



HUNTER COLLEGE

The City University of New York

Self-Study Design

prepared for

Middle States Commission on Higher Education

October 31, 2007

Hunter College Self-Study Design

Table of Contents

I.	Nature and Scope of Self-Study.....	1
II.	Intended Outcomes	6
III.	Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups.....	6
IV.	Charges to the Working Groups and Guidelines for their Reports.....	14
V.	Inventory of Support Documents.....	23
VI.	Organization of the Self-Study Report	25
VII.	Timetable for Self-Study and Evaluation	27
VIII.	Profile of the Visiting Evaluation Team.....	28

I. Nature and Scope of Self-Study

Hunter College's self-study will have four functions:

- To document compliance with Middle States standards for accreditation.
- To determine whether we fall short of full compliance with some standards, and, if so, to create a plan and timetable for achieving expeditious remedy.
- To investigate, deliberate, and plan how to move forward in three areas that are central to our continued success as an institution of higher education: (a) Becoming the premiere urban public liberal-arts institution, (b) offering a 21st-century education to 21st-century students, and (c) improving student engagement and satisfaction so as to increase the proportion of freshmen who graduate and to speed students' progress toward degrees while maintaining high standards of achievement.
- To describe the unifying elements among the diverse conceptions of Hunter's place and role in New York City and the larger society, and build consensus to plan for Hunter's future as a premiere liberal arts college with standout graduate and professional programs.

Accordingly, we undertake a comprehensive self-study with special emphases. Our eye will be focused on the use of all practicable and valid assessments to reassure ourselves of our competence in terms of Middle States standards, but also to examine our shortcomings and challenges in specific areas – and therefore to become a stronger institution at the outset of the new century.

To introduce these issues and show why we must face them now, we begin with a review of the College's historical background and current context, and proceed to consider the challenges that face us.

At a time when many colleges are struggling to redefine their mission and identities and maintain their enrollments, Hunter is secure in its *raison d'être*. Founded in 1870, Hunter is one of the oldest public colleges in the country. Hunter's mission of providing underserved working-class, minority, and immigrant students of New York City with a quality education is no less vital now than it was at Hunter's inception over one hundred years ago. Today, Hunter is the most sought-after college within CUNY, attracting more applicants and enjoying higher enrollments than at any time in its history. Hunter is also more selective now than at any time since the dawn of CUNY's open admissions policy in the 1960's, accepting only one in three applicants to its freshman class, and one in five applicants to its freshman Honors College. However, with our popularity and selectivity come challenges.

Hunter College is the largest of the 19 institutions that comprise the City University of New York (CUNY) system, the nation's largest urban public university. Currently, 21,000 students attend the college, pursuing both undergraduate and graduate degrees in more than 170 different programs of study. Because of its history of educating women and providing outstanding educational opportunities for minorities heretofore poorly served by the higher-education system, Hunter is a recognized national leader in educating a diverse, urban student body. Our faculty

are well-known and highly regarded and we attract some of the best students in all of CUNY. Our long and distinguished history in public education and our location in one of the world's premiere cities, enable us to offer our students a high quality education and unparalleled opportunities.

Hunter's trajectory over the past decade is wrapped up with CUNY's advance. In 2000, CUNY's Board of Trustees and its new chancellor, Matthew Goldstein, articulated a vision for the renaissance of the City University of New York. The new chancellor committed the University to focus on several key areas: attracting and retaining an accomplished faculty committed to research and teaching; attracting well-prepared students who are able to benefit from college instruction and meet the evolving needs of the disciplines and workplaces; demonstrating that CUNY deserves strong support from the public and private sectors; and providing the leadership for more public/private partnerships. As an example, CUNY's "Decade of Science" (2005-2015) involves robust investment in hiring substantially more distinguished full-time science faculty, providing more support for doctoral students in the sciences, supporting research initiatives in targeted areas, and enhancing science infrastructure throughout the university.

Hunter's President, Jennifer J. Raab, who took office in 2001, embraced the Chancellor's approach. She set out to raise Hunter's academic profile with the hiring of new full-time faculty, and supported the growth of graduate and undergraduate programs and initiatives that draw on Hunter's strengths within CUNY and in New York City. For instance, in the past six years Hunter has added new faculty and programs to enhance training in medical laboratory sciences, physical therapy, and communications sciences at our School of Health Sciences, developed a new Teacher's Academy at our School of Education, and enhanced our nationally known MFA programs in the arts within the School of Arts and Sciences. The university's decision to locate its new CUNY School of Public Health at Hunter recognizes the college's excellence at professional training in the health field. But in these areas, too, new programs have brought new challenges – especially by amplifying the problem of competing aims: how to provide a high-quality education to the city's underserved while also offering excellent post-graduate training programs in the arts, sciences, and professions.

As a college within a large and increasingly centralized university system, Hunter faces a particular set of challenges: we must pursue CUNY's goals, but we must also maintain our distinct identity and commitments – and chart our own future. Can we generate sufficient evidence to justify pursuing paths that seem promising to us, even if they follow a course other than that recommended by the university? How does Hunter's liberal-arts emphasis figure in an increasingly pre-professional university? With the university, like higher education generally, favoring the growth of research within the academy, Hunter will undoubtedly become a college that is *both* research- and teaching- intensive; how, then, should we retain our emphasis on teaching and learning, and how will we know we have succeeded?

In part, the key to resolving these competing goals will be to foster a culture of assessment. Evidence will be needed at each step, wherever Hunter seeks to pursue our own future in distinction to the university's broad plans, or whenever we choose to change course so as to follow CUNY's path. Here, we have made some progress, but challenges remain. We are late

in establishing infrastructure for continuing assessment, especially in our School of Arts and Sciences. Although the President has created a new administrative position to oversee assessment at the college, it has not yet been filled. And although the college has made funding available to support assessment going forward, we will need to continue to make resources available to overcome inadequate funding for assessment in the past.

And we face challenges that come not from our role within CUNY, but from our own goals and needs. Space looms as the most serious of our problems. Although the CUNY Board of Trustees approved a Master Plan for development in 1999, none of the projects included in that plan was funded. Hunter remains severely constrained by shortages of research and instructional space and compromised by the condition of many of our facilities. While we have improved existing structures at the main campus and at our Brookdale health-professions campus, opportunities for expansion are limited. And even where we expand Hunter's own space, the distance between facilities presents obstacles. With our main campus located on the Upper East Side and our professional campuses not as nearby as we would like, we cannot address the space problem without exposing ourselves to the intractable demands of the expensive real-estate market in New York.

The long-standing need for a new science and health building remains our most pressing problem, imperiling our status as a premier training and research institution for minority and immigrant professionals. Hunter's natural, physical, and health sciences programs have attracted more National Institutes of Health funding than any other institution in New York without a medical school. They have helped start the careers of scores of minority researchers, doctors, and nurses. But our antiquated and limited facilities do not allow us to compete for grants in areas that require more space. It is also unclear how much longer we can simply retrofit facilities built in the 1930's (Hunter's main-campus North Building) and 1950's (Hunter's Brookdale campus) without sacrificing research-grant opportunities. It is unclear that we can continue to attract top-notch scientists and doctoral students to work in these laboratories. And with a half-hour commute separating our lab facilities in the natural and physical sciences from the health-professions facilities, we cannot easily qualify for so-called translational research funding – one of the most important new set of funding streams and a potential enhancement for our mission to promote research careers for minority students.

