

MINUTES

Meeting of the Hunter College Senate

9 November 2022

1 The 671st meeting of the Hunter College Senate convened at 4:00 PM in HW 714.

2
3 **Presiding:** Laura S. Keating, 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 for in-
8 person meetings, and they were enabled to vote using iClicker.

9
10 **Agenda:** The agenda was adopted as distributed.

11
12 **Report by the**
13 **Administrative**
14 **Committee:**

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

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

18
19 Students: Cezar Torio (Human Biology)
20 Ermina Chowdhury (Undecided)
21 Sitora Akhadova (History)
22 Olivia Massey (Political Science, English Lit)
23 Alston Jiang (Undeclared)
24 Veronica Witkowski (History, Biochemistry)
25 Xin Huang (Biochemistry)
26 Madeline Zeron (Human Biology/ Thomas Hunter Scholar)
27 Maisha Mohosheen (Biochemistry)
28 Lorraine Santana (Biological Sciences)
29 Ramisha Parvez (Biological Sciences)
30 Elee Ballinger (Undeclared)
31 Nethya Samarakkodige (Political Science)
32 Sanzida Mohsin (Political Science and Media Studies)
33 Karlamarie Batista (Biology)
34 Irene Akintimehin (Human Biology)
35 Sarah Roberts (Undeclared)
36 Nusrat Jahan (Psychology)
37 Aliyah Ghany (Undeclared)
38 Vianny Cabral (Psychology)

39
40 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominees. The
41 motion carried by unanimous consent.

42
43 b) **Extraordinary Circumstance and Remote Participation**

44 Chair Keating said the following:

45
46 “On October 24, the Board of Trustees did pass a resolution authorizing that ‘all units and
47 committees’ of the CUNY colleges falling under the Open Meetings Law may in their discretion
48 use videoconferencing to allow remote participation by members at a meeting who are unable to
49 be physically present due to extraordinary circumstances. They also established the policy that
50 specifies the procedures units must follow if they decide to use videoconferencing in that way.
51 At our October 12 meeting, we had anticipated presenting a resolution at today’s meeting
52 adopting that remote option and we had asked permission from you for Senate committees to use

57 it for meetings between October 25 and today. Today the Administrative Committee met with
58 Malkie Schwartz and Sue Piper from Hunter Legal to go over the policy and procedures that we
59 must follow in implementing that extraordinary circumstances option. In our discussion, we
60 realized that there are several issues that the Senate should consider and discuss before we act
61 formally. So rather than forwarding anything today, we are putting on the November 30 agenda
62 a committee of the whole discussion on the nature and consequences of such a policy for either
63 the Senate assembly or Senate committees. We will be sending out the resolution and policy with
64 the meeting materials for November 30 and putting it up on the website. Till the Senate has had
65 a chance to discuss the BOT policy, we will require committees to meet in person. All members
66 that would be participating in a meeting as a member – voting and counting toward a quorum –
67 need to be physically present. We will still have a Zoom link for committees that have invited
68 guests attend. Members that cannot attend in person may Zoom in, but then they are like any
69 observer and cannot vote or have a right to speak.”
70

71
72 **Committee**
73 **Report:**

Nominating Committee

74 On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Chair Keating presented a report.
75

76
77 The Nominating Committee is submitting the following nominations for seats currently vacant on
78 Senate Committees:
79

80 **1. GRADUATE COURSE OF STUDENT & ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS**
81 **COMMITTEE**

82 Faculty Alternate: Lauren Schnell (Special Education)

83
84 **2. UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE**

85 Humanities & Arts: Milagros Denis-Rosario (AFPRL)

86
87 **3. COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY**

88 Student: Anastasia Villarreal (Philosophy)

89
90 **4. COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET**

91 Faculty from Humanities and Arts: Gerald Press (Philosophy)
92 Student: Julian Reich (History and Political Science)
93 Isabella Grullon (Political Science)

