

MINUTES

Meeting of the Hunter College Senate

4 December 2019

- 1 The 633rd meeting of the Hunter College Senate convened at 3:41 PM in HW room 714.
2
- 3 **Presiding:** Laura S. Keating, Chair
4
- 5 **Attendance:** The elected members of the Senate with the exception of those marked absent in Appendix I.
6
7 Alternate Senators were formally seated in accordance with the procedures approved by the Senate, and
8 clickers were distributed to them.
9
- 10 **Minutes** The minutes of 18 September, 2 October, 23 October and 6 November were distributed at the door and
11 will be voted on at the next meeting.
12
- 13 **Report by the**
14 **Administrative**
15 **Committee:**
- 16 a) **Special Senate Election for Vacant At-large Seats**
17 In accordance with Article IV, 2H i & ii of the Charter for a Governance of Hunter
18 College, the Administrative Committee is presenting the names of all nominees
19 received to date:
20
21 Students: Ariela Radoncic (SEEK)
22 Luisais Taveras (SEEK)
23
24 It was moved that the Secretary be instructed to cast a single ballot in favor of the nominee.
25
26 The motion carried by voice vote without dissent.
27
- 28 b) **Approved Curriculum Changes**
29 The following curriculum changes as listed in the attached Report dated 4 December 2019 have
30 been approved as per Senate resolution and are submitted for the Senate's information: Items:
31 US-2315 Classical and Oriental Studies/Chinese (Change in degree program), US-2316
32 Geography and Environmental Science (Change in courses, Add W), US-2317 Computer
33 Science (Change in course), US-2318 Computer Science (Change in degree program), US-2319
34 Computer Science (Change in minor), UR-2330 Classical and Oriental Studies (Routine change
35 in courses), UR-2340 English (Change in course), UR-2341 Political Science (Change in course),
36 UR-2342 Computer Science (Change in course), GS-1302 Curriculum & Teaching/Educational
37 Foundations (Change in degree program), GS-1303 Curriculum & Teaching/Educational
38 Foundations (Change in degree program), GS-1319 Computer Science (New Courses), GR-1323
39 Music (Change in courses), GR-1326 Anthropology (Routine change in course).
40
- 41 c) **Report of Work on Resolutions on the Governance of Programs and Interdisciplinary**
42 **Structures**
43 Professor Keating gave an update on the Administrative Committee's work on the Resolutions
44 on the Governance of Programs and Interdisciplinary Structures. The draft of the Resolution is
45 in Appendix II.
46
- 47 **Committee**
48 **Report** **General Education Requirements Committee**
49 Professor Keating called on Professor Lawrence Kowerski, Chair of the General Education Requirements
50 Committee to present a report. Professor Kowerski said the following:
51
52 "Hi, I will be brief. I just wanted to tell you what we have been doing. We have actually been doing quite
a bit of work. The main business that we have accomplished so far is that we have looked at American

57 Sign Language and considered how it fits as a foreign language in terms of our Foreign Language
58 requirement. We have determined that for languages that are not taught at Hunter, there are various
59 processes for having them included in the Foreign Language requirement. We have also determined that
60 in these processes, to varying degrees, American Sign Language has been accepted at Hunter. So, this
61 requires no change in policy in confronting this question. So, now we are rewriting catalogue language
62 and defining more consistently the process for how a student goes about having a foreign language not
63 offered at Hunter applied to the Foreign Language requirement. We are also in the process of overseeing
64 the General Education assessment of the LPS category: Life and Physical Science category of Pathways.
65 That seems to be moving very well and has been entirely faculty driven process with the guidance of Joel
66 Bloom. It is exciting to see that has come to fruition. We have also been working closely with the
67 Assessment Committee. I will allow Professor Gina Riley to tell you more about what we have been doing
68 but we are working on setting up a way of figuring out how to deal with the next phases of our five-year
69 plan of the assessment of General Education, namely focusing on flexible outcome in the flexible core of
70 Pathways. In addition, we are establishing an ad-hoc committee made up of members from various
71 committees within the Senate to look at creating outcomes for our Hunter Focus which is essentially our
72 Foreign Language requirement. The Writing and the Pluralism and Diversity requirements overlay. This
73 is what we have been doing.
74

75 **Academic Assessment and Evaluation Committee**

76 Professor Keating called on Professor Gina Riley, Chair of the Academic Assessment and Evaluation
77 Committee to present a report. Professor Riley said the following:
78

