to articles that came out in the New York Times about contributions from colleges to political officials. She assured the Senate that Hunter College had made no contributions on either tax-levy or non-tax-levy funds. 9
10
11
12
13

Regarding Search Committees, President Shalala reported that she had met with the Chairs, and that she would be meeting with the Committees and would communicate two things to them, i.e. the need to find very high quality candidates that are worthy of Hunter, and the President's desire not to have the Committees decide on a single model for a candidate and then try to produce three candidates of the same type-- but rather to think broadly and imaginatively about the kinds of people that are to be considered for these positions. Regarding her comments on the issue of affirmative action, President Shalala expressed her hope that the Senate would take them in the spirit in which they were communicated, namely her continuing support of the process and the spirit in which the Senate went through a difficult process to produce slates and names. She hopes that an additional affirmative action process would add to the general sensitivity. President Shalala reiterated that she is fully confident of the Search Committees and their Chairs, and enthusiastic about the opportunity to work with these Search Committees. 14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Regarding Recruitment, the President expressed her desire to refocus some of the College's efforts in relationship to the recruitment of the Freshman Class of 1981. She reported that we are very close to receiving from 80th Street the list of students who have applied to Hunter College and have been accepted to the College. In the past only about 42% of these applicants came to Hunter. The receipt of this list would give us a real opportunity to go after the students who have applied and who have been accepted. The President said that she hoped that we will have a recruitment activity that by being more aggressive will at an earlier stage produce promising students for admission to the College. The 'early' is extremely important in terms of the way in which we organize and allocate resources. 30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

On the issue of registration, the President reported that, at a meeting in which the Senate was represented, a post-mortem on registration procedures was done. As a result of that discussion, and also as a result of conversations with a number of students as well as faculty during the registration process, some changes were made for implementation during Spring registration. One of the things that can be done is to make a good faith effort to try and improve the quality of registration at Hunter. There are two elements of that. One is the actual mechanics of registration and making the process as smooth as possible. And the other is humanizing it and making it as personal and as supportive as possible. Some changes are being implemented: (a) accepting the recommendation that registration take place in the Cafeteria. Using the Cafeteria would allow us not only more space, but also more light 42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

and tables for people to fill out forms; (b) we are not returning 55
to the arena technique where all departments would have to be 56
represented, but are planning to have some increase in the presence 57
of Divisions, appropriate programs, or schools. Divisional Deans, 58
Department Chairs, and consultations would decide which aspects of 59
registration they think they might be able to handle in the room with 60
the minimum number of people. There is no mandate on a Division to 61
have anyone there, but in some cases (e.g., in the cases of schools 62
which do not hold most of their classes here in this building, or in 63
the cases of some of the programs where they would prefer to have 64
people in the room to give direction to students) it may be desirable. 65
Peer Counselors as well as as other students will be around to create 66
a more helpful atmosphere. The President said that the important thing 67
here is that we need a lot more people that are helpful and can answer 68
questions. We are trying to personalize the process. Also some things 69
are being done in terms of the paperwork required to try to smooth out 70
the process. These changes are marginal and will not solve the registra-71
tion problem as such, but new ideas will be tested out, and we will try 72
to change procedures as we go along--working with better rooms, in a better 73
atmosphere, and hopefully with some better attitudes to help registra- 74
tion to go more smoothly. 75

President Shalala informed the Senate that the City University continues 76
to be very concerned about the new regulations concerning TAP, and that 77
she had expressed very strong opinions about whether faculty will have 78
to take attendance for the purpose of financial aid. Strong objections 79
were raised to additional burdens being placed on faculty. Discussions 80
with 80th Street as well as the State continue. 81

The President concluded her Report and asked if there were any questions.82
No questions were raised. 83

Report by the There was no report. 84
Ombudsman:

Report by the Prof. Tamara Green, Secretary of the Senate, asked for the Senate's 85
Administrative consent to yield the floor to Prof. Massa, Chairperson of the Nominating 86
Committee: Committee. There was no objection. 87

Nominating Committee 88
Prof. Lou Massa, Chairperson of the Committee, presented the three-part 89
report as distributed, and moved for approval of Part A., the Committee's 90
proposed slate for membership on the newly established ad-hoc Committee 91
on Evaluation of Academic Administrators. 92

The floor was opened for further nominations, but none were made. 93

A motion to close nominations carried by voice vote, and the following 94
were elected: 95

Ad-hoc Committee on Evaluation of Academic Administrators 96

Chairperson: Prof. Thomas Mader - Communications 97

Faculty: Prof. Margaret Magnus - School of Nursing - Graduate 98
Prof. Rena Gropper - Anthropology - SGS 99
Prof. Mae Gamble - Curriculum & Teaching - Day 100
Prof. Gil Alroy - Political Science - at-large 101
Prof. Max Diem - Chemistry - at-large 102
Prof. Phyllis Moe - English - at-large 103