94
95 **5. COMMITTEE ON THE CALENDAR**

96 Student: Nusrat Jahan (Psychology)
97 Alternate: Rida Akhlaq (Biology)

98
99 **6. COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY**

100 Student: Anastasia Villarreal (Philosophy)

101
102 **7. GRADE APPEAL COMMITTEE**

103 Student: Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez (Public Health)
104 Student Alternate: Rida Akhlaq (Biology)

105
106 **8. MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE**

107 Student Alternate: Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez (Public Health)

108
109 **9. COMMITTEE ON THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

110 Student: Nusrat Jahan (Psychology)
111
112

117 Olivia Massey (Political Science, English Lit)

118
119 **10. COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING & TECHNOLOGY**

120 Student: Umar Faruque (Computer Science)

121
122 **11. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

123 HEO Representative: Sarah Jeninsky (THHP)

124 Student: Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez (Public Health)

125 Anastasia Villarreal (Philosophy)

126
127 **12. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION**

128 Student: Olivia Massey (Political Science, English Lit)

129
130 **13. COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION**

131 At-Large Student: Antisar Saeed (Human Biology)

132
133 **14. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT SUCCESS**

134 Student: Anastasia Villarreal (Philosophy)

135 Madeline Zeron (Human Biology)

136 Student Alternate: Kylie Klapp (Political Science)

137 Lorraine Santana (Biological Sciences)

138
139 **15. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE**

140 Student: Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez (Public Health)

141 Rida Akhlaq (Biology)

142 Ronette Johnson (Psychology)

143 Sitara Akhadova (History)

144 Ermina Chowdhury (Undecided)

145 Amanda Nunez (Political Science)

146 Isabella Grullon (Political Science)

147
148 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominees. The motion
149 carried by unanimous consent.

150
151 **Undergraduate Academic Requirements Committee**

152 Chair Keating called on Professor Kevin Sachs, Chair of the Undergraduate Academic Requirements
153 Committee, to reintroduce the **Resolution on Double Counting of Courses Between or Among Majors**
154 **at Hunter College**. Debate followed.

155
156 **RESOLUTION ON DOUBLE COUNTING OF COURSES BETWEEN OR AMONG MAJORS**
157 **AT HUNTER COLLEGE**

158
159 **RESOLVED, that as of the Fall 2023 semester, the following policy shall be implemented:**

160
161 “Policy on Double Counting Between or Among Multiple Majors

162
163 Courses may satisfy the requirements of more than one major. Double counting between or among
164 majors occurs when a student uses a course or courses to count towards the credit requirements of
165 more than one declared major. When double counting is allowed, the student does not need to take
166 additional courses to reach the required number of credits in the major.

167
168 After approval through curricular governance procedures of the Hunter College Senate, departments
169 or programs may allow double counting in their major programs. This means that a department or
170 program may allow courses already allowed in the major to count towards the major’s credit
171 requirements when students declared in the major(s) are also counting those courses towards the
172 credit requirements of other declared major(s).

173 **Minutes**
 174 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
 175 **9 November 2022**

176
 177 A student is allowed to double count courses between or among majors if and only if such double
 178 counting is allowed by all the majors for which the student has declared and towards which the credits
 179 apply.

180
 181 If any department or program for which the student has declared a major and towards which the
 182 credits apply does not have an approved policy that allows double counting of courses between or
 183 among majors, then double counting is not allowed. The student who uses the course(s) to satisfy the
 184 requirements of more than one major must take additional courses as approved by the major
 185 department(s) or program(s) to reach the required number of credits in each major.”

186
 187
 188 **RESOLVED, that as of the Fall 2023 semester, the following policy shall be reflected in the**
 189 **Hunter College Undergraduate Catalog:**

190
 191 “Policy on Double Counting Between or Among Multiple Majors

192
 193 Courses may satisfy the requirements of more than one major. Double counting between or among
 194 majors occurs when a student uses a course or courses to count towards the credit requirements of
 195 more than one declared major. When double counting is allowed, the student does not need to take
 196 additional courses to reach the required number of credits in the major.

197
 198 A student is allowed to double count courses between or among majors if and only if such double
 199 counting is allowed by all the majors for which the student has declared and towards which the credits
 200 apply.

