Office of the Hunter College Senate
Room 1018 East Building   Phone: 772-4200

MINUTES
Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
16 April 2008

1   The 488th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 3:50 PM in Room W714.
2
3   **Presiding:**   Richard Stapleford, Chair
4
5   **Attendance:**   The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those listed in Appendix I.
6
7   Alternate Senators were formally seated in accordance with the procedures approved by the Senate,
8   and clickers were distributed to them.
9
10
11 **Report by the**   There was no report.
12 **Administrative**
13 **Committee:**   The Chair asked the Senate to move on to the next item of business since President Raab had not yet
14   arrived. There having been no objection, it was so ordered.
15
16 **Reports:**   **Middle States Steering Committee**
17   Prof. Philip Alcabes, Co-chair of the Middle States Steering Committee, presented the report. The
18   following is a summary statement of his report. He said:
19
20   "On behalf of the co-chairs of the Self-Study, I want to catch you up on where we are and what
21   our plans are for the coming thirteen months.
22
23   As you probably know, working groups have been studying most aspects of operations at Hunter
24   College for some time now. Those working groups are going to submit draft reports to the co-
25   chairs of the Steering Committee, that is, Professor Clarkson, Provost Rabinowitz and myself, on
26   April 24th during the vacation week. We will do a light editing of those draft reports, and then we
27   will post them on a secure web-site which will be open to all members of the Hunter community.
28   Anyone who has a Hunter College e-mail address will have access to this web-site. We will post
29   information on the list serve, letting everybody know how to find their way to this web-site. It will
30   not be hard, and I encourage everyone to read the reports by the working groups and make
31   comments. We will make multiple avenues for commentary available, including e-mailing us, e-
32   mailing working group leaders, commenting on the web-site itself, and probably others.
33
34   By decision of the Steering Committee, the period for commenting on these working group drafts
35   reports will go from May 1st to June 1st. We may not reply to every comment, but we will
36   consider any commentary that is offered by anybody from the College community between May
37   1st and June 1st. On June 1st, working group leaders will revise their draft reports based on the
38   feedback that they have received following this posting and will give a finalized report to the Self-
39   Study Co-Chairs. We co-chairs will then spend the summer collating the reports and drafting a
40   College-wide Self-Study document.
41
42   The co-chairs will present a draft Self-Study Report to the Steering Committee on September 10.
43   The Steering Committee will consider and revise that report. On September 24th, the Committee
44   will give that draft report to an outside editor. The outside editor is going to be someone who is
45   hired by the Provost's Office with the advice of the Steering Committee. This person will be an
46   academic or former academic who has extensive experience working with Middle-States
47   Commission self-studies and reviews. That person's job will be to make suggestions to us about
48   improving the report and polish it in a way that will be recognizable to the Middle States site-visit
49 **Minutes**   **Page 5436**

team as excellent. That report will come back to us by the end of October. We will then hand that somewhat revised Self-Study Report to the Chair of the site-visit team, whose name is Earl Richardson. He is the President of Morgan State University. By Middle States requirements, he will be on campus four months prior to the visit by the full site-visit team. President Richardson's preliminary visit will take place on Thursday, November 13th; he will spend the day here. He will be investigating what he needs to set up the site visit by the full team, which will take place in April 2009. Prior to President Richardson's visit on November 13th we have to give him a draft report. He will get a draft that has been somewhat edited by an outside professional editor following review by the Steering Committee, following review by the Co-Chairs.

After the preliminary visit we will ask for input again from the College community. Generally, we will send another draft back to the same editor to ask for an even further polished version which we will get back in January. We have to submit a final version of our report to Middle States sometime in February. The site visit itself will involve a team of roughly ten people. I don't think that all have been appointed yet, but Middle States sets that up. The team is led by President Richardson, and the visit will take place sometime at the end of April 2009. We don't have the dates set up yet, but we will let you know as soon as we do. Middle States evaluation teams always come on a Sunday and they leave on a Wednesday. We are aiming for the end of April 2009 for the official full team site visit. That is the process we have planned."

