

# MINUTES

## Meeting of the Hunter College Senate

### 5 October 2016

1 The 588<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Hunter College Senate was convened at 3:40 PM in HW room 714.  
2

3 **Presiding:** Thomas DeGloma, Chair  
4

5 **Attendance:** The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those marked absent in Appendix I.  
6  
7 Alternate Senators were formally seated in accordance with the procedures approved by the Senate,  
8 and clickers were distributed to them.  
9

10 **Minutes:** The minutes from May 18 were approved as distributed.  
11

12

13 **Senate Chair's** Professor Thomas DeGloma said the following:  
14 **Open Remarks:**

15 "I just wanted to open the session with a few points on the agenda. I would like to say that my  
16 comments before the start of the last meeting regarding Roberts Rules of Order were intended to  
17 encourage participation and say that if you do not yet know them, I would hate to see them as a  
18 barrier to participation. Anyone can raise their hand and request a point of clarification to ask a  
19 question if appropriate. With this said, a Senator said that I might have given the wrong impression  
20 and I should state that they are the rules of order that the body operates by.  
21

22 "A few points on this is that RRO provides a framework for how meetings should be conducted.  
23 The agenda is required by our bylaws to go out ten days in advance of the meeting. This is an old  
24 process and was used when we used to physically mail out the items via snail mail or inter-office  
25 mail. Changes arise between the day when the agenda is sent out and the day of the meeting and  
26 these are bound to happen, and if you look at the packets distributed at the door, you can see on the  
27 second page there is a revised agenda. There are a few points that I would like to draw to your  
28 attention. The first is the report by the President and Provost on the Middle States Evaluation. The  
29 President has been called away for a Board of Trustees Meeting on the budget due to the recent  
30 holiday schedule changes. She is going to make every effort to arrive at this meeting later and she  
31 asked to have the report moved to the end of the meeting. The second change is Meg Williams from  
32 the GSA was going to present a report and has asked that it be postponed to the October 26<sup>th</sup>  
33 meeting. In place of this, I have asked that Acting Assistant Dean Robert Cowan, who spent time  
34 on the UFS Committee on Education in the Prisons, present a report on the work that they have  
35 done on educating individuals in prison. The Robert Rules of Order require the agenda to be  
36 circulated in advance but also allows the agenda to be changed before or at the meeting.  
37

38 "The second issue that I wanted to raise regards debate on any particular item. Debate will not be  
39 moderated by the person raising the issue, but by myself as chair. Roberts Rules of Order and  
40 CUNY typically follow the rule that a debate speaker can speak for no longer than two minutes.  
41 Individuals are not allowed to speak more than two times on a matter, and speaking preference is  
42 given to new members. I will exercise some discretion on the rule because I like to keep the flow  
43 and continuity on deliberation. We will try to respect this framework.  
44

45 Time limits are another issue that I would like to address. We can impose time limits on debates or  
46 reports. We try to organize the agenda with times limits in mind and plan the agenda with this in  
47 mind. If we want to change or limit debate time, it requires a two-thirds vote and calling the  
48 question on a matter also requires a two-thirds vote.  
49  
50

54 “Finally, I would like to talk about the difference between new business and old business. When an  
55 item is introduced under old business, the body has already seen the issue in the current form from  
56 a previous meeting. With new business, it typically is the first time an item is being presented or  
57 has been changed in a way that requires it to be newly submitted, and the body is allowed to ask  
58 questions of clarification on it. Action is on hold until the follow meeting when it will come back as  
59 old business to be debated and a decision made on it.”

60  
61 Professor Wallach asked why the resolution he was sponsoring was listed under new business and  
62 Professor DeGloma informed him that the old resolution presented was sent back to the  
63 Administrative Committee and they had not yet met to discuss it. Because the revised resolution is  
64 not the same as that which was sent back to the administrative committee, and it was not circulated  
65 10 days in advance of this Senate meeting, it is now New Business and needs to be treated as such.  
66 Therefore, it is listed under new business and will be introduced to the body today at which time  
67 only questions of clarification and procedure can be asked. At the October 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, it will  
68 come up under old business where debate can take place, amendments can be made, and the  
69 resolution can be acted upon.

