

M I N U T E S

Regular Meeting of the Hunter College Senate  
27 February 1979

The 114<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:35 pm.  
in the Playhouse.

Presiding: Sylvia Fishman, Chairman

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

Minutes: The Minutes of February 13th were approved as distributed.

Report by the President: A summary statement of President Wexler's Report to the Senate is attached  
as Appendix II.

Report by the Ombudsman: Ombudsman Sherover reported that several issues have come to a head in  
recent weeks and because of medical inability to make a report at the  
January meeting, this report combines both.

--There have been faculty complaints about 'abuse' of the Cr-NoCr system:  
it was to have been tied to the Rate-of-Progress system which the  
Senate had authorized; for computer-reasons, the administration has not  
been able to initiate that program, hence complaints about the way the  
Cr-NoCr system has functioned without it. I am assured that the Rate-of-  
Progress program will be initiated later this spring, but am bringing  
this to the attention of the Undergraduate Academic Requirements Com-  
mittee for whatever action they may deem advisable.

--There is no regular procedure for processing the granting of credit by  
transfer students for the growing number of inter-disciplinary courses;  
I will ask the Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee to suggest  
one.

--Several proposals have been received for (re)defining the grading  
standards we are using; I am bringing these to the Undergraduate  
Academic Requirements Committee.

--A number of faculty members have complained about Bookstore policies that  
interfere with academic programs--not ordering books; prematurely  
returning them. I have asked the Administrative Committee of the  
Senate and the Executive Committee of the FDA to each name two or three  
faculty members who would serve as an Advisory Committee to the Business  
Office.

--Several faculty members have complained about administration policy  
regarding one-semester sabbaticals; I have brought this to the attention  
of the Provost and am reporting that his response was that it was a  
divisional responsibility as to whether they would be able to accept  
applications for one-semester sabbaticals in view of budgetary considera-  
tions.

--In pursuing some student complaints about aspects of the Program in  
Nursing, I discovered that (presumably due to the administrative shifts)  
no part of the new Nursing program has been submitted to Senate channels  
for approval although the new program is already beginning to be  
scheduled; this has been referred to the Undergraduate Course of Study  
Committee for appropriate action. In addition, a procedure requiring  
students to pay tuition for an equivalency examination has been brought  
to the attention of the Provost and the Administrative Committee for  
action.

--The Charter Review Committee has been preparing some 'consensus'  
amendments on the expectation that the new amendment procedure will be  
approved; it is expected that the Senate will be informally consulted  
concerning its preferred alternatives before anything will be formally  
submitted.

Report by the Administrative Committee:	Prof. Tamara Green, Secretary of the Senate, presented the following resolution and moved for its approval:	53 54
	WHEREAS, the appropriate faculty body and the appropriate student body as determined by the BHE, have elected their representatives; BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate, as <u>the</u> governing body of Hunter College, instruct the Administrative Committee to include on the Senate Agenda regular reports by the College Screening Committee for Presidential Search.	55 56 57 58 59 60 -
	The question was called and carried.	61
	The motion to approve the resolution, carried with no opposition and 1 abstention.	62 63
Report by the Teacher Evaluation Committee:	<u>Teacher Evaluation Committee</u> Ms. Christine Young, Chairman of the Committee, presented the Report which included 2 different proposals for a new questionnaire. She informed the Senate that all question marks should be deleted on the Hunter College Form.	64 65 66 67 68
	The floor was opened for discussion.	69
	After discussion, Prof. Sherover moved to approve the Pittsburgh instrument.	70 71
	Prof. Korn moved that the motion be amended by adding: "and that some revisions be made."	72 73
	This was accepted by the mover and became part of the main motion on the floor.	74 75
	During discussion, the Chair proposed that the questions that need minor rephrasing be identified now.	76 77
	The questions that were identified for rephrasing were: # 3, # 6, # 14, # 16, # 20, # 23, the reference scale in the second grouping, and demographic questions since they do not provide for graduate programs.	78 79 80
	After further discussion the question was called and carried.	81
	The motion to adopt the Pittsburgh instrument with revisions to be made, carried by hand vote with 40 in favor, 15 opposed, and 1 abstention.	82 83
	After discussion about the deadline for submitting the revised form, Prof. Arend moved that a Committee be formed with Prof. Korn as Chairman, to make the revisions with a maximum deadline of one week, but urged the Committee to have revisions ready earlier.	84 85 86 87
	The question was called and carried.	88
	Prof. Arend's motion was approved by hand vote with 35 in favor, no opposition, and 2 abstentions.	89 90
Old Business:	There having been no Old Business, the next item on the Agenda was New Business.	91 92
New Business:	The Chair informed the Senate that there were two items to be considered: (1) a resolution proposed by Mr. John Connor as submitted, and (2) a Petition to be introduced by Prof. Marcia Brody.	93 94 95
	Mr. Connor's Resolution was on the floor.	96
	Mr. Connor informed the Senate of a correction in the second to the last paragraph, which should read:	97 98
	The Governor, Mayor, State Legislature, City Council, BHE, SUNY Board of Trustees.	99 100
	The resolution as corrected read:	101