201
 202 If any department or program for which the student has declared a major and towards which the
 203 credits apply does not have an approved policy that allows double counting of courses between or
 204 among majors, then double counting is not allowed. The student who uses the course(s) to satisfy the
 205 requirements of more than one major must take additional courses as approved by the major
 206 department(s) or program(s) to reach the required number of credits in each major.”

207
 208
 209 Voting by iClicker produced the following results: 63 in favor, four against, and two abstentions.
 210 The Resolution passed.

211
 212
 213 **Old**
 214 **Business:**

215 **Grade Appeals Committee**

216 Chair Keating called on Professor Lawrence Shore, member of the Grade Appeals Committee, to
 217 summarize the main changes in the **Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures**. The revised procedures
 218 are in Appendix II. Debate followed.

219 A motion was made and seconded to amend part I. Appeal at the Department/Program (or School) Level,
 220 Step 4: Written Report of Decision as follows:

221
 222 The committee chair will submit the report to the department chairperson who will send it to the parties
 223 involved as soon as possible. At the discretion of the department, the Department Chair can
 224 designate the chair of the Grade Appeals Committee to send the report to the parties.

225
 226 A motion was made and seconded to amend the first sentence of the proposed amendment so that the
 227 deadline for department chair sending the report to the involved parties be two weeks of receipt, that is,
 228 specifically, to amend the first sentence as follows:

229
 230 The committee chair will submit the report to the department chairperson who will send it to the parties
 231 involved as soon as possible within two weeks of receipt.

232

237 The secondary amendment carried by unanimous consent.
238

239 The chair asked for further secondary amendments with regard to timing issues involved in the proposed
240 amendment and that the issue of the Department Chair designee be dealt with after timing issues are
241 settled. There was no objection. A motion was made and seconded to amend the proposed amendment
242 with regard to the timing for when the committee chair will submit the report to the department
243 chairperson – that it be within two weeks of the hearing – and so, specifically, to amend the above just
244 amended sentence to read as follows:
245

246 The committee chair will submit the report to the department chairperson within two weeks of the
247 hearing. ~~who~~ The Department Chair will send it to the parties involved within two weeks of receipt.
248

249 The secondary amendment passed by unanimous consent.
250

251 The primary amendment on the floor, amended as above, was as follows:
252

253 The committee chair will submit the report to the department chairperson within two weeks of the
254 hearing. ~~who~~ The Department Chair will send it to the parties involved within two weeks of receipt.
255 At the discretion of the department, the Department Chair can designate the chair of the Grade
256 Appeals Committee to send the report to the parties.
257

258
259 A motion was made by the person who originally proposed the primary amendment to withdraw the
260 sentence below from the amendment:
261

262 At the discretion of the department, the Department Chair can designate the chair of the Grade
263 Appeals Committee to send the report to the parties.
264

265 The motion to withdraw carried by unanimous consent.
266

267 The primary amendment, so amended, was on the floor:
268

269 The committee chair will submit the report to the department chairperson within two weeks of the
270 hearing. ~~who~~ The Department Chair will send it to the parties involved within two weeks of receipt.
271

272 There was no further secondary amendment on the primary amendment. The primary amendment to part
273 I. Appeal at the Department/Program (or School) Level, Step 4 passed by unanimous consent and became
274 part of the main motion.
275

276 A motion was made and seconded to correct bullet point “c” in the Notes Re: Department/School Appeal
277 section of Part I of the Grade Appeals Procedures to comply with the Hunter P/NC policy:
278

- 279 c. A letter grade may not be changed to Pass/No Credit, ~~and P/NC grades may not be~~
280 ~~changed to letter grades~~ unless a student has requested it before the end of the semester.
281

282 The motion carried by unanimous consent.
283
284

285 There was a request to the Grade Appeals Committee to create a timeline of the grade appeal process. The
286 timeline does not require Senate approval.
287
288

289 A motion was made and seconded to amend in part II. Appeal at the Senate Level, Step 3: Senate Grade
290 Appeal Hearings as follows:
291
292

293 **Minutes**
294 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
295 **9 November 2022**
296

297 The Chair of the Committee shall inform all parties concerned (i.e. student, instructor, department chair,
298 registrar) of its decision in writing within two weeks of the decision.