Professor Alcabes concluded the report by answering questions from the floor.

Timetable for Middle States Re-accreditation :

April 30th or May 1st, 2008: PDF files containing Working Group draft reports will be posted on a secure site open to the Hunter faculty, students, and staff (only). Announcements will be posted on lists-serves, directing readers to the draft reports.
June 1st: period for comment on draft WG reports ends
June 30th: Revised WG reports submitted by WG leaders.
Summer 2008: The co-chairs will collate and produce a draft of the College's overall self-study report.
Sept. 10th: Co-chairs submit draft self-study report to steering committee
Sept. 17th: S.C. members return comments on draft report to co-chairs.
Sept. 18th: The steering committee meets to review and assemble changes to the draft report.
Sept. 24th: Draft report goes to an editor. The editor will know that a revised draft must be returned to the s.c. by Oct. 29th.
Oct. 29th: Editor submits revised draft report to steering committee.
Oct. 30th: The revised draft is discussed at the s.c. meeting and sent to Pres. Earl Richardson (chair of the Evaluation Team).
Nov. 13th: Pres. Richardson visits Hunter College.
Late Nov. and Dec. 2008: Steering Committee circulates the report to the college, soliciting commentary and making changes as needed. A second draft report is produced by the Steering Committee.
End of December, 2008: Second draft report is sent to the editor for a second revision.
January 30th, 2009: Editor submits revised version of second draft report to the s.c.
Feb 15th, 2009: Steering Committee finalizes report and submits to Pres. Richardson.
April 26th-29th, 2009: MSCHE evaluation team visits Hunter College.

Committee Reports: Professor Stapleford informed the Senate that the Report by the *Mellon Project Special Committee to Review the GER* has been postponed to the next meeting.

Teacher Evaluations Committee Report Re: Online Evaluations
Ms. Kelle Jacob, Chair of the Committee, informed the Senate that *Online Course Evaluations* had extended the demonstration period and anyone interested should go to: www. OnlineCourse Evaluations.com (click "view demo," and log in using username "demo@hunter.cuny.edu" and password "inspire." She then presented the following report dated 16 April 2008 as distributed:

Minutes   **Page 5437**

On May 18, 20005 the Hunter College Senate charged the Teacher Evaluation Committee and the Assistant Vice President of ICIT with the responsibility to work out details for implementing on-line evaluations. After carefully reviewing several companies, we have selected Online Course Evaluations.com. We believe that this company best serves Hunter's needs.

The College Administration has agreed to run a pilot program for the second session of Summer 2008 using our current evaluation questionnaire. It is the committee's recommendation that the Teacher Evaluation Committee serve as the evaluation administrators for the pilot program.

We hope to have a final report on on-line evaluations for Senate approval in Fall 2008 after the pilot program has been evaluated.

Description of the On-line Evaluation System

I. The Evaluation
- We will be able to use our current questions with the freedom to revise and update them at any time at no additional cost.
- Faculty has the ability to add specific questions to their own questionnaires regarding their course and will be the only ones to see the results of those questions.
- The system allows us to insert follow-up questions to get specific feedback. For example, a student responds that they were unable to understand their professor clearly, a follow-up question could provide an explanation (e.g., the professor needs to use a microphone, or the professor speaks with a difficult accent).
- Students will be able to evaluate TAs and course instructors on the same survey. While TA's will not be able to see the course instructor's results, the system may be set up so that course instructors can view their TA's evaluations.
- The system will allow students to be surveyed on dropped courses as well. This will allow us to find out exactly why students drop a particular course.

II. Evaluation Administration:
- Online Course Evaluations.com will email notifications to all students reminding them to fill out the teacher evaluations for all the courses they are enrolled in that semester. Each link is secure and allows for one-time access to a survey
- Teacher Evaluation Administrators are able to see how many students from each class, department, etc, have not completed their evaluations. This will allow them to send out reminders. The program can automatically send up to 5 email reminders to non-responding students. Other schools have found this feature very useful.

