

MINUTES

Meeting of the Hunter College Senate

6 November 2024

The 696th meeting of the Hunter College Senate convened at 3:58 PM in HW 714.

Presiding: Sarah Chinn, Chair

Attendance: The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those marked absent in Appendix I.

Alternate Senators were formally seated in accordance with the procedures approved by the Senate for in-person meetings, and they were enabled to vote using iClicker.

Agenda: The agenda was approved with the provision that Old Business be moved up the agenda to ensure proper attendance while discussing the revised Bell Schedule Proposal.

Report by the Provost: Chair Chinn invited Interim Provost Manoj Pardasani to give a report. Interim Provost Pardasani said the following:

“Good afternoon, everyone. First, I wanted to follow up on Nancy's statement. What we have done today was create safe community spaces here at 68th Street, but also at Brookdale and Silverman campuses for our students, faculty and staff. Our immigrant resource center is also available to our students as well as faculty and staff. We are closely monitoring, and we are asking if any of you hear from your students that they need anything, please let us know immediately. If more space is needed for more days over the next week or two, we will work on it right away and get it done. We have also sent out to the Deans and Chairs the statement from a national organization and resources, and we ask that they share with all the faculty. There are some important resources and data that might be helpful. We welcome ideas and suggestions and if you need more resources, whatever you need, please let us know. And, like Sarah said, we have to fight. So, thank you.

“The only other announcement that I wanted to make was faculty received an email from ICIT about a week ago regarding loaned laptops and computers that need to be upgraded. Security needs to be upgraded on those laptops, and a particular program has to be uploaded onto those laptops. But the email was a bit confusing and also seemed a little scary with deadlines and timelines involved. So, we sent a corrected email after that to say ignore the first email. We still need to upgrade security because in the world we live in, our systems can be easily hacked. Many of us log into not just email but CUNY systems and Hunter systems to view student and faculty records and HR, so we want to be careful. So, we are working on a different plan that will not require you to give up your laptop for 48 hours. We are working on different ways of doing it. Perhaps by appointment. Someone from ICIT could come to your office and do it for you in a short time, and check to see if you even need it. So, just wait for our next communication. It will come out in about a week or so that will clarify and make things a lot easier to do. That email said there was a deadline of December 15th. That is no longer the deadline. So, I do not want you to freak out about that because it is the end of the semester, and people need access, so nothing of that sort will happen. So, we apologize for the miscommunication. If you have any questions, please reach out to me or Gustavo Ordonez who is the Vice President of Operations and oversees ICIT. I assure you we are working on a better plan that works for everybody. Thank you.”

Middle States Update:

Chair Chinn invited Erica Chito-Childs, Interim Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, and Professor Thomas DeGloma, Sociology department, co-Chairs of the Steering Committee, to provide an update on Middle States. Their presentation is in Appendix II.

Old Business: Committee on the Calendar

Professor Jill Gross, Parliamentarian, explained that as per Robert's Rules Article 3, Section 26, the revised Bell Schedule Proposal that failed to pass at the last meeting can be brought back to the floor by a motion to renew. There are two steps to the procedure. First, a motion to renew needs to be raised and seconded by a voting member of the Senate. Then, that motion to renew needs to be voted on. Once it passes, the motion is back on the floor in its original condition.

There was a motion to renew. It was seconded. The motion to renew carried by voice vote without dissent.

There was a motion to consider the revised Bell Schedule Proposal. It was seconded.

Chair Chinn invited Professor Zachary Shirkey, Chair of the Committee on the Calendar, to reintroduce the proposal on revised Bell Schedule. Discussion and debate followed.

Senate Committee on the Calendar Bell Schedule Proposal

RATIONALE: The Revisions to the Bell Schedule, passed by the Hunter College Senate on 9 December 2020 and implemented in Fall 2021, require that "the impacts of the new schedule will be reported to the Senate within three years following implementation." Therefore, the Senate Committee on the Calendar has collected information on the effects of those revisions through a survey of Hunter College students, a survey of department chairs and program directors, and data on room usage supplied by the Registrar.