299 The motion carried by unanimous consent.
300
301

302
303 A motion was made and seconded to correct bullet point “b” in the Notes re: Senate Grade Appeal, in part
304 II, to comply with the Hunter P/NC policy:

- 305
- 306 b. The Senate Grade Appeals Committee may not accept appeals (a) in cases where a charge
307 of academic dishonesty is pending, or (b) concerning changes from a letter grade to
308 Pass/No Credit ~~or changes from P/NC to letter grades.~~
- 309

310 The motion carried by unanimous consent.
311

312
313 There was no further amendment or discussion of the proposed Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures
314 and the Chair proceeded to the vote.
315

316 Voting by iClicker produced the following results: 63 in favor, two against, and one abstention.
317 The Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures passed.
318

319
320
321 The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 PM.
322

Respectfully submitted,

323
324
325
326 Sarah Jeninsky
327 Secretary

APPENDIX I

The following attendance was noted from the meeting

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

Faculty					
AFPRL	Anthony Browne	X	Mathematics & Statistics	Sandra Clarkson	X
	Milagros Denis-Rosario	(A) A			0
	Lázaro Lima	(A) X		Robert Thompson	(A) X
Anthropology	Jackie Brown	A		Barry Cherkas	(A) X
	Stephanie Levy	(A) A	Medical Laboratory Sciences	Abigail Morales	A
	Milena Shattuck	(A) A		Chad Euler	(A) X
Art & Art History	Harper Montgomery	A		Muktar Mahajan	(A) X
	Chitra Ganesh	A	Music	Michele Cabrini	A
	Emily Braun	(A) X		L. Poundie Burstein	(A) X
	A. K. Burns	(A) X			(A)
Biological Sciences	Ben Ortiz	A	School of Nursing	Carolyn Sun	X
	Jesus Angulo	E		William Samuels	X
	Paul Feinstein	(A) X		Stephen Yermal	X
	Carmen Melendez	(A) X		So-Hyun Park	(A) A
Chemistry	Gabriela Smeureanu	A	Philosophy	Laura Keating	A
	Nancy Greenbaum	(A) A		Frank Kirkland	(A) X
	Brian Zeglis	(A) X		Omar Dahbour	(A) X
	Nadya Kobko-Litskevitch	X	Physics & Astronomy	Kelle Cruz	A
Classical & Oriental Studies	Yasha Klots	X		Yuhang Ren	(A) X
	Fang Dai	(A) X			(A)
	Doron Friedman	(A) A	Political Science	Robert Jenkins	X
Computer Science	Sven Dietrich	X		Lina Newton	(A) X
	Felisa Vazquez-Abad	(A) A		Michael Lee	(A) X
		(A)	Psychology	Roseanne Flores	A
Curriculum & Teaching	Laura Baecher	X		Michael Lewis	X
	Stephen Demeo	A		Glenn E Schafe	(A) X
		0 (A)		Peter Serrano	(A) X
	Tim Farnsworth	X	Physical Therapy	Jaya Rachwani	X
Dance	Maura Donohue	X		Milo Lipovac	(A) A
	David Capps	(A) X			(A)
		(A)	Romance Languages	Magdalena Perkowska	A
Economics	Tim Goodspeed	X			0 (A)
	Michelle Liu	A			0 (A)
		(A)	School of Social Work	Jonathan Prince	X
	Avi Liveson	(A) X		George Patterson	A
Educational Foundations & Couns	Sarah Bonner	X		Marina Lalayants	(A) X
	Jeanne Weiler	(A) A		Keith Chan	(A) X
	Markus Bidell	(A) X	Sociology	Mark Halling	X
English	Sarah Chinn	A		Mike Benediktsson	(A) X
	Amy Robbins	X		Michaela Soyer	(A) X
	Mark Miller	A	Special Education	vacant	
	Janet Neary	(A) A		Rhonda Bondie	(A) X
Film & Media Studies	Larry Shore	A		Kathryn Furlong	(A) X
			SLPA	Donald Vogel	E
	Martin Lucas	(A) A		Nancy Eng	(A) X
	Ricardo Miranda	(A) X		JungMoon Hyun	(A) X
Geography & Environmental Sci	Allen Frei	A	Theatre	Louisa Thompson	A
	William Solecki	(A) X			0
		(A)		Claudia Orenstein	(A) X
German	Elke Nicolai	A	Urban Policy and Planning	Lily Baum Pollans	A
	Eckhard Kuhn-Osius	(A) E		Victoria Johnson	(A) X
	Aine Zimmerman	(A) A		vacant	(A)
History	D'Weston Haywood	X	School of Urban Public Health	Susan Cardenas	A
	Manu Bhagavan	(A) X		Khursheed Navder	(A) A
	Aaron Welt	A		Steven Trasino	(A) A
Library	Iris Finkel	E	Women & Gender Studies	Jennifer Gaboury	A
	vacant			Catherine Raissiguier	(A) X
	Mee' Len Horn	(A) A		Rupal Oza	(A) X
		(A)			

