

MINUTES

Meeting of the Hunter College Senate

21 May 2008

1 The 491st meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 3:45 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, and
8 clickers were distributed to them.

9
10 **Minutes:** The Minutes of May 7th were approved with the correction that the words “The motion carried by voice
11 vote” be deleted from line 179.

12
13 **Report by the** A summary statement of President Raab’s report to the Senate is as follows. She said:
14 **President:**

15 “I know it is a very full agenda today. I want to make a couple of comments on some important
16 things.

17
18 I want to express my thanks to Professor Sakas as the Chair of the Academic Freedom Committee
19 and to all the committee members for the excellent work that went into the report, and to Richard
20 Stapleford for his leadership in helping this committee get off the ground and do its important work.
21 I believe very strongly that it is important for Hunter to have an Academic Freedom Committee, and
22 want to make a few points. I want to make sure that everyone understands that no one in the
23 Administration intended to require a particular curriculum or to ask anyone to teach a particular
24 point of view. The opportunity to offer the course was conveyed to a department with an
25 understanding that the department could choose not to offer it. I am personally committed to the
26 principles of Academic Freedom and I recognize its importance to the Hunter community. I agree
27 with the committee that a curriculum should not be imposed on any faculty in any class. Finally, I
28 support the recommendation of the committee that each department should consider whether they
29 have appropriate procedures to evaluate sponsored experimental courses.

30
31 I want to move on to a few issues regarding real estate. The first one concerns the proposal for
32 moving the School of Social Work, plus some additional space, to Harlem. As many of you
33 remember, in October the Chair of the Mater Plan Committee, Barbara Sproul, presented the
34 Committee’s Report and their endorsement of the concept of the School of Social Work moving to
35 Harlem. To go back, for those of you who were not at that meeting, we do not own the Social Work
36 building on 79th Street. For a number of years we had serious issues with the owner of the building.
37 There is an extremely restrictive lease that prevents us from using the building for anything but
38 Social Work and requires us to keep the building up to certain standards which are very rigorously
39 enforced by the landlord and prevents us from making changes in the building that we would need
40 for renovation or flexibility in the program. After a period of intense interactions with the landlord
41 we came to an agreement. Rather than continuing this situation, the landlord said that if they sold
42 the building and we agree to vacate the lease, they would give us a substantial amount of the
43 proceeds from the sale to allow us to relocate. We have been talking for many months with the
44 Social Work faculty about the possibility of moving the School to a location in Harlem that was
45 close enough to the main campus and the East Side subway. After beginning to look for sites within
46 Harlem that would possibly be affordable, we were able to interest the CUNY administration in
47 supporting this project. We now have a \$78M commitment from CUNY to match what will be a
48 \$40M gift from the owner of the 70th Street building, the largest gift in CUNY’s history. One of the

49
50

concerns of the Social Work faculty was that they prefer to have a free-standing school the way they currently do.

We thought that it would be difficult given the real estate prices in New York, but the current proposal allows the School to have a free-standing building. The faculty was also very concerned about making a move without any other Hunter program. We are talking to various programs to see what could possibly re-locate with the School of Social Work in East Harlem. The CUNY Board of Trustees last month approved a letter of intent to allow us to move forward with negotiations for the new school, and by the end of June we will have a development agreement in front of the Board of Trustees which will approve further work over the summer towards a creation of the new school in East Harlem. I am not giving you the exact address because there are still negotiations going on with the owners of the property. The property will require no residential relocation; much of it is vacant, and all of the commercial leases are on a month-to-month basis with the provision that if there is development on this site that the leases will be terminated. So, it is a very exciting proposal for us. The School of Social Work faculty have formed various committees that are working with our space planner to talk about their needs in the future and how they envision a new school of Social Work. We are working with a private developer to interview architects, and then the architect will be selected within the next month. Once selected, the team will begin to work with the faculty and begin to design the interior of the building towards the needs of the School. The other wonderful thing is that there will be substantial new space for Hunter College, not just for the School of Social Work but also for another program. If the Board votes to approve the letter of intent at the end of the month we will be moving along very rapidly, and by September we will be talking about the location and other issues.

On the proposal for the new Science and Health Building, we were expecting answers this week. However, the Department of Education, our partner in this project, asked that we give a two-week extension because there was additional information that they want developers to have so that they can respond. The responses are now due on June 5th. This remains a very complicated project. It remains a project in which there is some neighborhood opposition, but also some neighborhood support. It is an incredibly important project to our future, and we are going to continue to move forward to try to work with the community, our political leaders, and with community leaders to take the steps necessary to build a Science and Health Professions building in this neighborhood. It is not an easy thing to build anything in New York, and a tough neighborhood opposition is not particularly uncommon. We are trying our best to work with the neighborhood. The Master Plan Committee and the Senate have approved this project. It is very consistent with Master Plan goals supported by this body in 1999 and we are optimistically moving forward with all the various steps it is going to take to what I believe is saving the future of this college by giving the sciences the new space and the additional space they need to do their extraordinary work and to keep all of us together in the undergraduate education.

