

MINUTES

Meeting of the Hunter College Senate

9 May 2018

- 1 The 614th meeting of the Hunter College Senate convened at 3:42 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, and
8 clickers were distributed to them.
9
- 10 **Minutes:** The minutes of 14 March and 28 March were approved as distributed. The minutes of 18 April and 2 May
11 were circulated at the door and will be voted at the next meeting.
12
- 13 **Report by the**
14 **Administrative**
15 **Committee:** a) **Approved Curriculum Changes**
16 The following curriculum changes as listed in the attached Report dated 9 May 2018 have been
17 approved as per Senate resolution and are submitted for the Senate's information: Items: UR-
18 2183 Film and Media (Change in course), UR-2184 Film and Media (Change in course).
19
- 20 **Ombuds**
21 **Report:** **Report by the Ombuds Office**
22 Professor DeGloma called on Professor Sandra Clarkson to present the report on behalf of Professor
23 William Williams, College Ombuds Officer. Professor Clarkson said the following:
24
25 "I am here to report because Professor Williams has been in and out of the hospital for the last month. He
26 is out of the hospital, and he is doing very well, but he had a follow up doctor's appointment today.
27 This is going to be a non-traditional Ombuds report. The specific numbers of the people that have come
28 to him will be given as a written report later.
29
- 30 "A week and a half ago we were asked to attend a meeting of the University Faculty Senate to report on
31 what the Ombuds Office does here at Hunter. For that, I planned to review some of the history of the
32 Ombuds Office and to do this, I went through all of the minutes from the previous Senate meetings to find
33 out exactly what is done. Also, I served as Ombuds Officer for one year prior to coming back and serving
34 as the Chair of the Senate.
35
- 36 "For your information, the very first meeting of the Hunter College Senate was on the 14th of March in
37 1971. At the time that the Senate started, the Ombudsman was written into the Charter. The biggest task
38 that the Ombudsman was given at that point was an impartial review of the Senate. It says:
39 *'The Ombuds Officer shall be responsible for causing an impartial review to be conducted of the structure*
40 *and the functioning of the College Senate at the end of two years of operation, with a view to*
41 *recommending such changes in structure, functions, operations by-laws and the like as this review of*
42 *Senate experience may indicate.'*
43
- 44 "That was a major charge. The idea for the Ombuds on a regular basis was to review complaints that were
45 brought to him or her by members of the Hunter College community. An Ombuds person can be a student,
46 faculty or staff. Anyone who is eligible to be a member of the Senate can be an Ombudsman.
47
- 48 "The first Ombudsman was elected after nine different voting rounds. It started out with 15 people, and it
49 went over several years. The first Ombudsman took his job on October 23rd, 1973. The Senate formed in
50 Spring of '71, and the first Ombudsman was there in October, of '73. One of the first things that happened
51 was the Ombudsman was given what they called "freedom of the floor."

56 *“BE IT RESOLVED, that the newly elected Ombudsman be granted the privilege of freedom on the Senate*
57 *floor, as given to the President of the College and to the Chief Officers of constituency organizations.”*

58 He was given the ability to stand and speak on any issue. The first Ombudsman made his report and came
59 out with some of the things you will recognize as hearing previously in Ombuds’ reports. There were five
60 cases involving promotion tenure decisions, two cases of students who have been shut out of classes due
61 to the cancellation of class, alleged discrimination and distribution of funds from financial aid,
62 dissatisfaction with the basic prescription requirements which was GNA at the time, one case of a student
63 being denied matriculation even though the student met all of the requirements, and one case of a handicap
64 student being dissatisfied with the school counseling. Now, one of the things that happens is if an
65 Ombudsman is really doing his job, things start changing in the college itself to take care of those large
66 groups of problems. As you look around, there are things that came to the Ombuds person at the beginning
67 that will never go there now because there is an office that deals directly with it, for example our Office
68 of AccessABILITY.
69

70 “When they first dealt with the Charter, the stickiest issues they had were the percentages of faculty, staff,
71 faculty, administrators and students and the method for electing the student members. Anybody who was
72 in this Senate last year about this time remembers that we went through a lot of discussion about how to
73 elect the student members. That was a problem then, it is a problem now. One thing that cannot be changed
74 in the Senate Charter without having an actual vote of the entire College is the percentages of faculty,
75 administrators and students. So, many things the Senate can change on its own; however, to change the
76 percentages of faculty, administrators and students, the Senate has to go out to the community and have
77 people vote on it. That is still true. In the first few years when these Ombudsmen were in their job, most
78 of the business was dealing with the Charter and issues with the Charter. Then, there were some standing
79 committees that were set up, and there were different things recommended and implemented.
80

81 “In September of 1975 the first Ombudsman Louis Massa, Chemistry Professor, resigned because there
82 was a disagreement with the President. He tendered his resignation to the College Senate:
83 *‘I am tendering my resignation to the College Senate, the body which elected me to this office. Recently,*
84 *a series of steps have been taken towards curtailment of support to the office. This curtailment has now*
85 *reached the point where the office cannot function in the manner envisioned by the Governance Charter.*
86 *(...) Full-time support for this office has been withdrawn.’*
87

88 “He refused to serve. It might be interesting to know that this was September 30th, 1975. In March of ’76
89 there was an agreement that was made with the President regarding the Ombuds Office, and that
90 agreement is still in effect. The agreement said what support there was and that there would be a letter of
91 agreement that guarantees that kind of support each time there is a new Ombudsman. The second
92 ombudsman, Charles Sherover, wasn’t elected until September ’76, a whole year after Prof. Massa had
93 resigned.
94

95 “One of the things that happened as we have gone through the years is that the Ombudsman would look
96 at the people that are coming in, and they see that there is a group that has the same problem, the Ombuds
97 would come to the Senate or the Administrative Committee who hands things out to other committees and
98 looks for a solution. The most recent thing that happened with that is that Professor Williams came forward
99 with some complaints about the WU grade. If you remember, we recently passed something about that.
100 So, when you are doing a really good job, you work yourself out of a job.
101

102 “As I said, everybody who is eligible to be a Senate member can be an Ombudsman. We had full time
103 faculty, part time faculty who served as an Ombuds. We had a graduate student who served as an Ombuds.
104 We have had both men and women who served in this position. We changed the name from Ombudsman
105 to Ombuds Officer. We have had people from Arts and Sciences and Nursing. For this year, Professor
106 Williams says that about 65 people have come to see him so far, and of those about 15 were faculty. This
107 was definitely an uptick from last year when there were seven faculty members. Most common things this
108 time have to do with civility and respect. People are feeling they are not being treated appropriately.
109

113
114 “Students are feeling that faculty is not treating them appropriately, and faculty is feeling colleagues are
115 treating them appropriately. In many cases, people just want to sit and talk to somebody. The Ombuds
116 person can go forward and do something if the person who is complaining is willing. However, in a
117 situation where it is two people within a department, there might be some hesitation to do that. The
118 Ombuds Office has also been blind copied on communication that is going somewhere, and the person
119 wants somebody else to be a witness. The other big issue has to do with tenure and promotion. As you
120 know, that is a conversation that we have had in the Senate before. I think probably a lot of departments
121 have had it, and I imagine we will be having those. I thank you for listening to this unconventional report.”
122

123
124 Professor Filer proposed a motion to instruct the Secretary to send a note to Professor Williams to express
125 best and sincere wishes for speedy recovery.
126

127 The motion carried by voice without dissent.
128

129 **Committee**
130 **Report**

131 **Report by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Governance of Programs and Interdisciplinary Structures**
132 Professor Jessie Daniels, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Governance of Programs and
133 Interdisciplinary Structures, presented the report. The report is attached in the Appendix II.