WHEREAS, CUNY tuition is currently \$775/yr. for lower division students and \$ 925/yr. for upper division students. This compares with a nation-wide average of \$575/yr. for public colleges and universities.

The automatic \$150/yr. tuition increase for students entering their junior year coincides with an automatic \$200 reduction in Tuition Assistance Program awards after four semesters. Besides all of this, part-time students are denied any tuition assistance whatsoever under the Tuition Assistance Program.

A \$100 tuition increase has been publicly proposed although nobody will admit to being the author of the proposal. SUNY trustees would like an increase to help service bond debts for capital construction. Tuition in SUNY is tied directly to the debt service payments. In the opinion of Howard F. Miller (State Budget Director), both CUNY and SUNY should have the same tuition for reasons of "equity and parity." Thus a tuition increase at SUNY could well mean a tuition increase at CUNY--despite the fact that money and services from the State to CUNY and SUNY are not on any "parity."

Our Day Session Student Government (working in conjunction with the University Student Senate of CUNY, the Student Association of the State University, and other student groups), is fighting the proposed increase. The D.S.S.G. will provide materials, addresses, postage, and any help necessary to students and faculty members who would like to voice their opposition to the proposed tuition increase by writing City and State officials.

The proposed tuition increase would lead to enrollment declines. A nation-wide study by the National Council on Financing of Post-secondary Education shows that every \$100 increase in tuition yields an enrollment decline of 2-4%. Enrollment declines beyond those already anticipated would necessitate a revamping of such studies as the Howe Report that are based on current tuition levels.

The proposed tuition increase would not be good for either the State, the City, SUNY, CUNY, students, or faculty.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hunter College Academic Senate opposes the proposed \$ 100 tuition increase for both CUNY and SUNY that is slated to take effect in the Fall of 1979; and that the Administrative Committee of the Academic Senate will send letters arguing against that increase to the following people:

The Governor, Mayor, State Legislature, City Council, BHE, SUNY Board of Trustees.

The Administrative Committee shall also send written requests to the faculty members of Hunter College urging them to make their students aware of the proposed tuition increase, and to work with the D.S.S.G. in fighting that increase.

After brief discussion, Mr. Landow moved that the resolution be amended by deleting all reference to the State and SUNY.

The question was called and carried.

The amendment failed for lack of quorum, and Mr. Landow withdrew his amendment.

The question on the Connor resolution was called and carried.