The space problem is not restricted to sciences and professions: superb creative-arts programs, including studio art, film and media studies, theatre, music, and dance, now operate in limited and inadequate facilities that threaten their futures. Throughout the School of Arts and Sciences, a severe shortage of classrooms limits students' access to courses. Space crisis causes scheduling crisis, and scheduling crisis produces educational crises for our students – whose own schedules are constrained by jobs (a high percentage of Hunter students work outside the College, many of them full time) and family responsibilities. Space crisis means that students, who are all commuters, have little room to study or pass their between-class hours comfortably. It means that some faculty must share office space and makes conference rooms cramped and hard to schedule. We are concerned about our capacity to continue to attract distinguished faculty given our dwindling options for offering suitable space for creative or research pursuits. And we are concerned about our capacity to accommodate the needs of students with increasingly complicated lives.

Perhaps an interim solution to our space crisis resides in implementing technology for distance learning and more efficient learning. Hunter continues to make progress in applying advanced technology to teaching, learning and administration, but we have not generated a culture of technological innovation to promote learning. We are sometimes hindered in this regard when our resources must be diverted to implement broad CUNY central initiatives, but we have also been slow in creating “smart” classrooms and seminar rooms, and have not been aggressive in developing online, distance learning, and “blended” courses. We are upgrading the technology in our teaching laboratories, and investing in online databases and an information commons in the library, but much remains to be done.

Given our problems with space and scheduling, we are not surprised that national (NSSE) and local (CUNY Student Experience) surveys have revealed considerable student dissatisfaction with the Hunter experience, ranging from complaints about obtaining needed classes to observations about large lectures, lack of connection to the faculty, and food service. Our rates of retention of freshman and progress to graduation are low, and we must investigate whether any improvements to physical plant or procedures would increase students’ satisfaction in ways that translate into more student engagement or better rates of progress toward degrees.

Hunter’s virtues, including excellent programs and a premiere location, are also at the root of its challenges. We pride ourselves on the quality of our liberal-arts programs and enjoy a strong reputation as a liberal-arts college. Indeed, no senior college within CUNY has resisted the nationwide trend toward professional training at the undergraduate level and retained its liberal arts focus as strongly as Hunter College, and we are proud to be the premiere liberal arts college of CUNY. We also have outstanding professional training programs, though, and recognize the increasing demand from undergraduates for pre-professional training. So, even as we deliver excellent liberal-arts programs, we still see professional development as intrinsic to our contribution to New York City. Clearly, we need a vision of a 21st-century public institution that continues to be excellent in liberal-arts areas without sacrificing quality in professional training – and without falling out of step with the university or the city.

Need we look at liberal-arts education and professional training as occupying opposite sides of an imaginary abyss? Surely not – but we will have to plan for integrating them. This challenge will play itself out perhaps most dramatically in the area of general education. Hunter’s general education requirement is cumbersome; we must examine not only whether it can be streamlined but the larger question of how to offer general education that fits our expanding educational scope. With a large grant from the Mellon Foundation, the College is now in the process of examining how to deliver general education for the 21st century, and how to generate the perpetual care needed to maintain an excellent general-education program through fast-changing times.

Although known as an undergraduate institution committed to excellent teaching and focused on student needs, Hunter faces a challenge from competing goals in this regard, too. We have many highly regarded professional-training programs, including nationally known Schools of Social Work and Nursing. Investment in graduate programs has been a way for us to create career paths for students and serve the workforce needs of the city. We are creating new masters programs in

areas where the baccalaureate degree once served students well as entry into the profession, as with medical laboratory sciences and accounting, and in areas where expertise is sorely needed in the city, such as the teaching of Chinese. We are negotiating for the capacity to confer doctoral degrees (jointly with the CUNY Graduate Center). Increasingly, we are offering doctoral degrees in clinical areas where the Masters was once the terminal degree, as in audiology, physical therapy, nursing, and public health. Accordingly, our faculty members are more than ever engaged in graduate teaching and clinical supervision, conducting their own research, and training the next generation of researchers. But how will research and graduate training square with our traditional commitments to undergraduate education and classroom learning?

Research creates its own competing goals. We recognize the potential of research to expand learning opportunities for students and to further the scholarly interests of our faculty. The opportunity to work with graduate students can help us attract additional strong faculty. But we also know that, unless carefully integrated, research and teaching can create needs that directly compete, pulling faculty away from teaching and reshaping the culture of an institution. We must attend to the balance of research and teaching if we are to preserve Hunter's culture of learning-centered practice.

Finally, the changes at CUNY, and in higher education generally, create a new set of competing goals for Hunter. These relate to the remarkable diversity of backgrounds of our student body. We now have a large percentage of foreign-born students aspiring to become successful in the U.S.; these students might benefit from a liberal-arts education that orients them to the civic responsibilities that are fundamental to U.S. society and political discourse, and important to leadership in many sectors of western society. We would be ignoring our mission if we were to fail to provide civic education to this promising group. At the same time, there is a pull in nearly the opposite direction: for our students who were born and reared in NYC, a liberal-arts education will help them cultivate a sophisticated and culturally aware world view and global understanding – indispensable foundations for life as an educated person in the 21st century. Introducing American-born students to the requisites of world citizenship is part of our mission, too. But, how should we preserve and enhance our quality as a public liberal-arts college without sacrificing our service role, diminishing our stature as an institution, or turning our backs on students' needs? How does an institution face the problem of aligning civic engagement with global awareness, and how does Hunter do it given both our strengths and constraints?

With these challenges in mind, we foresee three central issues that face us and will continue to face us for the immediate future. These will be the special emphases of self-study:

- First, how can we become a premiere public liberal-arts institution, a first-rate center of learning in a highly diverse city, and an institution that models the tricky balancing of general with specialized education, liberal-arts with pre-professional education, undergraduate with graduate studies, traditional and humanistic studies with applied science?
- Second, how can we update ourselves, not only technically, but also pedagogically, so that we are offering a first-rate education to 21st-century students? How do we help students develop the critical thinking skills and knowledge necessary for reflective engagement in a world both

diminishing in effective scale and made increasingly complex and by rapid developments in technology?

- Third, how can we enhance student engagement with their own education and satisfaction with their overall experience at Hunter, so that what we do educationally will really matter – will serve our students well throughout their professional, intellectual, civic, social, and personal lives?

Done right, self-study will move all of the constituencies in the College to wrestle collectively with the pressing issues that we face, to marshal the most effective resources for confronting our challenges, and to bring into focus those aspects of our many and varied visions that we share and value. We want our self-study to chart a productive course for meaningful and measurable growth.