Students

Hunter Moran	A
Umar Faruque	A
Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez	A
Isabella Grullon	A
Nicole Palmetto	A
Rida Akhlaq	X
Ronette Johnson	A
Olivia Massey	A
Cezar Torio	X
Tabia Ahmed	X
Christopher Orzech	A
Sitora Akhadova	A
Ermina Chowdhury	A
Junia Sharmin	X
Ketia Newell	X
Viet Thanh Phan	E
Nourhan Ibrahim	A
Anastasia Villarreal	X
Sultana Wahab	X
Karlamarie Batista	X
Alston Jiang	X
Julian Reich	X
Cade Terada	X
Andrew Ackroyd	A
Vianny Cabral	X
Nethya Samarakkodig	A
Elee Ballinger	X
Ramisha Parvez	A
Lorraine Santana	A
Sanzida Mohsin	A
Irene Akintimehin	X
Sarah Roberts	A
Madeline Zeron	A
Xin Huang	A
Veronica Witkowski	A
Nusrat Jahan	A
Aliyah Ghany	A
Maisha Mohosheen	X

At-Large, Lecturers and Part-Time Faculty

Student Services	Burhan Siddiqui	A
	Luis Roldan	(A) X
Library	Jocelyn Berger-Barera	E
Library	Tony Doyle	A
Psychology	Stefan Schlussman	X
	0 vacant	
Medical Lab Science	Hongxing Li	A
Religion	Ron Long	A
Political Science	Rosa Squillacote	X
Special Education	Salvador Ruiz	X
Special Education	Gina Riley	A
	0 vacant	
THHP	Sarah Jeninsky	E
Art and Art History	Peter Dudek	X

Ex-Officio

President, USG	Ariana Ahmed	X
Vice President, GSA		0
President Alumni Association	Elizabeth Wilson-Anstey	X
President, HEO Forum	Abdul Hashim	X
President, CLT Council	Amy Jeu	X

ADMINISTRATION

Senators:		
HEO/CLA Representative	Lori Janowski	X
Vice President for Student Affairs	Eija Ayravainen	A
Provost	Manoj Pardasani	A
Dean, School of Arts & Sciences	Andrew Polsky	A
Dean of Education	Michael Middleton	X
Alternate Senators (3):		
Dean of Social Work	Mary Cavanaugh	X
General Counsel & Dean of Faculty	Suzanne Piper	X
Dean of Nursing	Elizabeth Capezuti	E

APPENDIX II

Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures

(Approved by the Hunter Senate 10/9/85, revised 5/04/2005, 3/25/15, 11/9/2022)

Scope of the Grade Appeal

The grade appeal process is designed to adjudicate the fairness of the final grade a student receives in a course. The appeals committees (see below) cannot alter the grade given by the instructor on a particular assignment. The appeals committee shall consider whether the instructor followed the grading criteria laid out in the course syllabus and whether the grading was arbitrary and capricious. (On occasion, an instructor may have good reason to alter a syllabus; in such cases, students must be informed in writing before the changes take effect.) A grade appeal should be limited to the grade that the student received. Other complaints about a course and/or an instructor should be raised in a timely manner (during the semester in which the course is given) to the department chair or program head.