134 There was a motion to refer the report to the Administrative Committee for further action.
135

136 The motion carried by voice with one abstention.
137

138 **Report by the Committee on the Budget**

139 Professor Randall Filer, Chair of the Committee on the Budget, presented the report. Professor Filer said
140 the following:
141

142 “I would like to thank the President and her financial staff for a very productive set of meetings that we
143 finally were able to schedule. To enter the interdisciplinary spirit and quote Charles Dickens wrongly “It
144 is not the best of times but it’s not the worst of times.” We are sailing along pretty much in a status quo
145 situation. The Finance Office and President’s Office were very open in sharing material and answering
146 every question that the Committee on the Budget members raised. Our 2018 budget, which is the fiscal
147 year we are in now, is slightly higher than 2017. When I say slightly, I mean on the order of nine million
148 dollars, which is not penny change. We don’t know the 2019 budget but CUNY, as the President reported
149 a month or so ago, seems to have survived the executive/legislative battles pretty much intact in terms of
150 state appropriated funds for the operating budget which will be up around 4% next year. We don’t see any
151 reason why our increase wouldn’t be about the same. We will, therefore, have a couple of million dollars
152 more to play with. Almost all of that is, however, committed to the last year of the contract wage increases.
153 It is the case that following next year the Board of Trustees-approved tuition increases for years two and
154 three will reverberate to a little bit of relaxation of the constraints at Hunter because the contract wage
155 increases stop. So, if the tuition goes up by \$200 and the wages don’t increase, there’s a little more money
156 to do other things. However, it’s not going to come into our pockets next year. So, I think the worst news,
157 or the best news is that it doesn’t look like we are facing cuts in the next year, and we ought to be able
158 to move along steady as we are going. If there is a modest relaxing of funding constraints two to three years
159 from now, it becomes a matter of serious debate for the community how these funds should be divided
160 among faculty release time as suggested by the new union contract, increased numbers of full-time faculty
161 (and fewer adjuncts) or more course opportunities for students. It is clear that we will remain severely
162 constrained and will not be able to address all desirable efforts.
163

164 “I want to comment on several other issues that various senators and members of the community have
165 raised with the Committee on the Budget that we addressed with the administration in our recent meeting.
166 First of all, if you see published figures on Hunter College budgets, staffing levels, teaching staffing levels,
167 or administrative levels, don’t believe anything you see because pulling apart statistics is an art form. You

172 may see in the press that the Hunter faculty size has fallen over the last few years. That is true but it is
173 only true because the School of Public Health was taken away from Hunter. You may see reports that the
174 administrative staff at Hunter has increased. That is true. I don't know whether we have too many or too
175 few administrators, but I do know that last year's reported increase is because certain staff members were
176 reclassified onto the state budget because somebody very smartly realized if we did so, CUNY would pick
177 up the fringe benefits rather than us, saving us a lot of money. So, all of a sudden the State budget lines
178 look like we have more administrative bodies (people), but there are no more actual people in the building.
179 So, please don't try to under or over interpret numbers you see in the press. If you have questions, send
180 them to the Committee on the Budget, and we will try and push them forward for you. In sum, our
181 operating budget from state money is approximately a quarter of a billion dollars a year between what we
182 spend at the campus level and what CUNY Central spends because they do fringe benefits and things like
183 that. In addition, there is about another \$10 million dollars a year from technology fees.
184

185 "One of the big areas that I am very pleased to report to the Senate regarding is the Hunter College
186 Foundation. In the past we had not received a great deal of information regarding the Foundation. . Now,
187 there has been very detailed reporting to the Committee on the Budget, and I want to bring the Senate up
188 to date. The College Foundation spent between about \$24 and \$25 million dollars in supporting the
189 operations of the college last year. While this looks like 10% of the State fund money, that is not quite
190 right because about half of that Foundation money was capital fund money. A piece of bad news is that
191 we've received a very good appropriation from the State for next year on maintenance money, much larger
192 than we have in recent years, but there is no new capital money in the State budget which means unless
193 something falls out of the sky, we will continue to own a "hole in the ground" rather than the long-
194 promised science building for a while. The Foundation sits on about \$125 million dollars of assets, almost
195 all of which is restricted money. Restricted money means it is for a particular purpose. About \$2 million
196 dollars is unrestricted, and that's basically our emergency fund. The Foundation is limited in what it can
197 do with the balance of its funds money. About half of these, about \$60 million dollars is restricted to
198 capital projects. It will be used for finishing the library and other projects. It will be released from
199 restriction as these are built. About \$60 million is restricted to academic programs, evenly split between
200 scholarship money and programmatic support money (for departments, professorships, and other specific
201 uses). The Foundation can spend only 5% of it a year. This is a widely used standard in the non-profit
202 community. If a donor gives them a million dollars for scholarships for left handed, redheaded people
203 from Nigeria, then you can take 5% of that (or \$50,000) and spend it on left handed, redheaded, people
204 from Nigeria for a scholarship.
205

206 "I will report a couple of other things about the Foundation. We checked carefully the Foundation's
207 administrative costs. These run about 10% of its annual expenditures. Outside monitors suggest that
208 donors pay attention when such costs run 30% or more of income so the Hunter Foundations costs are
209 actually quite low. Of those 10%, about half (4.5-5%) is fundraising expenses such as mailing and support
210 for alumni events and other things. Again, that is a very low ratio, well within guidelines that are set. So,
211 I don't know if I'm going to be called by the Inspector General or not, but, if I am, I'd say "Look, this
212 place looks pretty good, and it's being open. It seems to meet all the guidelines, and it's filling an important
213 need at Hunter".
214

215 "That's pretty much the report. Things seem to be moving along. We seem to know what we are doing.
216 We don't seem to be at a crisis. We survived the last couple of years of State cuts to CUNY funding better
217 than other CUNY Colleges. I'm not exactly sure how but we maintained the level of support for
218 fellowships and our level of support for faculty lines on the academic side while other colleges have seen
219 cuts. I think we are easing out of what was a tighter period, I don't think we are going to have great years
220 ahead but I also don't see any crisis. I thank all involved for their openness and responsiveness. I am
221 happy to answer any questions to the extent I can.
222
223
224
225

226 **Minutes**
227 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
228 **9 May 2018**
229

230 **New Business Committee on Governance**

231 Professor Sarah Chinn introduced the **Resolution on Non-CCE Full Time Lecturer Voting Rights**. She
232 read the Resolution into the record. Questions followed.
233

234 **Resolution on Non-CCE Full-Time Lecturer Voting Rights**
235

236 Recognizing that Article VII, section 8.11 of the CUNY Bylaws states, “The provisions of duly adopted
237 college governance plans shall supersede say inconsistent provisions contained in this article, and
238

239 Whereas the CUNY Board of Trustees has already granted a waiver to Hunter College to extend the right
240 to vote for Department Chair and Departmental Personnel and Budget committee to all Lecturers with
241 CCE, and
242

243 Whereas, some Hunter Departments have already allowed full-time Lecturers without CCE to vote in
244 Departmental Elections, and
245

246 Whereas all full-time faculty with or without tenure or CCE should have the right to participate in the
247 process of choosing their departmental leadership, and
248