79 “Good afternoon, how are you? In the Assessment Committee we have had a bunch of things occur since
80 October. We have taken a good look at our charge to understand what we are charged with. We have been
81 focusing on that five-year assessment plan. The five-year framework is on the Senate assessment website.
82 We worked with the GER committee. We have collaborated with the administration of the college. In
83 terms of assessment breakfasts, faculty and administrative directors have done many assessment
84 breakfasts. Go to them, they are very helpful with regards to looking at learning outcomes, designing
85 rubrics, and so forth. In terms of five-year assessment, the great news is we are on target. 2019 and 2020
86 was our Life and Physical Science focus. We are collecting data and analyzing that data in reliable and
87 valid ways. Looking ahead 2020 and 2021, our focus is on flexible core elective outcomes. Here, we have
88 been spending a lot of time going through all syllabi from flexible core courses both individually and as
89 a group and looking at the following. We are looking at the elective outcomes that are most likely used.
90 That is important to see what people are using in terms of the elective outcomes. We have been looking
91 at how syllabi are structured, how learning outcomes are pronounced and how they are linked to
92 assignments. We are also looking at faculty use of rubrics and how that works. On the whole, we are really
93 focused on recommendations for improving assessment. We always want to do it at a slow consistent and
94 tangible fashion, and we want to be knowledgeable regarding best assessment practices and faculty-wide
95 assessment practices.
96

97 **Charter Review Committee**

98 Professor Keating called on Professor Elke Nicolai, Chair of the Charter Review Committee to present a
99 report. Professor Nicolai said the following:
100

101 “Good afternoon, I would like to give a brief update on what we are working on in the Senate Charter
102 Review Committee this academic year. The committee has met twice so far to take a look at the Charter
103 to see where there are inconsistencies that need to be rectified and where updates are necessary. I will
104 name a few items. We noticed inconsistent language when it comes to ex-officio membership on
105 committees that come with or without voting rights. There is a different language that means the same
106 thing in the Charter. That could be unified. There is an inconsistency with regards to how many faculty
107 alternates per department should serve on the Senate. Article 3, section 1, speaks of two alternates, and
108 that is the practice right now. Article 4 section 3, speaks of one alternate for example, so there is a need

112
113 for unifying the language and the procedure. The pressing issue concerns the Evening Council (article 8
114 section 16). It has been on the horizon for quite some time. The Evening Council has been dormant for
115 some time simply because college life and scheduling do not seem to make the distinct entity necessary
116 anymore. Laura Keating mentioned in a meeting that even CUNY got rid of evening and day committees
117 dealing with issues for evening students, weekend students or the rest of the student body. We would like
118 to think about this in regards to the Charter. There have been several attempts in the past to deal with the
119 Evening Council one way or another. A decision has yet to be made. One could simply get rid of the
120 committee all together but that would then leave the Senate Administrative Committee with one seat
121 vacant since the Chair of the Evening Council also has a seat on the Senate Administrative Committee.
122 Should we get rid of the Evening Council, we would also have to consider the composition of the Senate
123 Administrative Committee. Another issue is the election of students to the Senate. For example, article 4,
124 section 2, speaks of 14 seats that are reserved for full-time undergraduates. Of these 14 seats, 9 are
125 reserved for full-time department majors that are being elected by the departments. We were wondering
126 how much this process is actually being followed. We want to look more into that. I have pointed out a
127 few things. I would like to leave it at that as you can see we are still in the process of identifying issues.
128 The next step would be to prioritize the issues the committee would like to tackle this academic year. I
129 hope I can be more specific or even provide you with some language at one point next semester.

130
131 **Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching**

132 Professor Keating called on Noam Sohn, Chair of the Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching to present
133 a report. Mr. Sohn said the following:

134
135 “I am the Vice Chair. My name is Noam. I am also the Chair of the Teacher Evaluation Committee. I am
136 going to give you the background on what we were tasked to do, what we have been doing and what we
137 should do next or think that we should do next.

138
139 “The current teacher evaluation does not acquire any valuable information for students to make a decision
140 on what professors to take, what professors to avoid or provide information to the P&B or Administration
141 on hiring decisions. The three objectives that we were more or less given were to create an evaluation that
142 was valuable for the students, create an evaluation that was valuable for the P&B and Administration to
143 make hiring decisions or reappointment decisions, and create an evaluation that reduces bias. I am going
144 to focus on the student and faculty issue because I know very little about bias, which we will get to at the
145 very end.