Students: Ms. Abby Murphy - School of Nursing - Graduate 104
Ms. Hillary Kaufman - Education - SGS 105
Mr. Gil Ehrenkranz - Political Science - Day 106
Ms. Beatrice Ott - Psychology - at-large 107

(One member of the Administration to be designated by the President) 108

Prof. Massa next presented Part B of the Report, the Committee's nomina- 109
tions for seats currently vacant on Senate Committee. 110

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| The floor was opened for further nominations. | 111 |
| A motion to close nominations carried. | 112 |
| A motion that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the Committee's nominations carried by voice vote, and the following were elected: | 113 114 115 |
| <u>Committee on the Calendar</u> | 116 |
| <u>Faculty</u> from School of Social Work - Prof. Elizabeth Landing | 117 |
| <u>Grade Appeals Committee</u> | 118 |
| <u>Faculty Alternate:</u> Prof. Helen Newman - Communications | 119 |
| <u>Advisory Committee on Library</u> | 120 |
| <u>Faculty Alternate:</u> Prof. Thomas Wesselkamper -Mathematics (Comp.Sci.) | 121 |
| <u>Student Standing Committee</u> | 122 |
| <u>Faculty Alternate:</u> Prof. Bernard Schneider - Curriculum & Teaching | 123 |
| <u>Undergraduate Course of Study Committee</u> | 124 |
| <u>Faculty Alternate:</u> Prof. Phillip DeLorey - School of Nursing | 125 |
| <u>Students:</u> Ms. Barbara Reisman - Biology - Day | 126 |
| Ms. Denise DeBaun - English - SGS | 127 |
| <u>Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee</u> | |
| <u>Student:</u> Ms. Lena Iacovelli - Special Honors - Day | 128 |
| <u>Committee on Evaluation of Teaching</u> | 129 |
| <u>Students:</u> Ms. Mickie Yoon - Education - Day | 130 |
| Ms. Pauline Alexander - SGS | 131 |
| Ms. Leonora Mau Pai - SGS | 132 |
| <u>Student Alternate:</u> Mr. George Skouras - Day | 133 |
| <u>Review Commission on Distribution Requirements</u> | 134 |
| <u>Faculty Alternate:</u> Prof Karen O'Brian - Home Economics | 135 |
| <u>Student:</u> Ms. Judith Jarrett - Psychology/Chemistry - Day | 136 |
| <u>Budget Committee</u> | 137 |
| <u>Student:</u> Ms. Debra Hubert - SGS | 138 |
| <u>Master Plan Committee</u> | 139 |
| <u>Student:</u> Mr. Michael Pichardo - SGS | 140 |
| <u>Departmental Governance Committee</u> | 141 |
| <u>Student:</u> Ms. Mickie Yoon - Day | 142 |
| <u>Facilities & Services Committee</u> | 143 |
| <u>Student:</u> Ms. Bonnette Wright - Day | 144 |
| <u>Charter Review Committee</u> | 145 |
| <u>Student Alternate:</u> Mr. Rick McQuillan - Day | 146 |
| For the Senate's information, Prof. Massa next presented Part C of the Report, seats currently vacant on Senate Committees; he asked that persons interested in filling any of the vacant seats should contact the Senate Office, Room 626. | 147 148 149 150 |
| Prof. Brick informed the Senate that there are vacant seats on the Nominating Committee for a Faculty Alternate and a Student Alternate. | 151 152 |
| He opened the floor for nominations for Faculty Alternate, and the following were nominated: | 153 154 |
| Prof. Mae Gamble - Curriculum & Teaching | 155 |
| Prof. Michael Jaworskyj - Political Science | 156 |
| A vote by hand produced the following results: | 157 |
| Prof. Gamble received 33 votes | 158 |
| Prof. Jaworskyj received 41 votes. | 159 |
| Prof. Michael Jaworskyj was elected to membership on the Nominating Committee. | 160 161 |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Prof. Brick next opened the floor for nominations for Student Alternate on the Nominating Committee, and Ms. Allison Shorey was nominated. | 162 163 |
| A motion to close nominations carried, and Ms. Shorey was elected. | 164 |
| Prof. Green brought to the Senate's attention the memoranda dated October 6th and October 28th from President Shalala re: Search Procedures. | 165 166 167 |
| After discussion, Prof. Gropper moved: | 168 |
| "that the Senate's Administrative Committee be requested to review the adopted procedures regarding Search Committees with the President, particularly with reference to the positions of Registrar and Chief Librarian, and, in due time, report back to the Senate." | 169 170 171 172 |
| The question was called and carried, and the motion was approved by voice vote. | 173 174 |
| <u>Undergraduate Course of Study Committee</u> | 175 |
| Prof. Jane Benardete, Chairperson of the Committee, presented the revised "Guidelines for Submission of Curriculum Proposals," as distributed. She informed the Senate that these "Guidelines" had been approved by the Graduate Course of Study Committee as well. | 176 177 178 179 |
| The question was called and carried. | 180 |
| The revised "Guidelines for Submission of Curriculum Proposals" were approved by voice vote (see Appendix II). | 181 182 |
| <u>Budget Committee</u> | 183 |
| Prof. Bernard Shull, Chairperson of the Committee, presented the Report dated 5 November 1980, as distributed. | 184 185 |
| After a brief question-and-answer period, Prof. Brick, on behalf of the Senate, thanked Prof. Shull and the members of his Committee, for making sense out of the complex area of the budget as it relates to the setting of priorities in College policy. | 186 187 188 189 |
| A motion to adjourn carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m. | 190 |