I. Appeal at the Department/Program (or School) Level

Step 1: Student-Initiated Discussion with Instructor

When a student believes that a final grade was not graded correctly, they must first confer with the instructor, in person (or via Zoom), regarding the accuracy of the grade received. This conference should be held within the **first three weeks of the semester following receipt of the grade**. At this time errors may be corrected.

If the grade is not an error, the student and instructor must review together all class material pertinent to the grade.

Step 2: Student Request for Department/Program/School Grade Appeal

If the student is not satisfied, or if the instructor does not meet with the student within the first three weeks of the semester, the student should promptly contact the Department Chair/Program Director (or School Dean in units with no departments) by submitting a written appeal, a statement that presents the basis for the grade appeal. This appeal must be submitted **within the first five weeks of the semester following receipt of the grade**. The Department Chair/Program Director/School Dean shall be responsible for giving the student a copy of the *Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures* as set forth in this document.

Step 3: Department/School Grade Appeals Committee and Hearing

The Department Chair/Program Director/School Dean shall convene a Department/School Grade Appeal Committee of three members **within two weeks of receiving the appeal**. The student has the right to request in writing that the Chair appoint a student as a member of the Department/Program/School Grade Appeals Committee. The Committee (if not otherwise specified in the By-laws) shall consist of three full time members of the Department/School faculty, unless the student has requested that a student be appointed as the third member of the committee. The Department Chair shall designate one faculty member of the Committee as Chair, who will be responsible for gathering the pertinent materials from the student and instructor for review by the Committee. This should include the relevant work submitted by the student, the instructor's grading criteria for this course (including the course syllabus), course assignments, and the instructor's evaluation of the work submitted as well as any other pertinent evidence. All materials shall be shared with the other members of the committee.

The Department Grade Appeals Committee must notify the student and the instructor, in writing, that they have the right to appear, separately, before the committee. **Within three weeks of its appointment**, the Department Grade Appeals Committee will convene a closed hearing where both parties have the opportunity to testify separately.

Step 4: Written Report of Decision

**Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
9 November 2022**

After the hearing the committee will render its judgment and prepare a brief written report, written by the chair of the committee with the support of a majority of the committee, explaining the reasons for its ruling, and whether the decision was unanimous, without mentioning any names or details that might violate confidentiality. The committee chair will submit the report to the department chairperson within two weeks of the hearing. ~~who~~ The Department Chair will send it to the parties involved within two weeks of receipt. This will allow the losing party to make an informed decision as to whether to appeal to the Senate Grade Appeals Committee.

If neither party appeals to the Senate Grade Appeals Committee within the designated time frame (see below), the department chair will ensure, if required, that a change of grade was submitted to the registrar.

Notes Re: Department/School Appeal:

- a. No grade changes can be made after a degree has been officially conferred.
- b. If the instructor of the course in question is presently a Department Chair or the Director of a program, that person will designate another senior faculty member to form the department/program grade appeal committee and perform the duties otherwise assigned here to the chair/program director.
- c. A letter grade may not be changed to Pass/No Credit, ~~and P/NC grades may not be changed to letter grades~~ unless a student has requested it before the end of the semester.
- d. If a student is appealing a grade from an instructor who is absent the next semester, the chair will endeavor to be in contact with the instructor and gather all the relevant documentation as specified above. The instructor will also be invited to testify remotely

II. Appeal at the Senate Level

Step 1: Initiating Appeal at the Senate Level

In cases in which the student or the instructor is dissatisfied with the decision of the Department/School Grade Appeals Committee, they may appeal to the Senate Grade Appeals Committee. This appeal must be initiated within two weeks of having been notified of the Department/School decision.

The individual initiating the appeal must fill out a *Grade Appeals Form* that is available in the Senate Office--Room HE1018, stating the basis for the appeal. The individual should also submit to the Senate Office for the Senate Grade Appeals Committee all information that they believe relevant to the appeal.

