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**COLLEGE-WIDE SENATE**

**GENERAL MEETING**

[Savoy Multipurpose Room](https://www.hostos.cuny.edu/About-Hostos/Our-Campus/Campus-Map)

120 East 149th Street (at Walton Ave)

Thursday, March 21, 2024

3:39 – 5:19 PM

**SENATE MEETING MINUTES**

**Present:**

* **Allied Health**: Professors Rodney Blair, Annie Chitlall, and Jarek Stelmark
* **Behavioral and Social Sciences**: Professors Ernest Ialongo (Chair), Nancy Genova, and Professor Felipe Pimentel
* **Business**: Professor Anders Stachelek
* **English**: Professors Christine Choi, Krystyna Michael, and Alexandra Milsom
  + **Education**: Professors Denise Cummings-Clay, Jacqueline DiSanto, and Michael Gosset
* **Gittleson**: Ms. Melanie Garcia
* **Humanities**: Professors Thelma Ithier-Sterling, Catherine Lewis, Ana Ozuna, Victor Torres Velez, and Nicole Wallenbrock
* **Language and Cognition**: Professors Isabel Feliz and Carl Grindley
* **Library**: Professor Jorge Matos
* **Mathematics**: Professors Junghang Lee and Lauren Wolf
* **Natural Sciences**: Professors John Gillen and Debasish Roy
* **Higher Education Officers** **(HEOs):** Ms. Karina Guardiola-Lopez, Ms. Jewel Jones, Mr. Michael Martinez, Dr. Silvia Reyes, Ms. Ursula Sanders, and Ms.Elizabeth Wilson
* **University Faculty Senate (UFS)**: Professors Gail August, Eugena Griffin, and Julie Trachman
* **Professional Staff Congress**: Professor Craig Bernardini
* **Senate At-Large Faculty Representatives**: Professors Stacey Cooper, Christine Hutchins, Teresa Gray, Diana Macri, Tram Nguyen, Clara Nieto-Wire, Hector Soto, Marcelo Viana Neto, and Simona Prives
* **Adjunct Faculty Representatives**: Professors Ruben Worrell and Juan Soto Franco
* **Student Government Association Representatives (SGA):** Dainma Martínez (President), Laura Cuevas, Jahneilia Curtin, Kyle Lewis, Kobe Jacobs, Ansumana Jammeh, John Santana, and Orlando Soto

**Absent:**

* **Mathematics:** Professors Edme Soho
* **Higher Education Officers:** Mr. Theudys Mejia and Mr. Piotr Kocik
  + **Public Safety / Maintenance**: Officer Clara Albino
  + **Student Government Association:** Cynthia Bongo,Kathy Disla, Yassir Djossou, Yaxeny Hernandez-Ravelo, Dorian Johnson, Melanie Ortiz Garcia, and Jasmin Sanchez

**Excused Absence:**

* + **Business:** ProfessorEddy Garcia
  + **Education:** ProfessorElys Vasquez-Iscan
  + **Higher Education Officers:** Mr. Travaras Geter, Dr. Marsha Milan-Bethal, Ms. Daliz Perez-Cabezas
  + **CLT:** Mr. Marino Corniel
  + **At Large:** ProfessorAndrew Connolly
  + **Student Government Association:** Brian Carter

**Non-Voting Ex Officio Members:**

* President Daisy Cocco De Filippis, SVP Esther Rodriguez-Chardavoyne, Provost VP La Toro Yates, Provost Shiang-Kwei Wang, VP Evelyn Fernandez-Ketcham, VP Colette Atkins, Dean Babette Audant, Mr. Carlos Rivera (HEO Organization Chair), and Parliamentarian Mr. Shmuel Gerber