Respectfully submitted,

Tamara M. Green
Tamara Green,
Secretary

A P P E N D I X I

The following members are noted as absent from the meeting:

FACULTY:

Seek: Henry Evans "E"

Anthropology: Lester Firschein
Daniel Gross "E"

Art: Lisa Vergara

Black & Puerto Rican Studies: Jose Sanchez
Myrna Bain

Chemistry: Bernard Greenberg

Communications: Linda Eagle
Serafina Bathrick

Economics: Arthur Gruen "E"

Educational Foundations: Kimberly Kinsler "E"

Health & Physical Education: Frances Allen
Claire Schmais "E"

History: Naomi Miller

Health Sciences: Lee Margulies "E"
Russell Sergeant
Laurie Selman

Library: Vivian Balaban "E"
William Omelchenko
Milton Mittelman "E"

Mathematics: Thomas Wesselkamper
Barbara Barone

Music: John Reeves White "E"

Philosophy: Peter Caws

Physics & Astronomy: Bo Lawergren

Political Science: Gil Alroy
Ken Sherrill
Julian Baim

Psychology: Robert Fried

Romance Languages: Juan Agudiez "E"
Carlos Hortas
Giuseppina Welsh

Social Work: Joel Walker

Student Services: Rafael Ferrer
Helen Clark "E"

Theatre & Cinema: Daniel Koetting
Ian Calderon
Constance Clark

Dean Dorothy White
Dean James Harrison "E"
Dean Larry Joyce "E"

STUDENTS:

Graduate Students:

Doris Chee
Kenneth Molinari
Lori Hartman
Helen Silberstein
Dolores Hull "E"
Robert Tilly
Barbara Sharon
Abby Murphy "E"
Virginia Snow

Day Session Students:

Gil Ehrenkranz
Sandy Del Pin
Gail Zinberg
Brian Seirup
Myra Bachman
Bob Behr
Linda Tate
Sarit Grinberg "E"
Karen Kaplan
Frances Rocco
Lawson Bernstein
Andrew Sushkiw
Donald Kern
Thomas DePrisco
Patricia Cavallero
Gilda Altmann
Jesus Linares
Darryl Penenberg "E"
Cynthia Butcher

Evening Session Students:

Louise Bryant "E"
Antonia Perez
Priscilla Scudder

"E" = Excused

A P P E N D I X I I

GUIDELINES FOR THE SUBMISSION OF:

S U B S T A N T I V E C U R R I C U L U M P R O P O S A L S
(revised 1980)

Definition of Substantive Items:

All items except those defined as routine shall be regarded as substantive.

Procedure:

Substantive Curriculum revision proposals, prepared in the attached format, shall be forwarded by the originating source(s) to the Divisional Curriculum Committee.

DIVISIONAL CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Preliminary screening of proposals by the Divisional Curriculum Committee or a sub-committee thereof shall result in the reduction of proposals to include: Course number, title, hours, credits, catalog description, Rationale (Justification).

The Divisional Curriculum Committee shall apprise all Senators, Department Chairpersons and members of the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee (Graduate or Undergraduate) of those items ready for final consideration by the Divisional Curriculum Committee, through circulation of course descriptions.

On a trial basis, and until further notice, this mailing will be handled through the services of the Senate Office. In this regard, the Divisional Dean's Office shall deliver by hand to the Senate Office (Room 626) five (5) copies of the abbreviated proposal(s) for substantive changes. The proposal(s) shall be accompanied by a forwarding letter which:

- a. clearly states whether the proposals are graduate or undergraduate, and that the proposed changes are "SUBSTANTIVE;"
- b. summarizes the proposed substantive changes;
- c. clearly indicates the date by which a written challenge to a proposal is to be received by the Divisional Dean's Office. This date shall be set at a minimum of 15 class days from the day a proposal is received by the Senate Office.