In light of this information, and to better align the schedule with student, faculty and staffing needs, as well as better use the limited available instructional space at Hunter College, the Committee has voted to propose the following revisions to the Bell Schedule to take effect beginning in the Spring 2026 semester:

BE IT RESOLVED that Hunter College adopt the schedule as proposed by the Senate Committee on the Calendar Committee that groups time periods into 150-, 75-, and 50-minute time blocks beginning at 7:00am through 9:50pm each weekday.

Appendix 1 displays time blocks for 75-minute class periods. Appendix 2 displays time blocks for 150-minute class periods. Appendix 3 displays time blocks for 50-minute class periods. These proposed changes do not affect Saturday and Sunday course offerings, which will continue to be governed by prior Senate resolutions.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Hunter College adopt a Community Period on Friday from 12:00pm to 2:00pm.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that classes offered two days a week will be paired Monday-Wednesday or Tuesday-Thursday. Classes offered three days a week will be Monday-Wednesday-Friday or Tuesday-Thursday-Friday.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there will be exceptions to the proposed time schedule, for example but not limited to, courses in the Schools of Education, Nursing, and Health Professions, courses at Silberman, 63 Madison, & Hudson Street campuses, courses that meet for longer than 3 hours, (e.g., studios, labs, rehearsals), and courses that meet after 9:30PM Monday through Thursday.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Department Chairs and Program Directors will plan schedules, including requests for exceptions, in consultation with school Deans. If the Registrar cannot accommodate particular schedule requests, the issue will be referred to Department Chairs, Program Directors, Dean(s) and/or the Provost to resolve the conflict.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the impacts of the new schedule will be reported to the Senate within three years following implementation.

Minutes
Meeting of the Hunter College Senate
6 November 2024

The question was called and carried.

iClicker voting produced the following results: 59 in favor, 13 against, and two abstentions.
The revised Bell Schedule was approved.

Report by the
Administrative
Committee:

a) Results of the election for the Search Committee for Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost

Below is a list of the search committee members forwarded to the President who will choose a search committee consisting of 4 faculty members and 3 students.

Nominees for Chair Panel:

Dean Mary Cavanaugh, Silberman School of Social Work

Nominees for Member Panel:

FACULTY

1. Humanities & Arts:

Prof. Janet Neary, English

2. Social Sciences:

Prof. Rupal Oza, WGS

3. Sciences & Mathematics

Prof. Sandra Clarkson, Mathematics & Statistics

4. School of Education:

Prof. April Kisamore, Special Education

5. School of Nursing and Health Professions

Prof. Nancy Eng, Speech Language Pathology and Audiology

Prof. Elsie Jolade, Nursing

6. School of Social Work/Library

Prof. Keith Chan, School of Social Work

Prof. Stephanie Margolin, Library

STUDENTS

Anel Radoncic (Political Science, History Adolescent Education, Certificate in Public Policy)

Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez (Public Health)

Christopher Chawki (Biochemistry)

Juniper Sokolov (Psychology, Political Philosophy, Public Policy)

Solange Arias (Clinical Psychology)

Zara Amer (Computer Science)

Ombuds
Report:

Chair Chinn invited Professor Ines Miyares, Ombuds Officer, to present a report.
Professor Miyares said the following:

“This is a very brief report. I have been in communication with Professor Flores. I am waiting for her to send me information for the activity of the Ombuds Office since her last report. She is pulling together that information.

“I do want to let you know that the Ombuds email is active. I have responded to all email concerns that have come in since Professor Flores stopped responding to the email when she went on sabbatical. If there are concerns, you can contact me either via ombuds@hunter.cuny.edu or through the Senate Office. At this point again, as soon as I have more information, I will bring a more complete report. Thank you.”

Committee
Report:

Committee on Grade Appeals

Chair Chinn invited Professor Jason Wirtz, Chair of the Grade Appeals Committee, to present a revision (in red) to the Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures. Short discussion followed.

Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures

(Approved by the Hunter Senate 10/9/85, revised 5/04/2005, 3/25/15, 11/9/2022, [11/6/2024](#))

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.

**In the event of documented, legitimate circumstances, the department or school can extend the deadlines within these procedures. A written explanation including this documentation must be provided.*

Step 4: Written Report of Decision

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. 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 Appeal 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, 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.

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.

The revised Hunter College Grade Appeals Procedures were approved by voice vote without dissent.