III. Programs to Encourage Student Participation
- Every completed evaluation automatically enters students in a raffle to win a prize, such as free iPod.
- Because evaluation administrators are able to see real-time response rates, they can email departments and specific faculty to send reminders to their students to complete their evaluations. These reminders can be sent through the program and teachers will not know who they are going to, protecting student anonymity. Please note that neither administrators nor faculty can see exactly which students have and have not filled out the evaluations. It is necessary to encourage faculty to maximize student participation.

IV. Analysis
- Instructors can customize their feedback in a way that is relevant to them.
- The instructor can see student comments as well as evaluation averages.
- Faculty has the ability to download all data off line and save as an Excel or Word document.

V. Results
- Results take no more than 30 days to be posted
- Students can see the mean results and comments based on selected questions of the evaluation, chosen by evaluation administrators.
- Results can be accessed through Bb.
- Students can search instructor's evaluation feedback by course and department.

Data Security- The OCE program uses a web-based interface that makes use of SSL (HTTPS) technology. This means that ALL data that is entered into our system is transmitted using 128-bit encryption.

Data is stored on separate servers than the servers that collect the data. Hourly transfers will be done with SQL Server's secure log shipping functions which is standard for SQL Server 2005. Servers are protected by a hardware firewall (Sonic Wall) and software firewall (ISA Server) and are secure against Cross Site Scripting and SQL Injection Attacks.

<u>Master Plan Committee: Comments on the Draft CUNY Master Plan 2008-2012</u>
Prof. Barbara Sproul, Chair of the Committee, presented the following report, which comprised the Master Plan Committe4e's response to the President's request for comments and suggestions for the 2008-2012 CUNY Master Plan Draft:

While advocating an "Integrated University", the draft seems largely lacking in any systematic analysis of existing strengths within the colleges. Consequently, its recommendations for the allocation of new resources appear more arbitrary than reasoned and while it is therefore difficult to make substantive comments in response, several points can possibly still be raised as a basis for the Senate's review.

There appears to be a definite bias within the draft towards City College, Baruch and even Medgar Evers: programs, improvements, new facilities in those schools are not only everywhere evident but they are described in intense detail--we read of the square footage of new buildings, committed budgets, plans for new programs. Hunter, by contrast, receives very little attention: existing programs deemed outstanding which are largely centered or were begun here at Hunter are not identified as such but are referred to as "CUNY programs", while other Hunter areas of excellence such as Roosevelt House and the Public Policy Program, the programs of the School of Social Work, unique and outstanding programs within Hunter's Arts and Humanities, etc., aren't mentioned at all.

When Hunter *is* mentioned in a serious way—a rare occurrence—details are suddenly lacking. Hunter's proposed science building is described 'in full' as "a new building" along with many others in a list of possible new CUNY structures (33). Its priority, size, cost, funding and specific uses, however, are missing later when the draft gets down to details: schedules of phased funding, allocations of square footage and names of architectural firms designing the projects are recounted in great specificity for the science buildings at City College (93), Lehman (94), Brooklyn (94), Queens (95) and John Jay (95), but Hunter is not there at all. The lack of detailed plans for Hunter's Science and Health Sciences Building is of greatest concern to the Master Plan Committee; this is a crucial issue, essential for Hunter's future.

Relatedly, while it is said that the CUNY School of Public Health will be 'located' at Hunter (28), there is no provision for its housing. Would it be in the "new building"? Where would this School reside for the next five years in any case? Similarly, while much is made of Hunter's new PhD granting authority (6), there is no account of what resources would be allocated to make this capacity truly functional. Such support plans ought to be part of the revised Master Plan.