**Non-Voting Ex Officio Absent**

* Mr. Eugene Sohn

**Guests**:

* Dean Andrea Fabrizio, Dean Ana I. Garcia Reyes, Dean Althea Sterling, Professor Nieves Angulo, Professor Jocelyn Baez, Professor Marcella Bencivenni, Professor Jason Buchanan, Professor Elizabeth Porter, Professor Olga Steinberg, Mr. Ricardo Garcia, Mr. Carlos Guevara, Ms. Amanda Fousse, Ms. Kelsey Hillebrand, Ms. Diana Kreymer, Mr. Philip Oliveri, Dr. Sofia Oviedo, Dr. Eric Radezky, Mr. Wilfredo Rodriguez, Mr. Darian Rivera, Mr. Rafael A. Torres, Mr. Gustavo Caraballo, Ms. Alyssa Valentine

**1.Call to Order**

Quorum established at 3:39 p.m.   
Senate called to order at 3:39 p.m.

**2.Approval of the Agenda**

Chair: New business: Professor Bernardini, Professor Lee, Elizabeth Wilson, etc.

Agenda was accepted as circulated.

**3.Approval of February 15, 2024 Senate Meeting Minutes**

Correction: Professor Gillen was present. Minutes will be corrected.

Minutes were accepted with this correction.

**4**.**Chair’s Report**   
   
Chairperson Ernest Ialongo (Submitted remarks)

**Hostos Senate-March 21, 2024**

**Chair’s Report on the Proposed Changes to the CUNY Bylaws**

Ernest Ialongo

Good afternoon everyone.

As you can tell from the many emails that have been going around this past month, it has been a busy period.

Let me begin by giving a brief overview of these events, as a prelude to our discussion of the [proposed changes](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/dz2974yd7yu4xf94zjoyo/h?rlkey=wi799mfm6efsva9mniqtftnd5&dl=0) to the Bylaws that Executive Vice Chancellor and University Provost Wendy Hensel is proposing, and we’re discussing later.

In late 2023, the University’s Budget Office released a fiscal analysis of the first quarter of the current fiscal year. The results were sobering, showing half the colleges with significant structural deficits.

In December, CUNY issued a mandate to these colleges to immediately cut their expenses, and we read about the draconian staffing cuts at Queens and York colleges.

This was all in the midst of Mayor Adams cuts to CUNY funding, with threats of more.

In early January, CUNY released a report entitled “Stabilizing the University’s Finances” which put forward a variety of cost savings measures, many of them in the realm of academic affairs, such as scheduling, class sizes, determination of program viability, etc.

On January 25, EVC Hensel sent a memo to Presidents, Provosts, and Deans with a series of what she called recommendations to operationalize that report, suggesting scheduling could be delegated to administrators, that program viability could be determined by a CUNY appointed committee, and recommended increasing class sizes.

It was all aimed at reducing the number of sections, and implicitly reducing the adjunct offerings and the adjunct budget in the process.

The Council of Faculty Governance Leaders [CFGL] issued a [statement](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/5602a4fah1lrd4fxwnu2y/11.CFGL-Response-to-EVC-Hensel-Memo-Final-for-Distribution.pdf?rlkey=3tnlyupfs361so93xtpiqycsz&dl=0) to CUNY in response on March 1, noting that we were all aware of the university’s budget crisis, but pointed out that the supposed recommendations would be read as mandates by college administrations, and that they were in fact in violation of the CUNY Bylaws regarding the prerogatives of Chairs over scheduling and faculty over curriculum.

We also stated that we were committed to working within the existing legislation as a part of shared governance to collectively address the university’s budget problems.

In a March 7 [response](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/x6kqx60shr3892va94kqk/12.EVC-Hensel-s-Response-to-Faculty-Governance-Leaders-March-1-2024-Letter-3.7.24.pdf?rlkey=ejq6tml7t9q0p5j0iiksv1dap&dl=0), EVC Hensel exhaustively laid out that she respected shared governance, that her memo was only to be read as a series of recommendations, and asked that we work in good faith to address the university’s problems together. She made a similar commitment to shared governance at a UFS meeting the previous week, as did Board Chairperson William Thompson, when the issue of the Hensel memo was brought up.

In Hensel’s response to the CFGL’s statement, she noted there were Bylaws changes she would propose, and would share with the UFS. These proposals were received just over a week ago and were shared within the university.

