MINUTES
Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
18 May 2005

The 456th meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:15PM in Room W714.

Presiding: Joan Tronto, Chair

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

Agenda: The agenda was adopted as distributed.

Report by the President: A summary statement of President Raab's report to the Senate is as follows. She said:

> "This is going to be a very brief report. I want to remind everyone to try to come to graduation. Our speaker and honorary degree recipient is Leonard Lopate from National Public Radio, who is just a thesis short of receiving his MFA from the Hunter College Fine Arts Program. Perhaps the most important thing we will be doing is bestowing our thanks and the President's Medal on Michael Griffel for all his years of service. There will be a reception at the college for everybody afterwards. You are all welcome to help celebrate. Our other honorary degree recipient will be Ellen Barkin who took about 30 to 40 credits at Hunter and many of them in Theatre. We take full credit for her success as an actress. She has agreed to come back and receive an honorary degree.

> School of Social Work graduation is on June 2nd, and our President's Medal recipient will be Virginia Fields, who is herself a social worker and has always been a very big supporter of all of the Hunter College programs."

Report by the Administrative Committee: The Chair presented the report as follows:

Election of Senate Officers
The Chair yielded the floor to the Vice Chair.

Mr. Davi opened the floor for nominations for <u>Chair of the Senate.</u>

    Professor Joan Tronto (Political Science) was nominated.

It was moved that nominations be closed. The motion carried by voice vote.

It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee.
The motion carried and Professor Tronto was re-elected Chair of the Senate.

Mr. Davi yielded the floor to the Chair.

The floor was open for nominations for <u>Vice Chair of the Senate.</u>

    Mr. Charles Blumenthal (Economics Major) was nominated.

It was moved that nominations be closed. The motion carried by voice vote.

It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee.
The motion carried.

The floor was open for nominations for <u>Secretary of the Senate</u>.

Professor Stuart Ewen (Film & Media Studies) was nominated.

It was moved that nominations be closed. The motion carried by voice vote.

It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee.
The motion carried.

The floor was open for nominations for <u>Chair of the Evening Council of the Senate.</u>

Professor Michael Turner was nominated.

It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee.
The motion carried and Professor Turner was re-elected.

<u>Senate Meeting Schedule for Fall 2004 and Spring 2005</u>
The Senate meeting schedule for the following Wednesdays from 4:00 to 5:25 P.M. was approved:

<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Spring 2005</u>
September 14 and 28	February 1 and 15
October 19	March 1 and 15
November 2, 16, and 30	April 5 and 26
December 14	May 10 and 17

<u>List of Candidates for Diplomas and Degrees</u>
Professor Tronto moved for the ceremonial adoption of the list of candidates for diplomas and degrees
to be awarded in June 2005. The motion was approved by hand vote.

<u>Approved Curriculum Changes</u>
The following curriculum changes, as listed in Parts I and II of the Report dated 18 May 2005, were
approved as per Senate resolution and were submitted for the Senate's information: Items GR-649,
GS-636, and UR-1442 (Geography), US-1430 (Computer Science), US-1432A (Biology), US-1432B
and US-1433 (Physics), US-1438 (Interdisciplinary Bioinformatics Concentrations), US-1427B, US-
1439 & US-1440 (Film & Media Studies), US-1441 & GS-639 (Psychology), US-1444 (School of
A&S/Provost Office/Student Services), GS-638 (Chemistry), GS-640 & GS-647A&B (English), GS-
643 & GS-646(Special Education), GS-644 (Health Sciences/Nursing), and GS-641 (School of
Nursing)

Committee Reports: **<u>Teacher Evaluations Committee</u>**
Mr. Charles Davi, Chair of the Committee, presented the report dated May 18th, as distributed. The
following resolutions were on the floor:

<u>Resolution 1:</u>
BE IT RESOLVED, that teacher evaluations shall be conducted for all summer courses. The
evaluations shall use the same form as the evaluations given during the fall and spring semesters.