Challenge Procedure at Divisional Level:

The intent to challenge a proposal under consideration by the Divisional Curriculum Committee must be promptly communicated in writing to the appropriate Divisional Dean or Deans within the time limit specified. The notice of intent must include a statement of the grounds on which the challenge will be based, and it must identify the person(s) sponsoring the challenge, giving name and college affiliation.

The Divisional Curriculum Committee shall:

- a. provide a forum for discussion of a challenged proposal;
- b. take responsibility for all corrections in a proposal;
- c. notify the sponsors of a challenge of the decision on the challenge made by the Divisional Curriculum Committee, within two working days of the Committee's meeting.

On completion of action at the Divisional Level, the Divisional Dean's Office shall:

- A. Obtain from the Senate Office for all substantive proposals a "US" (undergraduate-substantive) or "GS" (graduate-substantive) identification number, which shall be typed onto the the appropriate proposal in the upper right-hand corner.
- B. Submit by hand to the Senate Office 30 copies of the approved and final proposal, with a covering letter which clearly states the date of final approval by the Divisional Curriculum Committee, and is addressed to the Chairperson of the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee (Undergraduate or Graduate). This letter should clearly state if a proposal was challenged at the Divisional level and, if so, it should include a statement of the grounds given for the challenge.

SENATE COURSE OF STUDY COMMITTEE

Challenge Procedure at Senate Level:

The intent to challenge a curriculum item before the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee (undergraduate or graduate) shall be communicated in writing to the Senate Office within five working days of the last action on the curriculum item in question before the Divisional Curriculum Committee. The notice of intent to challenge must include a statement of the grounds on which the challenge will be based, and it must identify the person(s) sponsoring the challenge, giving name(s) and college affiliation.

The appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee shall provide a forum for discussion of a challenged proposal. The Committee shall invite all sponsors of the challenge as well as the sponsors of the challenged proposal to attend the discussion of the proposal in question. Action by the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee shall be considered final.*

Upon final action by the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee, the Senate Office shall identify on the Senate Agenda, for information purposes, approved substantive changes.

Approved substantive changes shall then be included in the appropriate section of the Chancellor's Report by the Senate Office.

*Appeals Procedure at Senate Meeting

All final action by the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee is subject to a motion to "Reconsider" or "Rescind" which has the effect of returning the item specified to the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee for further deliberation. (The motion to "Reconsider" or "Rescind" must be made at the Senate meeting at which the proposal is reported to the Senate.) All members of the Senate shall be notified of the new date for committee consideration and all interested parties shall be permitted to testify at that meeting. The Committee shall then make its decision and shall inform the Senate according to the present procedures at the following Senate meeting.

GUIDELINES FOR THE SUBMISSION OF:

ROUTINE CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

(revised 1980)

Definition of Routine Changes:

Routine items consist of changes in courses or programs previously approved by the Senate which require alteration in form, such as course number, and/or title, or course description, but leaving unaltered the essential character of the course or program in question. (The dropping of a course is considered "Routine.")

The following changes are NOT considered "Routine":

- Change in Credits
- Change in the Distribution Requirement
- Change or addition of pre-requisites
- Change in Course Level

F O R M A T

Routine curriculum proposals which require alteration in form must cite present and replacement language: "FROM:... TO: ...," and shall be followed by a single paragraph of Justification. The proposal shall also clearly state whether the changes are UNDERGRADUATE or GRADUATE "ROUTINE CHANGES."

P R O C E D U R E S

Curriculum revisions satisfying the definition of "routine changes" shall be forwarded by the originating department to the Divisional Curriculum Committee for review and approval.

Approval by the Divisional Curriculum Committee shall constitute College approval with one exception: If the Senate Course of Study Committee determines that an item has been improperly identified as "routine," the proposal shall be returned to the Divisional Curriculum Committee with the request that procedures for "Substantive Proposals" be followed.

On completion of action at the Divisional level, the Divisional Dean's Office shall:

- a. Obtain from the Senate Office, a "UR" (undergraduate-routine) or "GR" (graduate-routine) identification number. This number shall be typed onto the proposal before submission to the Senate Office.
- b. Submit to the Senate Office by hand 5 (five) copies of the approved routine curriculum changes under cover of a forwarding letter. This letter shall clearly state the date of approval by the Divisional Curriculum Committee, it shall be signed by the Divisional Dean, and shall be addressed to the Chairperson of the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee.
- c. Upon notification by the Chair of the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee, the Senate Office shall be responsible for identifying "routine" changes for information purposes on the Senate Agenda, and for inclusion in the appropriate section of the Chancellor's Report.

APPEALS PROCEDURE FOR ROUTINE CHANGES

1. A negative decision by the Divisional Curriculum Committee may be subject to appeal by the originating department to the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee.
2. The appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee shall review and act upon departmental appeals.
3. Action by the appropriate Senate Course of Study Committee on departmental appeals shall be considered final.