What has become clear, is that EVC Hensel’s view of shared governance is different than what the faculty believes it is.

Using the AAUP’s “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” of 1966, which is the basis of the CUNY Bylaws, and university systems nation-wide, it is widely understood, and practiced, that scheduling is the prerogative of Chairs, who bring to bear their academic judgement, familiarity with their faculty’s expertise and their students’ needs, and their commitment to academic freedom when developing a schedule.

However, they do not work in isolation. The administration controls the budget, and develops and executes overall college plans, and is responsible for carrying out university policy.

At Hostos, and elsewhere in CUNY, and beyond, Chairs, and Coordinators, develop the schedule with college goals in mind, and the Chairs and the administration work together on the final product, respecting each sides’ contributions to the well-being of the college and meeting students’ needs--and thus respecting each side's contribution to shared governance.

It does not seem this collaborative view, and best practice, is shared by CUNY Central.

EVC Hensel has claimed that her January cost savings memo was clear evidence of her commitment to shared governance, as she shared the document with the UFS when she sent it to college administrations.

However, faculty were not consulted on this memo. They were informed.

Moreover, she claims that shared governance was not mentioned in that memo because it was assumed it would be followed on the campuses.

Yet, she never retracted her claim that scheduling could be delegated to administrators, contrary to the Bylaws that place the schedule under the Chair's purview.

Now, EVC Hensel has proposed changes to the Bylaws which in fact negatively impact the Chair’s prerogatives over scheduling, seeking to make into law what she claimed were only recommendations in her January memo.

And, CUNY is seeking to push through these changes without any meaningful faculty input.

A small ad hoc committee of the UFS and CFGL is meeting with EVC Hensel [this] week, of which I am a part. However, this group cannot possibly speak on behalf of the faculty at this point on these proposed changes, as there has been no real time to discuss them across the university, and to offer any alternative language.

These proposals are being presented as minor changes that codify existing practice on the campuses.

This is not accurate.

These proposals seek to shift primary authority for scheduling from the Chairs to the Provost and Deans, wherein the administration is involved in the planning of the schedule, and not just the final overall approval.

Additionally, in order to codify the Provost/Dean's new role in planning the schedule, the proposed changes need to redefine the President’s role, and thus, it seems, to diminish it, from being the chief academic officer of their college, responsible for its overall academic quality, to its chief executive officer.

This is inconsistent with other parts of the Bylaws and Manual of General Policy as to the President’s role. Moreover, the addition of Provosts and Deans specifically in the Bylaws ignores that the Chancellor, or their designees, ie., Presidents, create sub-President titles per campus, recognizing different campus practices and needs.

These proposed changes seem rushed, are inconsistent, and there is a desire to push them through to completion, undermining any meaningful discussion on their consequences.

However, what seems to be clear from even a cursory read of these proposed changes is that CUNY is seeking to address its budgetary needs by stripping Chairs of their prerogatives over the schedule. EVC Hensel’s response to the CFGL’s statement explicitly said that on some campuses Chairs are making schedules without any regard to the budgetary consequences. Yet no evidence has been provided that this is happening, or where.

What is also clear is that in trying to shift blame to faculty for a college’s financial straits it confuses the actual roles of Chairs. Chairs, and Coordinators, do not control budgets. Presidents do. If there is a campus-specific issue involving a President, or Provost, or Dean and their inability to work with their faculty, then that is a matter the University Provost and Chancellor can handle at the campus administrative level.

Proposing wide-sweeping changes to the Bylaws that attack the Chair’s rights over the schedule is not the answer.

Many of our campuses, including our own, have a functioning relationship between the Chairs and the administration over scheduling, and we are collectively making our way out of the Covid crisis.

The proposed Bylaws changes ignore this and hinder best practices at the colleges that have been in place for decades.