The resolution was approved by hand vote with 33 in favor, 4 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

The Chair next yielded the floor to Prof. Marcia Brody. Prof. Brody read the following petition to the body:155  
156

To:157  
Governor Hugh Carey158  
Mayor Edward Koch159  
Chancellor Robert Kibbee160  
The Board of Higher Education161  
The People of the City and State of New York162

The selection of a new President for Hunter College is of profound importance to the institution. It is essential to the future well-being of Hunter that the most qualified potential candidate be found and attracted to the post. In order to assure the success of this endeavor, it is necessary both to engage in a broad nationwide search, and to allow enough time for qualified candidates to assess the merits of accepting the Presidency of Hunter while making tentative arrangements to leave whatever positions of responsibility they may currently occupy.163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171

In light of the need for a deliberate and thorough search, it is unfortunate that the Board of Higher Education appears intent upon choosing a new President before the expiration of its term of office in June, 1979. Such a rapid selection of the next President would likely exclude from serious consideration the majority of potential candidates from outside the City University. Indeed, most departments at Hunter engage in longer searches even for junior faculty positions.172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179

For these reasons, the undersigned members of the Hunter College Faculty request that the search initiated by the present Board of Higher Education be completed by its successor Board. In the interim, an Acting President should be named if President Wexler desires to implement her resignation before the arrival of the next President. We are convinced that such action would be in the best interest of the students and faculty of Hunter College, and thereby the people of the City and State of New York.180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Department</u>	
1.	_____			189
2.	_____			190
etc.				191

Prof. Mader moved that the Senate go on record as supporting both the wording and spirit of the petition.192  
193

After brief discussion the motion carried by hand vote with 34 in favor, 1 opposed, and 5 abstentions.194  
195

All business having been completed, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40pm.196

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: William Washington  
Gail Gordon  
Vernal Pemberton "E"

Art: Roy DeCarava  
Dennis McCarthy

Black & Puerto Rican Studies: John Clarke  
John Motley  
Alfred Sears

Chemistry: Jack Day  
Edward Barrett

Classics: Robert Forman

Communications: Pat Mitchell

Curriculum & Teaching: Migdalia Ortiz

Economics: Arthur Gruen  
Kenneth Smith

Educational Foundations: Alfred Pasteur

German: Minna Altman "E"

Health & Physical Education: Thomas Burke

Health Sciences: Robert Tannenbaum "E"

Library: Lucille Bailey "E"

Mathematics: Barbara Primosch

Music: Peter Basquin

Nursing: Mary Ranshorn "E"

Philosophy: William Bryar "E"

Political Science: Julian Baim

Psychology: Robert Fried  
Sandra McNab

Romance Languages: Dora Issacharoff  
James Pellicer

Social Work: Jack Kamaiko  
Malka Sternberg "E"  
Barbara Morrison

Sociology: Paulette Pierce  
John Hammond

Student Services: Florence Hartstein

Theatre & Cinema: Daniel Koetting "E"

Dean Evelyn Handler "E"  
Mr. Lewis Temares

STUDENTS:

Graduate Students:

Sheila Kurtz  
Lorraine Mancuso "E"  
Linda Meany "E"

Seek Students:

Pearl Patrick

Day Session Students:

Maritza Alvarado  
Rae Cannizzaro  
Diane Cimino "E"  
Gil Ehrenkranz  
Joel Sansone  
Leonard Shine  
Adele Francis  
Steven Greenspan  
Anthony Palmieri

Evening Session Students:

Jeri Beth Arzberger  
Laura Bernay  
Iris Ludwig  
Alexandra Matusinka  
Flora Price "E"

A P P E N D I X   I I

Remarks by President Jacqueline Wexler

Let me report on our plans to move forward on the new amendment procedure - in the change in the charter. I met yesterday with David Robinson who is the chairman of the Administrative Committee of the Board of Higher Education. It is this committee that analyzes and reviews these proposals, and sends them on to the full Board. Dr. Robinson supports what we propose to do. He thinks there should not be any serious political problems precisely because it passed as a unanimous vote of this faculty/student body. He wants me to do my informal homework by having a meeting with the head of the Cuny-wide Student Senate and the head of the Cuny-wide Faculty Senate. I made my tentative appointment with the student chairman last night at the Board, and I will make an appointment with the faculty chairman before the week is out to see that they are advised, that they understand, that they have had time to review our proposal and give any objections to us before our formal submission. It is our intention to move it to the committee at the earliest possible time, probably for the April agenda of the Board. Are there any questions on that issue?