II. Intended Outcomes

The overall goal of Hunter’s self-study is college-wide reflective engagement with a shared vision of Hunter College as a leading public institution of higher education in the 21st century. Specifically, we expect that the self-study will allow Hunter College to:

- Develop, in consultation with all major constituencies, a plan for Hunter’s future that is aligned with its historic mission and university priorities and respectful of Hunter’s distinct identity and particular strengths.
- Develop more effective and extensive communication between and among various constituent groups, and create necessary technologies and strategies to make communication possible.
- Deepen the sense of belonging to a Hunter community, which crosses school and divisional lines and knits the College’s many constituencies.
- Document, share, and celebrate Hunter’s strengths and successes.
- Describe, assess, and plan to take on the challenges facing a public institution that emphasizes learning through both teaching and research, and does so at all levels from high school to doctoral training.
- Devise strategies for improving student retention and graduation rates by increasing student engagement and satisfaction with their overall experience at Hunter.
- Define a vision for general education as fundamental to learning at Hunter and galvanize the college to plan, implement, and monitor general education.

III. Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups (WGs)

The Hunter College Self-Study is a work of the entire College community. Guided by the co-chairs, two senior faculty members and a senior administrator, it will reflect the investigation and

deliberation of a task force of nearly one hundred members of the faculty, staff, administration, and student body. The focused work of self-study will be conducted by seven working groups, most headed jointly by one faculty member and one administrator. Working groups will report to a steering committee led by the co-chairs.

An advisory panel of administrators, including the deans of all four academic divisions plus senior administrators, will serve as a resource for the steering committee. So will a Technology Task Force, to be headed by our Assistant VP for Instructional Technology, which will be available to all of the working groups and who are already involved in adapting new technologies in various areas.

The seven working groups (WGs) are organized so that each will address one or more Middle States “standards of excellence.” Working groups were selected to include faculty from different divisions of the College and at different ranks, plus administration and staff members selected from areas of the College’s management and service endeavors that are pertinent to that WG’s charge.

The standards that each WG will be responsible for are listed here.

Working Group 1: Institutional Goals, Resources, and Assessment

Standard 1: Mission and Goals.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal*

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

Working Group 2: Leadership, Administration, Integrity

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

Standard 5: Administration

Standard 6: Integrity

Working Group 3: Graduate Programs

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

Standard 9: Student Support Services

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Working Group 4: Faculty

Standard 10: Faculty

Working Group 5: Student Engagement and Progress

Standard 8: Student Admission and Retention

Standard 9: Student Support Services

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Working Group 6: General Education

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Standard 12: General Education
 Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Working Group 7: Academic Programs/Assessment (Major and Minor)

Standard 11: Educational Offerings
 Standard 13: Related Educational Activities
 Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

The following table keys the seven WGs to the fourteen Middle States standards, showing which standards will be addressed by which working group(s).

Standard	Title	Working Group						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Mission and Goals	X						
2	Planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal	X						
3	Institutional resources	X						
4	Leadership and governance		X					
5	Administration		X					
6	Integrity		X					
7	Institutional Assessment	X						
8	Student Admissions and Retention			X		X		
9	Student Support Services			X		X		
10	Faculty				X			
11	Educational Offerings			X			X	X
12	General Education						X	
13	Related educational activities					X		X
14	Assessment of student learning			X			X	X

The Steering Committee

The Steering Committee for Self-Study is co-chaired by Associate Professor Philip Alcabes (Urban Public Health), Professor Sandra Clarkson (Mathematics and Statistics), and Provost and VP for Academic Affairs Vita Rabinowitz. The chairs of each working group sit on the Steering Committee, providing a reliable mechanism for communication and accountability. All of the committee membership was selected by the provost in consultation with the president, vice presidents, deans, co-chairs of the steering committee and college governance leaders. The Steering Committee will meet monthly from October 2007 through June 2008 to coordinate working-group reports.

Members of the Steering Committee:

- Prof. Christa Acampora, Philosophy
- Eija Ayravainen, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment and Dean of Students
- Taina Borrero, Office of External Affairs
- Prof. Derrick T. Brazill, Biological Sciences

Prof. Lynn Chancer, Professor of Sociology
Christine Curella, undergraduate student, Macauley Honors College, Urban Studies major
Conan Freud, Acting Vice President of Finance and Administration
Prof. James Gordon, Psychology
Prof. Veronica M. Gregg, Africana and Puerto Rican/Latino Studies
Prof. Jill Gross, Urban Affairs and Planning
Kelle Jacobs, undergraduate student, Film & Media Studies major
Albert Peterson, President, Undergraduate Student Government
Prof. Anthony Picciano, Curriculum and Teaching
David Potash, Associate Provost
John Rose, Acting Dean for Diversity & Compliance
Prof. Helena Rosenblatt, History
Prof. Andrea Savage, School of Social Work
Prof. Richard W Stapleford, Art and Chair of the Hunter College Senate
Prof. Bill Williams, Mathematics and Statistics
Prof. Jason R Young, Psychology and Chair of the Faculty Delegate Assembly
Madlyn Stokely, Associate Dean of Student Support Services
Frank Steen, Chief Information Officer

Administrators who will be available to the Steering Committee to provide information or data, or facilitate access to faculty, students, or staff for further information collection include:

Department Chairs
Robert Buckley, Director, Research Administration
Shirley Clay Scott, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences
Marilyn Daley-Weston, Registrar
Joan Lambe, Director, Institutional Research and Assessment
Jacqueline Mondros, Dean of the School of Social Work
Chickie Piazza, Chief of Staff, President's Office
Louise Sherby, Associate Dean and Chief Librarian
Laurie Sherwen, Dean of the School of the Health Professions
David Steiner, Dean of the School of Education
Peggy Tirschwell, Assistant Provost
William Zlata, Director of Admissions

A Technology Task Force will be available to the Steering Committee and to Working Groups, to consider how technological improvements might contribute to any of the areas of learning or college life that we are studying:

Franklin Steen, Asst. VP for Information Technology, and Prof. Manfred Kuechler (Sociology), co-chairs, with Profs. Steve Gorelick, Jochen Albrecht, and Tony Picciano.

Space and Staffing

The Steering Committee will have the use of a small conference room and office on the tenth floor of the East Building. An administrator from the Provost's office will assist the committee

(and working groups) throughout the self-study. Blackboard, CUNY's Course Management System, is an essential ally in the self-study. A Blackboard Community has been organized for posting and sharing of information, rendering Hunter College's Middle States Self-Study process transparent to the community.

Parallel Committees

The college's Assessment committee is working with representatives from each department in the Arts and Sciences to refine and implement Outcomes Assessment Plans. This committee will serve as a resource for all aspects of self-study. Its chair, Prof. Sandra Clarkson, is also co-chair of the self-study Steering Committee.

Members of the college's Technology Committee currently sit on different working groups and on the technology task force for self-study.

Working Groups

The three Steering Committee co-chairs will coordinate working group scheduling and expedite access to necessary documents and data, and will attend working-group meetings whenever feasible. Profs. Alcabas and Clarkson are members of the General Education Working Group (number 6), which has the same membership as the executive committee of Hunter's contemporaneous initiative to study general education (funded by a grant from the Mellon Foundation).