70  
71 A motion was made to move the resolution on the agenda to point six and received a second.  
72 A voice vote was inconclusive, and professor DeGloma requested a vote by clicker take place, and  
73 the results were as follows: 47 for, 11 against, and 22 abstentions.

74  
75 The motion to move the revised resolution up failed as a majority of 51 was not obtained.  
76 Senator Acampora made a point of order and informed the Chair that the Senate has a tradition of  
77 distinguishing between actions that need to follow this particular rule and housekeeping items that  
78 do not.

79  
80 Professor DeGloma said that given this information he would revise his call and said the motion  
81 would carry as a housekeeping item, which only requires a majority vote of those present.

82  
83 **Old Business: Report by the Committee on Academic Freedom**

84  
85 Professor Sarah Chinn, Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom said the following:

86  
87 “I just have a brief report. I want to let the Senate know about the committee’s doings in the last  
88 senate year. We did three major pieces of work. We passed a new mission statement, and  
89 investigated two claims of violations of academic freedom. The first was dropped and the second is  
90 currently going through the resolution process.

91  
92 I want to read to you the updated mission statement since there are many new Senators and just say  
93 a few word about what my committee does:

94  
95 Academic freedom extends to all members of the Hunter College community. At its core, it  
96 constitutes the freedom to conduct research, teach, speak, and publish, subject to the norms and  
97 standards of scholarly inquiry, without interference or penalty, wherever the search for truth and  
98 understanding may lead. For faculty both individually and in the context of shared governance, it  
99 comprises the freedom, based on expertise in the field, to design and implement curriculum and  
100 evaluate colleagues within the structures elaborated by the CUNY Bylaws and the Hunter College  
101 Senate.

108 For instructors both part-time and full-time, it consists in teaching, evaluation of students, research,  
109 creative activity, and publication within their areas of expertise, as well as the freedom to speak  
110 extramurally. Academic freedom is of paramount importance in the realms of reappointment, tenure,  
111 and promotion. For students, academic freedom consists in the ability to be free within the  
112 classroom, laboratory, and other College spaces to express the widest range of viewpoints in accord  
113 with the standards of scholarly inquiry.

114  
115 The charge of the Hunter College Senate Standing Committee on Academic Freedom  
116 includes:

- 117 • To monitor, examine, and report annually to the Senate on the status of  
118 academic freedom at the College;
- 119 • To make appropriate recommendations regarding academic freedom policies  
120 and practices to the college's governance bodies and, as appropriate, through  
121 those bodies to the University Faculty Senate;
- 122 • To investigate possible violations of academic freedom.

123  
124 So we did a lot of points two and three last year and not much of number one. The committee,  
125 barring any issue, plans to organize a series of activities to educate the College community on  
126 academic freedom. I will say that we also investigate issues of violations of academic freedom and  
127 are versed in the AAUP process to adjudicate grievances. Please reach out to the committee if you  
128 have any concerns regarding a possible violation.”

129  
130 A Senator had a question regarding the status of the resolution passed last semester about Hiring  
131 Practices and asked if the subcommittee had met yet and what the membership slate is.

132  
133 Professor DeGloma informed the body that they have not met yet but will do so in the near future  
134 and a report from them will be forthcoming. The subcommittee is comprised of about a half dozen  
135 individuals, some from the Committee on Academic Freedom and Departmental Governance  
136 Committee and a few members at large.

137  
138  
139 **Report by the**  
140 **Administrative**  
141 **Committee:**

Professor DeGloma, presented the report as follows:

142 a) **Special Senate Election for Vacant At-large Seats**

143 In accordance with Article IV, 2H i & ii of the *Charter for a Governance of Hunter College*,  
144 the Administrative Committee is presenting the names of all nominees received to date:

145 Faculty at-Large: Janet Neary

146  
147 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee.

148  
149 The motion passed by voice vote without dissent.

150  
151  
152 **Report by the**  
153 **School of Arts**  
154 **& Sciences**  
155 **By-Laws**  
156 **Committee**

157 Professor Laura Keating provided a report on the work of the Art & Sciences By-Laws  
Committee. The report is attached as Appendix II.