Second, I wanted to report to you about the legislative overtures that are now underway in Albany. It is my understanding that there are at this point three possible bills. They may indeed merge into one or converge into one another. One is the City's bill concerning the structure of CUNY about which you have probably read in the newspaper. The second is the legislative bill itself. That is one in which the central leadership of CUNY has joined. The third is the Governor's bill, which is still in camera. The City of New York bill supports in essence the Howe Commission: a joint board for the City University of New York - a board that would reflect to some degree the shift in funding patterns of the City and the State which moves at least in some not too distant future to a full funding of the senior colleges by the State and a continued sharing in the funding of the Community Colleges by the City. All bills insure the preservation of a unified university in the form in which we have it now with only the appointing right of the State and the City, that is of the Governor and the Mayor, shifting to reflect the further shifting in the funding. It is my understanding that the Assembly bill is much in that form and that the City University is ready actively to support it rather than to have it foisted upon them. From my own conversations in late January with Mr. Morgado, the Governor's chief of staff, I believe that the Governor's bill will be in some similar form. The imponderable remains the timing on which the State will take over the full funding with regard to the operating budget and the capital construction budget. It is the position of the Chancellor, supported by most leaders in the University, that the first clean, clear step to be taken is the assumption of the full capital construction cost. From where all of us at Hunter sit, that is the critical agenda. The minute 100% funding gets assumed by the State, then it seems clear that our bonds will be sold. Indeed, Mr. Morgado has assured me of that. The Chancellor and the Board of Higher Education are taking a strong position that assumption of full construction costs be the first step. That will take us off the hook of being wrapped between two masters and two veto powers. The timing might be as early as April and it could be as late as early June. The encouraging agenda is that for the first time in modern history of the University, everybody seems to be together on the same agenda and, second, that the University is cleanly pressing for the capital construction to be the first and firm step taken. Are there any questions on that important agenda, or any differences from people who are close to the political scene with a different sounding?

Third, I would like to talk a little bit about space problems as they will continue to impinge upon this college until the construction is finished. You will, I think, read an article in the New York Times and perhaps in other newspapers tomorrow morning dealing with a seeming impasse that has arisen between the Board of Higher Education and the City government. Again, we are in the midst of the impasse. Not on any meritorious grounds, but simply because we happen to be the issue in a contest on procedure and protocol. As I think most of you know, we lost the lease for what we all call the FBI Building, on East 69 Street on December 30. We worked assiduously with the real estate people at the Board of Higher Education for substitute space, but no appropriate space was forthcoming. Through the good offices and artful work of Mr. Smith and Mr. Murtagh, we were able to gain very good available space in the Foundling Hospital which is about a block from us. The real estate people at 80th Street agreed to our moving in (we would have been

Appendix II (continued)

On the issue of how many administrative offices, I have never yet recommended we take the Provost's office out. I once tried to take the President's office out when we were looking at some space across the street which we did not get. I was at that time urged by faculty and student committees that that would be abdicating presence in the community and that would indeed be a cop-out. I have made great efforts to get big pieces of space. I've been trying to get the Registrar's office out of the main building for years. It is in prime space on the second floor. I have been stymied because it is so connected to records, the computers, to other things that would be so expensive to move in a temporary way that we would spend up far too much unavailable funds for a temporary move. Maybe somebody else may be brighter at this, Michael, than I am, but at this point we simply have not found a way to move other administrative units out of here. We have moved some.

