

**Ad-hoc Bylaws Advisory Committee – Recommendations for establishing bylaws for the  
School of Arts & Sciences  
April 15, 2015**

---

**Introduction**

In response to the charge presented to this Ad-hoc Bylaws Advisory Committee by the Administrative Committee of the College Senate, and based on the resolve of the Senate from the November 19, 2014 meeting, this Ad-hoc Committee presents the following recommendations to the School of Arts & Sciences for drafting bylaws for the school.

**I. Elements required by the Charter for a Governance of Hunter College**

We recommend that the Bylaws Drafting Committee familiarize itself with the entire Charter for a Governance of Hunter College (hereafter “Governance Charter”), as well as any forthcoming revisions to the Governance Charter. We have identified the following sections as being of particular relevance to the work of the Bylaws Drafting Committee.

- Article II, Section 1: determines powers of the Senate
- Article IV, Sections 1.b.i and 1.b.ii: definitions of departments and divisions
- Article IV, Section 5: pertains to college wide referenda and other faculty & staff votes
- Article VIII, Section 3.D: details curriculum committees for the SAS.
- Article X: Restricts the School of Arts & Sciences (or any other group) from holding powers granted to the Senate or any Senate committee
- Article XI, Sections 1-2. Requirements pertaining to Departmental Bylaws (may be useful as a model)
- Any recent revisions to the Governance Charter that may be relevant

**II. Relevant Documents pertaining to Governance in the School of Arts & Sciences**

**A. College documents and resources to support the School in this process:**

- Hunter College Strategic Plan (2012-2020)

- Senate resolution regarding the founding of the School of Arts & Sciences (October 9, 1997) (which includes a structural map of the School)
- The School of Arts and Sciences Strategic Plan (2013-2020)
- SAS Strategic Plan Implementation Report (April 15, 2014) (Hereafter “SAS Plan”)
- Guidelines for Establishing and Revising Departmental By-laws (Senate Departmental governance Committee, May 9, 2012)

**B. Any relevant documents pertaining to governance that are currently used by the School of Arts & Sciences**

The Bylaws Drafting Committee should investigate and consult any and all current SAS documents and/or working procedures pertaining to SAS business, which include but are not limited to documents and procedures that pertain to,

- Professional assessment: Procedures for promotion and tenure decisions
- General planning, especially as it pertains to establishing priority areas for new hires and the establishment of new programs (as outlined in the SAS Plan, Priorities 1.A, 3, and 4)
- Curricular matters: Planning for interdisciplinary programs and school wide programs, such as honors and learning communities, especially as these impact curriculum development needs (as outlined in the SAS Plan, Priorities 2.B and 4)
- Planning related to the use and improvement of facilities/space (as outlined in the SAS Plan, Priority 5)

General questions that need to be addressed include:

- How are committees organized/populated? What are their terms? How are decisions made?
- How does the school handle tenure and promotion procedures prior to FP&B review?
- Who has policy-making powers in the school about school matters?

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that the Bylaws Drafting Committee work to formalize the definition, responsibilities, powers, and procedures of SAS committees and other working groups (including formalizing the SAS Advisory Council and defining its relationship to the newly formed Council of Chairs).

### **C. Documents from other CUNY Schools (See Addendum A)**

### **D. External Documents**

There are a wide variety of public SAS bylaws from other schools that might be reviewed. [These include Rutgers University, University of Virginia, University of Pittsburgh, Duke University, University of Maine, Cleveland State University, Oklahoma State University, and the University of Vermont.]

We leave it to the Bylaws Drafting Committee to determine which it will ultimately consult. However, we encourage the Bylaws Drafting Committee to keep in mind that these documents, while potentially useful in some ways, reflect the concerns of schools that have different administrative structures. Most lack a Senate with as broad a range of legal authorities and responsibilities as afforded to the Hunter College Senate by the Governance Charter. The Governance Charter should therefore be the primary document of reference while drafting the SAS bylaws.

## **III. Consultation with Interested Parties**

Representatives of this advisory committee consulted with the following parties and/or their official representatives. All concerns were reported to the committee and discussed while this committee was composing its recommendations.