161  
162 **New Business: Reintroduction of Revised Resolution on the CUNY Policy of Freedom of Expression and**  
163 **Expressive Conduct**

164  
165 Professor DeGloma informed the body that when a resolution is introduced as new business it  
166 becomes the property of the Senate. Between the period when a resolution is introduced and it  
167 appears next as old business, Senators can read it, discuss it and when it comes back up in old  
168 business after the deliberative process, it can be modified. This is not what happened with this  
169 resolution. Professor Wallach, working with the FDA, submitted a revised resolution. However, it  
170 was not theirs to revise as it belonged to the Administrative Committee. After discussion, the  
171 original author, is reintroducing it as new business. The body will entertain questions and  
172 clarification questions of the content of the resolution. At the following meeting, the body will  
173 debate and offer amendments.  
174

175 Professor Wallach said the following:

176 "The resolution is the same as the previous resolution with the only change being an amendment  
177 that streamlines the process. This is a statement by Hunter College to the CUNY Board of Trustees,  
178 which is in the process of crafting the Resolution on Freedom of Expression and Expressive  
179 Conduct, which will be presented at the January meeting and we would like to influence the  
180 process."  
181

182 Professor John Wallach presented the following resolution:  
183

184 **RESOLUTION ON BoT PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION**  
185 **AND EXPRESSIVE CONDUCT:**

186  
187 We, members of the Hunter College Senate, applaud the protections for freedom of speech and  
188 expressive conduct noted in the BoT's proposed new Freedom of Expression and Expressive  
189 Conduct policy.  
190

191 However, the proposed policy places its enforcement against "prohibited conduct" (described in  
192 Sections 2 & 3 of the BoT Resolution) solely in the hands of "the President [of each educational  
193 unit of CUNY] or his or her designee, in consultation with the Director of Public Safety or  
194 designee" [4.1], thereby excluding faculty, students, and staff from practical authority in  
195 determining violations of academic freedom, along with freedom of expression and expressive  
196 conduct.  
197

198 Insofar as the character of Hunter College as an academic institution is a *community* of  
199 administrators, faculty, staff, and students dedicated to advancing critical, historical, and scientific  
200 thinking, along with global learning, and the Senate is the most widely representative legislative  
201 body at Hunter, we believe that a Senate representative of these constituents of the college  
202 community ought to be officially involved in determining violations of the code of freedom of  
203 expression and expressive conduct.  
204

205 Because of the practical obstacles to having a range of representatives consulted, we recommend:

206  
207 -- that the Chair of the Hunter College Senate as a representative of the Hunter College community  
208 be officially involved, with the President and Director of Public Safety or their designees, in citing  
209 prohibited activities under this policy as members of a newly constituted  
210

211 **Minutes**  
212 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**  
213 **5 October 2016**

214 Freedom of Expression and Expressive Conduct Enforcement Committee, aka the FEECE  
215 Committee;

216  
217 -- that the Chair of the Senate make a report to the Senate of any enforcement against "prohibited  
218 conduct" authorized by the FEECE Committee.

219  
220 After a lengthy question and answer period Chair DeGloma announced that the body would  
221 proceed to the next item on the agenda.

222  
223  
224 **Report by Acting Assistant Dean Robert Cowan on CUNY's Work to Educate Prisoners**

225 Chair DeGloma invited Acting Assistant Dean Robert Cowan to present a report on the CUNY  
226 UFS Committee on Education in Prison. The Senate has requested a copy of his presentation.

227  
228  
229 **Report by the President and Provost on Middle State Evaluation**

230 The President and Provost gave a PowerPoint presentation on the upcoming Middle States  
231 Evaluation. The presentation is attached as Appendix III.

232  
233  
234 Due to the late hour, it was moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried, and the meeting  
235 adjourned at 5:22 PM.