We have hired a library planner. Professor Sherby and many other representatives were on the committee and we will be working very hard this summer on some initial planning which will be based on the document submitted to this body by the Presidential Task Force on the Library. We hope to have plans to show you for discussion by the time people return in September.

Finally, another initiative that we have spoken about in this body has been supporting faculty to increase the use of technology in the classroom. I just want to remind everybody that the summer initiative for faculty and technology, has had many responses. I think we had about 70 applications. We want to encourage all of you to rethink how to integrate technology into the classroom. There are \$2,000 stipends for faculty who participate, and much support from the staff and other colleagues to create new programs and information that you will be using in the classrooms. I am urging you to consider last minute applications.”

Election: **Election of Senate Officers**

The Chair yielded the floor to Vice Chair. The floor was open for nominations for Chair of the Senate.

Professor Richard Stapleford (Art) was nominated.

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

112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172

Minutes
Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
21 May 2008

It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee. The motion carried by voice vote without dissent and Professor Stapleford was re-elected.

The floor was open for nominations for Vice Chair of the Senate.

Mr. Steven Beard 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 by voice vote without dissent and Mr. Beard was elected.

The floor was open for nominations for Secretary of the Senate.

Professor Phil Alcabes (School of Health Sciences) was nominated.

It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee. The motion carried by voice vote without dissent and Professor Alcabes was elected.

The floor was open for nominations for Chair of the Evening Council of the Senate.

Professor Sandra Clarkson (Mathematics & Statistics) was nominated.

It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee. The motion carried by voice vote without dissent and Professor Clarkson was re-elected.

Report by the
Administrative
Committee:

The Chair presented the report as follows:

Senate Meeting Schedule for Fall 2008 and Spring 2009

The Fall 2008/Spring 2009 Senate meeting schedule was adopted for the following Wednesdays from 3:30 to 5:25 P.M.:

<u>FALL 2008</u>	<u>SPRING 2009</u>
September 10 and 24	February 4 and 18
October 15 and 29	March 4 and 18
November 12 and 19	April 1 and 22
December 3 and 17	May 6, 13, and 20

List of Candidates for Diplomas and Degrees

Professor Stapleford moved for the ceremonial adoption of the list of candidates for diplomas and degrees to be awarded in June 2008. The motion carried by voice vote without dissent.

Approved Curriculum Changes

The following curriculum changes, as listed in Parts I and II of the Report dated 21 May 2008, were approved as per Senate resolution and were submitted for the Senate's information: Items US-1532 (Mathematics & Statistics), US-1533 (Biological Sciences), US-1534 (School of Arts & Sciences), US-1535 (Curriculum & Teaching), GS-766 (Mathematics & Statistics), GS0767 (School of Social Work), GS-768 (Curriculum & Teaching), GS-769 (Educational Foundations), GS-770 and GS-771 (Special Education), GS-772 (Health Sciences/Communications Sciences), and GS-773 (Music).

Committee
Reports:

Mellon Project Special Committee on the GER

Professor Christa Acampora, Chair, of the Committee, presented the following resolution for Senate approval:

WHEREAS, general education at Hunter College constitutes a substantial portion of the overall curriculum, and

173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233

WHEREAS, there are many facets of general education that require coordination at an administrative level, and

WHEREAS, it is desirable to have academic leadership to support general education, such as through faculty development; and

WHEREAS, most of the courses contributing to general education come from the School of Arts & Sciences; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hunter College Senate recommend to the President that an administrative position of Associate Dean for General Education be created and located in the School of Arts & Sciences; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the position of Associate Dean for General Education be occupied by a senior member of the current faculty; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Associate Dean for General Education shall work closely with the *Mellon Project Special Committee to Review the GER* or other appropriate Senate Committees, and with relevant partners in Student Services, and with a designated partner in the Provost's office (e.g., an Associate Provost); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Associate Dean for General Education shall have, generally and minimally, the following responsibilities as outlined in the discussion of care-taking on page 41 of the committee's initial report, including but not limited to:

1. Advocate the value of general education, and lead faculty to ensure participation.
2. Ensure sufficient budgetary resources are available for the general education program, and monitor those expenses.
3. Create opportunities for faculty development and curricular revision and renewal.
4. Collect, organize, and disseminate relevant data for planning and assessment.
5. Encourage faculty to engage in responsible and responsive programmatic assessment.
6. Plan and manage implementation, and collaborate with Senate leaders to ensure needed curricular changes can be made swiftly and efficiently.
7. Coordinate relevant administrative functions necessary for oversight (including transfer credit evaluation, scheduling, and appeals).
8. Encourage student progress and create opportunities for "early intervention."
9. Consult regularly with affected stakeholders in an advisory council, including faculty, students, relevant administrators, and Senate committees.

Professor Acampora yielded the floor to Provost Rabinowitz, who read the following statement:

"I am pleased to support this resolution before the Senate. The Mellon Project has worked extraordinarily hard over the past year to study how we can improve our general education requirement. They have consulted with literally hundreds of administrators, faculty, students, staff and outside experts. They have begun and sustained a series of fruitful discussions that have brought together parts of the community that did not speak to each other before and galvanized individuals and groups to revisit our ways of working. They have issued a report that presented four models of GER for Hunter, and gone a long way toward building a consensus for a hybrid of two models that preserves the best of our current GER while it revitalizes how we conceptualize, communicate, and deliver it.

