

214  
HUNTER COLLEGE  
City University of New York  
OFFICE OF THE HUNTER COLLEGE SENATE

Room E1018

772-4200

Administrative Report

TO: Members of the Hunter College Senate  
FM: Senate Administrative Committee  
RE: **MEETING OF THE HUNTER COLLEGE SENATE**  
**WEDNESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 1993, FROM 4:20 PM TO 5:50 PM, in Room W714**

A G E N D A

1. Report by the President
2. Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds
3. Report by the Administrative Committee
  - a. Additional nominations for vacant seats on the Senate
  - b. Approved Curriculum Changes  
The following curriculum changes, as listed in the Report dated 10 November 1993, have been approved as per Senate resolution, and are submitted for the Senate's information: Items GR-372 (Curriculum & Teaching), US-858 (Economics), US-875 and US-876 (Mathematics & Statistics), US-877 (Biological Sciences), US-878/GS-368 (Geology & Geography).
3. Report by the Nominating Committee
  - Grade Appeals Committee  
Student Alternate: Cathy Goodridge (Accounting)
  - Departmental Governance Committee  
Faculty from Health Professions: Isabel Cadenas (Health Sciences)
4. Progress Report by the Undergraduate Course of Study Committee on Pluralism and Diversity (attached)
5. Old Business
6. New Business

*May Brock (Engl/Honors) Day  
Mark Quick (B'2 PRS) Eve  
Jessica Potland (Sec Lk) Grace*

**N.B.:** Also enclosed is a curriculum proposal currently under consideration by the Curriculum Committee of the Schools of Health Professions with a date for challenge and/or correction of November 10th.

**Undergraduate Course of Study Committee**  
**Progress Report to the Hunter College Senate on Pluralism & Diversity**

I.

The Undergraduate Course of Study Committee began its work on the pluralism and diversity requirement last Fall when the requirement was passed. At that time, we asked departments to submit proposals to their divisional curriculum committees. This process occurred more slowly than we had expected. We considered carefully several departments' requests; we requested again that departments submit courses. Hundreds of courses were submitted to us in April; we had received too many courses to make careful judgments about all of them all at once. We therefore approved last Spring courses for which we believed there were no doubts about their appropriateness, and postponed consideration of courses that seemed in any way problematic until this Fall. We are now engaged in this work, and wish to report to the Senate about the principles that guide our thinking. We do so as well to make our criteria and thinking clear to the entire College Community. This discussion is an important one for the entire College, so we believe that our proceedings should be clear to everyone.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

Although it should go without saying, let us first observe that our standards for evaluation are academic and institutional. By academic standards, we mean that our decisions are based upon an understanding of the spirit of the requirement, i.e., that to be adequately educated in the modern world requires a serious and sustained engagement with the issues addressed by the pluralism and diversity requirement. The exact meaning of the spirit of the requirement is hard to define; we are guided by the initial resolution passed by the Senate, and by our thinking about a number of ambiguities and questions that are discussed later in this report.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

By institutional standards, we mean that our decisions need to be guided by our responsibility to ourselves and our students that the College's curriculum is what it appears to be. What is printed in the catalog constitutes a legally enforceable contract. Therefore, when we include a course within a requirement, we need to be able to guarantee institutionally that, if a course is included in this requirement, then it will always include the content, perspective, and focus that has made it eligible for inclusion in this requirement.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

While we recognize questions of curriculum are questions of budgetary and other forms of priority, we cannot make decisions for the College based on political judgments. We will not allow departments eager to increase their numbers of students, or to ease the burden of this requirement on their majors, to use this opportunity to include in this requirement courses that do not rightly belong. Second, while some shifts in departmental priorities may occur as departments think about their approach to these questions, it would be most inappropriate for us to think of our work as providing either a carrot or a stick for such rethinking. We are not trying to bend departments' priorities and directions. If there are consequences for departments from our decisions, they may decide how best to deal with those consequences.

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

II.

As we think about this requirement from intellectual and institutional perspectives, a number of difficulties face our work. (1) In reality, our work is more akin to determi-

39  
40