Membership in the working groups is as follows:

Working Group 1: Institutional Goals, Resources, and Planning

Chaired by Prof. Jill Gross (Urban Affairs and Planning) and Frank Steen, Asst. VP for Instructional Technology

Theoni Angelopoulos, Student Affairs/Office of the Dean of Students (invited)
Prof. Howard A Chernick, Economics (invited)
Ellen Chesler, Women and Public Policy, Roosevelt House
Reva Cohen, Office of Student Services (invited)
Prof. Mary Flanagan, Film and Media
Amanda Fuentes, President's Office
Deborah Gardner, Teaching Academy, Provost's Office
Adjie Henderson, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences
Prof. Gary Krasilovsky, Physical Therapy, (invited)
Prof. Manfred P Kuechler, Sociology (invited)
Prof. Gess A Leblanc, Educational Foundations
Prof. Scott Lemieux, Political Science (invited)
Prof. Pamela Mills, Chemistry
Sharon Neill, Business Services (invited)
Prof. Rupal Oza, Geography
Jerry Quagliariello, Registrar's Office (invited)
Fay Rosenfeld, Institutional Advancement
Andrew Silver, Office of the VP for Finance and Administration

Kristina Testa-Buzze, Dir. of Wellness Education (invited)
Ernest Tubb, Registrar's Office (invited)
Prof. Darrell Wheeler, School Of Social Work
Terry Wansart, Director of Athletics
Students to be named later

Working Group 2: Leadership, Administration, Integrity

Chaired by Prof. Richard Stapleford (Art), chair of Hunter College Senate, and Dean John Rose, Office of Diversity and Compliance

Prof. Elizabeth Beaujour, Russian & Slavic Studies (chair of Thos. Hunter Honors Program)
Peggy Beveridge, Registrar's Office (invited)
Prof. Jack Caravanos, School of Health Sciences
Prof. Robert P Dottin, Biological Sciences (invited)
Assoc. Dean Michael Escott, Student Services
Prof. Randall K Filer, Economics
Meredith Halpern, Exec. Director for Marketing & Communications
Prof. David J. Hodges, Anthropology (invited)
Bonnie Kaplan, Student Services (invited)
Prof. Ellen T. Klass, Psychology (invited)
Prof. Andrew Polsky, Political Science
Prof. Inez Miyares, Geography
Prof. Ezra Shahn, Biological Sciences (invited)
Prof. Trudy Smoke, English (invited)
Prof. Robert H. Stanley, Film and Media Studies (invited)
Patricia Woodard, Library (invited)
Sonia Acevedo, Animal Facility (invited)
Students to be named later

Working Group 3: Graduate Programs

Chaired by Profs. Derrick Brazill (Biological Sciences) and Andrea Savage (Social Work)

Prof. Janos A. Bergou, Physics and Astronomy
Prof. Jacqueline Brown, Anthropology (invited)
Prof. Martin Chodorow, Psychology (invited)
Prof. Sarah Jane Dodd, School of Social Work
Assoc. Dean Frank Flammino, Health Professions
Prof. Nicholas Freudenberg, School of Health Sciences (invited)
Prof. Frank Gardella, Curriculum and Teaching
Prof. Steven Gorelick, Film and Media Students (invited)
Prof. Paul A. Kurzman, School of Social Work
Prof. John O'Neill, Educational Foundations (invited)
Prof. Claudia Orenstein, Theater
Prof. Marianna Pavlovskaya, Geography
Prof. Thomas Sleight, English (invited)
Milena Solo, Acting Director of Graduate Admissions
Thom Taylor, Administrator, English Dept. (invited)
Nick Trippel, Head of Learning Lab, Sociology Dept. (invited)

Prof. Joseph Viteritti, Urban Affairs and Planning
Prof. Harris P Zeigler, Psychology (invited)
Students to be named later

Working Group 4: Faculty

Chaired by Profs. Jason Young (Psychology), president of FDA, and Helena Rosenblatt (History)

Prof. Jeffrey Allred, English
Prof. Jill Bargonetti, Biological Sciences
Prof. Emily Braun, Art
Prof. Laura Cobus, Library
Martin Dornbaum, Director, Media Center, Schools of the Health Professions
Prof. James B Freeman, Philosophy (invited)
Carolynn Julien, Director, Human Subjects Research Committee
Prof. Beatrice Krauss, Urban Public Health
Prof. Donna Masini, English (invited)
Dana Reimer, Administrator, Dept. of Geography & Geology (invited)
Janet Robertson, Asst. Dean of Arts & Sciences
Prof. Jonathan Shannon, Anthropology
Prof. Joan Tronto, Political Science
Prof. Donald Vogel, School of Health Sciences
Students to be named later

Working Group 5: Student Engagement and Progress

Chaired by Prof. Veronica Gregg (Africana and Puerto Rican/Latino Studies) and Associate Dean Madlyn Stokely

Prof. Adrienne Alaie-Petrillo, Biological Sciences
Barbara Barone, Dolciani Mathematics Learning Center
Regan Christie, Student and Alumni Activities, Schools of the Health Professions (invited)
Lisa Decker, Distance Learning and Videoconferencing Center, ICIT
Enercida Guerrero, Reading/Writing Center (invited)
Sarah Jeninsky, Thomas Hunter Honors Program
Barbara Landress, Pre-law Advisor, Student Services
Prof. Mary Lefkaritis, Curriculum and Teaching
Prof. Regina Linder, School of Health Sciences
Prof. Bernadette McCauley, History, Chair UARC (invited)
Dennis Paoli, Reading/Writing Center
Prof. Roger A, Persell, Biological Sciences (invited)
Clare Pistey, Welcome Center, Student Services
Prof. Alicia Ramos, Romance Languages
Prof. Marilyn Rothschild, Physics and Astronomy
Elizabeth Sachs, Study Abroad
Prof. William V. Sweeney, Chemistry
Scott Stursa, Students Services, Transfer Issues
Prof. Jeanne D Weiler, Educational Foundations

Case Willoughby, Director of Advising Services, Student Services
Lolita Wood-Hill, Pre-health advising
Nadine Young, Registrar's Office
Students to be named later

Working Group 6: General Education

Chaired by Profs. Christa Acampora (Philosophy) and James Gordon (Psychology)

Prof. Philip Alcabes, Urban Public Health
Prof. Richard Burke, Music
Prof. Sandra P Clarkson, Mathematics and Statistics
Prof. Rebecca Connor, English
Prof. William G Sakas, Computer Science
Vita C. Rabinowitz, Provost
Students to be named later