230
231
232   Details of the refurbishment of Hunter's facilities are also missing. Of particular concern are
233   improvements to our MFA Building, our science facilities, and our library. While Hunter's MFA
234   Program is commended for its excellence (58), the long-needed repair of its building is not
235   mentioned at all (even though money for a new facility was actually in the 2004-2008 Master
236   Plan). Further, the section on improvement of science facilities, cited as a priority throughout the
237   discussion of the draft's "Decade of Science" chapter (31-36), makes no special mention of
238   Hunter's facilities—a fact particularly worrisome when considered alongside the lack of detail
239   about a possible new science building. Are our scientists to use space in the two buildings of City
240   College's Advanced Science Research Center (ARSC)— described in the draft as a "shared
241   research facility…providing state-of-the-art laboratories in one location for the University's top
242   faculty"? (93) Lastly, the section on upgrades to CUNY libraries (54-57)—reading like a copy of
243   Hunter's Library Taskforce Report—not only doesn't credit Hunter's vision but mentions no work
244   to be done on our campus in this regard. We think these three oversights in terms of the specifics
245   of upgrades ought also to be of great concern to the Hunter community.
246
247   Hunter's student residential facilities—long a recruitment tool for the college and in some
248   question now given the proposed sale of the Brookdale campus—are mentioned only in passing
249   with the possibility of a combined dormitory for students from Hunter, Baruch and John Jay (85).
250   There is no guarantee of the number of rooms for Hunter students, no maintenance of our current
251   uniqueness in being able to offer such housing and its connection to our attraction of honors
252   students and special foreign students, no date or budget for possible construction, etc. Details are
253   once again missing when it comes to the Hunter project. Contrast that with the specific plans
254   outlined for dorms being built at Queens, Staten Island and the 'Towers' at City College (99) and
255   the disturbing pattern of the draft Master Plan's neglect and disregard of Hunter is obvious. We
256   very much hope these issues are all rectified in the revised version of CUNY's Master Plan.
257
258   Beyond all this, there is no thinking reflected in the draft of unique ways in which Hunter does
259   and could further address issues of collective interest in the "Integrated University". We would
260   hope the final draft would stress Hunter's capability of leading the university in our areas of
261   special strength--curricular and programmatic--and in responding to initiatives such as "fostering
262   a global outlook" (69), dealing with "students with families" (76), contributing to the "CUNY
263   Leadership Academy" (83), etc. All in all, this current draft of the CUNY Master Plan is a
264   document troubling for the future strength of our college: a great deal of work remains to be done
265   in terms of its revision to restore Hunter to its position of prominence within the university.
266
267   Professor Stapleford informed the Senate that President Raab had requested that the report be
268   submitted directly to Vice Chancellor Selma Botman at CUNY.
269
270   After extensive discussion the Senate moved on to the next item of business.
271
272   **Report by the**   The following is a summary statement of President Raab's report to the Senate. She said:
273   **President:**
274   "I want to thank Kelle Jacob and the members of the Teacher Evaluations Committee for the
275   work done on student evaluations. I think it is very exciting. All those of us involved with campus
276   planning constantly come to a point where we don't have the data that we need to make decisions.
277   This idea of having another tool for collecting student data and needs is very important, and I
278   know that.
279
280   This leads me into the second announcement, which is another project that Senate has worked on
281   that is also near and dear to the students' hearts, the library project. We are making great progress.
282   The committee had final interviews and has recommended the selection of the Library Planner.
283   This will happen pretty quickly and we can hopefully do a lot of work over the summer so that
284   there can be data and presentations when people return. That is the first part of the feasibility
285   study to be quickly followed by beginning the design work.
286

