

Office of The Hunter College Senate

M I N U T E S

Regular Meeting of The Hunter College Senate  
11 February 1975

<sup>524</sup>  
The fiftieth meeting of The Hunter College Senate was convened at 4:50 p.m. at the Hunter College Playhouse.

Presiding: Charles M. Sherover, Chairman

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

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

Report by the Ombudsman: Ombudsman Louis Massa's Report to the Senate is summarized in Appendix III.

Report of the Administrative Committee: Prof. Elie de Comminges, Secretary of the Senate, informed the body that the Graduate Course of Study Committee Report must be acted on today if its proposal is to be in effect for the Fall term--and if there is no objection, it would be placed as first item on the Agenda.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

Graduate Course of Study Committee Report: Prof. Joan Buxbaum, Chairman of the Committee, presented its report consisting of items G-77 and G-81.

She informed the Senate that item G-77 (New Program in American Studies) had been reconsidered by the Committee, and, since all questions raised by the Senate at its meeting on October 22nd, 1974 had been answered satisfactorily, moved for approval of G-77.

Miss Loreeta Goldstone, member of the Graduate Course of Study Committee, presented a minority statement, asking that G-77 be rejected on the grounds that there is no need for another specialized degree.

After discussion, Mr. Weissman moved, and it was seconded: that G-77 be postponed until the minority statement could be typed and studied further.

After discussion the question was called, and the motion to postpone was defeated by hand vote.

After further discussion the question on the motion to approve G-77 as presented was called.

The motion to approve G-77 (New Program in American Studies) was defeated by hand vote with 36 in favor and 38 opposed.

Prof. Buxbaum then moved for approval of G-81 (Department of Health & Physical Education).

After discussion and clarification the question was called, and the motion to approve G-81 carried unanimously by hand vote.

Undergraduate Course of Study Committee Report:

Undergraduate Course of Study Committee  
Re: Basic Prescription  
The Chair asked the members to refer to his memorandum dated February 11, 1975. He informed the Senate that the motion on the Floor is item "D" of the Majority Report dated 26 November

(see lines 63-68 of the Minutes of November 26th, together with the specification resolution dated December 10th (see Appendix III of the Minutes of December 10th); and that what is to be voted on first is Mr. Weissman's amendment to item "A" of the specification resolution. 47  
48  
49  
50  
51

that the Nominating Committee instead of the Under-graduate Course of Study Committee be charged to appoint the members to the Review Commission. 52  
53  
54

The floor was opened for discussion on the Weissman amendment. 55

Prof. Tannenbaum moved that the Weissman amendment be changed to read as follows: 56  
57

that the Nominating Committee instead of the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee be charged to nominate members to the Review Commission and submit these names to the Senate for approval. 58  
59  
60  
61

This was accepted by the mover and became the amendment to the main motion. 62  
63

After discussion the question was called, and the motion to amend item "A" of the specification resolution was passed by hand vote with 53 in favor and 23 opposed. 64  
65  
66

The main motion as amended was on the floor. 67

Prof. Tannenbaum moved that the word "Committee" be changed to "Commission" in item D of the November 26th Report. 68  
69

This was accepted by the mover and became part of the main motion. 70  
71

Provost Maynard moved the following amendment to item "A" of the specification resolution dated December 10th: 72  
73

that student members be eliminated from the Review Commission. 74  
75

After discussion the question on the amendment to strike student membership from the Review Commission was called. 76  
77

This amendment was overwhelmingly defeated by hand vote. 78

Prof. Tannenbaum moved the following amendment to item "A" of the specification resolution dated December 10th: 79  
80

that the five faculty members consist of one faculty member from each of the four Divisions and one faculty member from the Schools of Health Professions. 81  
82  
83

After discussion the question was called and the amendment was defeated by hand vote. 84  
85

Prof. Tannenbaum then moved the following amendment: "that the Senate review reports of the Commission's functioning on a regular basis." 86  
87  
88

This amendment was defeated by hand vote with 27 in favor and 40 opposed. 89  
90

The question on the main motion as amended (Item "D" of the Report of Nov. 26th, together with the specification resolution of December 10th) was called. 91  
92  
93

The motion carried by hand vote. 94

The Chair informed the body that the Overflow Meeting on February 25th would have to be held as scheduled. The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m. 95  
96  
97

*Elie de Comminges*  
Elie de Comminges, Secretary

APPENDIX I

The following people were noted as absent from the meeting:

Anderson, Ruth	Furnier, Jocelyne
Bencsik, Gabriella	Valentine, Malcolm
Bertsch, Walter	Van Burkelow, Anastasia
Beveridge, David	Weiss, Joseph
Brand, Christine	Weissman, Harold
Brooks, Leslie	Wertz, Marjorie
Burckle, Lloyd	Zilinsky, Edmund
Chappell, Richard	
Chiang, Faye	
Chiang, Janice	
Chiang, Jean	
Chin, Agnes	
Cohen, Mark	
Conant, Francis	
Connell, Roy	
Contente, Sarah	
Cooper, Alice	
Daly, Bob	
Danna, Robert	
De'Riesthal, Mark	
Diamant, Julia	
Doolan, Donna	
Escott, Michael	
Fierce, Wilfred	
Fink, John	
Firschein, Lester	
Franklin, Carole	
Fried, Robert	
Garcia, Milagros	
Gillis, Verna	
Gonchar, Ruth	
Gourevitch, George	
Grant, Robert	
Gross, Jeff	
Grossman, Roy	
Grossman, William	
Hachigian, Jack	
Hasson, John	
Herrmann, Patricia	
Heywood, Maurice	
Hopkins, Kevin	
Kaback, Elliot	
Kassamali, Jaffer	
Kearin, Thomas	
Korn, Sam	
LaCalle, Jose Moreno	
Liscio, Richard	
Wackler, Bernard	
Magnus, Margaret	
Martin, Marjorie	
Mathai, Parel	
McNeill, Juanita	
Meubart, I.J.	
O'Halloran, Christopher	
Pinkston, Deborah	
Piscitello, Bernadetta	
Quinn, Kathleen	
Rosenfeld, Lawrence	
Savarese, John	
Scott, Marvin	
Serrano, Elizabeth	
Slesinsky, Theresa	
Smith, Carole	
Sorensen, Sybil	
Statsinger, Roslyn	