146
147 “So first, the student issue. We started this committee three years ago or so when Joy was the Vice Chair,
148 then Stephon tried and then I tried. We will get back to that important point in a second as well. The
149 student issue is difficult. The conclusion that we came to, and it is definitely an opinion, is that the school
150 cannot make an evaluation that is good for students to use. It is because the most important information
151 for a student is qualitative information such as, “a professor gives a tremendous amount of reading, a lot
152 of homework, but he grades on time” or “he gives a tremendous amount of reading and gives one question
153 on the test even though you read 500 pages,” so information that tells you something about the class, not
154 something like, “I like the person” or it was clear and concise on a scale of 1 to 7 or 1 to 5 or something
155 like that. The reason Hunter cannot do that is because Hunter cannot really be responsible for publishing
156 what students say since they can say anything. If you are paying attention to what is going on Facebook,
157 we cannot be a platform, we cannot have students grade their professor and plan for information that is
158 really valuable and plan for information that is totally appropriate for Hunter to publish. So, that was the
159 first conclusion.

160
161 “The issue came to hiring and reappointment. The general consensus is that there needs to be more input
162 from P&B and administrators to let us know what information they are looking for when they are making
163 hiring decisions. This is a historically supposed to be a majority student-led committee and students do
164 not know what should be taken into consideration while making these hiring P&B decisions.

165 **Minutes**
166 **Meeting of the Hunter College Senate**
167 **4 December 2019**
168

169 “That brings us to the final issue which is bias, which again being a student, I do not know how to remove
170 bias from evaluation. That sounds like a pretty difficult task. Even though there is research about it, I do
171 not know I can take this on. The general conclusion is that a student should not lead the committee
172 anymore. There have been three students who have tried - Joy, Stephon, exceptionally talented students,
173 and they were not able to get it done. I’ll be the third person to not get it done. This needs to be someone’s
174 job who really understands assessment, someone who is being paid to do it. I have other suggestions and
175 what we could do to make this evaluation work but I’ll take questions. I’d also like to say I want to thank
176 the people who were on the committee. We met several times over the past year or so. The same faces
177 showed up, and I got a lot of honest feedback throughout the process. In the beginning we were very
178 energized and then toward the end it was overwhelming. So, I just want to thank the committee for their
179 work.
180

181
182 **New Business** Professor Keating called on Provost Lon Kaufman to give an update on the Middle States. Provost
183 Kaufman said the following:
184

185 “You have all been waiting for the past seven months to learn the final outcome of the Middle States
186 accreditation visit. The Middle States Commission’s reaffirmation of accreditation, received by the
187 College in November, cited no recommendations for improvement – not even the three suggestions made
188 by the team site committee when they were here last April.
189