We will have more to say on all this later, but suffice it to say that these changes are significant, a danger to functioning relations on many of our campuses between faculty and administration, and seek to address what are campus-specific problems with wide-sweeping changes to scheduling that, in reducing the Chair’s role, will affect course offerings for students, academic freedom, and the quality of work life a Chair seeks to ensure for their faculty as they meet students' needs.

I’m sure we all look forward to getting to this item on our agenda today.

Thank you.

**5.President’s Comments**   
  
  President Daisy Cocco De Filippis, Ph.D. (Submitted remarks)

Good afternoon, muy buenas tardes,

It is good to be with you.

As the semester progresses, our primary focus is about the teaching and learning, academic and student support areas to ensure continued success for our students. I offer a very special thank you to our Provost who is working diligently with OAA and academic leaders on the creation of the summer and fall schedules that are responsive to our academic programs and the needs of our students. I understand that there was a student survey taken which saw robust participation.

I hope midterms went well and know that additional support is being made available to our students, as needed, to ensure a successful semester.

Thank you for all you do each-and-every day to facilitate the journey for so many, including our very own as professionals. Mil gracias y bendiciones.

Daisy Cocco De Filippis, Ph.D.

President

**6.SGA President’s Comments**

President Dainma Martínez (Submitted remarks)

Every single one of us has limitless potential and tremendous power, and that fact continues to spring into my head. We, the students, are more than just individuals who want to learn and develop in a classroom; we are the future of positive change, the ambassadors of hope, and the embodiment of what is new. The power to choose tomorrow's world rests with us. With new ideas and limitless imagination, we are at the front of development. In our role as students, we stand at the heart of change, dreaming of a better, more level future than anybody has ever imagined.

Our impact, however, extends well beyond the walls of academia. We are a symbol of the energy, strength, and persistent dedication to greatness that define the human spirit. Truly, the future is ours as students, we must give thanks to those who are shining the knowledge that we seek here at Hostos. We all want to see a world free by the limitations of the past and driven by the opportunities of the future.

Soon on April 18th at 11am we will be having the Bronx Beautification Project. The project consists of us cleaning up around the A building and towards the back, We ask for those who are able to volunteer to ….Volunteer, I will be sending out a sign up forum for those who wish to volunteer.

I also want to finish off by saying Thank you, Thank you to everyone here, thank you for all that everyone here contributes towards Hostos life.

**7.Curriculum Items**

a. Liberal Arts Option – Professors Porter and Bencivenni

i. Women and Gender Studies Liberal Arts Option –Revision

Y = 58

N = 0

A = 0

I = 0

Item passed.

b. Natural Sciences Department – Professor Olga Steinberg

i.PHY 299 –Revision

Y = 52

N = 2

A = 0

I = 1

Item passed.

c. Humanities Department – Professor Catherine Lewis

i.DD 108 –Revision

Y = 52

N = 0

A = 2

I = 0

Item passed.

d. Mathematics Department - Prof. Junghang Lee

i.CST 140 -New Course

Y = 56

N = 0

A = 0

I = 0

Item passed.

ii.CST 160 –Revision

SGA President Dainma Martinez: Will software needed for this course be paid for by the College?

Provost Shiang-Kwei Wang: We will continue to explore opportunities to pay for this with grant money.

Y = 55

N = 0

A = 0

I = 1

Item passed.

**8.Curriculum Items (Informational)**

Presented by Prof. Nancy Genova

a. Criminal Justice Distance Ed -NYSED

b. PPA Distance Ed -NYSED

c. Paralegal Distance Ed -NYSED

**9.Reports of the Senate Standing Committee**

None.