APPENDIX II

The following is a summary statement of President Wexler's Report to the Senate:

President Jacqueline Wexler addressed the Senate and welcomed back everyone, with particular congratulations to the Registrar's Office and Academic Advising for a smooth transition into the second semester under most difficult circumstances. She outlined-- and emphasized the continuing aspect of--her deliberations with the Budget and Course of Study Committees of the Senate and noted Provost Maynard's desire to continue an active interest with the latter. The immediate goal of the administration is to continue to explore ways to see the linkages between a career focus for students and a liberal-arts-education.

Mrs. Wexler announced that the final bidding has come in under-bid on the two new additions to the Hunter campus. This might enable our plans for the renovation of the present structure to go on the agenda sooner than expected. The Alumni Association has also contributed \$100,00 for the renovation of Roosevelt House--a most necessary project. Especially commendable is the fact that the money will be spent on unseen improvements, plumbing, heating, etc. Mrs. Wexler publicly thanked the Association for its voluntary generosity and concern for the continuing life of the Hunter community.

The President also announced that preliminary engineering studies have been completed for transforming the Playhouse into a music/concert hall and usable lecture hall with adequate lighting and seating. The cost should approach \$1,000,000--\$4,000,000 less than the cost of a new building in this area. The thrust of finding funds for this project will be to private philanthropic sources in an attempt to convince such sources of the need of public institutions to share that kind of support with the private institutions. All institutions are on a multiple base of support today. She is working to convince some sources that our Playhouse is a most worthy candidate for their funds.

While the extent of our 1.59% budget cuts have been publicized through meetings with all segments of the Hunter community and through the student media, another .3% cut was processed through natural attrition of now frozen lines and through our advantageous accrual position. President Wexler expressed her gratitude for the sober, intelligent and generous way in which all members of Hunter have approached the budget situation. She expressed the feeling that strong federal funding will be required for that situation to change at all. She cautioned that expanding budgets are not projected in the near future, but reiterated her strong feeling that working together in an atmosphere of honesty and principle is the best way to confront the continuing challenge.

APPENDIX III

The following is a summary statement of Ombudsman Louis Massa's report to the Senate:

In my past report to the Senate, I have concentrated on the discussion of specific problems. Having acted in the role of Ombudsman for something over a year, my first report to the Senate for this semester may be an opportune time to give you an overview of the role as it has existed in the College.

One way of classifying the activities of the office is in terms of the internal breakdown of the College into faculty and staff, students, and administration. The problems brought to me by the faculty and staff have in the majority of cases involved:

- a) non-reappointment decisions
- b) promotion decisions
- c) personal and/or professional conflicts within a department or division.

It is important to note that in attempting to be helpful in these matters I have tried to not make the mistake of interposing myself between the person bringing the problem to me and the ordinary structure that is set up to solve specific problems, e.g., the Personnel & Budget Committee structure and the Union structure. Most of the problems brought to me by students have centered around:

- a) grades
  - b) access to courses and other services of the school
  - c) interpretation of requirements, e.g. with regard to matriculation and graduation, etc.
  - d) personal and/or professional conflicts with faculty members
  - e) non-reappointment of favored faculty members.
- The administration has tended to raise numerically fewer cases than the other two groups, but they have been important ones in terms of precedent established. These have involved:
- a) interpretation of the governance charter
  - b) interpretation of Senate legislation
  - c) arbitration of disagreements.

There has been a cluster of problems that have been associated with the routine functioning of the Hunter College Senate. Such problems have included:

- a) interpretation of the governance charter
- b) interpretation of Senate legislation
- c) day-to-day problem solving associated with committees of the Senate
- d) requests for advice on how to bring problems to the Senate and how to best follow them through
- e) problems associated with charter review.

The principal way in which the tradition of the Ombudsman in the College is created is through the actions the Ombudsman takes and through the judgments he renders in concrete situations that are brought to the office on a day-to-day basis. I have tried to publicize the role of the Ombudsman and make it better understood by means of:

- a) interviews with the college press
  - b) regular reports to the Senate and other groups, such as the Faculty Delegate Assembly, the Evening Session Council, and the student governments
  - c) discussion with the administration and the College counsel.
- I have also undertaken a study of the history of the Ombudsman's role as it has existed on the college campus in this country. In addition, I have tried to supplement this study by means of discussion and correspondence with other Ombudsmen at other campuses of the City University and at other campuses around the country.

There has been a series of cases involving arbitration and/or crisis intervention. I am thinking principally of the tems-political situation involving the Senate elections of last spring and of the Evening Session Council officers last fall. There have also