236  
237  
238  
239 Respectfully submitted,

240  
241  
242 Dana Reimer  
243 Secretary

**APPENDIX I**

*The following attendance was noted from the meeting*

(A) =Alternate, A=Attended, X=Absent, E=Excused

Faculty					
AFPRL	Anthony Browne	A	Mathematics & Statistics	Sandra Clarkson	A
	Denis Milagros	(A) A		Verna Segarra	A
		(A)		Pat Burke	(A) X
Anthropology	Jackie Brown	A	Medial Laboratory Sciences	Rob Thompson	(A) A
	Mike Steiper	(A) X		Chad Euler	A
	Marc Edelman	(A) X		Robert Raffaniello	(A) X
Art & Art History	Lynda Klich	E	Music	Dean Johnston	(A) X
	Paul Ramirez Jonas	X		Jewel Thompson	A
	Susanna Cole	(A) A			(A)
Biological Sciences	Nebahat Avcioglu	(A) X	School of Nursing	Michele Cabrini	(A) X
	Derrick Brazill	A		Christine Ganzer	X
	Shirley Raps	A		Abigail Kotowski	X
	Paul Feinstein	(A) X		Lynda Olender	(A) X
Chemistry	Maria Pereira	(A) X	Philosophy	Omar Dahbour	X
	Akira Kawamura	A		Laura Keating	(A) A
	Gabriela Smeureanu	(A) X		Christa Acampora	(A) A
Classical & Oriental Studies	Nancy Grennbaum	(A) X	Physics & Astronomy		
	Joanne Spurza	A		Ying Chen	(A) X
	David Petrain	(A) X		Kelle Cruz	(A) A
Computer Science	Alex Elinson	(A) X	Political Science	Jill Schwedler	A
	Lie Xie	A		John Wallach	(A) A
	Felisa Vasquez-Abad	(A) X		Michael Lee	(A) A
Curriculum & Teaching		(A)	Psychology	Roseanne Flores	X
	Jody Polleck	X		Joseph Lao	A
	Jason Wirtz	A		Peter Serrano	(A) A
	Stephen Demeo	(A) X		Peter Moller	(A) X
Dance	Ben Shuldiner	X	Physical Therapy	Herb Karpatkin	X
	David Capps	A			(A)
	Betsy Cooper	(A) X		Milo Lipovac	(A) X
Economics	Kathleen Isaac	(A) X	Romance Languages	Julie Van Peteghem	X
	Avi Liveson	A		Rolando Perez	(A) X
	Tim Goodspeed	X		Monica Schinaider	(A) X
	John Li	(A) X		Terry Mizrahi	X
Educational Foundations & Cou		(A)	School of Social Work		
	Veronica Muller	A		Samuel Aymer	(A) X
	Alexander Fietzer	(A) A			(A)
English	Janet Neary	(A) A	Sociology	Mark Halling	A
	Leigh Jones	X		Mike Benediktsson	(A) X
	Sarah Chinn	A		Michaela Soyer	(A) X
Film & Media Studies	John Keegan	(A) X	Special Education	Elizabeth Klein	A
		(A)		Jennifer Klein	A
	Larry Shore	X		Kristen Hodnett	(A) X
	Sissel McCarthy	(A) A		Donald Vogel	(A) X
Geography	Isabel Pinedo	(A) X	Speech-Language Pathology and Audiolo	Michelle MacRoy-Higgins	X
	Haydee Salmun	A		Carol Silverman	(A) X
	Jochen Albrecht	(A) A		Jonathan Kalb	A
German		(A)	Theatre		
	Elke Nicolai	A		Claudia Orenstein	(A) X
	Eckhard Kuhn-Osius	(A) A		Jill Gross	(A) X
History		(A)	Urban Policy and Planning	Stanley Moses	X
	Rick Belsky	A			(A)
	Manu Bhagavan	(A) E		School of Urban Public Health	Phil Alcabes
Library	Eduardo Contreras	A	Women & Gender Studies	Steven Trasino	X
	Mee' Len Hom	A		Jennifer Gaboury	(A) A
	Sarah Ward	A		Catherine Raissiguier	X
	Adina Mulliken	(A) A			
	Danise Hoover	(A) A			