The resolution before you today is perhaps the single most important resolution this committee will issue. There is a general recognition within CUNY and around the nation that General Education programs—the largest programs in most colleges and universities—are treated as orphans, and that they—and the thousands of undergraduate students who take 30-60 credits of general education—

234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294

deserve more care and attention. The establishment of a senior administrative position in academic affairs, to be filled by a respected faculty member, preferably from our existing faculty, ensures that a sharp academic eye will be focused on our general education program, including its structure, curriculum, communications, implementation, and assessment. This academic leader will be responsible for significant faculty development and regular coordination across administrative units and academic departments.

It is true that the CUNY MP calls for the creation of such a position by 2012, that many CUNY Colleges have already seen fit to establish the position, and that best practices in higher education now include significant investment in general education, continual general education renewal and increased academic responsibility for general education. That said, this resolution comes before you not because someone is making us do it or because everyone else is doing it, but because our colleagues who have studied the matter believe that it is in our deepest collective interest as an institution that we pay more and better attention to the general education program that we are offering our students. I can not offer a stronger recommendation.

Your Mellon colleagues will be working over the summer to improve our process and develop new general education courses on a pilot basis. As always, we welcome your involvement.

Christa will be on sabbatical. Please join me in saluting a very special chair.”

Provost Rabinowitz yielded the floor to Dean Scott, who read the following statement:

“To date, most of my comments on the Mellon Committee work have been confined to issues related to my disciplinary training and to my own academic idiosyncrasies— such as my love for the language of aspiration, effort, and intellectual wholeness in the original mission statement. But the President and Provost have asked me to speak more—and more forcibly—in my role as Dean, and that is what I will do today.

We all know that there are many structures for delivering General Education— and I have worked in several different schemes— none are perfect, and most can work with greater or lesser efficacy and efficiency— even when the structure is less than ideal. Based on my own experience and on my thinking about Hunter’s situation and aims for its students, I offer the following perspective.

I wholeheartedly support what I take to be the substance and spirit of this resolution: the location of responsibility for GER in The School of the Arts and Sciences; the appointment of a senior faculty member now among the Arts and Sciences ranks to oversee the program; and the reporting of this officer for General Education to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

I do so for historical and philosophical, structural and practical reasons.

Across the country, General Education is the remnant of the arts and sciences or liberal arts education that used to be the heart or even the full body of college or university education— it is, then, almost synonymous with arts and sciences broadly defined.

Based on my experience as a student, teacher, and administrator in other colleges and universities, my involvement with AA C and U, and my study of various reports such as those by Ernest Boyer, I have come to the firm conviction that general education and the other components of the undergraduate curriculum should be integrated as seamlessly as possible. The fact that at Hunter most undergraduates are enrolled in Arts and Sciences and even those enrolled in the School of Education or Nursing take many of their required courses in the School of Arts and Sciences allows Hunter to develop something like that seamless integration of general education into the overall education of our undergraduates.

295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355

The structures of Hunter— and the School of Arts and Sciences as it is now comprised— then, allow us to aim at general education and the more specific disciplinary learning of the majors to foster an education that underwrites possibilities for the mature self, capable person and the responsible citizen that John Adams advocated in his draft of the Constitution for the State of Massachusetts in 1779, in chapter 6, Section II, charmingly entitled “The Encouragement of Literature, ETC.” The word *literature* as he used it there meant almost anything of a scholarly, scientific, aesthetic or literary nature, and he declared it the duty of the government to “cherish” the interests of literature, the arts, the sciences, in which he included agriculture, and the social sciences, in which he included “commerce,” as that was understood at the time. That concept of education is consonant with Hunter’s historical, enduring aims.

My own philosophical position, then, is that the School of Arts and Sciences is the proper home of general education, and its faculty and its administrators do have and must accept ongoing responsibility for it: we, too, all of us, must “cherish” those “interests” identified by John Adams.

There are also good practical and structural reasons why GER at Hunter should reside in the School of Arts and Sciences and why the faculty member/administrator overseeing it should report directly to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The departments and the faculty of Arts and Sciences offer all of the courses in the general education curriculum; the committees that are the first level of review for revised and new courses are in Arts and Sciences, and the Dean of Arts and Sciences is a voting member of those committees. The Dean of Arts and Sciences, or his/her designee, is also a non-voting member of the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee.

The Dean of Arts and Sciences interviews the candidates to be hired into the tenure-track faculty; the dean participates in faculty reviews during the probationary period, and the dean reviews all applications for tenure and promotion and presides over the divisional committees. The dean is in regular conversation with the Chairs and meets upon invitation with all departments. As a result, the Dean is stationed to promote the interests of general education in conversations with incoming faculty, to know what faculty are doing, and to know how their interests and projects might support the ends of general education.

Furthermore, the Dean of Arts and Sciences attending to the needs of one school and its varied but coherently related disciplines, if empowered by the administration and this body and served by an able faculty/ administrator overseer, can be closely and considerately involved in general education. I personally would relish that charge. And I feel confident that Arts and Sciences would, as the members of the search committee did when I was hired, look for zeal for all the components of undergraduate education in future inhabitants of 811 East.