<u>Resolution 2:</u>
BE IT RESOLVED, that teacher evaluations for asynchronous (on-line) courses shall be
administered in person.

<u>Resolution 3:</u>
BE IT RESOLVED, that Hunter College shall move towards conducting all teacher evaluations
on-line, and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Assistant Vice President for ICIT and the Senate's Teacher
Evaluations Committee be requested to work out details for implementation, including security
and confidentiality concerns, and that a final report be submitted to the Senate in Fall 2005.

After discussion it was moved that Resolution 3 be amended to read as follows: "…shall <u>further</u> <u>investigate </u>conducting all teacher evaluations on-line…"

The amendment was approved by voice vote.

It was moved that the question be divided. The motion carried.

Resolution 3, as amended, was on the floor. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Resolution 2 was on the floor.

After discussion it was moved that the motion be amended by deleting the words "in person."

The amendment was approved by voice vote. The motion, as amended, was approved by voice vote.

Resolution 1 was on the flor.

The motion was approved by voice vote.

<u>Select Committee on the First Year Experience</u>
Professor Angelo Angelis, Chair of the Committee, presented the following Progress Report:

1. The committee focused its efforts during 2004-2005 on investigating current practice in the first year program and discussing possible alternatives. These efforts included fruitful exchanges with Associate Provost Michael Griffel and the ORSEM Committee.

2. The Committee's research has led to the following working conclusions.
   - There is a clear need to prepare incoming students for the transition to a four-year college experience. This includes incoming freshmen and transfer students.
   - The best interests of incoming students and the college would be served by creating a 3-credit first year seminar to replace the current 1-credit Orientation Seminar.
   - The first year seminar should be developed as a signature course for Hunter College. In this sense, it would serve as a common experience for all Hunter students and would also serve as a distinguishing element of the Hunter College undergraduate program.
   - The first year seminar should be a requirement for all incoming freshmen and, eventually, for all incoming transfer students.
   - The course should involve students in an interesting, active, and integrated program that makes use of a range of academic and intellectual skills. At the same time, it should include the key elements of the current Orientation Seminar.
   - The course should be taught by academic instructors (fulltime faculty and qualified adjuncts), in collaboration with advisor-counselors and faculty from the Library. The course should be based on a central theme that is unique to Hunter College and that engages students in the wealth of resources available in New York City.

3. The Committee entertained a number of options for first year seminar programs, including the New York City Neighborhood Project developed on campus by Professor Jack Salzman of the History Department

   - The committee recommends serious consideration of the New York City Neighborhood Project as the freshman seminar for the academic year 2006-2007.
   - The program makes extensive use of New York City as a source for student research by students in a project to chronicle in photographs and writing New York City neighborhoods. Student work has resulted in a major exhibit and an ongoing project to develop a database of images and text.
   - The program has been successfully tested over the past few semesters with freshmen and upper-level students.