Step 2: Senate Grade Appeal Set Up

Upon receipt of this material the Senate Grade Appeals Committee will request the Department/School to forward copies of the following for the Senate file:

1. Student's initial written complaint to Department Chair.
2. Written notice to student and instructor of right to appear before the Department/School Grade Appeals Committee and the student's right to request that the Department Chair appoint a student member to the Grade Appeals Committee.
3. All materials used by the Department/School Grade Appeals Committee in reaching a decision.
4. The course syllabus.
5. The report sent to the chair and the parties from the Department Grade Appeals Committee on the decision and the basis for it.

Step 3: Senate Grade Appeal Hearings

The Senate Grade Appeals Committee (consisting of 4 faculty members and 3 students with a quorum being 51% of the Committee) will then review all the relevant evidence. The Committee may interview the individuals involved in the grade appeal and other resource persons. It shall notify the student and the instructor of a scheduled committee meeting, thereby providing an opportunity for them to appear separately before the committee.

**Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
9 November 2022**

The Senate Grade Appeal Committee shall confine its consideration to whether the instructor applied the specified grading standards of the course, whether the grade was arbitrary and capricious, and whether the appeal process at the depart/program level was properly followed.

After considering the evidence, the Committee will meet in closed session and will reach a decision by majority vote. All proceedings are confidential. The Chair of the Committee shall inform all parties concerned (i.e. student, instructor, department chair, registrar) of its decision in writing **within two weeks of the decision**. **The decision of the Senate Grade Appeals Committee is final.**

Notes re: Senate Grade Appeal

- a. The Senate Grade Appeals Committee does not permit department grade appeals to be bypassed. The Senate Grade Appeals Committee reserves the right to send appeals back to the departmental level for reasons of significance (e.g., new evidence or testimony introduced).
- b. The Senate Grade Appeals Committee may not accept appeals (a) in cases where a charge of academic dishonesty is pending, or (b) concerning changes from a letter grade to Pass/No Credit **or changes from P/NC to letter grades**.

Rationale for Changes in Grade Appeal Procedures:

The rules and procedures for grade appeals must be fair and transparent. The current rules undermine due process. When a department grade appeal committee, through its chair, writes its report explaining the decision, this report is not made available to either party disputing the grade. Only the Department Grade Appeal Committee, the department chair, and the Senate Grade Appeal Committee (SGAC) see it. The student and instructor also need to see the report. This will help them make an informed decision as to whether to appeal or not. Putting together an appeal is time-consuming and it is valuable and reasonable to know why you lost so as to determine the grounds on which to appeal. The department grade committee chair can write the report to protect confidentiality by omitting all names and details of what transpired.

This procedural change will also improve the efficiency of the SGAC process. Currently, the committee hears a number of frivolous appeals because the parties do not know why they lost. In addition, because the party appealing to the SGAC has not seen the report, they usually spend valuable time in the hearings rearguing the case already heard at the department level where the committee has more subject matter expertise. A losing party who knows why they lost will be able to make a more focused appeal. And seeing the report, the student or instructor will be able to learn from the experience and adjust future behavior. Without seeing the department committee's reasons, a student or instructor can lose two appeals and never know why.

This new procedure will also protect against another problem- the overloading of the grade appeal process. In a number of grade appeal cases there are often other issues going on between the instructor and the student in addition to the grade appeal. These often exacerbate the grade appeal, which are not simple to begin with. Because grade appeals are currently so broadly understood, the grade appeal process often becomes a conduit for other grievances and issues that are beyond the purview and capacity of the grade appeal committee and are better dealt with by the chair and other offices at the college. Currently too many issues get channeled into the grade appeal process. Students should not have unrealistic expectations about what a grade appeal committee can do. It cannot regrade a paper but it can ensure that the rules for grading for the class are stated clearly in the syllabus and followed, and that the grading was not arbitrary and capricious.

Changes to the procedures have also been made to generally update this document to provide clarity, efficiency, and corrected language wherever possible.