Let me add only one other point: I have worked in several different systems for General Education. None were perfect; none completely solved all the systemic problems; but those that worked best, integrated General Education and Arts and Sciences. In fact, in my own undergraduate education, the two were indistinguishable. The least academically credible system I worked in created a separate college for General Education which in time had to be disestablished. At SIUC, two colleges, the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Sciences, offered 98 percent of the general education courses, and so at one point the provost decided the have the Director of General Education, drawn from the faculty of Liberal Arts, report directly to the Provost rather than to the Dean of Liberal Arts. What this meant in point of fact was that the Dean of Sciences and the Dean of Liberal Arts worked together with the Director and then lobbied the provost on behalf of general education. In time, because most of the courses were in the College of Liberal Arts, responsibility for the workaday problems devolved to me. That complicated system worked, after a fashion, because the Director was capable and conscientious and he and I worked well together. But because at Hunter there is one school, not two or several, offering the General Education curriculum, we can avoid such a Rube Goldberg mechanism for the delivery of those arts and sciences it is our duty as citizens and faculty to “cherish.”

356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413

After discussion the question was called and carried.

Voting by clickers produced the following results: 63 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion carried.

Select Committee on the First-Year Experience

Professor Angelo Angelis, Chair of the Committee, presented the progress report dated May 21, 2008 as distributed.

A summary of his introductory statement is as follows:

“The purpose of our report is to bring the Senate up to date on the activities of the Select Committee on the First-Year Experience. The report is fundamentally in three parts, a brief overview of what the committee has been doing followed by some of the data that we have collected in the course of our meetings over the past few years. You will see that we collected much of our data from other activities in the college, but it has a direct relevance on the kinds of decisions that the Senate and the college might make regarding a First Year Program we may want to have in the future. We also collected data on the best practices in freshmen and first year programs in other institutions - some are similar to Hunter’s and others are different. Next year we want to explore what might make a good First Year Seminar at Hunter. We would like to look closely at the types of the interdisciplinary courses that appear to be successful based on the data we brought in or from what is often referred to as signature courses that engage students in certain focused studies and require students to use a variety of skills, including writing and presentation skills. We would like to investigate further what the successful elements of other Freshmen Year Programs are beyond these types of courses, bearing in mind that the general education requirement is under consideration by the Mellon Committee. Among the things that we would like to look at is what might allow Hunter College to increase student opportunities to gain access to regular line faculty. This seems to play a very important role in successful programs. Finally, we would like to explore other opportunities with freshmen retention in mind. Our data collection indicates that this is an important issue here at Hunter. We see the committee as a clearing house representing the Senate as a way of gathering information on Freshmen activities at Hunter, working with other stake holders in this, and certainly as an agent that goes out and tries to gather information from other institutions. That is where we are at and what this report hopes to put before the Senate.”

Committee on Academic Freedom

Professor Stapleford introduced the Report by the Committee on Academic Freedom dated 21 May 2008 as submitted, together with the Administration’s response to the report as distributed. The Report by the Committee on Academic Freedom is attached as Appendix II. The Response of the Administration to the report is attached as Appendix III.

Professor William Sakas, Chair of the Committee presented the following timeline of events:

TIMELINE: Academic Freedom Committee’s Report on Film and Media’s Special Public Relations Seminar, MEDP 299.48

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| May 17, 2007 | Committee Chair receives verbal complaint about the course. |
| May 24, 2007 | A second complaint from outside Film and Media Faculty. |
| Early Sept, 2007 | Two additional verbal complaints about the course – one from a faculty member outside of Film and Media. |
| October, 2007 | Informal inquiry by Committee Chair. |
| Oct 24, 2007 | Summary presentation of inquiry to the Committee respecting confidentiality of those involved. |

Nov 5, 2007 Formal complaint from two Film and Media faculty members.

Nov 14, 2007 Formal investigative subcommittee established.

Dec, 2007 Formal inquiry was conducted. Progress reports to
 – Feb, 2008 the committee respecting confidentiality of those involved.

2008, Mar 12 Presented first draft of report to the Committee w names.

2008, May 7 Penultimate draft submitted to the Senate Administrative Committee.

2008, May 9 Final draft submitted to the Senate Administrative Committee, Provost, and interviewees.

From the IACC <http://www.iacc.org/media/Campaigns.php>

Get Real Campaign = “ ... educate consumers about the unintended consequences of purchasing counterfeit products ...”

College Outreach Campaign = “ ... take the *Get Real* message directly to consumers who create a large demand for fakes – young adults”

“The goal of the College Outreach Campaign is to educate college students ... so as to change their minds and attitudes and begin to change behavior – making the act of purchasing fakes un-cool.”

Quotes from Hunter Students

“In this class, I have learned that counterfeiting entails a whole lot more than I ever could have imagined.”

“Now I’m an educated consumer, so I can take that knowledge on with me and educate more people about the ills of counterfeiting itself.”