249 Whereas it is advantageous for academic departments to have voting input from all full-time faculty in
250 order to reflect the diversity of rank among the full-time instructional staff in each department,
251

252 Therefore, be it resolved that all academic departments may allow all full-time Lecturers, regardless of
253 whether they have CCE or not, to vote for their Department Chair and their Departmental P&B
254 Committee.
255

256
257
258 Due to the late hour, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 PM.
259
260

261 Respectfully submitted,
262

263
264 Dana G. Reimer
265 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) X		Bill Williams	X
	Edgardo Melendez	(A) E		Patrick Burke	(A) A
Anthropology	Jackie Brown	A	Medical Laboratory Sciences	Verna Segarra	(A) A
	David Hodges	(A) A		Chad Euler	E
Art & Art History	William Parry	(A) X		Robert Raffaniello	(A) X
	Daniel Bozhkov	E	Muktar Mahajan	(A) X	
	Lynda Klich	A	Jewel Thompson	A	
Biological Sciences	Susan Cole	(A) X	Music	Michele Cabrini	(A) X
	Susan Crile	(A) X			(A)
	Derrick Brazill	A	School of Nursing	Christine Ganzer	A
	Shirley Raps	A		Abigail Kotowski	A
Chemistry	Paul Feinstein	(A) X	Philosophy	Charles Reuter	(A) A
	Maria Pereira	(A) X		Omar Dahbour	E
	Akira Kawamura	A		Frank Kirkland	(A) A
Classical & Oriental Studies	Gabriela Smeureanu	(A) A	Physics & Astronomy	Christa Acampora	(A) E
	Nancy Greenbaum	(A) X			
	David Petrain	A			(A)
Computer Science	Dai Fang	(A) A	Political Science		(A)
	Shawna Leigh	(A) X		John Wallach	A
	Lei Xie	E		Jill Schwedler	(A) A
		(A)		Michael Lee	(A) X
Curriculum & Teaching		(A)	Psychology	Roseann Flores	A
	Jason Writz	X		Jonathan Rendina	A
	Karen Koellner	X		Peter Moller	(A) X
Dance		(A)	Physical Therapy	Chris Braun	(A) A
	Maura Donohue	X			(A)
	Carol Walker	(A) A			(A)
Economics		(A)	Romance Languages	Monica Schinaider	X
	Avi Liveson	X		Julie Van Peteghem	(A) A
	Tim Goodspeed	X			(A)
Educational Foundations & Cou	John Li	(A) A	School of Social Work	Carolyn Gelman	X
		(A)		Michael Lewis	A
	Veronica Muller	X		Adam Brown	(A) E
	Alexander Fietzer	(A) A		(A)	
English		(A)	Sociology	Mark Halling	A
	Leigh Jones	A			(A)
	Sarah Chinn	A		Michaela Soyer	(A) X
Film & Media Studies	Steven Wetta	X	Special Education	Elizabeth Klein	A
		(A)		Lauren Schnell	X
	Sissel McCarthy	(A) E		Virginia Gryta	(A) A
	Larry Shore	(A) A	Speech-Language Pathology and Audiolo	Donald Vogel	(A) A
Geography	Isabel Pinedo	(A) X		Michelle MacRoy-Higgins	A
	Ines Miyares	A	Theatre	Carol Silverman	(A) X
	Shipeng Sun	(A) A			
	(A)	Jonathan Kalb		A	
German	Elke Nicolai	X	Urban Policy and Planning	Claudia Orenstein	(A) X
	Eckhard Kuhn-Osius	(A) A		Victoria Johnson	X
	Ane Zmmeman	(A) A		William Milczarski	(A) A
History		(A)	School of Urban Public Health		(A)
	Rick Belsky	A		Phil Alcabas	A
	Iryna Vushko	(A) A		Steven Trasino	(A) X
Library	Jill Rosenthal	A	Women & Gender Studies	Khursheed Navder	(A) A
	Sarah Ward	A		Jennifer Gaboury	A
	Adina Milliken	X		Catherine Raissiguier	(A) A
	Mee' Len Hom	(A) A		Rupal Oza	(A) X
	Danise Hoover	(A) A			

Students

Mila Adelman	A
Sarah Russo	X
Richard Lu	A
Alexa Michel	X
Sandra-May Flowers	X
Milana Khaitova	X
Polina Safovich	X
Sara Shanaj	X
Kendra Cornelis	A
Noam Sohn	A
Alfie Corteza	A
Lucien Formichella	X
Fatmata Barrie	X
Sohail Khan	X
Shannon O'Rourke	E
Asheley Siewnarine	X
Demi Moore	X
Saim Siddiqui	X
Linda Yohannes	A
Anam Khalid	A
Nicolas Fuchs	X
Nibras Karim	X
Jessica Flaherty	X
Jasmine Azeharie	X
Christoper Cantor	A
Ilya Geller	X
Maneka Phiri	X
Dine Butler	X
Michael Galka-Giaquinto	E
Hieu Dang	X
Cara Fitzgerald	X
Melanie Lozier	X
Darin Kalev	X
Leonid Prog	X
Kiran Javaid	X
Stephon Odom	A
Jacqueline Rozado	X
Zaiba Iqbal	A
Patrick Ricci	E

At-Large, Lecturers and Part-Time Faculty

Student Services	Brian Maasjo	X
	Shannon Salinas	(A) X
Library	Jocelyn Berger-Barera	A
Geography	Dana Reimer	A
English	Meghann Williams	X
Library	Ajatshatru Pathak	A
Medical Lab Science	Hongxing Li	A
Philosophy	Ian Blecher	X
Sociology	Thomas DeGloma	A
Urban Affairs & Planning	Elaine Walsh	A
Economics	Randal Filer	A
History	Bernadette McCauley	A
THHP	Sarah Jeninsky	A
Psychology	Joseph Lao	X

Ex-Officio

President, USG		
Vice President, Graduate Student Association		
President Alumni Association	Kim Haffner	X
President, HEO Forum	Terry Wansart	X
President, CLT Council	Amy Jeu	X

ADMINISTRATION

Senators:		
HEO/CLA Representative	Brian Buckwald	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
Alternate Senators (3):		
Dean of Education	Michael Middleton	A
Special Counsel to the President & Dean	Laura Hertzog	A
School of Nursing	Gail McCain	A

Appendix II

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Governance of Programs and Interdisciplinary Structures of the Hunter College Senate

INTRODUCTION. The members of this committee are dedicated to the pursuit of excellence at Hunter College. We recognize that the highest educational goals for our students are often achieved when faculty are not bound by traditional disciplinary boundaries when developing curricula. We also maintain the necessity of establishing clear guidelines about how such courses of study are administered within Hunter College given that the CUNY by-laws and the Hunter College Charter are silent on the matter of program development and oversight. It is in this spirit of collaboration and cooperation that this committee was formed. In accordance with a Senate Resolution adopted on December 7, 2016, an Ad Hoc Committee on the Governance of Programs and Interdisciplinary Structures was created. The committee was charged with addressing issues related to the governance of all programs “including those entities officially named Programs, Institutes, Centers, Schools, and any other non-departmental or interdepartmental entities offering or managing courses of study in any capacity.” We were further charged “with also (A) researching current structures and practices pertaining to the governance of such entities at Hunter College, (B), consulting with all relevant programs and administrative offices, (C) consulting and coordinating with all relevant Senate committees, including the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee, and (D) reporting to the Senate and making recommendations for Senate action to ensure the faculty governance of Programs and Interdisciplinary Structures.” In the simplest terms, our concern was addressing all curricula and courses of study that are currently situated outside of or separate from academic departments, as well as those within departments.