- A. Arts & Sciences Advisory Committee
- B. Hunter College Senate
- C. Faculty Delegate Assembly
- D. Higher Education Officer Forum

#### IV. Organizational process for devising bylaws

A. We propose that the Bylaws Drafting Committee be composed according to the following representational structure:

1. The Bylaws Drafting Committee should be composed of 11 voting members, including 7 members of the full time Arts and Sciences faculty, 1 Higher Education Officer working in the SAS, 2 full-time students, and the Dean of Arts and Sciences (or the Dean's appointed representative). In addition, there should be a member of the Senate Departmental Governance Committee serving in a non-voting, ex officio capacity. **TOTAL:** 11 voting members, 1 non-voting, ex officio member.

The seven faculty members of the committee must include the following (note that one person can fulfill multiple requirements):

- a. At least one faculty representative from a smaller department (of less than or equal to 12 members).
- b. At least one faculty representative from a larger department (of greater than or equal to 18 members).
- c. At least two department chairs
- d. At least one faculty representative from each of the three SAS Divisions (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, and Natural Sciences)
- e. At least one faculty representative from a department with a Graduate Program
- f. At least one faculty representative from a Program (non-Departmental perspective)
- g. Not more than one representative from any one department

B. We propose the following process be adopted to facilitate the formation of a Bylaws Drafting Committee.

1. Immediately following the presentation of this report to the Senate, the Senate Nominating Committee should announce the formation of the Bylaws

Drafting Committee to all Departments and Programs in the SAS and call for nominations to be forwarded. The Senate Nominating Committee should compose a Bylaws Drafting Committee in compliance with the representational requirements outlined in section IV.A.1.

2. Of the seven faculty members, the Senate Nominating Committee should choose three from six nominations put forth by the Dean and the A&S Advisory Committee. The Senate Nominating Committee should appoint the remaining four faculty positions. The Nominating Committee will be responsible for ensuring the representational requirements outlined in section IV.A of this report are fulfilled.

3. The HEO representative should be chosen by the Senate Nominating Committee from nominations submitted by the HEO Forum.

4. The student representatives should be appointed by the Senate Nominating Committee.

5. The representative of the Senate Departmental Governance Committee should be chosen by the chair of that committee, in consultation with the Senate Administrative Committee.

6. After the Senate Nominating Committee has composed a Bylaws Drafting Committee in compliance with the representational requirements outlined above, a committee membership list should be forwarded to the Dean of Arts & Sciences for final approval upon consultation with the Advisory Council.

C. We propose that, according to a timeline agreed upon with the Advisory Council, the Dean of Arts & Sciences convene the first meeting of the Bylaws Drafting Committee. At its first meeting, this committee should elect a chair from its membership.

D. We propose that the Bylaws Drafting Committee's first order of business be to clearly establish a process for ratifying the SAS bylaws (see suggestions for input, deliberation, and ratification in Section V). Having a clearly defined ratification process in place will allow the committee to organize its efforts with the specific details of this process in mind.

## V. Input, Deliberation, and Ratification

This Ad-hoc advisory committee feels that the formal bylaws drafting process, including final ratification, should be determined by the Bylaws Drafting Committee. However, we encourage the Bylaws Drafting Committee to keep the following in mind while conducting its business.

**A. Input & Deliberation.** The following timeline / procedural map ought to be considered. The Bylaws Drafting Committee should,

1. Make its process and timeline public.
2. Consult with all interested parties named above, as well as representatives from all interdisciplinary programs.
3. Produce a first draft of the SAS bylaws to be shared publicly.
4. Circulate the first draft to all interested parties for comment.
5. Post the first draft online with a feedback mechanism (preferably with an anonymous feedback option)
6. Host at least three **public hearings** for members of the SAS to comment, some of which can be targeted public hearings.
7. Send the first draft of Bylaws to all **departments** and **programs** with clear time line for specific comments and questions.
8. Rework the draft bylaws according to comments (and in continued consultation with Senate Departmental Governance Committee)

**B. Ratification.** The SAS Bylaws must ultimately be ratified by the College Senate. We suggest that the Bylaws drafting committee consider a pre-ratification process that includes departmental votes, program votes, and a popular vote (a referendum of all SAS members, as membership comes to be defined in the Bylaws) when developing a process for ratification.