IACC: “College students are talking. And, they’re telling each other: it’s not cool to buy counterfeit goods.”

After extensive discussion of the report, Ms. Jacobs moved the following resolution on behalf of the Administrative Committee:

Whereas, “academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning (AAUP);” and

Whereas, content of courses is reserved to individual faculty through departmental oversight committees, and the faculty collectively through the Hunter College Senate; and

Whereas, experimental special topics courses are unusual in that they do not automatically pass through departmental curriculum committees; therefore,

Be it resolved, that all new experimental special topics courses, sponsored or otherwise, be approved by departmental curriculum committees.

After discussion, Professor Kuhn-Osius moved that the resolution be amended to read as follows: “Be it resolved, that all new topics in experimental special topics courses...”

After discussion the question on the motion to amend was called and carried.

471 **Minutes**
472 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
473 **21 May 2008**

474
475
476
477 Voting by clickers produced the following results: 30 in favor, 25 opposed, and 6 abstentions. The
478 amendment was defeated.

479
480 The resolution as presented by the Administrative Committee was on the floor.

481
482 The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 PM because of the late hour.

483
484
485
486 Respectfully submitted,

487
488
489
490 Jill Gross,
491 Secretary

APPENDIX I

The following members were noted as absent from the meeting:

Faculty

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

Classical & Oriental Studies Fang Dai (A)

Curriculum & Teaching Ann Ebe (A)

Economics Howard Chernick
Jonathan Conning (A)

English Mark Miller
Christina Alfar (A) "E"

Film & Media Studies Michael Gitlin

Health Sciences Jack Caravanos

Library Luis Gonzales (A)
Lauren Yannotta "E"

Nursing Judith Aponte

Physics/Astronomy Noel Goddard (A) "E"

Political Science John Wallach (A)

SEEK Patricia Martin (A)

School of Social Work Lorraine Tempel
George Paterson

Special Education Shirley Cohen
Angela Mouzakitis (A)

Student Services Reva Cohen (A) "E"
Madlyn Stokely

Lecturers and Part-Time Faculty

William Mayer (Classics)
Constantin Radis (Sociology)
Carmela Scala (Romance Lang)
Aubrey Ewaroo
Jeffrey Mongrain (Art)

Administration

Dean Jacqueline Mondros (A)
Dean Laurie Sherwen (A)

Ex-Officio

Jason Ares, CLT Council President
Agnes Violenus, Alumni Assoc. Pres.
Nadine Young, HEO Forum Pres.
Sarit Levy, GSA Pres.

Students

Jiayun Zhong
Karen Busani-Halevi
Binu Abraham (Classics, THH)
Maria Arettines "E"
Diana Rojas (Romance Lang)
Tithi Ghosh (Math)
Jean-Kenson Dorlouis (Biochem)
Tonia Tiewul (THH)
Dulguun Maidar (Poli Sci)
David Wexler (Poli Sci)
Meryam Bukhari (undeclared)
Jenny Alcaide
Julia Estevez (Art)
Natalia Urrea (grad.-Romance Lang)
Miguel Suero (Grad.-Theatre)
Jakub R Walko (Econom)
Sera Yeysides (Econom/PoliSci)
Nia Smith (Media)

APPENDIX II

Report from the Academic Freedom Committee: Film and Media's Special Public Relations Seminar, MEDP 299.48

I. Genesis of the Investigation

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom was initially sent a complaint by two tenured members of the Film and Media Department, Stuart Ewen and Peter Parisi. This complaint claimed that “during the spring semester 2007, a course was offered in the Media Studies program that appears to have been put in place by the college administration and structured and supervised to serve the purposes of a corporate trade association.” Moreover, the complaint claimed that Tim Portlock, an untenured, newly-hired faculty member, “had been assigned to teach the course even though he lacks any training in marketing or public relations. (He is a digital artist, specializing in the creation of virtual 3-D environments).” Although the committee came to the conclusion that corporate financial sponsorship of courses is not, in and of itself, an infringement of any of the accepted standards of academic freedom, these charges seemed serious enough, raising questions of possible interference with the curricular mission of the College beyond financial sponsorship and possible misappropriation of faculty time, that the Committee created a subcommittee to investigate the claim.

The subcommittee was able to conduct formal interviews with the complainants, the instructor, Deputy Chair Kelly Anderson, and the liaison from the College President’s office to Prof. Portlock, Taina Borrero. The Department Chair, James Roman, did not respond to repeated requests for an interview and eventually declined to meet with the subcommittee. He did, however, meet with the Chair of the Academic Freedom Committee. The Chair also held a phone conversation with the Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Eija Ayravainen.

II. The Course: "Special Public Relations Seminar" MEDP 299.48

The course under discussion here was a Special Topics Seminar offered in Media Studies. Given the special status of topics courses in the Hunter curriculum, that is, that departments can offer individual special topics courses on a limited basis without having to go through departmental or College-wide curricular review, this course was not reviewed by a curriculum committee within Film and Media or the School of Arts and Sciences, or by Undergraduate Course of Study before it was offered.