To accomplish this work, the Senate convened this committee. Nominations were taken to fill the committee according to the membership criteria and the Senate voted to confirm the committee members. It was comprised of the following members:

SAS Social Sciences: Jessie Daniels, (Chair)
SAS Arts & Humanities: Janet Neary
SAS Math & Sciences: Shirley Raps
School of Social Work: James Mandiberg
School of Education: Christina Taharally
Nursing, Health Professions, and UPH: Nancy Eng
Interdisciplinary Programs: Rupal Oza
A&S at large (3): Bernadette McCauley; Catherine Raissiguier; Omar Dahbour
Dean (non-A&S): Michael Middleton
Undergrad Students: Edward Friedman and Jacqueline Rozado
MA student: Meghann Williams
Provost (or designee): Lon Kaufman
Dean of A&S (or designee): Andrew Polsky

Members who serve with voice but no vote:

Joseph Lao (Psychology, as Chair of the Senate Governance Committee, 2016-17) Sarah Chinn (English, as Chair of the Senate Governance Committee, 2017-18) Eckhard Kuhn-Osius (German, as Chair of the Senate Undergraduate Course of Study Committee)

At the first meeting of the committee, the Chair of the Senate reiterated the charge. The committee then discussed its approach to this charge and consequently designated three sub-committees. These were as follows:

a. Sub-Committee on Principles, Values, and Vision (Omar Dahbour, Chair). This sub-committee considered how the promotion of flexibility and innovation in scholarship and curriculum development fits with the values and vision of the college. What are the principles and values associated with interdisciplinary innovation? (Perhaps these include intellectual flexibility, cooperation in research and teaching, and the traversing of conventional disciplinary divides, for example.) This committee also considered how other values at the core of our academic and intellectual mission (such as shared governance, faculty control over curriculum and scholarship, and academic freedom, for example) should inform our approach to innovation and interdisciplinarity. The latter set of principles/values should not be eclipsed by the drive for intellectual flexibility and innovation, nor should they eclipse the need to develop interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary structures. Given this set of concerns, what are the core principles and underlying values that should inform the (whole) committee's approach to its mission? This sub-committee drafted and approved statements of principle and these are included in Appendix C.

b. Sub-committee on Personnel and Consultation (Bernadette McCauley, Chair). This sub-committee explored the (1) mapping the terrain of programs, centers, institutes and other interdisciplinary structures at Hunter that are relevant to the (whole) committee's work (which might also include determining which are relevant to the committee's mission and goals and which are not); (2) developing a list of personnel who might have information or perspective to contribute to the committee's mission and work; (3) developing a protocol for reaching out to such personnel (perhaps interviewing them) in order to inform the committee's work.

c. Sub-committee on Rules and Procedures (Shirley Raps, Chair). This committee was concerned with researching College and University rules and procedures that pertain to the committee's work in order to ensure that the committee adheres to them when moving forward with recommendations to the Senate. These rules protect the integrity of our academic institution and should not be taken lightly. Important documents include (but are not necessarily limited to): The Charter for the Governance of Hunter College, official Senate Procedural documents (such as Procedures for Preparing and Submitting Curriculum Proposals for College Approval), the bylaws of schools and other academic units of the college, The Bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees, the CUNY Manual of General Policy, and the PSC/CUNY contract.

After the initial meeting, the committee met again on the following dates:

- 2017: April 4, May 4, May 26, July 19, September 7, October 25 (subcommittee chairs + chair only), November 15 and December 5.
- 2018: March 8, March 21, April 11

SURVEY. A good deal of the work of the committee as a whole was spent developing a survey instrument (Appendix A). It was distributed (with help of Senate Office Administrative Associate, Lara Miranda) to all programs and interdisciplinary structures, including “those entities officially named Programs, Institutes, Centers, Schools, or any other non-departmental or interdepartmental entities offering or managing course of study in any capacity.” The goal of this survey, in keeping with the charge of the committee, was to determine the scope of programs and interdisciplinary structures, and to ascertain their current governance structure. We used the results of the survey to inform our discussions and recommendations. A summary of the survey results is found in Appendix B.

The survey responses reveal that “program” and “interdisciplinary” are not terms with clearly defined meanings at Hunter College, which made the work of the committee even more challenging. There remains some debate between and among members of the committee about these terms, and about the charge of the committee (whether to consider governance of all programs or just those deemed interdisciplinary). For the sake of this report, we use the terms in the name of the committee “programs and interdisciplinary structures” as the boundary of our work and to mean: curricular degree programs (majors, minors, and certificates) that cross conventional disciplinary lines.

In keeping with the charge of this committee, we collected information about the range of structures for organizing and offering courses currently in place at Hunter College. The following is what we found:

- departments (e.g., Women and Gender Studies, Africana and Puerto Rican/Latino Studies)
- interdisciplinary self-governing programs; programs with courses from more than one department or school that offer a major, track, minor, or certificate (e.g., Asian American Studies, Quantitative Biology)
- self-governing programs with curriculum from other departments, schools, and programs (e.g., Human Biology, Human Rights)
- graduate programs shared by the School of Education and departments in the School of Arts & Sciences (e.g. MA in English Adolescent Education, or Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics)
- interdisciplinary curricular programs housed within a department (e.g., Environmental Studies major)
- “non-self-governing” interdisciplinary curricular programs (e.g., Health Careers Preparation Post-Baccalaureate Certification, Quant Bio)
- interdisciplinary interchange in the form of single courses and cross-listed courses (e.g., Thomas Hunter Honors courses team taught by professors in different departments, not intended to be a permanent course offering)
- the professional schools, are variously organized, including:

- School of Social Work (SSW) is organized into “methods” and “fields of practice,” and all new courses are approved by tenure-track faculty through the SSW’s Curriculum Committee;
- Bellevue School of Nursing offers programs of study that lead to licensure and certification in a range of specialty areas;
- School of the Health Professions offers programs of study that lead to licensure in Nutrition, Physical Therapy, Speech/Language Pathology and Audiology
- and others not specified above.

This typology is a comprehensive but not an exhaustive catalogue of structures offering interdisciplinary courses of study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our overall recommendation is that all programs and interdisciplinary structures at Hunter should be faculty led and governed; and, that all structures should seek Senate approval for a governance document, which guarantees that roles and functions are filled and properly defined with full transparency. Our specific guidelines concerning governance, curriculum, faculty and administrative roles are detailed below.

1. **GOVERNANCE.** The impetus for any new program or interdisciplinary structure should begin with a consultation between faculty and administration, and may be initiated by either. Then, a conversation follows about the need or demand for such a program among students, and the available resources to meet such a demand.

Early in this process, faculty should draft a proposal to establish the self-governing entity that addresses all of the operational needs of the new program or structure. The proposal should include a description of the nature and purpose of the relevant unit, instructional expectations (if applicable), staffing expectations, proposed departmental affiliations and relationships with other existing units, plan for governance, budget details (including plans for reallocation of existing monies and sources of new monies, and including any anticipated revenues), and a relevant resolution. The resolution should include a "Resolved" paragraph specifying the name of the entity, the name of the college (Hunter College), and the effective start date. The resolution statement must be followed by an "Explanation" paragraph. The Explanation should briefly describe the entity, purpose and mission.