Working Group 7: Undergraduate Programs

Chaired by Prof. Lynn Chancer (Sociology) and Associate Provost David Potash

Prof. Sean Ahearn, Geography (invited)
Prof. Angelo Angelis, History
Iris Aroyewun, International Students Office (invited)
Prof. Richard Belsky, History
Gina Cherry, Instructional Learning, ICIT
Prof. Omar Dahbour, Philosophy (invited)
Ilene Drapkin, Student Services (invited)
Myrna Fader, Student Services (invited)
Prof. David Foster, Biology (invited)
Lorraine Gallucci, Continuing and Professional Studies, VP Administration
Martha Giannasio, Office of Financial Aid (invited)
Luis Gonzalez, Library
Prof. Eliza Hertz, School of Education
Prof. Mark Hillery, Physics and Astronomy
Prof. Deborah Jensen, Curriculum and Teaching (invited)
Lynn Kemen, Student advisor, Psychology
Susan Kreisman, Manhattan Hunter Campus Science High School
Prof. Eckhard K Kuhn-Osius, German
Prof. Khursheed Navder, Nutrition
Jonathan Schoenwald, Macaulay Honors College
Prof. Michael Steiper, Anthropology (invited)
Prof. Brian Wood, Art (invited)
Sylvia Velazquez, Student services (invited)
Paula Wicklow, Career Development Services
Clay Williams, Library
Lauren Yanotta, Library (invited)
Students to be named later

IV. Charges to the Working Groups and Guidelines for their Reports

A. Charges to the Working Groups

We have apportioned the fourteen standards of excellence of the Middle States Commission to the seven working groups for documentation of compliance, as noted above. But we also ask that the working groups identify key issues and concerns, suggest modes of inquiry, and recommend steps for the College to take to address specific aspects of their own area that relate to the three themes of our self-study.

Here, we note the specific charge to each working group.

Working Group 1: Institutional Goals, Resources, and Planning

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

These standards pertain to the extent to which Hunter College has clearly articulated and widely shared missions and goals, has allocated resources consonant with its mission and goals, and is engaged in meaningful and systematic assessment of its success in meeting those goals. This working group should gather appropriate documents to demonstrate that Hunter is in compliance with each of these standards.

In particular, the working group will study Hunter's mission statement and gather evidence to show that the College is meeting those goals set forth therein. It will document compliance with planning and resource allocation, at all levels, including clarity of communication of the planning process. It will study the institutional set-up of the College, and gather evidence to show that institutional resources are being used to support efforts to achieve the College's main mission.

Budgets, planning documents, and the output of many outcome and process evaluations should be available for the working group to study. Since 2000, CUNY has mandated that all the colleges regularly engage in annual assessments of their overall institutional effectiveness via a wide-ranging and rigorous process known as Performance Management Process (PMP). Hunter's professional programs have long submitted to regular evaluation by their respective accrediting boards and the State of New York, and have always fared well in these assessments. But most programs in the School of Arts and Sciences have only recently embraced calls for the assessment of student learning in their majors. Hunter approved in principle a college-wide assessment plan in 2003, and in 2006-2007, named a director of assessment and elicited plans for assessing student learning from all 34 programs in Arts and Sciences. The working group will document that institutional-level assessments are proceeding regularly and efficiently (this working group is not responsible for process-type assessments of classroom teaching or of non-classroom educational projects and programs, such as the Reading/Writing Center).

We also ask the working group to address the following questions regarding these standards:

Questions

- How effectively is Hunter meeting its goals? What is Hunter doing well, and where is there room for improvement?
- How effectively are assessment results used to inform planning and budgeting decisions?
- What is Hunter's mission in the dawn of the 21st century and how does the current mission statement reflect the college's goals and priorities in a revitalized and increasingly centralized CUNY?
- How is technology being used and how can it be used in the future to deal with needs of students, faculty and administration?
- How effectively does strategic planning meet anticipated needs and address unanticipated problems? How can better planning strengthen Hunter's hold on its position as a leading example of public higher education?
- In particular, how can Hunter plan for its future needs both physically and academically?

Potential Methods of Inquiry

- Review of documents: mission statement, PMP, budget requests, facilities plans, annual reports, student services reports, CUNY Master plan, previous Middle States reports
- Interviews with stakeholders (internal and external)
- Surveys of staff, students, and faculty
- Findings of Senate Committee on Performance Objectives and Outcomes Assessment
- Reviews of literature and contacts with peer institutions to learn about best practices

Working Group 2: Leadership, Administration, Integrity

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

Standard 5: Administration

Standard 6: Integrity

These standards cut to the heart of how important decisions are made at Hunter College and address the roles of various leadership positions and governance bodies. These standards also relate to how we protect academic freedom and guarantee the integrity of faculty and student scholarship. Hunter College has long had a system of shared governance in which the administration and Senate, which is composed of faculty, staff, administrators and students, have joint responsibility for policies and procedures. The meaning and practice of shared governance are contested issues at Hunter, and demand some attention.

This working group will document compliance with standards on leadership, administration, and integrity, including evidence that leaders with stated responsibilities discharge those tasks and are accountable for them, that administrative officers are qualified for their positions, that fairness is observed in hiring and all processes within the institution, and that opportunities for employment and promotion are openly and fairly communicated.

Questions

- How effectively have important decisions about academic programs and curriculum and student services and student life at Hunter been made?
- How effectively do Hunter's administrative organization and governance structures promote the use of data that allows for informed and intelligent planning and decision making?
- How can Hunter make effective use of the financial and policy making oversight of the Board of Trustees and the CUNY central administration in implementing its vision for the 21st century?
- Hunter's system is one of shared governance between the Hunter College leadership team and the Hunter College Senate, which is composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators.
 - How can these roles best be communicated and understood?
 - How will a system of shared responsibility function to uplift teaching and learning, even as public scrutiny of higher education intensifies?
- How can Hunter support and develop the next generation of leadership – academic, Senate, administrative?

Potential Methods of Inquiry

- Review of documents and literature, including HC Senate minutes, HC publications (e.g., *At Hunter*), minutes of the CUNY BoT, CUNY Budget Requests, Hunter budget, Open Line, Presidential statements, Faculty Delegate Assembly's faculty survey, AAUP and CUNY Academic Freedom reports, student services reports
- Interviews with stakeholders (internal and external)
 - HC faculty, administration (Dean for Diversity, Director of HR, Senate committees, chairs) and students, HEOs
 - CUNY administrators and trustees, government and community leaders
 - Leaders at similar institutions outside CUNY
- Surveys of staff, students and faculty

Working Group 3: Graduate Programs

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

Standard 9: Student Support Services

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Hunter College is currently a masters-granting institution whose undergraduate mission has always been its primary focus. Over 15,000 undergraduates are enrolled, most of them in the School of Arts and Sciences, with 5 to 6,000 graduate students in masters programs in the professional schools (Education, Social Work, Health Sciences, Nursing) as well as Arts and Sciences.

Increasingly, masters and doctoral degrees are necessary credentials for many fields. Hunter is now developing plans to confer joint doctoral degrees with the CUNY Graduate Center in some areas, including the sciences and public health. To strengthen our graduate profile, we

are in the process of re-envisioning our graduate admission process, hiring the first director of graduate admissions in our history, hiring faculty to staff graduate programs, investing in our libraries, and developing new graduate programs in key areas, including the creative arts.

This working group will document compliance with standards in the areas of admission and support for graduate students, as well as educational offerings in the areas of technology and information literacy.