All of the interviewees pointed out the connections between the International AntiCounterfeiting Coalition (IACC), a trade organization made up of the manufacturers of luxury goods; Paul Werth Associates, the public relations firm that represented the IACC; Coach, Inc. who provided \$10,000 which was used to fund the course; and the fact that Coach CEO Lew Frankfort is a Hunter alumnus who received an honorary degree in May 2007, and has recently given a large donation to the College.

The structure of the course followed the guidelines laid out in the “Professor/Faculty Advisor Project Kit,” which had been compiled by the IACC as part of their “Get Real” campaign. The Kit included general guidelines for the structure of the course, the desired outcomes of the course, including possible student projects, a “backgrounder” for students to fill them in on the IACC’s take on luxury good counterfeiting, a student evaluation form, and so on. The Kit emphasized the role of Coach as a funder of the course and asked instructors to “make sure [students] are aware that Coach has generously donated funds for this project.” As mentioned, \$10,000 was made available to Prof. Portlock to spend on course materials.

The IACC has a website detailing the campaigns that emerged from this course: www.iacc.org/resources/Hunter_Report.pdf

III. Findings

Although Prof. Roman said he could not recall who in the administration initially approached him with the idea of offering the course, from interviews with the relevant parties it appears that the course originated in the Office of the President. In the months before it was assigned to Prof. Portlock, meetings took place between Prof. Roman, Ms. Borrero, the Vice President for Student Affairs Eija Ayravainen, and the Pre-Law Program Coordinator Barbara Landress to determine which department would offer this course.

According to Prof. Roman, he chose Tim Portlock to teach the course because, although he did not have the expertise necessary, Prof. Portlock is a junior faculty member, and as Chair, Prof. Roman tried to give untenured faculty the opportunity to teach high profile courses. Prof. Roman attested to the fact that Prof. Portlock did not object to the teaching assignment. Prof. Roman also mentioned that he told Prof. Portlock that it would be good for Prof. Portlock to be visible to the administration. After Prof. Portlock expressed concern over his own lack of familiarity with the course content, Prof. Roman assigned an adjunct with public relations experience, Ben Weissman, to assist him.

During the subcommittee's interview with Prof. Portlock, Prof. Portlock indicated that during conversations with Prof. Roman, Prof. Portlock expressed extreme reluctance to teach the course for two reasons: first, public relations and marketing are far outside his area of expertise, which is web-based art; second, he objected to corporate-sponsored courses for ethical reasons. Prof. Portlock also said that he expressed his fear to Prof. Roman that if he did a substandard job with it his tenure chances might be in jeopardy. Moreover, Prof. Portlock communicated to the subcommittee his belief that he was assigned the course because he was "the most vulnerable faculty member" in the department due to an unsatisfactory evaluation of his professional activity by the departmental P&B.

Over the course of the rest of the semester, Prof. Portlock said he was in frequent (up to three times a week) communication with Ms. Borrero or other staff in the President's office, representatives of the IACC, Coach, and Paul Werth, the PR firm that represented the IACC. According to Prof. Portlock, this led to a conference call with Prof. Portlock, Mr. Weissman, and Melina Metzger, a Paul Werth employee. Prof. Portlock asked how much leeway he had in presenting the issue of counterfeiting. When Ms. Metzger said "We want you to teach all points of view," Prof. Portlock reported that he asked if he could bring in pro-counterfeiting perspectives. The attorney allegedly responded: "If you think you're going to get some Senegalese guy to come in and unroll his mat and show his wares, that's not going to happen." According to Prof. Portlock, the attorney ended the conversation by saying "If you think we're going to give \$10,000 to a course that's going to be critical of us, you're wrong." He asked her to repeat this, and she did.¹

Several of the parties interviewed testified to the fact that the course put considerable stress on Prof. Portlock. Ultimately he had to take responsibility for reserving space for student tabling, ordering promotional items, and one week was on the telephone with vendors for six to eight hours every day. Initially he charged \$3,500 worth of goods to his credit card, but eventually a system was worked out in which he would request reimbursement from the office of the VP for Student Affairs. According to Vice President Ayravainen, she often handles funds from outside donors and approves reimbursements when the funds are targeted for student use (e.g., scholarships). Although the funding was specifically for course materials, Vice President Ayravainen explained that at the time it seemed to be the most expedient way to issue reimbursements since there is a well-established system to handle donor contributions through her office.

Although Prof. Portlock told us that the students were enthusiastic about the course and highly motivated, he expressed academic concerns about the IACC guidelines for the course, most centrally that there were no guidelines as to how he should evaluate student work, since, as he put it "it was all about product."

At the May 2007 Film and Media departmental meeting, Prof. Roman thanked Prof. Portlock for teaching the course. According to all members of Film and Media that were interviewed, this caused immediate uproar among the other faculty, who had no idea the course was being taught. At the October 10th meeting, Prof. Parisi reported on the course. The rest of the faculty expressed unease with what had transpired. The department decided that in future any potential sponsored courses should be vetted by the entire departmental Curriculum Committee, and that the course itself was a mistake that should not be repeated.