190
191 The meeting was adjourned at 4:31 PM.
192

193 Respectfully submitted,
194

195 Sarah Jeninsky
196 Secretary
197

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	Bill Williams	E
	Milagros Denis-Rosario	(A) X			0
	Lázaro Lima*	(A) X		Patrick Burke	(A) X
Anthropology	Jackie Brown	A		Barry Cherkas	(A) A
	David Hodges	(A) A	Medical Laboratory Sciences	Abigail Morales	A
	Milena Shattuck	(A) A		Chad Euler	(A) X
Art & Art History	Harper Montgomery	A		Muktar Mahajan	(A) X
	Thomas Weaver	A	Music	Jewel Thompson	X
	Emily Braun	(A) X		Michele Cabrini	(A) A
	A. K. Burns	(A) X			(A)
Biological Sciences	Derrick Brazill	A	School of Nursing		0
	Shirley Raps	A		Cheryl Zauderer	A
	Paul Feinstein	(A) X		Jin Young Seo	A
	Maria Pereira	(A) X		So-Hyun Park	(A) A
Chemistry	Gabriela Smeureanu	A	Philosophy	Laura Keating	A
	Nancy Greenbaum	(A) A		Frank Kirkland	(A) A
	Manashi Chatterjee	(A) X		Omar Dahbour	(A) A
Classical & Oriental Studies	David Petrain	X	Physics & Astronomy	Kelle Cruz	A
	Leah Garrett	(A) X			(A)
	Lawrence Kowerski	(A) A			(A)
Computer Science	Anita Raja	A	Political Science	John Wallach	X
	Felisa Vazquez-Abad	(A) A		Sanford Schram	(A) X
		(A)		Michael Lee	(A) A
Curriculum & Teaching	Lacey Peters	X	Psychology	Roseann Flores	A
	Karen Koellner	A		Jonathon Rendina	A
	Debbie Sonu	(A) X		Peter Moller	(A) X
	Christine Rosalia	A		Chris Braun	(A) A
Dance	Kathleen Isaac	X	Physical Therapy	Nicki Silberman	A
	Lori Brungard	(A) A		Thomas Holland	(A) X
		(A)			(A) X
Economics	Randall Filer	X	Romance Languages	Paolo Fasoli	A
	John Quiang Li	X		Magdalena Perkowski	(A) X
	Tim Goodspeed	(A) X			(A)
	Avi Liveson	(A) X	School of Social Work	Alexis Jemal	A
Educational Foundations & Cou	Goeum Na	A		Anna Ortega-Willam	X
	John Ranellucci	(A) X		Jonathan Prince	(A) A
	Amanda Crowell	(A) X		Ilze Earner	(A) X
English	Sarah Chinn	A	Sociology	Mark Halling	A
	Amy Robbins	X		Mike Benediktsson	(A) X
	Chong Chon-Smith	X		Michaela Soyer	(A) A
	Janet Neary	(A) X	Special Education	Virginia Gryta	A
Film & Media Studies	Tami Gold	X		Kristen Hodnett	(A) X
				Sari Gupta	(A) X
	Martin Lucas	(A) X	Speech-Language Pathology and Audiolo	Donald Vogel	A
	Larry Shore	(A) X		Nancy Eng	(A) A
Geography	Ines Miyares	A		JungMoon Hyun	(A) A
	Shipeng Sun	(A) X	Theatre	Louisa Thompson	X
		(A)		Jonathan Kalb	X
German	Elke Nicolai	A		Claudia Orenstein	(A) X
	Eckhard Kuhn-Osius	(A) X	Urban Policy and Planning	Lily Baum Pollans	A
	Lisa Marie Anderson	(A) A		Victoria Johnson	(A) A
History	Eduardo Contreras	A		Matthew Lasner	(A) X
		0 (A) X	School of Urban Public Health	Phil Alcabes	A
	Jill Rosenthal	X		Susan Cardenas	(A) X
Library	Sarah Ward	A		Victoria Fischer	(A) X
	Adina Milliken	X	Women & Gender Studies	Jennifer Gaboury	X
	Mee' Len Hom	(A) A		Catherine Raissiguier	(A) X
		(A)		Rupal Oza	(A) X

Students

	0	
Pooja Chopra		X
Richard Lu		X
Alexa Michel		A
Brian Sullivan		X
Mia Becewa		X
	0	
Phuong Vo		X
	0	
Noam Sohn		A
Nafeeza Ali		A
YanHong Li		X
	0	
Raymer Contreras		X
	0	
Zaiba Iqbal		X
Hardik Bhaskar		X
Leonid Prog		X
Linda Yohannes		X
	0	
Bryan Terry		X
	0	
Andrew Shkreli		X
	0	
Dorothy Slater		A
Ariela Radoncic		X
Luisais Taveras		X
Jeanine Hampton		X
	0	
Ariel Ortega		A
Milana Khaitova		X
Chaya Dickel		A
Naho Hirohata		X
	0	
Igal Sultanov		X
Brian Sullivan		X
	0	
Chelsea Yu		X
Tahseen Chowdhury		X
Harrison Cade		X
Priyal Thakkar		X

At-Large, Lecturers and Part-Time Faculty

Student Services	Kevin Nesbitt	A
	Luis Roldan	(A) A
Library	Jocelyn Berger-Barera	A
Library	Tony Doyle	A
Psychology	Stefan Schlussman	A
	0	0
Medical Lab Science	Hongxing Li	A
Religion	Barbara Sproul	A
THHP	Jerry Press	X
Mathematics & Statistics	Sandra Clarkson	X
	0	0
Educational Foundations	Jeanne Weiler	X
THHP	Sarah Jeninsky	A
Psychology		0

Ex-Officio

President, USG	Kamalpreet Kaur	X
Vice President, Graduate Student Association	Kamalpreet Kaur	X
President Alumni Association	Kim Hafner	X
President, HEO Forum	Denise Lucena-Jerez	X
President, CLT Council	Amy Jeu	X

ADMINISTRATION

Senators:		
HEO/CLA Representative	Brian Buckwald	A
Vice President for Student Affairs	Eija Ayravainen	A
	0	0
Provost	Lon Kaufman	A
Dean, School of Arts & Sciences	Andrew Polsky	A
Alternate Senators (3):		
Dean of Education	Michael Middleton	A
General Counsel & Dean of Faculty	Carol Robles-Román	A
School of Nursing	Gail McCain	A