Questions

- What is the ideal mix of masters, professional, doctoral, and undergraduate students and programs for Hunter to be an excellent urban public institution?
- How do we expand our masters, professional, and doctoral programs while we maintain our focus on undergraduate education?
- What is the current role of the traditional masters programs in liberal arts departments? What programs have potential for growth and investment and which programs should be deemphasized or closed? What new programs should we be planning?
- How has Hunter strengthened its outreach to prospective graduate and professional students and improved recruiting? How can outreach be further enhanced?
- Should the college consider increasing its certificate programs to attract students and provide professional development?
- Does Hunter have the resources in terms of faculty, space, library facilities, research infrastructure, and financial organization to support graduate education (including support for graduate students) in an increasingly competitive environment? If not, how might we go about securing these resources in the coming years?

Potential Methods of Inquiry

- Review enrollment data in graduate programs
- Review documents: minutes of Graduate Course of Study committee, catalogs, letters of intent
- Examination of graduate programs at comparable institutions
- Conduct surveys, interviews or focus groups with current students, chair of Graduate Student organizations, program graduates, deans, graduate advisers, Provost, Director of Admissions, VP of Student Affairs, representatives from CUNY and the Graduate Center, employers
- Reviews of literature and contacts with peer institutions to learn about best practices

Working Group 4: Faculty

Standard 10: Faculty

No institution of higher learning can move to the next level of excellence without regularly investing in its faculty. Hunter is well known for the excellence of its faculty, and new lines provided by CUNY have allowed for further building of the faculty: Through such university-funded initiatives as the “CUNY Compact,” and “cluster lines,” Hunter has added well over 60 new lines to the faculty since 2001. However, several recent surveys have pointed to dissatisfaction on the part of many Hunter faculty members around shared governance, support for research, teaching, and workload.

The Working Group on faculty will document compliance with standard 10, including demonstration that Hunter faculty (including adjunct faculty) are adequately qualified according to professional standards, standards for promotion and tenure are communicated clearly and constructed and applied fairly, principles of academic freedom are observed within the context of Hunter's mission, and that adequate resources are devoted to faculty development.

In addition, this working group will examine how faculty practice can contribute to each of the self-study's themes, i.e., faculty role in increasing Hunter's excellence, faculty involvement in creating and maintaining the 21st-century university, and optimizing the learning relationships between students and faculty.

Questions

- How does faculty development help move Hunter toward excellence in the 21st century?
- How effective are professional development efforts to help faculty understand and use a learning-centered approach that incorporates contemporary pedagogies?
- How is teaching excellence recognized and rewarded, and how are faculty members' attempts to improve student learning safeguarded so that new methods can be investigated and assessed?
- How does faculty excellence contribute to student engagement and retention?
- How has Hunter supported its faculty in their research, scholarship, and creative work?
- How can procedures for hiring and training adjunct faculty be improved to improve learning at Hunter?

Potential Methods of Inquiry

- Review of documents: HC Senate minutes (committees and full Senate), bylaws of Senate and CUNY with regard to faculty rights and responsibilities, PSC contract, faculty handbook, adjunct handbook, faculty grievances policies, policy on academic freedom, ICIT training schedule, activities of faculty resource center.
- Review data – history of recent hires, workload reports to assess change in numbers of f/t and p/t faculty, travel awards, fellowship leaves
- Interviews, surveys, focus groups of representative faculty – tenured and non-tenured, adjuncts, FSSE
- Reviews of literature and contacts with peer institutions to learn about best practices

Working Group 5: Student Engagement and Progress

Standard 8: Student Admission and Retention

Standard 9: Student Support Services

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Like many urban public universities, Hunter's retention and graduation rates look disappointing. In part, our students' financial straits often make it hard for them to finish 120 credits in six years, and some of our highly qualified students transfer out to private colleges after a year or two of good grades at Hunter. Still, the facts of widespread student

dissatisfaction at Hunter are inarguable, and we surmise that students' experience translates into poorer retention and slower progress toward their degrees than we might see optimally.

This working group will document compliance with standards 8, 9, and 13, including demonstrating that admissions policies are clearly articulated and fairly administered, information on financial support is readily available, student-support professionals are qualified and adequate in number, procedures for student grievances are clearly communicated and fairly administered, and student advising is thorough. Where compliance is in question, this working group will recommend steps to achieve compliance and assess completeness of compliance, and propose a timetable for implementing those steps. In addition, this working group will address the role of admissions, advising, counseling, grievance, and other student-centered procedures in improving student satisfaction and progress toward degrees. And it will examine how the availability of new degrees and degree combinations affects both student satisfaction and progress.

Questions

- Why do Hunter students leave before graduating?
- How effective are strategies to increase student retention and graduation rates? What new interventions or strategies should now be introduced? How can the body of research on student retention, and practices at peer institutions, help Hunter to shape more effective strategies and best practices?
- How do we communicate the importance of improved student satisfaction in generating better retention and graduation rates and support faculty and staff in trying new strategies to endeavor to improve student life?
- What steps can be taken to ensure that the expansion of graduate-program offerings does not detract from undergraduate students' progress toward degrees?
- How can technology be used to promote student progress and communication?

Potential Methods of Inquiry

- Data review and analysis: NSSE, FSSE, CUNY Student Experience survey, IR studies of specific groups
- Review of documents: Report of President's Advisory Committee on Student Services, student handbook, annual reports of student services offices, schedule of classes
- Focus groups: transfer students, freshmen, graduating seniors
- Interviews with advisers, staff (Registrar, Financial Aid), Deans Stokely and Escott
- Interviews with faculty – those who teach gen ed courses and students in the “block” programs, those whose focus is primarily within the major
- Interviews and review of minutes of Student Standing Committee of the Senate
- Findings of Senate Committee on Performance Objectives and Outcomes Assessment
- Reviews of literature and contacts with peer institutions to learn about best practices

Working Group 6: General Education

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Standard 12: General Education

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

In 2000, Hunter College made the first major change to its "distribution requirements" in twenty five years when it adopted the General Education Requirements and Graduate Requirements that remain in force today. The General Education Requirement (GER) is a framework that offers students introductory requirements in "core" areas such as English composition and American History, courses in ascending levels of "broad exposure" (sophomore level), and "focused exposure" (junior, senior level) in areas outside their major.

In 2005, the President of Hunter College and the acting Dean of Arts and Sciences received a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to examine Hunter's undergraduate curriculum, with a special emphasis on the general education and graduation requirements. Today, the Mellon Project is a major initiative at Hunter that provides Hunter faculty, administrators, professional staff, and students with a special opportunity to come together to reflect and improve upon the educational experience of our undergraduates and to develop a shared understanding of the requirements and their value. We expect to assess how well the GER achieves its major goals of offering students opportunities for more advanced study outside of their major while making connections among disciplines throughout their academic careers. We shall investigate how effectively our curriculum helps students acquire the competencies, skills, and experiences that will serve them for a lifetime of learning and professional and personal achievement. Moreover, we shall explore how we can move as a community from thinking of general education as a set of requirements that student meet to a program of learning that can be responsive to innovative teaching and the rapidly changing state of knowledge in the 21st century. As the Mellon Foundation recognized in its award, Hunter's core mission is education in the liberal arts and sciences, broadly conceived. The work of the Mellon Project should poise Hunter to seize its title to a premiere urban public university and to define standards of excellence for others to model.