IV. Conclusions

Given the findings above, the committee has come to the following conclusions:

1. Although Prof. Roman maintained that Prof. Portlock was neutral, even pleased, to teach MEDP 299.48, we do not believe that was the case. This is more than a case of competing versions of events: all our other interviewees from Film and Media were clear in their belief that Prof. Portlock was coerced into teaching this course. They all commented on Prof. Portlock's embarrassment at having to acknowledge he was teaching it and his emotional stress both before and during the semester in which the course was offered. Moreover, they were all in agreement that Prof. Portlock was selected to teach the course because he was newly hired, untenured, and vulnerable, even though he was wholly

¹ The Committee agreed that the subcommittee should only approach persons with a current Hunter College affiliation. Hence, Ms. Metzger and Mr. Weissman who has left Hunter and is currently out of state were not interviewed on this point.

2. unqualified to teach this material. This clearly contravenes the American Association of University Professors (AAUP)'s standard on academic freedom as stated in its 1940 Statement on Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure, "Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning." In this case, it is impossible to separate the question of freedom to teach in one's area of expertise from the issue of tenure. Prof. Portlock's desire for tenure left him open to coercion in ways that a tenured faculty member would not have experienced. Prof. Roman's attempt to reassure Prof. Portlock that the administration would be very pleased if Prof. Portlock did a good job on this course seems to us to qualify as much as a threat as a comfort.
3. At the same time, our interviewees agreed that Prof. Roman did not necessarily *intend* to coerce Prof. Portlock. Even Prof. Portlock himself concluded that Prof. Roman "probably thought he was doing me a favor." Given our further conclusions below, we believe that the violations of academic freedom in this case extend beyond what we agree was the infringement of Prof. Portlock's rights. While we do believe that Prof. Roman behaved inappropriately, particularly in not consulting with his departmental P&B committee before assigning the course, we did not find any evidence that he intended to harm Prof. Portlock's tenure candidacy.
4. The IACC Professor/Faculty Advisor Project Kit makes clear that only one point of view is acceptable for the course. Moreover, Prof. Portlock's suggestion that contrary opinions be aired was summarily (and, apparently, disrespectfully) dismissed. This also clearly and seriously subverts the tenets of academic freedom. In its 1940 Statement, the AAUP maintains that "Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject." In its 1970 interpretation of the 1940 principles, the AAUP clarifies this point: "Controversy is at the heart of free academic inquiry." The committee concludes that controversy was not allowed in the course: only one perspective was allowed, which was that of the IACC. It is important to note that this was an infringement not only of Prof. Portlock's academic freedom rights, but also of the academic freedom rights of the students who took the course. Students enrolled in the special topics course were not provided with materials or the opportunity to pursue multiple points of view of the counterfeit product market. The IACC course pack imposed a narrow and biased perspective in the classroom; students were not presented with a scholarly analysis of the counterfeit market. Moreover, the IACC's emphasis on the Coach company's financial contribution to the course, and the lavish funds available to instructors, at the very least suggest that the IACC believed that they were paying for a service, a service that brooked no challenge to its message.
5. The committee also concludes that the IACC (in the person of Melina Metzger and the IACC attorney) actively interfered in the content, process, and teaching of this course over the semester in which it was offered. This is clearly a violation of academic freedom for the reasons listed above. Although the committee finds that the President's office did not directly interfere with the course during the semester, it feels that the frequent and repeated communication with Prof. Portlock was unusual and inappropriate administrative involvement. The committee also wonders why the office of the Vice President for Student Affairs was involved with the administration of the funds for the course, rather than the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The committee finds that there was an inappropriate blurring of administration and curricular concerns making it difficult for Prof. Portlock to exercise his right of academic freedom in the classroom and raises questions about shared governance, in particular the faculty's oversight of the curriculum.
6. While several of our interviewees were convinced that this course was a direct result of a large donation to Hunter by Lew Frankfort, the CEO of Coach, we did not have access to any information that could prove or disprove that belief. Moreover, it seems to us that courses with corporate sponsorship in their own right do *not* violate academic freedom as long as there is no coercion involved at any stage. While we do have questions about the larger academic ethics of Hunter's offering courses that are generated by corporations or that are linked to donations, we believe that it is up to the Senate or individual departments to decide, as Film and Media has done, how to approach such courses. In addition, we commend the Film and Media Studies Department in formulating a meaningful policy to deal with sponsored courses that ensures that such courses meet with approval of a committee of faculty members. We strongly recommend that other departments consider enacting similar guidelines specific to courses receiving funding from outside of Hunter.

In summary, the committee concludes that there were three aspects of MEDP 299.48 that circumvented the academic freedom rights of Prof. Portlock and his students.

- The most egregious aspect was that free inquiry into multiple points of view was effectively blocked despite the expressed desire of the instructor to promote such inquiry. Only a single point of view, a distinctly non-scholarly perspective that came from outside of the Academy and hence not subject to the usual rigor of peer-review and other academic standards of higher education, was presented during the course.