Appendix II

RESOLUTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE SENATE ON THE GOVERNANCE OF PROGRAMS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STRUCTURES

Resolution I: Ensuring Faculty Governance of Curricula Offered Independently of Departments

Whereas the BOT Statement on the Governance of the University states, “Subject to the Board of Trustees, the faculty is primarily responsible for academic matters, including the criteria for admission and retention of students, promulgation of rules concerning attendance, the awarding of credit and degrees, the quality of teaching, research and the guidance of students, and the general quality and advancement of the academic program of the college. The responsibility for the academic program extends to the personnel responsible for that program and, therefore, includes the selection, retention, promotion and quality of the faculty” (BTM,1971,02-09,001, p.22), and

Whereas, with regard to the academic program of the college, the CUNY Bylaws, Article IX states that departments “subject to the approval of the faculty or faculty council, where existent, and subject to these bylaws, shall have control of the educational policies of the department through the vote of all its members who have faculty rank or faculty status” (Article IX, 9.1.a)¹ and that each department “shall have the fullest measure of autonomy consistent with the maintenance of general educational policy” (Article IX, 9.1.g), while requiring that a department have at least

- a committee on personnel and budget, consisting of five tenure-track faculty, four of whom are tenured including the Chair, elected by tenure-track members of the department (Article IX, 9.1.a and e);
- an elected Chair, who “shall be the executive officer of his/her department and shall carry out the department’s policies” (Article IX, 9.3.a);

and further,

Whereas the Hunter College Governance Charter requires a department’s bylaws to provide for “a department policy committee or committees” (Article XI, section 1) and “shall also provide for the review of curriculum proposals” (Article XI, section 2); and

Whereas through this resolution the Senate is to provide general policy, currently lacking, that would ensure analogous faculty autonomy over credit-bearing curricula including courses, minors, certificates, and degrees when run independently of departmental curriculum or policy committees, and independently of departmental P&B committees (as far as permitted by the negotiated contract and the CUNY Bylaws and Manual of General Policy), and

Whereas, by Article VI, 6.4.b of the CUNY Bylaws, “Except for the appointment of persons whose sole educational duties shall be administrative, all original appointments to the instructional staff shall be made to a department,” and, by the negotiated PSC-CUNY contract (Article 18), faculty evaluation and reappointment to the teaching faculty is to be done through departments, thus,

RESOLVED, That, when credit-bearing curricula, minors, certificates, and degrees are offered independently of departments, they shall be controlled by a unit of full-time teaching faculty with departmental appointments who have expertise relevant to the unit’s curriculum, consisting of at least three appointed to lines bearing tenure (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) or a Certificate of Continued Employment (CCE) (Lecturer, Doctoral Lecturer). Full-time faculty on non-tenure or non-CCE bearing lines (e.g. Distinguished Lecturer, Clinical Professor) may in part constitute the unit so long as the number of tenure- or CCE-line faculty members constitute at least two-thirds of the membership. The unit shall operate under unit-approved bylaws that provide for, at a minimum, (1) and (2) below:

(1) a committee(s) whose responsibilities shall include the development, review, assessment, and approval of the credit-bearing curriculum offered by the unit (including courses, minors, certificates, majors, and degrees), the approval of policies involved in the unit’s student advising, and the assurance of the quality of instruction. The committee(s) may be identical to the unit itself or may consist in a subgroup of the unit through election. Full-time faculty on non-tenure or non-CCE bearing lines may serve as members

¹ Faculty holding titles of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor have faculty rank; those holding titles of Instructor, Lecturer or Doctoral Lecturer (full time), Distinguished Lecturer or Clinical Professor have faculty status.

of a committee so long as the number of tenure-track or CCE-line faculty members is greater than a majority, as specified by the unit.

(2) the selection by the unit of leadership to carry out the policies approved by the unit, subject to the approval of the Provost and for a set term. The role of the unit leader(s) should be well-defined.

The unit's leadership shall be a member(s) of the teaching faculty with expertise relevant to the unit's curriculum and have a full-time faculty appointment(s) in a department.

Resolution II: The Establishment of By-laws for Non-Departmental Academic Units

RESOLVED, That once approved by the Hunter College Senate, a new non-departmental academic unit shall submit by-laws within two years, consistent with its approved governance plan, for approval by the Senate Committee on Governance and for adoption by the Senate.

RESOLVED, That non-departmental academic units existing as of Spring 2020 shall work with the Senate Committee on Governance to formulate and submit by-laws within two years for approval by the Committee on Governance and adoption by the Hunter College Senate.