177
178
179   4. The Committee will continue its efforts in Fall 2005 with the following goals:
180   • To develop a model first year seminar using the New York City Neighborhood Project.
181   • To investigate additional issues related to a first year program, including coordination of
182   the first year seminar with the block program and with library resources.
183   • To coordinate its efforts with the ORSEM Committee.
184   • To submit recommendations to the Senate for its consideration with ample time for a Fall
185   2006 startup.
186
187   5. The Committee recommends the appointment of a Director of ORSEM/First Year, who would
188   oversee the ORSEM Seminar for the 2005-2006 academic year and would then be in a position
189   to initiate the first year seminar in Fall 2006.
190
191   **Committee on Computing & Technology**
192   Professor Manfred Kuechler, Member of the Committee, presented the following report on the
193   committee's 2004-2005 Activities:
194
195   "During the 2004-2005 academic year the committee's activities were concentrated in the
196   following areas:
197
198   **Teaching and Learning with Technology (TLT) Initiative**
199   The committee applauds the college's recent efforts to increase the quality and availability of
200   technology for instructional purposes. However, we are concerned with the availability of support
201   for those members of the faculty trying to integrate technology into teaching and learning in
202   discipline specific, pedagogically sound ways. The TLT Initiative was developed to address this
203   concern. The most recent version of the initiative follows. In the process of developing the
204   initiative the Provost's Office, Deans, ICIT and others were consulted. The proposal was
205   modified in response to the feedback that was received. Of great interest to the committee is
206   feedback from Assistant Vice President-ICIT, which has not yet been provided. Members of the
207   committee recently met with the Provost and Deans, who expressed general support for the goals
208   and broad outlines of the initiative.
209
210   **Blackboard 6**
211   Over the summer Hunter College will be moving from its current version of Blackboard to
212   Blackboard 6. In preparation for this move ICIT pilot tested Blackboard 6 with a small number of
213   volunteers during the spring 2005 semester. The committee is concerned with achieving a smooth
214   transition in the fall. To this end it finds the differences between old and new versions of
215   Blackboard to be significant enough to require some faculty training. The committee urges ICIT
216   to provide such training as well as a timely response the implementation issues identified in the
217   trial-run.
218
219   **Blackboard Policy**
220   Blackboard policy issues were discussed this year, including the archiving of courses and their
221   subsequent accessibility to faculty. The draft of a policy statement concerning these issues was
222   developed by ICIT. The committee provided feedback and awaits a revised version. Blackboard
223   policy remains a high priority for the committee and will be a central focus next year, when issues
224   of student privacy and faculty academic freedom will also be reviewed.
225
226   **Review of Small Technology Faculty Grants**
227   Members of the committee were involved in the review of proposals for the technology faculty
228   grants from the Office of the Provost.
229
230   **Collaborations across the College**
231   This year the committee has benefited from a collaborative working relationship with the Office
232   of the Provost. Michael Griffel has been deeply involved with the committee and the Provost has
233   visited with the committee and invited its members to a Provost-Deans meeting. The committee
234   has also benefited from the participation of ICIT in discussions of technology issues as they have

developed. In this regard, Gina Cherry, the Educational Technologist, has been a new and enthusiastic participant in recent discussions. The participation of the Assistant Vice President – ICIT, Anand Padmanabhan has been uneven."

The Teaching and Learning with Technology (TLT) Initiative

1. What are the goals of TLT?

In the 21st century a Hunter College degree should mean that graduates are equipped to utilize technology in ways uniquely relevant to the disciplines they studied. Whether the graduate is an elementary school teacher utilizing a computer enhanced microscope in tandem with a wireless mobile computer laboratory to demonstrate cell structure, a sociology major utilizing software to analyze interview transcriptions, or a dance major recording the choreographed movements of a dance piece, a Hunter College graduate should be skilled in using technology in discipline-relevant ways. This is the principal goal of the TLT initiative and it goes beyond merely preparing students who are information literate (able to effectively use technology to gather, evaluate and disseminate information). Its aim is to provide a quality education for the 21st century.

2. What is TLT?

The goal described above cannot be achieved by requiring a course or two in technology. What is needed instead is the integration of discipline-relevant technology knowledge, skills, and dispositions into courses in each major. This can only occur when the faculty teaching such courses teach, model and foster the use of technology. TLT is a comprehensive approach to providing Hunter College faculty and students the necessary support for integrating technology into the teaching and learning process, in discipline-relevant ways. Such support only starts with state of the art technology hardware and software. These must be combined with the personnel needed to foster the discipline-relevant utilization of this technology by faculty and students across multiple courses in their discipline or major. Such support personnel must not only be skilled in the technical aspects of the hardware and software, but must also be sufficiently knowledgeable about the content and pedagogical practices of specific disciplines to assist faculty to effectively incorporate technology into teaching and learning.

3. Who will provide TLT support?

The new position of "TLT Facilitators" will be created, one each for the Schools of Health Professions, Education and Social Work, and three for the School of Arts and Sciences (one TLT for each of its Divisions of Natural Sciences/Mathematics, Social Sciences, Art and Humanities).