The Hunter College Senate and the CUNY Board of Trustees must approve the resolution. Once effective, the new entity should submit by-laws to the Senate Committee on Governance for approval.

In the case of existing programs that are currently functioning without by-laws in place, current program directors and/or faculty steering committees in charge of such programs should approach the Senate Administrative Committee and Committee on Governance within two years with a plan for governance. The Senate will advise each existing program as to whether it has an approved governance structure. By-laws are not effective until approved by the Committee on Governance and the Hunter College Senate.

2. **CURRICULUM.** Interdisciplinary courses and curriculum must follow Senate-mandated curricular procedures involving review by either the Senate Undergraduate Course of Study Committee or the Senate Graduate Course of Study (as appropriate to the level of study). This might mean that either (a) constituent departments that are part of an interdisciplinary initiative host the interdisciplinary courses and that these constituent departments’ curriculum committees develop said courses for review by Divisions, Schools and the Senate as appropriate; or, (b) some departments, schools, or self-governing programs offering interdisciplinary curriculum programs may want to form an interdisciplinary curriculum committee from among their voting faculty members. This elected interdisciplinary curriculum committee might then develop courses for review by Divisions, Schools and the Senate as appropriate. This process, and the interdisciplinary curriculum committee’s voting members, should be defined in the program’s by-laws or governance plan as noted above and approved by the Senate.

In the latter case, we must keep in mind that Senate Curriculum procedures (Part A, Section III.2) mandate that, “Curriculum proposals that are interdisciplinary in nature require the review of all School/Divisional Curriculum Committees in whose purview the course falls.” For one, this level of review is necessary to ensure that interdisciplinary units do not infringe upon the curricular offerings of other units, which also eliminates redundancy and encourages academic cooperation at the college. This review is also necessary to assess resources required; for instance, if the proposal pulls resources from a school and requires financial support from their dean, it would be appropriate for the school or the campus to review in order determine if the additional support is warranted. This additional level of review is very helpful for correcting any remaining errors in proposals.

Administrative officers may not take on the faculty function of developing and implementing curriculum. With regard to this point, the jurisdiction and responsibilities of the administration and faculty are defined in the Board of Trustees Minutes listed in Article 2.08 of the Manual of General Policy, in the CUNY Bylaws Articles VIII, IX, and XI, and elsewhere.

3. **FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION OF CURRICULAR PROGRAMS.** In the spirit of faculty governance and program stability, this committee strongly recommends that programs be directed by full-time faculty with tenure. However, we recognize that for various reasons this may not always be possible. Only when there are no tenured faculty available, other full-time faculty may be chosen for the position of Director according to the procedures of that program’s governance document.

In all cases, appointments of Program Directors are subject to the approval of the President or their designee. Program Directors must be full-time faculty members attached to a department. Following the pattern of Department Chairs, the committee recommends that Program Directors serve a term of three (3) years.

The committee recommends that doctoral lecturers with CCE be incorporated into the governance structures of programs and interdisciplinary structures. We also recommend that interdisciplinary structures make meaningful efforts to craft a curriculum in which a significant number of courses are taught by full-time faculty, who are more able to mentor and advise students.

4. **FOSTERING INTERDISCIPLINARY INNOVATION.** As a whole, the committee was in enthusiastic agreement in our desire to foster interdisciplinary innovation at Hunter College. Some of the most generative and energizing collaborations happen between faculty across departmental boundaries and from different disciplines, divisions or schools. Yet, actualizing such collaborations is often so cumbersome as to discourage those efforts. Thus, we urge the Senate to consider creation of an incubator that makes interdisciplinary innovation vibrant, easy and interesting.

APPENDIX A.

SURVEY for HUNTER COLLEGE CHAIRS and PROGRAM DIRECTORS

This is a survey designed by the Ad-hoc Senate Committee on the Governance of Programs and Interdisciplinary Structures*. It is intended to gather information about the wide range of programs that are concerned with curriculum in any way at Hunter College and, more specifically, how they are governed. Our committee has been tasked by the Senate with developing a report for faculty colleagues on these matters, and we ask your help in gathering information for this purpose.

PART A. This part to be filled out by programs, centers and departments and any other administrators of programs. For the purpose of this survey, “academic programs” are defined as any that include courses from one or more academic unit. In this section, we ask general questions about the kind of academic program that you administer.

1. Please list any academic programs operating under or through your academic unit, or to which your unit regularly contributes courses and/or faculty.
2. Please provide any of the following that you may have about your interdisciplinary academic program: mission statement, overview of the program, program learning objectives, brochures, flyers, or link to a website with such materials.

PART B. Current Governance. Given our charge as a committee, we are most interested in how your interdisciplinary academic program is currently governed. In this section, we ask about several related questions about the way your program is currently governed.

3. For any interdisciplinary program listed under PART A. above, please describe briefly the formal governance structure (if any) of the program.
4. By what process does the program make changes in its curriculum? Please identify the faculty (and others, as applicable) within the program who participate in curriculum decisions.
5. If the program has faculty members with a formal program affiliation, how are they selected? How does the program secure teaching commitments from faculty in other academic units? Does the program include faculty with joint appointments in other units? If so, how are they evaluated?
6. If program faculty members are housed in other academic units, what is the role (if any) of the program and its director in the evaluation and observation of those faculty members in personnel decisions (reappointment, tenure, and promotion)?
7. Does the program have a director (or head or other title to denote the administrative leader of the program)? By whom is the director chosen? For how long does the director serve? By whom is the director reviewed and how often? Who has the authority to remove/replace the director?
8. Who schedules courses for the program, has the ability to cancel classes if they are under-enrolled, and decides who teaches the courses in the program?
9. If the program has selective admissions, who chooses the students? If someone other than the program director advises students, who selects the advisor(s)?

10. What proportion of the courses in the program is taught by adjunct faculty? Are the adjunct faculty 'career adjuncts' or people with a career outside of academia?

11. How are FTEs allocated by the college when a course is offered through an interdisciplinary program? With respect to Interdisciplinary Programs, how are students assigned - that is, how is it decided which department gets the 'credit' for which students?

PART C. Shortcomings of Governance. We expect that there may be shortcomings or challenges to the way that your program is currently governed. In this section, we ask about those challenges.

12. Please describe any shortcomings or particular challenges your interdisciplinary academic program faces due to the way it is currently governed.

13. How would you suggest this be changed?

APPENDIX B.