**10.UFS Update**

Report submitted by Prof. Trachman

I.Remarks from Board of Trustees (BoT) Chair, Mr. William Thompson: i)First, he acknowledged the great work being done by the UFS representatives on the various BoT committees, including our Doctoral and Graduate Students’ Council representative. ii)CUNY is at a crossroad. American citizens, more and more, are questioning the value of higher education. This led him to talk about CUNY’s current budget concerns. There has been a certain amount of back and forth with Governor Hochul’s staff and he felt like they are working with CUNY.   CUNY is also looking into other revenue sources such as income from unused property, charitable contributions.as well as all of us “tightening our belts” including at CUNY Central.           In the Q and A portion: a) Prof. N. Benton, JJ (from the Budget Advisory Committee) suggested there is a need to revisit the allocation of moneys to the different campuses. The “formula” being used is ancient and some campuses are favored while some are disadvantaged. Different metrics should be used in the future. b)Prof. E. Ialongo (Senate Chair, HCC) spoke at some length about the Wendy Hensel memo “Strategies for the Optimal Use of Academic Resources,” sent at the end of January. Many felt that the CUNY Bylaws were not being followed with respect to shared governance. He also talked about the impact this memo had at some of the campuses.  Chair Thompson had not seen the memo before it was sent out. c)Prof. D. Bennett (NYCCT) ask where does the BoT stand when it comes to DEI concerns with it being under attack in many parts of the country?  He answered by saying the situation has improved at CUNY and cited a few campuses as examples. He recognized it is an issue across the country but we are in New York and they are dedicated to diversity.

II. Remarks by Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Wendy Hensel (via Zoom/with slides): She talked a little bit about structural deficits and then talked at length about the memo. She said it was done in consultation with the campuses. She also stressed that this was not a mandate but rather a set of recommendations. This is a beginning of a conversation – including discussion and training of department chairs.  She promised there would be equity across campuses. In the Q and A portion (which included a number of comments): Many questions and comments were directed at shared governance concerns/ academic freedom/ faculty involvement.  She tried to reassure us that she and the other administrators believed in shared governance. Some questions were more specific about such concerns relating to determination of class size, determination of course modality.  Prof. L. Ellis point blank asked if an analogous memo was sent to administrators and we were told yes. The 16% cost was being shared.

III.Remarks by UFS Chair, Prof. J. Verzani (CSI): i)Prof. Verzani will appoint two faculty members to participate on the recently formed Committee on Academic Policy (CAP) housed within the Office of Academic Affairs. He mentioned a couple of strategies that could help with scheduling issues, for ex. overlapping sections and with low enrollment courses/programs: the consortium model, epermits.   Ii) He mentioned that campus faculty governance leaders (FGLs) play a role in ECP evaluations (chancellor is evaluated every two years. Campus presidents every 3 years). Sometimes UFS members are asked to participate in this evaluation process.  iii)He asked us to look the blog relating to LMS policy (see my UFS report from Feb. HCC Senate meeting for more details) and the letter writing campaign regarding the budget.

**11.CUNY’s Proposed Revisions to the Bylaws and Manual of General Policy: Discussion and Response**

*Professor Grindley (Submitted remarks)*

STATEMENT FROM THE LANGUAGE AND COGNITION DEPARTMENT

The Language and Cognition Department asserts that the proposed CUNY bylaw changes would negatively and profoundly impact the college's vulnerable ESL population, damage the elective delivery of Academic ESL and Linguistic courses, and needlessly challenge academic structures and practices that have existed since the first Medieval universities. Although a student-centered scheduling policy initially seems politically expedient, removing or diluting a Chair's role in favor of what will most certainly be a partially or wholly automated just-in-time model goes against the core assumption of traditional scheduling, that curriculum sequences, electives, and prerequisites should be carefully planned and educationally coherent. Prioritizing convenience will dilute academic rigor, increase complexity and cost, require administrative intervention by non-disciplinary professionals, and introduce a layer of operational fragility into scheduling. Student-centered scheduling will also introduce equity concerns as the needs of the small and vulnerable ESL population will be subsumed into the larger student body. The inability to plan and protect specific scheduling blocks—which have been used to construct what are for all intents and purposes learning communities—will damage what little remains ofour community and cohesion. Finally, unpredictability, insecurity, and inconsistency in scheduling will lead to increased faculty burnout and dissatisfaction, impacting teaching quality, and faculty retention. The Language and Cognition Department has worked diligently to construct a model schedule that acknowledges the needs of students, the needs of faculty, and the needs of our discipline, and we are opposed to this unwelcome insult to our professional expertise. The relationship between the Chair and the Department, with their mutual understanding of departmental curriculum and their students, is essential to the goals of shared governance and academic freedom. Interfering with this relationship will hurt the Department's ability to create programs and schedules designed to help students to progress in their academic goals.