**Students**

Darcie Dominianni	A
Maria Pia Sifuentes	X
Stephanie Barragan	A
Albiona Aga	X
Sandra-May Flowers	X
Mila Adelman	A
Joy Nuga	A
Sara Shanaj	A
Erica Fu	X
Noam Sohn	A
Shannon O'Rourke	A
Asheley Siewnarine	X
Demi Moore	A
Anna Ozbek	X
Sheana Budhoo	X
Stephany Graces	X
Samuel Genchikmakher	X
Ahmed Elsaeyed	X
Emaad Khwaja	X
Omar Elwany	X
Charles Bachmann	X
Mustafa Gadelrab	X
Jyothisraj Johnson	X
Sarah Lamsifer	A
Michael Mazzeo	A
Meghann Williams	A
Hieu Dang	X
Cara Fitzgerald	A
Melanie Lozier	X
Nicole Parker	X
Jawwaad Alam	A
Marie Mazzeo	X
Sarah Mathew	A
Elyas Amin	A
Edward Friedman	A
Adam Hobbins	X
Daniel Smith	X
Jennifer Uolla	X
Lena Suponya	X
Soumya Misra	A
Stephon Odom	X

**At-Large, Lecturers and Part-Time Faculty**

Student Services	Brain Maasjo	A
	Shannon Silenas	(A) X
Mathematics & Statistics	Bill Williams	A
Geography	Dana Reimer	A
Library	Jocelyn Berger-Barrera	A
Classical & Oriental Studies	Shawna Leigh	A
Medicial Lab Science	Hongxing Li	X
Philosophy	Ian Blecher	A
Dolciani Math Center	Barbara Barone	A
Sociology	Thomas DeGloma	A
Urban Affairs & Planning	Elaine Walsh	X
Urban Affairs & Planning	Laxmi Ramasubramanian	A
History	Bernadette McCauley	A
THHP	Sarah Janinsky	A

**Ex-Officio**

President, USG	Melany Balaguera	X
Vice President, Graduate Student Association		X
President Alumni Association	James Amodeo	X
President, HEO Forum	Denise Lucena-Jerez	X
President, CLT Council	Amy Jeu	X

**ADMINISTRATION**

<b>Senators:</b>		
HEO/CLA Representative	Marylin Daley-Weston	A
Vice President for Student Affairs	Eija Ayravainen	A
Vice President for Administration	Robert Pignatello	A
Provost, Acting	Lon Kaufman	A
Dean, School of Arts & Sciences	Andrew Polsky	A
<b>Alternate Senators (3):</b>		
Dean of Education	Michael Middleton	A
Special Counsel to the President & Dean	Laura Hertzog	A
School of Nursing	Dean Gail McCain	X

## Appendix II

### Report of the School of Arts and Science Bylaws Committee to the Senate – October 5, 2016

“I am Laura Keating, Associate Professor in the Philosophy Department, and Chair of the School of Arts and Sciences Bylaws drafting committee. Today I wanted to update the Senate on the status of our bylaws drafting process, which was started through a resolution passed by the Senate two years ago, in Fall 2014. We hope to release the preliminary draft soon and we anticipate through the subsequent consultation period to have extensive discussions with a variety of people and groups about the details of the draft and the ways it should be revised. So I won’t get into the content of the bylaws draft in this report; that should wait until people have had a chance to read the preliminary draft after it has been finalized by the committee.

“1. In order to refresh our institutional memory, I would like to begin by reminding people how this bylaws project arose out of the college’s strategic planning process and certain actions of the Senate, and so to make clear why this drafting process is taking place now and how the Senate has been involved so far.

“In April 2011, the Hunter College Strategic Plan for 2012-2020 was approved by the Senate. One of the “next steps” identified at the end of that plan, was that “our component schools and units should also engage in planning processes appropriate to their particular roles and missions” (p.18). It was in fulfilling that next step in the college strategic planning process that gaps in the governance structure of the School of Arts and Sciences and the need for bylaws became apparent. Yes, some aspects of school governance are clear. The governance of the school curriculum committee is specified to a large extent in the Hunter College Governance Charter, and the structure and procedures of the three school P&B committees are spelled out in the 1997 Board of Trustees resolution that established the school, as well as in other college and university documents governing appointments, tenure and promotion. When President Caputo proposed the new School of Arts and Science in 1997, he proposed certain other committees to be set up, including an Interdisciplinary Program Council and a Council of Chairs that would advise the Dean at meetings of the School Advisory Committee chaired by the Dean. (Eventually, the Interdisciplinary Program Council stopped meeting and the Council of Chairs stopped meeting independently of the Advisory Committee until it was revived in Fall 2014.) When the school was established in 1998, no bylaws were drawn up to formally establish these committees or any other governance structure for determining school policies and procedures outside the purview of the curriculum and P&B committees and the administrative prerogatives of the Dean. So when in Fall 2011 and after, when the school was faced with the task of developing a school strategic plan and an implementation plan for that strategic plan, the lack of any set process for establishing faculty committees in the school and the lack of a specified procedure for the school faculty to ratify any planning, policy, or procedural document came to the fore. For both the Strategic Plan and the Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan, drafting and ratification had to be done through ad-hoc processes. For the Strategic Plan, a consultation process started in January 2013 after the issue of a preliminary draft by a Dean-selected committee. After the committee issued a revised version of the plan in March 2013, each department voted on the plan at its March department meeting, and then at the April 2013 meeting of the School Advisory Committee, department chairs participated in a final ratification vote. For the Implementation Plan of the Strategic Plan, there again was a drafting, consultation, and revision process carried out by a Dean-selected committee. This time ratification took place only through a vote of each department, held at its May 2014 department meeting, with the department’s vote reported directly to the Dean.