Committee on Academic Freedom

Chair Chinn invited Professor Markus Bidell, Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom, to provide a report. The committee's report is below. Discussion followed.

Report to the Hunter College Senate

From: Markus Bidell, PhD, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom, Hunter College
Re: Disposition and Recommendations on Academic Freedom Complaint & Investigation

Date: November 6, 2024

BACKGROUND

In February of 2024, the Standing Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) of the Hunter College Senate received a written complaint of violation of academic freedom brought by three faculty members against Ann Kirschner, then Interim President of Hunter College regarding the rescheduling of the film, *Israelism*. The Hunter College Senate became aware of the cancellation of the initial showing of this film scheduled on November 14, 2023. On November 15, the Senate then voted on a resolution brought to the floor condemning the cancellation as a violation of academic freedom. This investigation only pertains to the events after the Senate resolution and includes the way the event was rescheduled and managed.

The Chair appointed a 2-member committee to investigate and draft a preliminary report. The CAF unanimously endorses this report.

DISPOSITION

On the preponderance of evidence available, the subcommittee and full committee concludes that the way the administration handled the rescheduling and screening of the film constitutes a violation of the complainants' academic freedom. This finding applies only to events that were within the scope of this investigation (i.e., subsequent to the Senate meeting of November 15, 2023).

Furthermore, the subcommittee and full committee concludes that Interim President Kirschner violated Henderson Rule 1 (i.e., A member of the academic community shall not intentionally obstruct and/or forcibly prevent others from the exercise of their rights. Nor shall he/she interfere with the institution's educational process or facilities, or the rights of those who wish to avail themselves of any of the institution's instructional, personal, administrative, recreational, and community services.).

RECOMMENDATIONS - The CAF makes two recommendations:

1. The subcommittee recommends that the CAF clarify (and possibly revise) the procedures for bringing a complaint to the committee and post this information where it will be publicly available.

2. As soon as possible, the CAF recommends that Hunter College administration form a faculty, administration, staff, and student committee charged to develop clear guidelines, standardized procedures, protocols, and policies, regarding how campus academic activities are assessed, modified, canceled, or rescheduled if public safety become a concern.

3. No academic event may be cancelled for public safety reasons without presenting clear evidence of such safety concerns to the Hunter Community. We recommend that these types of situations involving public events and public safety be operationalized by this newly developed committee.

