

HUNTER COLLEGE
SENATE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes: March 9, 2011

Committee Members

Members Present: Philip Alcabas, Cristina Alfar, Eija Ayravainen, Sarah Bonner, Elizabeth Beaujour, Sherryl Graves, Robert Greenberg, Sharon Neill (for Len Zinnanti), Elizabeth Nunez, Andrew Polsky, John Rose, Richard Stapleford, Bill Sweeney, Patricia Woodward

Task Force Members Present: Case Willoughby (Student Success and Engagement)

Consultants: Anthony Knerr, John Braunstein (Anthony Knerr & Associates)

Proceedings

Meeting called to order at 10:40 a.m.

I. Approval of Minutes of March 2, 2011 SSPC Meeting

Richard Stapleford moved that the Committee review the meeting minutes of March 2 and provide comments by March 10, and that the Committee provisionally accept the minutes submitted. The motion was accepted by unanimous consent.

II. Review and Discussion of *Draft Strategic Plan for Hunter College* revised by SSPC Subcommittee (Corrected Working Draft for March 9, 2011)

The objective of this meeting was to produce a final Draft SP for introduction to the Hunter community. Andrew Polsky (AP) introduced the document, noting that an extensive email exchange had taken place over the last week.

- Basic description of the college has changed – now “Student Centered University”
- Added Student Success to the Introduction, although that category was not included in the President’s remarks on 3/2 (which guided the organization/drafting of the introduction)

The Committee thanked AP for all his work on a much improved draft that captures the main points of a very intense email discussion.

Richard Stapleford asked AK & Associates for their comments on the current draft. These included:

- That AK and JB agree with the Committee that the Senate should see a more detailed document (as opposed to moving toward succinctness right now)

- This is an excellent draft, which speaks to the complexity of the discussion. Also a “discursive draft,” somewhat duplicative in places. AK’s preference is for a crisper mission and vision statement.
- Introduction is very long. Table of Contents can identify three sections of the Intro as subpoints (since Intro is weighted equally with strategic objectives, better to identify main points in TOC). Discussion of themes in Intro should have parallel construction.
- Under possible appendices, wouldn’t include the TF reports. Plan has gone way beyond the TF work.
- Find a place up front for the idea, now located in the conclusion, that the planning process doesn’t end with formal adoption of the plan.
- Plan does a very good job of capturing Hunter’s distinctiveness; brings out that Hunter is striving to be a research oriented institution, and ties that goal to teaching.

The floor was opened for responses to AKA’s comments and general discussion of the Draft.

- Cover Letter
 - Should include names of the members of the Committee.
 - Needs to offer a complete account of the process and group.
 - Clarify role of Middle States, which gave a timetable, but Hunter took initiative to develop SP.
- Recognition of Scholarship of Teaching in Tenure and Promotion (I.1.)
 - Discussion of whether this goal amounted to an imposition of tenure and promotion criteria on departments.
 - Noted that the contract says that teaching is the primary consideration for promotion and departments clearly use other criteria – no need to change language of the plan
 - Vita Rabinowitz argued that the scholarship of teaching is only one of 4 recognized forms of scholarship (+ scholarship of discovery (original research), integration, application); Why are we focusing only on this form of scholarship? Most tenure and promotion cases do not involve the scholarship of teaching.
 - focusing attention on plan and Committee’s focus on teaching
 - need to include this goal because we’re trying to diversify recognition of research
 - could we accomplish above goals by saying, “the full range of scholarship”?

—point is to become more research intensive in ALL ways, including the scholarship of teaching

- Recruitment of diverse faculty is given implied priority (as first bullet under I.1.) If it is in fact a high-priority item, are subpoints detailed enough? Currently, bullets speak more to the question of development.
- Encourage Effective Teaching (I.3.)
 - Second bullet (mentoring) should not be addressed exclusively to adjuncts; need to work with full-time faculty as well, especially on assessment efforts. Do teachers know what their goals are? How do they know if goals have been reached?
 - Consider distinct mentoring needs of junior and adjunct faculty, especially with respect to problems with communication.
 - Need to fully explain role of teaching and learning center.
 - Need to include goals of rewarding effective teaching and assessing student learning.
 - Consider whether section is too short, not balanced with points relating to research.

AP will circulate a new version of the Draft on March 10 for final review before distribution to Senate on Friday, March 11. Substantive changes need to wait at this point until after March 23 Senate meeting. The Committee will consider implementation questions after the Senate discussion (SP might need to be revised more in the direction of benchmarks).

On March 11, the Draft will also be made available via email from Hunter SSPC (text will be the Cover Letter with link to plan) to the entire Hunter community. An email address should be provided for responses.

III. Plan for Obtaining Feedback from the Hunter Community

Eija Ayravainen emphasized the need to include staff in distribution. She will discuss the Draft with undergraduate and graduate student governments.

FP&B isn't able to consider the SP until its April 5 meeting.

In order to have the current Senate take up the SP on May 4, the document must be delivered to the Senate by April 27, at the latest. SSPC will have to have all feedback (from Senate, Town Halls, other campuses, email comments) by March 30.

The Plan will be presented to the neighborhood once approved by the Senate, at which point the College can meet with key constituencies including neighborhood, donors and prospects.

IV. Next Steps

March 30 (Senate Conference Room): 10:30 –1. Review and incorporate comments received to date. Decide whether April 6 meeting is needed.

April 6 (Senate Conference Room): Meeting time changed to 11:30 (from 10:30).

April 13 (President’s Conference Room): 10:30 – 1.

April 27 (Senate Conference Room): 10:30 –1. Finalize the SP before submitting to Senate.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 pm.

Minutes submitted by Simone White, Administrative Assistant to the Committee.