“While the Implementation Plan was approved by a majority of Arts & Sciences departments (15 of 24), almost a third (7) of the departments chose the option “not ready to vote.” This caused some uncertainty among some faculty about the Implementation Plan ratification process and again highlighted the gaps in the school governance structure. This eventually led to the issue of the governance of the School of Arts and Sciences being raised by Professor John Wallach and others on the floor of the Senate in October 2014 – details of which I won’t rehash here. But that did result, at the November 19, 2014, Senate meeting, in the presentation of a resolution by Professor Sarah Chinn, that the Administrative Committee of the Senate set up an ad hoc committee to create procedural guidelines for the drafting of bylaws for the School of Arts & Sciences. This resolution was approved by the Senate at that meeting. The ad hoc committee was formed in February 2015, and was chaired by Professor Tom DeGloma, who presented a draft of those guidelines to the Senate on April 15, and then a revision on May 4, 2015.

“The bylaws drafting committee was subsequently established at the end of the Fall 2015 semester by the Senate Nominating Committee and the Arts and Sciences Advisory Committee working together to collect nominations and finalize membership according to the recommendations of the Senate Ad hoc committee. That committee consisted of

“The Dean, Andrew Polsky

Seven faculty representatives from the Arts and Sciences:

Anthony Browne (Africana & Puerto Rican/Latino Studies)

Alexander Elinson (Classics, Arabic Studies)

Mande Holford (Chemistry)

Laura Keating (Philosophy)

Neepa Maitra (Physics)

Bernadette McCauley (History)

Elke Nicolai (German)

One HEO representative: Sarah Jeninsky (Thomas Hunter Honors Program)

Two full-time students: David Kanbergs and Faiyaz Rahman

One non-voting representative of the Senate Departmental Governance Committee: Joseph Lao (Psychology)

“This Fall the member from Classics reported to me that he would not be able to attend meetings this semester and the Senate Nominating Committee selected a replacement, Professor Avi Liveson (Economics) from its pool of nominations. That ends a brief history of how the committee and its charge have come about. In the rest of the report I just want to briefly describe the process and the plans of the committee.

“2. The SAS Bylaws Drafting Committee first convened on January 28, 2016 to elect a chair and start the drafting process. We had eleven meetings from February to May in Spring 2016 and have had three meetings this September. I would like to thank the committee members for all their hard work and support, including the material support given by the Dean who provided meeting space, coffee, and snacks.

“3. After some initial drafting, in the Spring of 2016, we consulted various people as we encountered particular issues and questions.

“From Arts & Sciences, we consulted department chairs on some key parts of earlier drafts at two meetings of the School Advisory Committee in April and May 2016, and at a meeting of the Council of Chairs in May. In accordance with the recommended guidelines of the Senate Ad hoc committee, in April, we consulted the program heads and directors of all the non-departmental interdisciplinary programs in the School of Arts and Sciences, including Asian American Studies, Jewish Studies, Human Rights, Human Biology, Religion, and Public Policy. In addition, we consulted the heads of Thomas Hunter Honors Program and the Macaulay Honors College at Hunter, who utilize Arts & Sciences faculty and courses. For all, we asked questions concerning the nature of the governance of their program, the approval path for the program’s curriculum, where they would want a voice for the program in Arts and Sciences faculty or school committees, and what school mechanisms would better support their programs.