The report was approved by voice vote without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Jeninsky
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	A
	Milagros Denis-Rosario	(A) X			0
	Lázaro Lima	(A) X		Robert Thompson	(A) A
Anthropology	Jackie Brown	A	Medical Laboratory Sciences	Barry Cherkas	(A) X
	Stephanie Levy	(A) A		Chad Euler	X
	Milena Shattuck	(A) A		Steven Einheber	(A) X
Art & Art History	Howard Singerman	A	Music	Muktar Mahajan	(A) X
	Dave McKenzie	A		Michele Cabrini	A
	Emily Braun	(A) X		L. Poundie Burstein	(A) A
Biological Sciences		(A)	School of Nursing	Steven Spencer	(A) A
	Ben Ortiz	A		William Samuels	X
	Jesus Angulo	A			0
Chemistry	Paul Feinstein	(A) X	Philosophy	Tara Heagle	X
	Carmen Melendez	(A) X		Deidre O'Flaherty	(A) X
	Gabriela Smeureanu	A		Omar Dahbour	A
Classical & Oriental Studies	Nancy Greenbaum	(A) A	Physical Therapy	Daniel Harris	(A) X
	Brian Zeglis	(A) X		Kyle Ferguson	(A) A
	Nadya Kobko-Litskevitch	X		Steve Kofsky	A
Computer Science	Frederick Rogals	A	Physics & Astronomy	Chad Woodard	(A) X
	Doron Friedman	(A) A			(A)
		(A)		Ying-Chih Chen	X
Curriculum & Teaching	Felisa Vazquez-Abad	A	Political Science	Yuhang Ren	(A) X
	Raj Korpan	(A) X			(A)
	Saptarshi Debroy	X		Lina Newton	A
Dance	Justin Tojeira	(A) A	Psychology	Robert Jenkins	(A) A
	Edgar Troudt	A		Michael Lee	(A) A
	Stephen Demeo	A		Darlene DeFour	A
Economics	Maverick Zhang	(A) X	Romance Languages	Nesha Burghardt	A
	Tim Farnsworth	X		Glenn E Schafe	(A) A
	Darvejan Jones	A			0 (A)
Environmental Foundations & Counseling Programs		0 (A)	School of Social Work	Sam Diiorio	A
		0 (A)		Monica Calabritto	(A) X
	Tim Goodspeed	A		Julie Van Peteghem	(A) X
English	Michelle Liu	A	Sociology	Samuel Aymer	A
	Kenneth McLaughlin	(A) A		Daniel Gardner	X
	Avi Liveson	(A) A		Seon Mi Kim	(A) X
Film & Media Studies	Sarah Bonner	(A) A	Special Education	Samuel Aymer	(A) X
	John Keegan	(A) A		Mark Halling	A
	Veronica Muller	X		Mike Benediktsson	(A) X
Geography & Environmental Science	Sarah Chinn	A	SLPA	Heba Gowayed	(A) X
	Janet Neary	A		Salvador Ruiz	A
	Mark Miller	A		Melissa Jackson	(A) X
German	Katie Winkelstein-Duvenec	(A) X	Theatre	Kristen Hodnett	(A) X
	Kelly Anderson	A		Nancy Eng	A
				Michelle MacRoy-Higgins	(A) X
History	Tami Gold	(A) A	Urban Policy and Planning	Stanley Chen	(A) X
	Gustavo Mercado	(A) X		Claudia Orenstein	A
	William Solecki	X		Phillip Brown	X
Library		(A)	Nutrition and Public Health*		0 (A)
	Sun Shipeng	(A) A		Victoria Johnson	A
	Christina Mekonen	A		Lily Baum Pollans	(A) X
Mathematics & Statistics	Elke Nicolai	(A) A	Women & Gender Studies		(A)
		0 (A)		Susan Cardenas	X
	D'Weston Haywood	X		Khursheed Navder	(A) A
Medical Laboratory Sciences	Aaron Welt	(A) A	Music	Steven Trasino	(A) X
	Mary Roldan	A		Christopher Mitchell	A
	Iris Finkel	A		Priscilla Yamin	(A) A
Music	Ajatshatru Pathak	X	School of Nursing	Rupal Oza	(A) X
	Dorian Onifer	(A) A			
		(A)			

Students

Daniel Cronin	A
Ariadna Pavlidis-Sanchez	A
Olivia Massey	X
Lorraine Santana	X
Ermina Chowdhury	X
Nishat Raihana	A
Viet Thanh Phan	X
Veronica Witkowski	X
Juan Sebastian Barahona	X
Izadora Lima Soares Prereira	X
Aliyah Harrison	X
Susana Sanchez	X
Rachel Weng	A
Ezra Hubbard	X
Iman Meawad	X
Hafsa Naseer	X
Roseline Olumuyide	X
Tyler Etienne	X
Priscilla Jimenez	A
Alexander Pappas	X

At-Large, Lecturers and Part-Time Faculty

Student Services	Burhan Siddiqui	A
	Luis Roldan	(A) X
Library	Jocelyn Berger-Barera	A
English		0
Psychology	Stefan Schlussman	A
Social Work	James Mandiberg	X
Medical Lab Science	Hongxing Li	X
Religion	Wendy Raver	A
Geography	Ines Miyares	A
Classical and Oriental Studies	Christopher Stone	A
Special Education	Gina Riley	X
Registrar	Jennifer Dennington	A
THHP	Sarah Jeninsky	A
Art & Art History	Peter Dudek	X

Ex-Officio

President, USG	Bushir Juwara	X
Vice President, GSA		0
President Alumni Association	Elizabeth Wilson-Anstey	X
President, HEO Forum	Denise Lucena-Jerez	A
President, CLT Council	Amy Jeu	A

ADMINISTRATION

Senators:		
HEO/CLA Representative	Francisco Sandoval	A
Vice President for Student Affairs	Eija Ayravainen	A
Provost	Manoj Pardasani	A
Interim Dean, School of Arts & Sciences	Erica Chito Childs	A
Dean of Education	Julie Gorlewski	X
Alternate Senators (3):		
Dean of Social Work	Mary Cavanaugh	A
Assistant Vice President for Student Aff	Joseph Fantozzi	A
Dean of Nursing	Ann Marie Mauro	A