On the first issue which you raised about the School of Social Work. Hunter does not "own" the School of Social Work. Neither does the Board of Higher Education. The Silberman Foundation which owns the facility granted it without cost to the Board of Higher Education or to Hunter College for what is tantamount to a 99-year lease on the condition that it be used for the School of Social Work and/or for any other compatible programs which are approved by the Silberman Foundation. Mr. Silberman has been extremely cooperative about this. We have over the years put a number of programs there. For a while we used a whole floor for the developing Brookdale programs on the aging. First of all, we can't change it. But I want to be fair in my own judgment. My understanding is that it is heavily used, at least on some evenings, because our School of Social Work is the only school of social work in the City which runs a one-year residency plan available for people who are in the working social service community. Aside from that, I believe that if that stipulation had not been on that building in 1972 and 1973, it would be a wasteland like everything else we've got. It has been preserved as a kind of, I hope, portent of the future of what the academic community ought to look like if we are ever to be a college of first resort rather than a college of last resort. That's an opinion, but I wanted it clear first that I would not have power to change it even if my opinion were to the contrary. It is clearly in the lease involving the philanthropic gift. One of the positions that I continue to make to everyone in the political sector and to the Board of Higher Education is that Hunter College has not had a bit of space in the public sector since 1940. That's just a fact. The School of Social Work was provided by a philanthropic gift. Roosevelt House was provided by a philanthropic gift. The Hunter-Bellevue School of Health Professions will be renovated almost exclusively by philanthropic money, and if that had not happened, I do not know where Hunter would be at the present time. But I go back to the position, Michael, at any time you request, I would be glad personally to sit down with your committee, particularly if I know the agenda and prepared for it in the coming months. Are there any questions on space?

We have an agreement with the Foundling Hospital that we will get the use of 12 more offices on July 1 which will provide for 24 faculty people in space better than most of you have. That was as far as we could get at the present time and it is why it is so important that the Foundling not get dragged into some political press hullabaloo, or they may pull out of the whole thing. We're trying to protect against that. I will try for more, but we go for what seems feasible, get people used to it and move on. I'm having lunch tomorrow with Rabbi Schneier from Park East Synagogue to talk to him about any possible usable space. We may have the most ecumenical college in the history of mankind out of sheer necessity.

I am sure that I in the summer and my successor in the fall, if there is one, will try to be sure that the water faucets work at Temple Emmanuel. I can't imagine they have a theological connection, but I wouldn't want to raise that as a necessary requisite for the meeting tonight.

One last point. This is the first time I have addressed you since I sent you the letter of my own intention to retire from the presidency. I am most grateful for the many written and spoken words of gratitude and encouragement that I have had since that time. I had a number of reasons for deciding on January. I think it would be clearly apparent to many of you from the time I entered and certainly in my own self-appraisal made at the time of the evaluation that I

Appendix II (continued)

thought ten years was the outside limit for my presidency. My decision was only one of whether I should announce it in January or in June. I decided on January largely because I felt that it was imperative that the momentum for the search take place while the faculty was in place, that there would be a perception, if not a reality, that someone was going to do something in the dark of the summer, if the announcement were made in June.

I have tried to stay out of the search process, perhaps to a point of bending over backwards. I know there was a good deal of disagreement about which body ought to recommend the faculty persons who are on the search committee. I did not enter into that discussion because it seemed to me so important and appropriate that I stay out of the search process. I know that members of the faculty have met with Mr. Robinson. I did talk with him about the issue because of the representations that have gone back and forth. I think he clearly understands the position of this Senate and will be working with various people, perhaps on this issue, but certainly on future issues in dealing with governance roles at Hunter.

The only thing that I would like to ask you, if I can as a colleague, is that we all be extremely careful to keep this out of the political arena. The most clear and present danger that can afflict an academic community and assault its academic freedom is politicians getting involved in a one-to-one decision on any personnel appointment and particularly on a president. They might at some point have a perfectly elegant candidate, but to allow them, much less invite them, to get involved in that process is to flirt, I think, with the most dangerous thing an academic community can do. I think I need say no more. I do believe that you all have now made your representations directly to the Board. I think that the faculty leadership has now dealt directly with the Board. As a colleague, I only want to urge you very strongly to stay with that position. Any direct intervention to the political sector is done at a potentially very high price. I think we have been reasonably successful at any time in my administration in keeping the appointments process in academic and not political hands.

Last, in the first time since I've made my announcement, I again thank this body for its hard work, for its maturing during these times and to wish it very well. It has been an interesting experience from that first day we met at Hunter-Bellevue to this day.

Looking back, I would take the job again. But I am utterly convinced for my sake and for the college's sake, it is far better to leave a little too soon than a little too late. I am sure there are those people who think now it's a little too late. But I at least wanted to go while some believed it was a little too soon. Thank you so much.