**ADDENDUM TO REPORT  
Ad-hoc Bylaws Advisory Committee**

**School Bylaws at Hunter and Other CUNY Colleges**

**I. School Bylaws at Hunter College**

Given the definitions of `department` and `division` in Article IV.1.b of the Hunter College Charter, some schools are technically departments and so fall under Article XI of the Charter: the School of Urban Public Health, Hunter-Bellevue School of Nursing, and the Silberman School of Social Work. These schools all presently have bylaws which may be found on the Senate page

**<http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/senate/resources/Departmental%20by%20laws>**

Like the School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Education and the School of Health Professions are divisions, and at present have no bylaws (although all of the departments of these schools have bylaws).

**II. CUNY governance plans**

A list of governance plans for each CUNY college may be found at

<http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/la/governance-plans.html>

For Brooklyn, see link below.

**III. Bylaws at four largest senior colleges at CUNY besides Hunter**

**A. Colleges, like Hunter, where college-wide bodies are the ultimate legislative or policy making bodies:**

1. Brooklyn College: The Brooklyn College Governance Plan may be found at

[http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/abo\\_policies/150309\\_Brooklyn\\_College\\_Governance\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/abo_policies/150309_Brooklyn_College_Governance_Plan.pdf)

Different college-wide bodies have legislative authority over different issues. Principally, there is a Policy Council chaired by the President of the college and a Faculty Council, the bylaws for both may be found at

<http://www.brooklyn.cuny.edu/web/academics/faculty/facultycouncil/publications.php>

Brooklyn College has as three separate schools i) Humanities and Social Sciences; ii) Natural and Behavioral Sciences, and iii) Visual, Media, and Performing Arts. The schools do not have bylaws.

2. Queens: The governance document for Queens is the Queens College Academic Senate Charter and is found at <http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/la/governance-plans/queens.pdf>

Three of Queens' four divisions are Arts and Humanities, Math and Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences. The divisions do not have their own bylaws.

**B. Colleges where ultimate legislative or policy making authority lies in the schools:**

1. Baruch College: The Baruch College Governance Charter may be downloaded from

<http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/la/governance-plans.html>

For the most part, School Faculties have the rights and responsibilities that at Hunter belong to the Senate. These are specified in Article VII.

Baruch has the Weissman School of Arts and Sciences. Its bylaws may be found at [http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/wsas/faculty\\_resources/WSAS\\_Bylaws.htm](http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/wsas/faculty_resources/WSAS_Bylaws.htm)

2. City College: The City College Governance Plan (June 1999) may be found at <http://www.ccnyc.cuny.edu/about/policies.cfm>

Governance is split between a Faculty Senate and School Faculty Councils, including the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), which consists of a Division of Humanities and the Arts and a Division of the Sciences. CLAS has its own bylaws (available in the Hunter Senate office), but the divisions do not.

More information of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) bylaws may be found in “CLAS Faculty Council Guide Book for Curricular Changes,” downloadable at <http://www.ccnyc.cuny.edu/academicaffairs/ccnypolicies.cfm>

#### **IV. To be noted in using these sources:**

A. The two CUNY senior colleges that have school bylaws grant legislative powers to the schools, powers that at Hunter belong to the Senate. The two CUNY colleges that do not have school bylaws, like Hunter, grant legislative powers mainly to a faculty senate. No other division-type schools at Hunter have bylaws. Thus, in drafting bylaws, the School of Arts and Sciences would be breaking new ground.

B. On the independent school model at Baruch and City, bylaws for both the college and the school specify the separation of legislative authority (for example, see Article I.3 of City College Governance Charter and the section “Overall Faculty Governance Structure” in the CLAS Faculty Council Guide Book).

At Hunter, all college issues except tenure and promotion to Associate Professor fall under the purview of the Senate (see Article II, Section 1). This should be kept in mind in using the bylaws in Part III.B as models. Given the broad policy making powers of the Senate, a distinction between the powers of the Senate and the SAS will not be able to be made. All policies (outside of tenure and promotion) will ultimately have to be referred to the Senate.

Thus, it will be important to specify the policy making bodies in SAS and their relation to the Senate. Non-policy making activities would not have to come under the purview of the Senate. These may include reviewing or studying matters of concern to SAS, and making recommendations or expressing opinions about SAS matters to SAS policy making bodies.