As we discussed last time, the expected budget cuts of a little over $17M did come through to the CUNY system as a whole. However, there has been no decision on how that would be distributed to the campuses. The Chancellor has made a commitment to try to insulate the campuses from cuts as much as possible, and to try to absorb them on a system-wide basis rather than individual campuses. We will let everyone know as soon as possible. We did do very well in the Capital Budget, which includes $81M for the Science building. Although, we cannot start construction yet, this money was kept in the budget and it continues to be in the budget. There is a very strong commitment and I am constantly working with the people on 80th Street on the RFP. Just yesterday we were down at the Brookdale campus with a whole conference of potential bidders giving information. So, this project is very much alive and very much moving forward. As we have also discussed, and we can confirm it now, the $78M for the new School of Social Work was also in the budget and it should cover not just the School of Social Work but some extra space that we hope to build on the site that we are looking at closely now. We will be able to report back to the Senate soon. It is a very exciting event for Hunter. We will have a new building for the School of Social Work and we will be able to locate some other programs there as was the request of the Social Work faculty. Also retained in the budget was the concept of an endowment for Public Higher Education for SUNY and CUNY, although the source that was suggested by the previous Governor of using the NY State lottery system to finance the endowment has been dropped.

The President concluded her report by inviting the Senate to a wine and cheese party in her conference room.

New Business: Prof. Michael Perna moved that: The Hunter College Senate supports the petition presented to the Director of Continuing Education & Special Programs, demanding that the IELI Faculty Room be preserved for the continued use of IELI faculty, teachers and tutors and that plans to convert the IELI Faculty Room into a classroom be suspended immediately."

After discussion the question was called and carried. The motion was defeated by voice vote.

It was moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Gross,
Secreatry

APPENDIX I

The following members were noted as absent from the meeting:

Faculty

Africana&PR/Latino Studies: Pedro Lopez-Adorno (A)
                      Anthony Browne

Biological Sciences   Thomas Schmidt-Glenwinkel (A)

Chemistry   Pamela Mills
                 Namby Krishnamachari (A)

Classical & Oriental Studies Fang Dai (A)

Computer Science   Ioannis Stamos (A)

Curriculum & Teaching   Ann Ebe (A)

Economics   Howard Chernick
               Jonathan Conning (A)

Film & Media Studies   Tim Portlock (A)
                 Michael Gitlin

German   Elke Nicolai (A) "E"

Health Sciences   Mimi Fahs (A)

History   Bernadette McCauley (A)
               Barbara Welter

Mathematics   Makram Talih (A)

Music   David Capps (A)
               Barbara Hampton

Philosophy   Frank Kirkland (A)

Physics/Astronomy   Ying-Chih Chen (A)
               Marilyn Rothschild "E"

Political Science   Joan Tronto "E"
               John Wallach (A)

Psychology   Jeffrey Parsons (A)

Romance Languages   Monica Calabritto (A)

SEEK   Maria Rodriguez

School of Social Work   Bernadette Hadden

Sociology   Charles Green (A)
               Manfred Kuechler "E"

Special Education   Grace Lappin
               Thomas McIntyre (A)

Student Services   Reva Cohen (A)

Theatre   Alan Sikes
               Joel Bassin (A)

Urban Affairs   Stanley Moses (A)

Lecturers and
Part-Time Faculty
Barbara Barone (Math & Stat.) "E"
William Mayer "E"
Aubrey Ewaroo
Jeffrey Mongrain (Art)
Christa Acampora (Philosophy)

Administration
Dean Laurie Sherwin (A) "E"

Ex-Officio
Jason Ares, CLT Council President
Nadine Young, HEO Forum Pres.
Sarit Levy, GSA Pres.
Alex Kohen, USG Pres.

Students
Keren Busani-Halevi
Binu Abraham (Classics, THH)
Nicole Odom
Tonia Tiewul (THH)
Jean-Kenson Dorlouis (Biochem)
Alex Kohen (Poli Sci)
David Wexler (Poli Sci)
Jian Jie Ren
Alexander Kipp (Grad.Theatre)
Mariya Kayumova (Poli Sci) "E"
Jakub Robert Walko (Econom)
Sera Yeysides (Econom/PoliSci)