“We also gathered information on other programs in the college that utilize Arts & Sciences faculty and courses, including certain financial aid programs such as MARC and the Freshman Scholars Programs (which include the Roosevelt, Yalow, Muse, and Athena programs).

“Other people consulted were with the chair of the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee of the Senate, the past two Chairs and the present Chair of the Hunter Senate, the Provost, the Registrar’s Office, PSC-CUNY, the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs, and both Hunter and CUNY legal counsel. Additional members of the HEO Forum were consulted as well as some staff of Arts and Sciences.

“Let me stop briefly here to note that in addition to learning about specific interdepartmental programs, the committee tried to get clear on the general structure of interdepartmental program governance at Hunter. We discovered that there are no explicit documented policies at the Senate level on program governance. Yet, as we also learned, CUNY leaves the governance of interdepartmental interdisciplinary courses of study to be worked out by the individual CUNY campuses. It is very clear that the Hunter Senate does have certain standards for program governance in mind when considering proposals for interdepartmental courses of study, but these are not explicit in the Senate’s curriculum procedures nor in the Hunter College Governance charter. The bylaw committee believes that this gap in governance at the college needs to be addressed as soon as possible given the importance of interdisciplinary program development in the Hunter College Strategic plan.

“4. We are now very near to completing a draft that would be ready as a “first draft” for consideration by the school and we hope to distribute it by next week to all Arts and Science departments and faculty for feedback as well as other stakeholders (such as staff of SAS, all programs heads and directors of the interdepartmental programs mentioned above, student government associations, and the HEO forum), including members of the Senate.

“5. We are still working on the consultation plan, but following the recommendations of the Senate Ad hoc committee, there will probably be several public meetings, including meetings with specific targeted groups, as well as some way people can submit feedback electronically. We hope to announce the consultation plan by the end of next week.

“That ends my report. Before I take any questions, as a Senator, I would like to point out that the School of Arts and Sciences is the first school that is a division - according to the definitions of the College Governance Charter - to draft bylaws, and the process for the ratification of divisional bylaws is not explicit in the Hunter College Governance Charter. In giving their recommendations, the Senate Ad hoc committee stated that “The SAS Bylaws must be ultimately ratified by the College Senate.” I would like to request now at the beginning of this process for establishing the bylaws for the School of Arts and Sciences that the Senate Chair explain the role that the Senate will play in this process”.

Appendix III  
Report by the President and Provost on Middle State Evaluation

# HUNTER

---

Hunter College of the City University of New York, a distinguished public university, values learning in the liberal arts and sciences as a cornerstone of individual development and a vital foundation for a more just and inclusive society. Continuing our long tradition of expanding opportunity, we seek students from all backgrounds to engage in a rigorous educational experience that prepares them to become leaders and innovators in their communities and in the world. Hunter also contributes to intellectual discourse by supporting excellent scholarship and creative activity by its accomplished faculty.

Hunter undergraduate, graduate, and professional curricula challenge students to think critically - to approach problems from multiple perspectives, distinguish the questions each raises, and recognize the kinds of evidence each values. The College's academic programs stress the significance of human diversity, emphasize research and artistic creation, and invite students to extend their education beyond campus. We cultivate the qualities our graduates need to thrive in their chosen careers and make a difference as active citizens.

We embrace our setting at the heart of New York City - we seek to draw on its energy, capitalize on its remarkable resources, weave it into the fabric of our teaching, research, and creative expression, and give back to it through our service and citizenship.

# HUNTER

---

*The Care of the Future is Mine*

## **MIDDLE STATES ACCREDITATION**

---

Middle States Accreditation is an expression of confidence in an institution's mission and goals, its performance and its resources.

## **MIDDLE STATES ACCREDITATION**

---

Middle States Accreditation is an expression of confidence in an institution's mission and goals, its performance and its resources.