4. What will be their qualifications?

TLT Facilitators must have ample knowledge, technical skills and experience with the practical use of technology in teaching and learning in a substantive field relevant for the school/division they will serve. There are several options for selecting and placing such individuals:

- Associate HEO Lines (new hires)
- Faculty lines (new lines with partial reassigned time to serve as facilitators)
- Faculty lines (existing lines with partial reassigned time to serve as facilitators)
- Some combination of new and existing faculty lines

5. Where will they be located?

Regardless of where they are hired or to whom they report TLT facilitators should have their offices in close physical proximity to the school/division they serve in order to maximize interaction with faculty.

There are several alternatives for locating the TLT Facilitator positions within the Hunter College organizational structure. One alternative is for them to be hired on tenure-track faculty lines and partially reassigned from teaching to carry out TLT functions. Another alternative is for TLT facilitators to be hired permanently on the level of associate HEO. In this case they could be assigned to departments, to ICIT, or to a TLT Center which reports to the Provost as the chief

295   academic officer or to ICIT. In the latter case one of the TLT Facilitators would serve as

296   coordinator/director of the TLT Center and would also be part of ICIT's board of directors to

300

301

302   ensure that hardware planning and purchasing as well as ongoing maintenance and basic user

303   services meet the teaching and learning needs of faculty and students.

304

305   **6. Costs**

306   The costs of the initiatives will differ significantly depending on the specific option chosen.

307

308   •   Associate HEOs

309   This is the most expensive option, approximately $100 Thousand per TLT Facilitator

310   (benefits included) for a total of $600 Thousand.

311

312   •   New faculty lines

313   The cost of an assistant professor

314

315   •   Reassigned time for existing faculty lines

316 $13500 per TLT Facilitator for a total of $81000 for the entire initiative

317   (Assuming 5 course releases per year for each TLT Facilitator at a replacement cost of

318 $2700 per course)

319

320   In addition to the release time, these faculty members will need development activities

321   such as workshops (in person or online), for which an additional $3000 dollars per

322   facilitator should be budgeted ($18000 total)

323

324   Mr. Anand Padmanabhan, Acting Assistant Vice President for Instructional Computing and

325   Information Technology, made the following statement:

326

327   "The idea and the proposal have value to it. Hunter has hired an instructional designer and is

328   close to having a second one onboard. I propose that we evaluate the needs from each school. I

329   propose the following to do that study: I will allocate three dedicated days in a month of the

330   second instructional designer to the School of Arts & Sciences and one dedicated day per month

331   to each of the other schools of the second instructional designer's time to help the faculty in each

332   of those schools exclusively. This does not mean that this person is available only during those

333   times but exclusively during those times to the respective school. We study the impact of this for

334   the next academic year and based on the facts make a determination on the needs for additional

335   lines. I would also strongly suggest that if we do go forward with the six TLT lines, we should

336   have a further discussion of having an integrated educational technology group that is not

337   duplicating efforts."

338

339   **Other Reports:**   **Report by the Advising Task Force**

340   Acting Associate Provost Michael Griffel presented the report as follows. He said:

341

342   "This is a status report of what the Task Force on Advising has been discussing this year and

343   where we feel we want to begin discussion in the fall and then move toward certain actions the

344   College might take during the next year.

345

346   First, I would like to thank the people who served on the Task Force, co-chair Linda Carlson and

347   the members Kelly Anderson, Ilene Drapkin, Kimberly Engber, David Foster, Bonnie Kaplan,

348   Ellen Tobey Klass, Fredericka Liggins, Evelyn Melamed, Susan Neville, Lina Newton, Michael

349   Schleifer, Rukmini Singh, Madlyn Stokely, and Joan Tronto.

350

351   I want to split this update into two parts--the topics we discussed in our meetings, and what we

352   should continue to concentrate on in the year ahead.