The self-study's working group 6 on general education is exactly the steering committee that has been guiding our work for the Mellon-funded project since June 2007. It has already collected documents and gathered assessment information, and begun drafting plans for the wider College community to examine the crucial questions regarding general education. Toward the present self-study, this working group will document compliance with standards 11 and 12, including adequacy of support for general-education programming and teaching and scope and content of general education. It will also examine clarity of general-education requirements and adequacy of advising concerning these requirements, and recommend steps to improve communication and advising about general education where efficiency in meeting standards could be enhanced.

Questions

- What is the purpose of general education given the current state of knowledge and trends in the development of general education in the 21st century, and how effective is our current program in delivering it?
- How can Hunter effectively design an educational program for a diverse student population with a great variety of different needs, expectations, and levels of preparation, and whose course of study often diverges from traditional paths?

- How can Hunter define excellence in engaging students throughout their academic careers regardless of their points of entry?
- How well does Hunter use assessment results to modify general-education programs so as to better meet learning needs?

Potential Methods of Inquiry

- Review of documents: catalogs, advising handbooks, schedule of classes, departmental assessment plans, syllabi, minutes of departmental, school, and Senate curriculum committee meetings.
- Review of assessments of general-education courses and the existing Gen Ed program.
- Interviews with student services advisers, faculty advisers, Senate leadership, Senate assessment committee, students (pre and in-major)
- Surveys and focus groups with current students and alumni
- Liaison with Mellon Project committees
- Reviews of literature and contacts with peer institutions to learn about best practices

Working Group 7: Undergraduate Programs

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

With more students hoping to enter graduate or professional schools after obtaining the baccalaureate degree, with more opportunity to do so locally as Hunter's (and other local institutions') graduate-program offerings expand, and with more joint bachelors-masters programs, the nature and focus of the undergraduate major demand consideration. So, too, does the credit requirement for the major demand consideration: already, some majors in the arts and sciences are becoming more rigorous, with more prerequisites, with higher GPAs for entry, and with more credits and experiences required for graduation. While Hunter is considering how to deliver general education to undergraduates in the 21st century, we must also examine how general and specific education will mesh, and how to deliver both forms. The amplitude of research at Hunter, more demand from students to undertake research at the undergraduate level, and the question of how to effect a balance between research and other forms of learning (especially traditional classroom teaching) require a critical and forward-looking examination of undergraduate education in the modern public university.

This working group will document compliance with standards 8, 11, 13, and 14, particularly regarding standards for admission of transfer students, clarity of criteria for entering majors, and advising for students who fail to meet the criteria for entering a chosen major (std. 8); use of assessment information to improve major curricula and course offerings, integration of learning resources (IT, library) into educational programs, and articulation agreements regarding transfer (std. 11); effectiveness of placement tests and developmental learning programs (std. 13); and clarity of expectations for student learning outcomes, appropriateness of assessments of learning and teaching, and assessment evidence showing that students are learning at the proper level (std. 14).

In addition, this working group will consider questions relating undergraduate programs to all three self-study themes.

Questions

- Do assessments show that students achieve key learning outcomes in every major? How should student achievement be improved? Does encouraging students to declare their majors as early as possible affect progress toward degrees?
- How should we determine whether academic programs are of appropriate rigor?
- Should learning-outcomes and assessment practices be required parts of new and revised course descriptions? What are other ways that assessment can be integrated into our course approval and delivery process? How should departments and programs use assessment results to improve teaching and learning?
- What steps are needed to improve Hunter students' information literacy as the demand for managing information intensifies? What sort of library should Hunter have, and how do we transform our library system from the traditional books-on-shelves library to the 21st-century information center?
- What can be done to get faculty to focus on continually upgrading and improving the undergraduate programs given the push to add more and better graduate and pre-professional programs?
- How can distance learning contribute to expediting students' progress toward choosing the major and completing the major, especially in a space-straitened environment? What more can be done to expand nontraditional routes to completing course work, declaring majors, and graduating?

Potential Methods of Inquiry

- Review of documents: catalogs, advising handbooks, schedule of classes, syllabi (evidence of course goals and clear ways to assess student attainment of goals), minutes of departmental, school, and Senate curriculum committees
- Interviews with faculty advisers in both major and minor departments, Senate committee on assessment, students (pre- and in-major), Senate leadership, advisors in Student Services
- Liaison with General Education Middle States committee and Mellon committees
- Review of data concerning performance of IELI students on TOEFL
- Surveys, focus groups with students and alumni
- Survey instrument to assess faculty attitude towards online courses, experiential learning, special programs (could be folded into a survey with questions coming from other work groups)
- Findings of Senate Committee on Performance Objectives and Outcomes Assessment
- Reviews of literature and contacts with peer institutions to learn about best practices

B. Guidelines for Working Group Reports

Working group reports should be no more than about 20 double-spaced pages long, written using MS Word in 12-point Times New Roman type with 1-inch margins. They should be

written in concise, jargon-free language suitable for an audience familiar with higher education but not acquainted with Hunter College. Supporting documentation may be included in appendices or by citing relevant documents.

Each working group's report should be organized as follows:

1. A statement of the working group's charge and the questions it addressed.
2. A brief, factual orientation to the history and context of the situation at Hunter in regard to the working group's topic.
3. An analysis of the methods of inquiry undertaken and the outcomes of that inquiry. Both strengths and challenges should be addressed and collaborations with other working groups should be described.
4. A discussion of how the group's findings relate to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education's Standards of Excellence
5. Overall conclusions
6. A prioritized list of realistic and specific recommendations

V. Inventory of Support Documents

Hunter College catalogs: undergraduate and graduate

Schedule of classes

Hunter College data

- Hunter College fact books
- Institutional data submitted to IPEDs
- Enrollment data
- Gender equity benchmark data

Annual Performance Management Process (PMP) reports

CUNY budget requests and actual budgets.

Planning Documents

- CUNY Master Plans
- Hunter College Strategic Plans
- Hunter College Master Plans
- Hunter College Facilities Plans

PSC-CUNY Contract

Bylaws: CUNY, Senate, Departments

Documents related to Academic Freedom

- Report of the Senate Select Committee on Academic Freedom
- AAUP Principles of Academic Freedom

External grant-related data

- Research Foundation's annual reports

- Grant updates from the Office of Research Administration

Recent reports to accrediting agencies

- 2004 Middle States periodic report
- 1997 Middle States self-study report
- Recent accreditation reports for professional programs

Departments' student learning assessment plans and results

Findings of Senate Committee on Performance Objectives and Outcomes Assessment

Recent Survey/Interview Data

- 2007 NSSE
- 2007 FSSE
- 2007 Mellon Project faculty interviews
- 2007 Mellon Project student surveys: senior survey, student survey on general education
- 2006 CUNY Student Experience Survey
- 2007-7 GEP Science Faculty Survey
- 2006 FDA faculty survey
- 2005 CUNY Faculty Experience Survey

Meeting minutes

- CUNY Board of Trustees
- Hunter College Senate: general and subcommittees
- Faculty Delegate Assembly (FDA): general and subcommittees
- Undergraduate student government (USG)
- Graduate student association (GSA)

Handbooks

- Faculty handbook
- Adjunct faculty handbook
- Student services website

Task Force and Advisory Committee reports

- 2007 Report of the President's Task Force on the Hunter College Libraries
- 2005 Report of the CUNY Task Force on Reading and Writing
- 2002 Report by the President's Advisory Committee on Student Services
- Report on "College-wide Task Force on Outcomes Assessment"

Hunter College periodicals

- President's "Open Lines"
- At Hunter
- Hunter Envoy
- The Word
- The Voice (FDA newsletter)
- Senate News bulletins

VI. Organization of the Self-Study Report

Hunter's self-study will accomplish three ends: document compliance with Middle States standards, create plans for correcting deficiencies or inefficiencies in complying with Middle States standards, and address three questions of great importance to the College:

- How can our good public institution of higher education set the standard for excellence even while we expand our academic offerings?
- How should Hunter educate students for the 21st century?
- What improvements in student life will increase the proportion of freshmen who graduate and speed students' progress toward degrees?