Professor Carl James Grindley, Chair

Professor Norma Pena de Llorenz, Deputy Chair Professor Karin Lundberg, former Chair, Dept. P&B Professor Gail August, former Chair

Professor Patricia Frenz-Belkin, Dept. B&B

*Professor August (Submitted remarks)*

We may have some processes at our college that could be improved. However, what we do not need is a top-down plan to arrange scheduling according to algorithms based on data from institutions that may be very different from ours.    
  
Many of the suggested changes refer to meeting the needs of students.   
  
But what about the needs of our faculty? Our faculty is very dedicated to the students. We do hours and hours of uncompensated work to improve the educational experience for students. We are a vital component in the success of our college and our students. Our faculty has research interests and expertise—and we create courses to share this with our students. We also have personal lives, families, and need teaching schedules which allow us to maintain a reasonable work-life balance and to give us opportunities to develop as academics and healthy human beings. Treating faculty like robots, scheduling classes without their needs, without their input, is not going to help to maintain talented instructors and enthusiastic teaching.  
  
Our expertise feeds the discipline, the discipline is represented through the departments. Programs and curricula are based on our expertise, be it subject matter or pedagogy. This is the quintessential core of higher education.  
  
I’m asking our college, including our administrative partners, to speak out to support the traditional relationship of chairs to departments, creating curriculum and schedules to meet the needs of their academic discipline, their students, and their faculty.

*Professor Craig Bernardini*

Removing chairs is neutralizing their power. From a pedagogical perspective, full time faculty have always held the post-observation conference and to require that chairs add this to their many duties would be untenable and unsound.

Every week we encounter further bureaucratic horror that prevent us from focusing on teaching students.

*Professor Felipe Pimentel*

Points out that negotiations have perpetually undermined faculty and at times an insinuation that chairs should be removed from Bargaining Unit. Argues that collective actions is needed.

*Professor Jacqueline DiSanto*

Having chairs conduct the post-observation conversation is contrary to the spirit of peer observations.  One of the purposes of peer observation is to have collegial conversations centered around the practice of teaching.  It is intended that both the faculty being observed and the one conducting the observation will benefit from this conversation.  If only the chairs hold these conversations, great opportunities for mentorship, collegiality, and shared practice will be lost.

*Professor Ana Ozuna*

The Department Chairperson and coordinator facilitate scheduling and interject their institutional knowledge to develop course offerings that best meet the needs of our students. CUNY should recognized and value  the institutional knowledge held by Chairpersons and coordinators.  
  
Professor Ozuna reference a popular saying in Spanish: "ojos que no ven, corazón que no siente" to note the absurdity of overlooking the significant and synergistic act of observing a course whether it be in person or online; undoubtedly the post-observation meeting can only be justly conducted by the initial observer of the course, not the chairperson.

*Professor Hector Soto*

Old proverb, if you don’t have a seat at the table you are on the menu.

*Professor Trachman*

When we started to revise our Charter of Governance, and CUNY opposed the preamble in order to reduce the role of faculty and Hostos held strong. We need to stay strong.

*Mr. Kobe Jacobs*

Asks what is the BOT’s motive in regulating the role of academic chairpersons and undermining faculty rights?

How do students play a role in advocating for chairs and against these changes, and what are faculty doing in terms of fighting this?

Chairperson asks to extend time to 5:15

Chairperson Ialongo responds that students can speak up at USS and collectively to lobby administration to bring discontentment over the bylaws changes to the EVC and Chancellor.

*Mr. Akwasi Osei-Tutu*

Why is this not being circulated that professors are being taken advantage of and it’s not good for students, classes, and morale? If students knew that this would shortchange their academic experience, they would absolutely get involved.