353

354   The first part is about the subject matter of our discussion.

355

What is advising? How do we define it? How do the different College constituencies define advising? It is a word that we all use, but sometimes we don't know what we are talking about.

What is the relationship between advising and teaching? And along with that, what are our responsibilities as teachers and as advisors?

What are the best advising practices that we can articulate here at Hunter and at other colleges throughout the country? If there are advising practices that have been effective and successful and that have received praise from our students, perhaps we should share those with all departments and regions of the College.

What are our own current advising processes and services? Where should the student go to get certain questions answered? And when should we check up on the students? What is Hunter's student-to-advisor ratio by department and by office? Do we have enough advisors? The counselors and advisors in Student Services are clearly beleaguered by the tremendous number of students that each and every one of them mathematically and necessarily has to try to help. What are we to do in the departments with 1500 majors? Can we afford the release time these advisors deserve?

In order to carry out good advising duties, we need to know how the students feel about advising and what they demand of us. Are the students satisfied with how they are receiving advice, and what about the advice they receive?

What are student expectations and what are student responsibilities? How can we teach them to accept their own responsibilities? Shouldn't they read the catalogue at least in the section devoted to their major and their minor? Shouldn't they find out whether this or that section of a possible "W" course carries the "W" in a given semester? What are the expectations and responsibilities of advisors? Should a faculty member in a department be available two hours a week or three hours a week, in their office or by email, to answer the questions that come in?

What should the advisors receive in the way of appreciation or pay for doing many hours of work that may or may not help them be promoted, retained, tenured, thanked?

How do we disseminate the academic and procedural information to the advisors and to the students? If someone is not in the Senate on a day when a curriculum proposal is reported as accepted, how does that someone find out that the course or the change in degree requirements or admission requirements is now the law of the land, or will be effective in the next semester, and how do we inform our students of these changes?

We talked about enhancing the coordination among the academic departments and the administrative offices. Shouldn't someone in a department be in touch with someone in Student Services or someone in a dean's office, when a change is about to be recommended or voted in? What are the effects of the changes in academic and administrative policies and procedures? What are the effects of these on advising? This is a menu that is challenging and critically important, and we spent many meetings discussing these issues.

We have a few points for you to consider over the summer and to discuss among colleagues, and to come back in the fall when the Task Force will begin its work anew. The Task Force has no ultimate authority, but it can make recommendations to the Senate, the vice-presidents and deans, and to the faculty.

Here are some of the ideas that we would have people think about:

Explore the best practices at Hunter and share such approaches throughout the College. Improve the department liaison project, which is dedicated to enhancing the coordination among the academic departments and specific administrative offices. Analyze the effect of the current student-advisor ratio in the majors and in Student Services.

Analyze the effect on student satisfaction ratings and on student success. What should the Administration think about? Should they consider offering incentives such as release time to faculty advisors and using available technologies to disseminate current academic and procedural information to advisors and to students, and establishing a College-wide advising coordinator who would be responsible for working with all advising personnel in the College to maintain an approved policy and develop ideas for improvement?

What can the Senate do? Should it think about fostering a College-wide discussion about the role and nature of academic advising, about requiring a mandatory check point here and there such as a pre-graduate check point for the upper-level juniors approaching 90 credits, and perhaps about establishing something we can call Problem Central, a committee that would deal with the effects of changes in academic and administrative policies and procedures that have an impact on advising?

This is very much an in-progress report. We are not far enough along amongst ourselves even to have written it down and have made it look as if this was something here and now for us to talk about and vote on. But we did want to let you know that we have been busy considering the many issues involved in advising. This is where we ended the year. It is a very good package of issues and topics to continue to discuss next year."

<u>Resolution</u>

Provost Pizer presented the following resolution in honor of Acting Associate Provost Michael Griffel:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hunter College Senate with much appreciation thanks L. Michael Griffel on the occasion of his retirement for his many years of dedicated distinguished service to the Hunter College community.

The motion was approved by acclamation.

It was moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 5:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart Ewen
Secretary