SURVEY RESPONSES FOR HUNTER COLLEGE CHAIRS AND PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Contents~ Academic Units

Women and Gender Studies 14

History, Jewish Studies 15

Comparative Literature 16

AUD consortium..... 16

19 teacher education programs. They are: TESOL, Childhood (grad and undergrad), Early Childhood (Grad and undergrad), Literacy, EDSUP, Bilingual, Graduate Math, Adolescent English, Adolescent Social Studies, STEM, Foreign Languages, 3 Creative Arts, 5 Partnership Programs (EHTP, UTR, TFA, Success Academy, TESOL)..... 17

Philosophy (major/minor); Philosophy, Politics, and Society (major/minor); Political Theory (minor); Human Rights (certificate); Logic (minor); Thomas Hunter Honors Program; Macauley Honors College; Legal Studies Program; Environmental Studies Program; Religion Program; Women and Gender Studies (cross-listed courses) 17

Physical Therapy 18

Mfa creative writing 18

Thomas Hunter Honors Program..... 18

Legal Studies, Political Theory, and International Relations Minors; Public Policy, Caribbean and Latin American Studies, and Human Rights Program 19

Human Biology..... 19

SPED Dept: Learning Disabilities, Behavior Disorders, Adolescent Special Education, Severe/Multiple Disabilities, Early Childhood, Special Education, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Gifted, Applied Behavior Analysis, Teaching Fellows, Teach For America. Curriculum and Teaching: All Teacher Cert Programs - SPED courses 20

International Relations minor, Political Theory minor; and Legal Studies minor 20

Geography; Environmental Studies 21

Total Responses: 25 surveys started, 14 completed

BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES

PART A

Women and Gender Studies

Program Overview 1/ Program Learning Goals After completing of a major in Women and Gender Studies, students will be able to: 1. Describe the contributions of disenfranchised groups across historical and social locations. 2. Use gender, class, race, dis/ability, sexuality, and nationality as central and intersecting categories of analysis. 3. Develop interdisciplinary research skills and familiarity with critical Gender, Class, Race, and Sexuality theories and intersectional modes of inquiry. 4. Demonstrate skills in oral communication, writing, information technology, media literacy, and critical thinking. 5. Connect academic work with social and political realities outside the university. 6. Apply social justice principles and ethics to their own lives and their engagement with surrounding communities. 2/ Mission Statement The department of Women and Gender Studies focuses on the critical examination of gender; class; race; dis/ability; sexuality; and nationality as intersecting dynamics of social and identity formation. Our mission is to: • Educate students about the principles, theories, and concrete applications of these critical analyses. • Encourages students to examine the complex ways in which the social formations of sexuality, gender, race, class, national origin, dis/ability, and sexual orientation shape human experience and produce structures of power and inequality. • Re-examine the historical record to make visible the experiences and contributions of disenfranchised groups in a vast range of historical and social locations. • Connect academic work with social and political realities outside the university; enhance students’ understanding of and resistance to structures of inequalities; and link research, teaching/learning, and activism. Through its broad interdisciplinary

research and curriculum, the department of [Gender, Race, and Sexuality Studies] promotes transformative practices in research, creative work, pedagogies, and local/global partnerships. *** Our faculty is an interdisciplinary group of scholars whose research, teaching and advocacy work focuses on the relationships between these forces, drawing from women, gender, and feminist studies; ethnic and critical race studies; LGBT and queer studies; disabilities studies; as well as the study of nationalism and class.

PART B

Formal Governance structure We function as a regular department. However, we also have a steering committee drawn from a range of other departments and disciplines.

Changes in the curriculum Curriculum Committee and standard College procedures.

Program Director Department Chair (last one recruited through outside search)

Program decision making Chair in consultation with faculty members.

Percentage taught by adjuncts 90% -- we recruit both junior academics, long-time adjuncts, and folks salaried outside of academia

FTE allocation When we formally cross-list a course with another department. The registrar creates a section with a number of seats assigned to the other department. In most case, we have to rely on "informal" cross-listing by counting courses in other departments. In this case the other department gets all the "credit."

PART C

Academic program challenges Currently we have 3 FT faculty members. As such, we cannot possible function as a full-fledged academic unit. We need 5 FT faculty to run a proper P&B committee, run legitimate chair elections, staff crucial committees (e.g. curriculum), etc.

Suggestions for changes For now, we are making do thanks to the generosity of our steering committee members. However, the labor they perform for our unit is unlikely to be counted toward their own promotion and tenure and is rendered invisible by the structural limits of the College. We obviously need the necessary lines (5) required by CUNY to ensure the proper running & governance of our unit.

PART A

History, Jewish Studies

Program Overview Mission Statement, Program Learning Objectives, Masters Poster, Overview of Program, links to website with materials

PART B

Formal Governance Structure Jewish Studies is inter-disciplinary and has been housed for many decades until recently, in History, but it operates independently and now that it has been re-structured as a Center for Jewish Studies with a national search for a director, History has only nominal oversight and does not participate in any formal governance structure for Jewish Studies. History only oversees the History courses offered as part of the Jewish Studies Program and provides the interim director with an office, but has no other role in Jewish Studies.

Changes in the curriculum The Interim Director of the Jewish Studies program (Dr. Bruce Ruben) is an adjunct who consults with the History Department Chair about course offerings in History only. There are no tenure track faculty now that Prof. Robert Seltzer has retired in the Jewish Studies Program.

Role of programming, evaluation, and observation The Jewish Studies Program's History faculty are all adjuncts (one or two per semester), including the interim director of the program.

Program Director Department Chair Yes, Jewish Studies has an interim director, Dr. Bruce Ruben. For many years before his retirement, Robert Seltzer, a tenured full professor in the History Department was the Director of the Program, but the Department was involved only in so far as providing a physical office, doing web invoicing for speakers, and providing observations for adjunct faculty hired in the History Department to teach Jewish History courses. The authority to remove or replace the director was never in the History Department's hands.

Student selection No selective admissions; program director advises students.

Percentage taught by adjuncts In History, all of the faculty teaching Jewish History courses in the Jewish Studies Program are adjunct faculty. Occasionally, Prof. Laura Schor, who is a tenured full professor in History will offer a course whose content qualifies for credit in the Jewish Studies Program, but that is handled by the Program, not the Department.

FTE allocation In the past, students in enrolled in Jewish History courses offered by the History Department that also counted for the Jewish Studies Program, and these were treated not as inter-disciplinary courses but simply as History courses that could be counted for Jewish Studies credit. I do not know how the Jewish Studies Program will operate in the future, but History will continue to offer Jewish history courses as long as there is student demand.

PART C

Academic program challenges Because the Jewish Studies Program has been housed in History under the direction for several decades of a full time faculty member of the Department, I am not really aware of what shortcomings or challenges it may have faced. Now that the program is only housed in History as an interim solution while a new Center of Jewish Studies is organized with its own director, I do not know what the formal relationship will be (if any) with the History Department.

PART A

Comparative Literature

PART B

Formal Governance Structure P&B Connitte (Romance Languages) Shared Governance (Comparative Literature)

Changes in the curriculum P&B (Romance Languages) Committee (Comparative Literature)

Formal program affiliation Faculty in Romance Languages consists of full-time faculty plus more than 80 adjuncts/graduate students on fellowship.

Role of programming, evaluation, and observation Romance Languages evaluates faculty members every end of Spring Semester. Comparative Literature faculty are evaluated by their respective Departments.

Program Director Comparative Literature has a Coordinator who is usually the elected chair of Romance Languages.

Program decision making In Romance Languages each curriculum committee schedules courses. In Comparative Literature, the Coordinator and the chairs of participating Departments schedule courses

Percentage taught by adjuncts 70% including Romance Languages and Comparative Literature

FTE allocation We should have a serious conversation on this issue. Not just FTE, but workload in general

PART C

Academic program challenges Cross-listing courses through Departments and Programs has become extremely problematic. I has troubles cross-listing courses between Romance Languages and Comparative Literatures, and I coordinate both Programs.