## MIDDLE STATES ACCREDITATION

---

### Fifteen items for eligibility

- The institution has a mission statement and related goals, approved by its governing board...
- The institution systematically evaluates its education and other programs...
- The institution's student learning programs and opportunities are characterized by rigor coherence and appropriate assessment of student achievement throughout the educational offering, regardless of certificate or degree level of delivery and instructional modality.
- Institutional planning integrates goals for academic and institutional effectiveness and improvement, student achievement of educational goals, student learning, and the results of academic and institutional assessments.
- The institution has documented financial resources, funding base and plans for financial development...

## MIDDLE STATES ACCREDITATION

---

### Seven Standards

## Standard 1: Mission and Goals

---

“The institution’s mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.”

## Standard 1: Mission and Goals

---

- Developed collaboratively
- Approved by the governing body
- Evaluated periodically
- Publicized and widely known
- Goals focused on student learning
- Supported

## Standard 2: Ethics and Integrity

---

“Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies and represent itself truthfully.

## Standard 2: Ethics and Integrity

---

- Commitment to academic freedom
- Culture of respect for diversity
- Fair hiring practices
- Affordability and accessibility
- Compliance with government policies

### Standard 3: Student Learning Experience

---

“An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence at all program, certificate, and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, level and settings are consistent with higher education examples.”

### Standard 3: Student Learning Experience

---

- Learning experiences are assessed
- Academic programs clearly described (catalog)
- General Education experience
- A curriculum consistent with mission
- Periodic assessment of programs

## Standard 4: Support of Student Experience

---

“Across all educational experiences, settings, instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences and goals are congruent with its mission and offerings. The institution commits to support retention, persistence completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professors which enhances the quality of the learning environment, contributes to the educational experience and fosters student success.”

## Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness

---

“Assessment of student learning and achievement demonstrates that the institution’s students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their programs of student, degree level, institutions’ mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education.”

## Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness

---

- Clearly stated educational goals at institutional and degree program levels with relevant educational experiences and with the institution's mission
- Assessment of learning goals
- Use of assessment for improvement

## Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness

---

- Clearly stated educational goals at institutional and degree program levels with relevant educational experiences and with the institution's mission
- Assessment of learning goals
- Use of assessment for improvement

## Standard 6: Planning, Resources, Improvement

- Institutional and unit objectives that are assessed, mission-linked and used for resources allocation
- Planning and resource allocation is mission based.
- Budget process; Human resources

## Standard 7: Governance, Leadership, Admin

“The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies it serves.”

## Standard 7: Governance, Leadership, Admin

- Clear and transparent governing structure
- Appropriate governance body
- CEO credentials, authority, responsibility
- Appropriate administration structure
- Periodic assessment of the effectiveness of governance, leadership & administration

## MIDDLE STATES ACCREDITATION

### Self Study

## SELF STUDY

---

**Oct 31 – Nov 1, 2016**

Two persons from the campus attend the  
Middle States Self Study Institute

- Provost, Assessment Liaison Officer or co-Chair
- Training on the new standards
- Training about the new process

## SELF STUDY

---

**Fall/Spring 2016-17**

President appoints the Steering Committee

- co-Chairs; Members
- Steering Committee organizes the Self Study process
- Proposes the Self Study design
- Approval by President
- Approval by Hunter's MSCHE VP (visit to campus)
- Assignment of working groups

## SELF STUDY

---

### Spring/Fall 2017-18

#### Working Groups move forward

- Campus conversations
- Meetings with stakeholders
- Report regularly to the Steering Committee

## SELF STUDY

---

### Spring/Fall 2017-18

- Assessment committee – program learning outcomes
- Hunter Strategic plan progress
- Schools' strategic plan progress
- General education assessment
- Campus learning outcomes and assessment
- Campus master plan –
- Institutional learning outcomes –
- Assessment of admin units with respect to Intuitional learning outcomes and strategic plan.

## SELF STUDY

---

### Fall/Spring 2018-19

Steering Committee develops draft Self Study  
Final draft is approved by the President  
Institution disseminates the Self Study  
Reported electronically to Middle States

## MIDDLE STATES ACCREDITATION

---

### Team Visit

## TEAM VISIT

---

### Spring 2019

#### Campus Prep

- Mock visit
- Resource "Room"
- Logistics (hotels, travel, escorts, meals, computers, etc.)

#### Visit

- Executive report on exit

Final Team report is sent to the President