APPENDIX II



UNDERSTANDING OUR ACCREDITATION PROCESS

- LEGAL:** "MSCHE IS A TITLE IV GATEKEEPER AND IS A LINK TO FEDERAL PROGRAMS, AND INSTITUTIONS ACCESS TITLE IV THROUGH MSCHE ACCREDITATION."
- REFLECTIVE:** OUR WORK BEGINS WITH A THOROUGH SELF-STUDY PROCESS, PROVIDING AN OPPORTUNITY TO REFLECT ON AND ESTABLISH WHO WE ARE AS AN INSTITUTION, WHAT WE DO TO IMPACT THE WORLD AROUND US, AND WHAT OUR GOALS ARE AS WE LOOK TO THE FUTURE.
- PRAGMATIC:** THIS IS AN ORGANIZED PROCESS WITH FIVE GUIDING PRINCIPLES, SEVEN ESTABLISHED "STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITATION," AND A CONCRETE TIMELINE LEADING UP TO AN EVALUATION TEAM VISIT TO HUNTER IN THE FALL OF 2027.

MSCHE Guiding Principles

- ▶ **A Mission-Centric Institution**
- ▶ **Centrality of the Student Experience**
- ▶ **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**
- ▶ **Data-Based Decision-Making**
- ▶ **Innovation**



The Accreditation Steering Committee

Co-chairs: Dean Erica Chito-Childs, School of Arts & Sciences
Professor Thomas DeGloma, Sociology

Working Group Co-Chairs (one working group for each of the seven Middle States standards for accreditation)

Administrative staff with expertise in the process, including:

- ▶ Manoj Pardasani, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs
- ▶ Jim Llana, Advisor to the Provost
- ▶ Lynn Beller, Executive Consultant to the Provost
- ▶ GERALYN Lederman, Chief of Staff, Provost's Office



Working Group I: Mission & 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."

Co-Chairs:

Peter Englot, Senior Vice President of Communications
and External Affairs & Executive Deputy to the President

Zachary Shirkey, Professor & Chair, Political Science



Working Group II: Ethics & 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."

Co-Chairs:

Ian Blecher, Doctoral Lecturer, Philosophy

John Rose, Dean, Diversity and Compliance



Working Group III: Design and Delivery of the 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 setting are consistent with higher education expectations."

Co-Chairs:

Paul McPherron, Professor & Chair, English

Nicole Bennett, Associate Provost & Assistant Vice President,
Academic Affairs



Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience

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

Co-Chairs:

Brian Buckwald, Assistant Dean for Student Achievement

Joseph Fantozzi, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment



Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

"Assessment of student learning and achievement demonstrates that the institution's students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their program of study, degree level, the institution's mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education."

Co-Chairs:

Lawrence Kowerski, Associate Professor, Classical and Oriental Studies

Gina Riley, Clinical Professor, Special Education



Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

"The institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges."

Co-Chairs:

James Mandiberg, Associate Professor, Silberman School of Social Work

Justin Stec, Assistant Vice President of Finance and Business Operations



Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

"The institution's planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges."

Co-Chairs:

Sandra Clarkson, Professor, Mathematics and Statistics

Geralyn Lederman, Chief of Staff, Provost's Office



Communicating with the Hunter Community

The Middle States accreditation process hinges on active participation and support from the entire institution. Our goal is to create a collaborative environment that enhances understanding and commitment to Hunter's accreditation goals.

Each milestone of the process will be communicated to the community, and your feedback will be sought, via a variety of platforms:

- ▶ The Middle States Website
- ▶ Senate Meeting Reports
- ▶ Town Hall Meetings (In-Person & Zoom)
- ▶ Emails
- ▶ Social Media
- ▶ Campus Screens



Contact Us!

WEBSITE:

[HUNTER.CUNY.EDU/ABOUT/ACCREDITATION/
MIDDLE-STATES](https://hunter.cuny.edu/about/accreditation/middle-states)

EMAIL:

MIDDLESTATES@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU

HUNTER
The City University of New York