Suggestions for changes Honestly, I don't know. Certainly by not hiring yet another dean tasked with this mission. The Senate might convene a meeting of Departments and Programs in the fall. I r

PART A

AUD consortium

Program Overview [https://www.gc.cuny.edu/Page-Elements/Academics-Research-Centers-Initiatives/Doctoral-Programs/Audiology-\(Au-D\)](https://www.gc.cuny.edu/Page-Elements/Academics-Research-Centers-Initiatives/Doctoral-Programs/Audiology-(Au-D))

PART B

Formal governance structure Governance is shared by faculty members who teach in this Program, from the three participating colleges - Hunter, Brooklyn and the GC

Changes in the curriculum this goes thru the Curriculum Committee composed of AuD faculty from all three participating colleges

Formal program affiliation The Hunter faculty who teach in the AuD program split their time between Hunter and the GC though they are hired by Hunter and are considered Hunter faculty

Program Director the EO is selected by faulty who teach in the program form the three colleges

Program decision making The EO, who, at the moment is a Hunter faculty member

Student selection The EO, who, at the moment is a Hunter faculty member

FTE allocation students apply to the AuD program so that 'credit' is afforded the AuD Program

PART C

Academic program challenges Though this issue has not come up yet, on the Hunter side, one potential problem is that faculty are not all evaluated by the same college so that there is likely differences across campuses as to how faculty are being judged and as to what the specific college might value, etc.

Suggestion for changes may need to look at re-structuring the AuD

PART A

19 teacher education programs. They are: TESOL, Childhood (grad and undergrad), Early Childhood (Grad and undergrad), Literacy, EDSUP, Bilingual, Graduate Math, Adolescent English, Adolescent Social Studies, STEM, Foreign Languages, 3 Creative Arts, 5 Partnership Programs (EHTP, UTR, TFA, Success Academy, TESOL)

Program Overview See info from program coordinators

PART B

Formal governance structure Program coordinators

Changes in the curriculum Program coordinators draft curriculum proposals in collaboration with program faculty. The proposals are then submitted to the department curriculum committee for review. Next, the proposals are discussed at the department meetings, along with recommendations and comments from committee members. Once the department votes to approve, the proposals would then be reviewed at the School of Education curriculum committee with is consisted of one member from each department, the associate dean and the department chairs (who do not vote).

Formal program affiliation Selection of faculty from other programs is a joint process, based on faculty members willingness, and the articulation of program coordinators. We do have several faculty members with joint appointment. Our department does their annual reviews and tenure and promotion.

Role of programming, evaluation, and observation The role of the other program and its director would include all of the personnel decisions, including reappointment, tenure and promotion.

Program Director Program coordinators are appointment by the Dean of school of Education. There is no term limits. Faculty members in some programs rotate to serve as program coordinators. The School of Education dean has the authority to remove/replace the program coordinators.

Program decision making Program coordinators do the course scheduling, cancel low-enrolled courses and select/mentor adjunct faculty.

Student selection Program coordinators, with the help of program faculty, do the admission. Advisors are selected based on a joint decision of program coordinators and faculty.

Percentage taught by adjuncts 80% of the courses in our department are taught by adjunct faculty. We have a few career adjuncts and the majority of them have career outside of academia.

FTE allocation We don't have interdisciplinary programs.

PART C

Academic program challenges The creative arts programs may be considered interdisciplinary programs: Music Education, Dance Education and Theater Arts Education. We provide faculty for their teacher education courses, as well as staff field supervisors for student teaching. There is no coherence: some of these programs are housed in our department and others are not.

Suggestion for changes Work out a coherent organization structure for these programs.

PART A

Philosophy (major/minor); **Philosophy, Politics, and Society (major/minor); Political Theory (minor); Human Rights (certificate); Logic (minor); Thomas Hunter Honors Program; Macauley Honors College; Legal Studies Program; Environmental Studies Program; Religion Program; Women and Gender Studies (cross-listed courses)**

Program Overview see Philosophy Department webpage

PART B

Formal governance structure some programs have advisors (philosophy; PPS), others have committees and/or advisors (political theory; human rights; logic); still others have a quasi-departmental structure of their own (Religion; THHP; MHC); others are departments or are administered within other departments (WGS; Geography, for Environmental Studies)

Changes in the curriculum Philosophy makes curricular changes via proposals to the department as a whole--they are discussed and approved in regular dept meetings

Formal program affiliation Program affiliations are voluntary; faculty who teach from outside the dept generally do so through cross-listed courses; no joint appointments as such

Program Director Philosophy Dept has a chair, voted on by the department in the usual way

Program decision making dept chair

Student selection N/A; we have a dept advisor whose job (as a lecturer) specifies this duty

Percentage taught by adjuncts 50-60 percent; most are graduate students, a handful w/other outside work

FTE Allocation this is negotiated w/other departments; usually enrollments are divided about 60/40 between philosophy and other depts for cross-listed courses

PART C

Academic program challenges Some programs are not governed by regular faculty (eg Human Rights), which can make communication more difficult; others (eg MHC) "expect" courses to be offered that may not fit well within our regular offerings; at the same time, it is not easy for regular faculty to teach across disciplines (eg offer a Philosophy/German course with another regular faculty member); this actually constitutes a barrier to regular faculty doing interdisciplinary work

Suggestions for changes all programs should have direction and advising by permanent academic faculty appointed in depts--this would give them more stability; second, certain rules (see 12, above) should be loosened to enable regular faculty to more easily do interdisciplinary teaching

PART A

Physical Therapy

Program overview www.hunter.cuny.edu/pt

PART B

Formal governance structure We are not interdisciplinary.

Changes in curriculum All full time faculty are members of our curriculum committee.

Program Director The Dept. Chair is elected by the full time faculty every three years. The Dean of the SON and Health Professions oversees our program and does reviews of the Dept. Chair.

Program decision making Department Chair does all.

Student selection All faculty participate in the admissions process and the Dept Chair does the final selection. Dept Chair is the primary student advisor.

Percentage taught by adjunct faculty About 15% are taught by adjunct faculty, all of whom are career physical therapists working full time outside Hunter.

PART C

Challenges to academic programming We have no shortcomings in our non-interdisciplinary program.

PART A

MFA creative writing

PART B

Formal governance structure Peter Carey exec director. Tom sleigh director. Gabriel Packard associate director

Changes in the curriculum Directors

Formal program affiliation Recruitment through formal procedures. Some faculty appointed whose course are open to English Dept Ma students if MFA students don't fill all places in class

Role of programming, evaluation, and observation These faculty are subject to evaluation by English dept.

Program Director Director and exec director report to dean and president. Appointments are ongoing. Administrative leader is associate director.

Program decision making Exec director and director. Classes always have full enrollment due to structure of program

Student selection Faculty choose students

Percentage taught by adjunct faculty No adjunct faculty

PART A

Thomas Hunter Honors Program

Program Overview The program's website stating its mission is: <http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/thhp/welcome-page> .

PART B

Formal governance structure While THHP is in the process of updating its by-laws, the following is taken from the first section describing its governance structure: The Thomas Hunter Honors Program (hereafter "the Program" or "THHP") is an interdisciplinary honors program that reports to the Provost and is governed by a 12-16 member Council on Honors (hereafter COH). The Program has two officers, a Chair and a Deputy Chair, chosen from among the COH members. The Chair and all COH members are both elected by the COH and appointed by the Provost. An advisory committee, consisting of the Chair, Deputy Chair, and three COH members appointed as Academic Advisors, serves as the Executive Committee of the Program.

Changes in the curriculum For new courses, interested faculty submit a course proposal for review that is initially reviewed by the Chair, Deputy Chair, and Program Coordinator, and ultimately reviewed and approved (or not) by the full COH. At meetings of the full COH, discussions of general program curricular changes are also discussed and voted on.