- The unconventional nature of the course, both in its genesis (i.e., from outside of Hunter), and the extremely narrow perspective presented in the IACC's Professor/Faculty Advisor Project Kit, clearly invites discussion about substantive issues of pedagogy at Hunter. The choice of an untenured faculty member whose expertise falls well outside of the scope of the IACC course material predisposed a situation which made it difficult for the instructor to exercise his academic freedom rights, both in his ability to refuse to teach the class beforehand, and in his ability to control the subject matter presented while the course was running.
- Content of courses at Hunter is reserved to individual faculty, and the faculty collectively through the Hunter College Senate. There was unwarranted involvement in the course from parts of the administration that are not charged with curricular substance, i.e., the Office of the President and the Office of Student Affairs. This blurring of the definitions of shared governance specifically contributed to the academic freedom concerns articulated above.

In closing the committee notes that there is much deeply troubling about the genesis and execution of MEDP 299.48 beyond issues of academic freedom. This episode raises concerns about the ethics of pedagogy in higher education today — concerns that deserve discussion by the College community. Sponsored courses seem not to violate academic freedom in their own right, but invite manipulations of the usual principles of classroom discussion. More discomfiting, the course in question, MEDP 299.48, made use of Hunter students to advance corporate interests, and created a false ad campaign² that deceived Hunter students (who were not in the class). The nature of the course allowed for a casual approach to the dignity of students and relied on deception to achieve some of its aims — which were, we emphasize, as much corporate as pedagogical. While we cannot say that these ethical questions amount to outright violations of assumed principles of academic freedom, we note that they share with the academic-freedom concerns explicated above a disregard for the usual practices of pedagogy and the principles of teaching at Hunter College.

² "Hunter's campaign", as the IACC's website puts it, centered around a fictional student who posted fliers "all over the campus advertising a \$500 reward for her [lost] bag". After receiving a counterfeit bag for her \$500, this fictional character then created a blog, a YouTube video, and MySpace.com and Facebook.com Web pages to "educate her peers about counterfeiting by using online tools in conjunction with an on-campus event."

APPENDIX III
Response of the Administration
to the Report of the Academic Freedom Committee
on Film and Media's Special Public Relations Seminar MEDP 299.48.

The Administration wants to thank Professor Sakas, the Chair of the Academic Freedom Committee, the Academic Freedom Committee for the work that has gone into this investigation, and Professor Stapleford for his leadership. We also thank them for the opportunity to respond to certain aspects of the report and to have our response included with the report.

Office of the President

The Administration completely agrees with the fundamental premise of the Committee's report – that course curricula should be determined by faculty and that faculty members should not be mandated to teach a particular point of view or approach. This Administration will work together with the community to uphold that principle.

The Administration never intended to require a particular curriculum or to ask anybody to teach a particular point of view. The opportunity to offer the course was conveyed to the Department with an understanding that the Department could choose not to offer it. It was our understanding that the course had been well received on several other national campuses before being offered to Hunter and could provide a valuable learning opportunity for our students. It was in this spirit that the opportunity was conveyed to the department.

The report alludes to a possible connection between the course offering and a gift to the College, but concludes that the Committee did not have access to the information necessary to draw a conclusion on the matter. Unfortunately, the Committee never asked to speak with anybody in the Office of Institutional Advancement or the President's Office who had knowledge of the gift or the donor. We think it is important that the community understand the background.

The course did not come about as a result of the donor mentioned in the report. It came about through a different connection at the company, the corporate General Counsel, who is also a donor to Hunter, the daughter of a Hunter alumna, and a supporter of the Mother's Day Campaign. She had previously helped the College with internships and other opportunities for Hunter students and asked whether Hunter would be interested in offering a course that had been successful at other colleges.

The donor mentioned in the report is a Hunter alumnus who has a long history of personal giving to Hunter. He was an original supporter of the original Mother's Day campaign which was conceived in 2004 and instituted in 2005. By early 2005, he was helping to frame and agreed to serve as Chair of the President's Visioning Cabinet—a small group of the College's most wealthy prominent alumni who helped launch the Hunter \$50 million Capital Campaign. As is traditional, each of the alumni who served on the Visioning Cabinet had expressed a willingness to make a major gift to Hunter when the Visioning Cabinet was formed and indeed all but one (whose gift is still pending) have done so already. The gift was an act of generosity by an alumnus and his wife who share a passion for Hunter and for education. The gift was made from the donor's personal assets not from the corporation.

According to faculty from the School of Education, the gift has greatly benefited students and has been transformative for our School of Education. It is changing the way our faculty is able to teach our education students and we hope and expect that its benefits will reverberate throughout the college.

Office of Student Services

The only involvement of the Office of Student Services with this course was to ensure that the Professor received payment from the available funds for the expenses he incurred for course materials. The Office of Student Services typically processes payments from private funds used to support student activities—whether the funding is for scholarships or for classes, extracurricular activities or other school programs. The most recent examples are the privately funded Model UN, an academic course in which the Dean worked closely with the Professor to support various activities relating to the class, and the Student Engagement initiative.

Closing Remarks.

We thank the Committee for this opportunity for internal self assessment, education and progress. The Administration agrees with the recommendation of the Committee that each Department should consider whether they have appropriate procedures to evaluate sponsored experimental courses. We hope that the College community can move forward propelled by its own internal mechanisms to work together to shape an institution and a process that nurtures both academic freedom and academic responsibility.