Our self-study report will add to this process, making certain to incorporate the views of faculty, administration, and students who are all valuable stakeholders in Hunter's success.

The self-study report will be organized as follows:

Executive Summary and Eligibility Certification Statement

Chapter 1. Sustaining the Excellent Urban Liberal-Arts Institution of Higher Education

- 1.1 Introduction: Hunter College in Context.
- 1.2 Mission, Planning, and Institutional Renewal (Standards 1 and 2):
- 1.3. Institutional Resources and Administration (Standards 3 and 5).
- 1.4 Leadership, Governance, and Integrity (Standards 4 and 6)
- 1.5 Institutional Assessment (Standard 7)
- 1.6. Toward a Strategic Vision for Becoming a Premiere Urban Liberal-Arts College

Chapter 2. Student Engagement and Progress Toward Degrees

- 2.1 Introduction: Student Life (and its Discontents)
- 2.2. Student Admission and Retention (Standard 8)
- 2.3 Student Support Services (Standard 9)
- 2.4 Toward a Strategic Vision for Student Engagement at Hunter

Chapter 3. 21st-Century Teaching and Learning for 21st-Century Students

- 3.1 Introduction: The Teaching-Intensive College
- 3.2 Faculty (Standard 10)
- 3.3 Educational Offerings and Opportunities (Standard 11)
- 3.4 General Education for a New Century (Standard 12)
- 3.5. Related Educational Activities (Standard 13)
- 3.6. Assessment of Student Learning (Standard 14)

3.7. Toward a Strategic Vision for Teaching and Learning in the 21st Century.

Chapter 4. Conclusion: Maintaining Quality, Confronting Challenges

Appendices

The organization of the report will follow the 14 Middle States standards, in order. Where the documenting compliance with the standards touches on our self-study's three questions, the relevant chapter will explore how planning and implementing changes in that area touch on self-study themes.

VII. Timetable for Self-Study and Evaluation

Date	Activity
2006- 2007 Academic Year	
Fall 2006	Joan Lambe attends Middle States Self-Study Institute. Prof Sandra Clarkson attends Assessment workshop. Professors Pat Woodard and Clay Williams of the library attend the MS Annual Meeting.
Spring 2007	Comprehensive model for self-study selected Working Groups appointed and begin meeting
August 2007	Steering Committee appointed Self-Study Design drafted
2007 – 2008 Academic Year	
September 2007	Self-Study Design submitted to Steering Committee, President, Deans, and others for feedback
September 28, 2007	Self-Study Design submitted to Middle States
October 12, 2007	Middle States Commission Liaison, Linda Suskie, visits Hunter
October 29, 2007	Submit revised Self-Study Design to MSCHE
November 4-6, 2007	Provost Rabinowitz and Annemarie Nicols-Grinenko (Office of the Provost) attend Middle States self-study institute
Dec 2007 – March 2008	Steering committee oversees research of working groups Working groups involve Hunter community as they gather and review data
Winter 2008	MSCHE selects evaluation team chair Hunter approves selection of evaluation team chair Evaluation team chair and Hunter select team visit date Hunter sends copy of self-study design to evaluation team chair
March-April 2008	Working groups draft reports
Spring 2008	MSCHE selects evaluation team members Hunter approves evaluation team
April 2008	Working group reports due to Steering committee
May 2008	Steering committee reviews working group reports; if necessary, additional information, revisions requested
June – July 2008	Steering committee compiles working group reports and prepares draft of self-study report
2008 – 2009 Academic Year	
August – September 2008	Draft of self-study report reviewed by community and governance bodies
October 2008	Steering committee revises report based on community feedback Draft of self-study report to evaluation team chair
November 2008 (at least 4 months before team visit)	Evaluation team chair makes preliminary visit to Hunter

Nov – Dec 2008	Steering committee makes final revisions to self-study report
January 2009 (at least 6 weeks before team visit)	Final draft of self-study and supporting documents sent to evaluation team and Middle States
March 2009	Evaluation team visit to Hunter
March / April 2009	Evaluation Team report sent to Hunter
April / May 2009	Hunter reviews for factual accuracy; if necessary, corrections sent to MSCHE
May 2009	Evaluation Team issues final report
May / June 2009	Hunter response to the team report
Summer 2009	Commission accreditation decision

VIII. Profile of the Visiting Evaluation Team

The profile of the evaluation team was chosen with Hunter’s most important goals in mind:

- Planning how to move forward in:
 - Becoming the premiere urban public liberal-arts institution.
 - Offering a 21st-century education to 21st-century students.
 - Improving student engagement and satisfaction so as to increase the proportion of freshmen who graduate and to speed students’ progress toward degrees while maintaining high standards of achievement.
- Describing the unifying elements among the diverse conceptions of Hunter’s place and role in New York City and the larger society.
- Generating a common vision of Hunter’s potential to model both education and training programs for future professionals as well as the excellent liberal-arts education fundamental to the development of future leaders.

Suggestions for the composition of the team:

1. A president of an urban public liberal arts institution with professional schools and a mission similar to Hunter’s and experience as a Middle States evaluation team chair.
2. A provost or dean from a teaching and research intensive institution with a mission and programs similar to Hunter’s and whose experience includes moving from an institution that grants undergraduate and master’s degrees to one that also grants doctoral degrees.
3. A chief financial officer responsible for the business and management operations of an urban public institution similar in scope to Hunter.
4. A faculty member from an institution with a strong liberal arts emphasis whose experience includes general education reform.

5. A faculty member from an institution with strong professional programs whose experience includes moving from a teaching-intensive to a research and teaching intensive model.
6. A student affairs or enrollment-management vice-president or dean with experience at an urban public institution with a largely commuter student body, whose mission and programs are similar to Hunter's.
7. A librarian with responsibilities similar to those of Hunter's Chief Librarian for supporting faculty and students and experience in technologically enhancing library services.
8. An expert in educational assessment
9. An expert in higher-education planning or institutional research.

Some institutions that are not direct competitors of Hunter's, but are similar and from which visiting evaluators might be selected:

University of Massachusetts, Boston
Temple University
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Maryland Baltimore County
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
UC Riverside
U. of Houston
Bowling Green State U.