Formal program affiliation All faculty in THHP come from other departments. These are faculty who are either invited by the COH or who approach the COH themselves. The COH is continually looking to recruit new faculty to join the Council, particularly with a focus on breadth of representation across disciplines at the college. Faculty teach in THHP with the approval of their department chair.

Role of programming, evaluation, and observation THHP is not involved in the personnel decisions of faculty.

Program Director The Chair of THHP is elected by the COH for a 3 year term. The COH may also vote to remove a Chair.

Program decision making The program coordinator (Sarah Jeninsky) schedules courses for the program. Due to the nature of the program (we offer only a minimal number of courses and would offer more if we had additional resources), all courses have waiting lists. See above regarding how courses and their instructors are determined.

Student selection Regarding admissions: Students in BA programs who have accumulated between 24 and 70 credits (at least 24 of which are Hunter credits, 15 Hunter credits for transfer students) with a 3.65 or better cumulative average are invited to be interviewed for the Program. These 50-minute interviews are conducted in the early fall and spring by faculty members of the Council on Honors. Students must write a short essay explaining why they want to pursue interdisciplinary studies and provide a graded writing sample from one of their Hunter courses. The program has very intensive student advising--all students are required to see an advisor at least once each semester, though many come much more frequently for course and career guidance. Advisors are selected by the Chair from among those COH members who express interest and availability to advise.

Percentage taught by adjunct faculty Most courses (90+%) are taught by full-time faculty, though, when an adjunct has relevant expertise for teaching a course, they have been appointed as well.

PART C

Challenges to academic programming The Council is currently revising its bylaws to address new changes to the governance structure, including having a new deputy chair elected each year, and prescribing specific duties and responsibilities to its executive committee, which will consist of the chair, the deputy chair, and those members of COH currently serving as advisors in the program.

Suggestions for changes The COH is currently discussing and making its desired changes to its by-laws.

PART A

Legal Studies, Political Theory, and International Relations Minors; Public Policy, Caribbean and Latin American Studies, and Human Rights Program

Program Overview See: Department of Political Science

PART B

Formal governance structure For the 3 interdisciplinary minors, governance issues are decided by the Department of Political Science. For the Human Rights and Public Policy programs, Political Science faculty sit on the governance boards.

Changes to curriculum As it relates to the minors, the sub-field faculty members make curriculum changes. Regarding the HR and PP programs, our faculty, along with faculty from other departments, make curriculum changes.

Formal program affiliation The Department of Political Science is not involved in the selection of faculty from other academic units for the HR and PP programs

Program decision making Because Public Policy is not considered a full academic program, they ask our department to schedule some of their courses. They find the faculty and we are asked to support their choices.

PART C

Challenges to academic programming No problems

PART A

Human Biology

Program Overview <http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/human-biology>

PART B

Formal governance structure We have a Director and Faculty Committee of 5, drawn from our 5 main participating departments (Bio, Psych, Soc, Anthro, COMHE/NFS).

Changes in the curriculum Director and Faculty Committee discuss changes and submit them through the Senate.

Formal program affiliation All faculty have appointments in Departments. Our list of participating faculty is based on faculty interest and the Faculty Committee decides on inclusion.

Program Director Yes. So far there has only been one director who helped to begin the program. After the inaugural term will then be elected by the Faculty Committee. Terms are then 3 years after inaugural.

Program decision making We only schedule our Capstone course HMBIO401. The director and faculty committee decides who teaches.

PART A

SPED Dept: Learning Disabilities, Behavior Disorders, Adolescent Special Education, Severe/Multiple Disabilities, Early Childhood, Special Education, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Gifted, Applied Behavior Analysis, Teaching Fellows, Teach For America. Curriculum and Teaching: All Teacher Cert Programs - SPED courses

Program Overview <https://hunter-soe.digication.com/spedhunter/Home/>

PART B

Formal governance structure The Dept of Special Education is one of three departments in the School of Education. There are three chairs that report to the Dean of Education. Each department has multiple programs run by program coordinators.

Changes in the curriculum There is a dept curriculum committee that reviews proposals that are voted on by the faculty. This is then bumped up to the School of Education Curriculum committee with dept representatives who votes on the proposals.

Formal program affiliation A search committee selects and recommends faculty to the Dean, Provost, President. Teaching Commitments from faculty in other units is done in consultation with chairs & the dean. Some have joint appointments with the CUNY Graduate Center. They are primarily evaluated in their home dept.

Program Director Chair of Special Education - is elected every three years. If they are tenured, they are not reviewed. Unsure of removing/replacing.

Program decision making The chair in collaboration with the dept administrator and program faculty schedule courses. Cancellation occurs at the School of Education level by the Associate Dean

Student selection The program coordinators/faculty choose students. Advisors are assigned by program coordinators.

Percentage taught by adjunct faculty 80 percent adjuncts. Many are teachers in schools some are career adjuncts.

FTE allocation not sure

PART C

Challenges to academic programming Lack of consistency across programs. Some are run well, others are not.

Suggestions for changes Not sure where to begin. Hiring talented hardworking people is critical. Providing incentives for tenured senior faculty to continue to stay engaged is important to the culture. Having more undergraduate programs would lead to more faculty presence during normal working hours. Because we only teach in the late afternoon and nights, faculty are not around during the day. We need better physical space to hold classes and encourage faculty collaborations.

PART A

International Relations minor, Political Theory minor; and Legal Studies minor

Program Overview http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/polsci/curriculum/copy_of_minor-in-international-relations-2; <http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/polsci/curriculum/political-theory-minor>; <http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/polsci/curriculum/legal-studies-minor>

PART B

Formal Governance Structure The governance structure is not very formal; we just meet periodically with faculty from departments that contribute courses and faculty to teach.

Program Director Directors rotate among the Political Science faculty; they serve for 3 years.

Program Decision Making Chairpersons of the contributing departments to the minors

FTE Allocation FTEs are allocated according to which department offers the minor courses and students enroll in that department's courses

PART C

Challenges to academic programming None whatsoever

PART A

Geography; Environmental Studies

Program Overview www.geo.hunter.cuny.edu;

PART B

Formal governance structure The chair of the department oversees both programs. Each one (Geography and Env. Studies) has an academic adviser. Geography also has a masters adviser.

Changes in the curriculum We continually, including currently, go through processes of curriculum revision, and all faculty participate. one to three faculty generally lead the discussion for each program.

Formal program affiliation The Env. Studies is a program, and has no formal affiliation. Generally, dept of Geog. faculty participate

Program Director there is no formal director, but the chair of Geography and the adviser share the duties that might normally fall under a director

Program decision making there is no formal admissions, students have to declare their major

Percentage taught by adjunct faculty Significant portion - around half are taught by adjuncts, probably about 30-40% by long-term adjuncts. Some of them have other careers, others mostly rely on adjunct teaching

FTE Allocation all through the department of geography

PART C

Challenges to academic programming Governance seems to work ok

Appendix C.

The sub-committee on Principles, Values and Vision drafted these two principles that guided the work of the committee.

VALUE OF INTERDISCIPLINARITY

Interdisciplinarity constitutes efforts at disciplinary innovation designed to incorporate new concepts, ideas, and methodologies for research. Its values are transforming existing disciplines, creating new knowledge, and encouraging faculty collaboration, without necessarily creating new academic units.

PRINCIPLE OF GOVERNANCE

All curricular decisions (i.e., courses and programs offered) shall be vetted and overseen by full-time, tenure-track faculty. This ensures the existence of structures for collective decision-making, which is essential for an institution's identity as a center for research and innovation.