President Dainma Martinez notes that she speaks with students every day and invites them all the events at the college. She encourages everyone to check their emails because so much information is sent and spreading the word is key. Semanario is weekly and in it she has her sections to speak about all these issues. Please reach and get involved.

“We’re all trees and we’re meant to grow.”

*Provost Shiang-Kwei Wang*

Reports that she has information to share after having had a meeting with EVC Hensel. However, at Hostos, the Provost upholds that OAA works closely with Chairs in a transparent and effective process to serve the students. Student surveys afford an understanding of what students need in terms of courses. This information is shared with Chairs who share with coordinators and P&B. Every two days Chairs are provided with enrollment data leading up to the first day of classes and this process is integral to how OAA operates.

Chairs attended a Central’s PD for Chairs on Scheduling in January 2024 and feedback suggested that Hostos was ahead of the curve in terms of this process.

Stipulating that she was not defending the plans, Provost Wang reports that EVC Hensel’s justifications include:

The Bylaws were completed in 1965, and that language cannot reflect the complex CUNY system that the university has become. There is no change to faculty’s role. Departmental leadership does not have the perspective that upper administration has on the college’s budget. We need to maintain transparency.

Chairperson: I don’t know which comptroller flagged which campuses for budgetary mischief, and that has not been shared. However, Chairs do know the larger budget because Chairs are in conversation with other Chairs across CUNY, with the UFS, etc.

*Professor Marcella Bencivenni (Submitted remarks)*

I would like to speak to CUNY recent proposed changes to the bylaws and share some of the preliminary concerns that have been raised by the PSC, which has already called for the immediate withdrawal of these proposals.

An article detailing the union position will appear on the next issue of the Clarion, but I would like to summarize the most salient objections.

The PSC opposes these proposed measures because they represent “a sweeping overhaul of shared governance” and, if passed, would significantly change the academic character of the university.

First, let’s consider the proposed change in the description of the role of college presidents: Instead of being the College “principal academic officers” presidents would become chief “executive officers.” Words matter. If there were any doubts about CUNY’s increasing corporatization, the elimination of any reference to the president’s “academic” responsibilities and “qualifications” makes the CUNY management’s corporate culture crystal clear.

The proposed changes would also give Deans and Provosts increased managerial oversight of academic departments, essentially giving them control over recruitment, evaluation, and scheduling of classes by taking these very same responsibilities away from chairs.

In fact, the proposed changes in “duties of chairpersons” (Article IX, section 9.3 of the CUNY Bylaw) would shift department chairs’ responsibilities away from departmental academic matters such as curriculum and scheduling towards purely administrative concerns, essentially making chairs into no more than paper pushers who have no real agency when it comes to shaping their department’s culture and visions

As PSC president James Davis put it, this is essentially an attempt to destroy the very idea of the department chair as an academic leader and put in its place the department chair as appendage to a dean.”

I find these proposed changes very concerning because they show that CUNY management is serious in wanting to take away the most important responsibility assigned to chairs, academic judgements, out of the department and place them into the administration.

Despite assuring us that they believe in, and support, shared governance, CUNY is constantly trying to erode faculty rights. And seriously, based on the policies CUNY has implemented in the last 20 years – from CUNYFirst to pathways to how they have handled the pandemic -- would you really give more decisional power to management?

BTW, I don’t think that it’s a coincidence that these proposed changes were submitted now, at a time when faculty governance and the rights of department chairs are under attack from CUNY also at the bargaining table.  
  
University Provost Hensel has indicated the administration’s intention to hear from faculty and finalize these changes at the June meeting of the Board of Trustees.

It is critical that we let them know what we think.

**12.New Business**

*Prof. Bernardini – PSC CUNY Chapter Co-Chair*

Tabled to next meeting.

**13.Adjournment**

No motion was made to extend time. Meeting ended at 5:19.

**Submitted by:**   
   
*Tram Nguyen, Recording Secretary, and Chair Ernest Ialongo*