The New School
University Faculty Senate

Tuesday, February 5, 2008
8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

Working Session

Co-Chaired by Elzbieta Matynia, Alan McGowan, Keith Buhl

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Rm. 712

Agenda

8:30 Brief Reports on the recent work of the Senate Committees
Faculty Affairs (5 minutes)
Governance Committee (5 minutes)
Academic Policy & Space (15 minutes)

8:55 Part–time Faculty Issues (20 minutes)
Discussion

9:15 Restructuring of the University: the role of the UFS
Discussion

10:00 Adjourn

Present

Members
Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes
Bea Banu, NSGS
Keith Buhl, Co-chair, Drama
Dierdre Boyle, NSGS
David Brody, Parsons
Emanuele Castano, NSSR
Doris Chang, NSSR
John Clinton, Milano
Alice Crary, NSSR
Onno De Jong, Parsons
Linda Dunne, Dean, NSGS
Shoshanah Goldberg, Milano
Rachel Heiman, NSGS
David Howell, Milano
Robert Kirkbride, Parsons
Mark Larrimore, Lang
Elzbieta Matynia, Co-chair, NSSR
Alan McGowan, Co-chair, Lang
Dominic Pettman, Lang
Faye-Ellen Silverman, Mannes
Paula Stuttman, NSGS
Sven Travis, Parsons
Tom Vasiliades, Drama
Susan Weller, Parsons
Jennifer Wilson, Secretary, Lang
Johanna Woodcock, Parsons

Visitors

Absent
Tracyann Williams, NSGS

1. Reports on the recent work of the Senate Committees.

A) Faculty Affairs

Alice Crary declared that Tracyann Williams of FAC had been appointed to a university wide task force on benefits, and an update was being awaited. She explained that the committee's energies had been focused on dealing with review and promotion issues, across the university, with the Provost's Office. She mentioned a few upcoming meetings, one of which will be devoted to our ongoing conversation about a whole range of relevant issues and another that focused on clarifying the category "extended employment" and, more specifically, capturing the sense in which there is a "presumption of continuity" for people who are promoted to EE. She also mentioned that the committee discovered that the faculty handbook had no discussion of "post-EE reviews" to parallel its discussion of "post-tenure reviews" and, further, that we had discovered that the PO meant to have such a discussion. So we agreed with the PO to help draft it with an eye to creating language that would capture the presumption of continuity built into EE. To close, she voiced concerns of the committee over the lack of an amendment procedure for the handbook, but have not yet found time to address this topic.

B) Governance Committee Report

Doris Chang and David Howell reported on a meeting between the governance committee, Ron Kassimir and Elizabeth Ross of the Provost's office at the end of the fall semester. Three goals of the meeting were described as: 1) to express concern regarding the lack of formal governance structures in many of the divisions, 2) to inquire into the status of the divisional bylaws that were submitted to the Provost's Office at the end of Spring 2007, and 3) to discuss mechanisms for involving faculty in discussions of the plans for restructuring the university. A meeting between Ron and Liz and the Deans was scheduled in order to discuss the Committee's concerns regarding the need for formal governance structure in all of the divisions.

C) Academic Policy and Space

Robert Kirkbride discussed the focus points of the Space Planning committee: 1)Revision of the APC Space Planning document; 2) UFS request status report from Curriculum subcommittees of university-wide programs; 3)Emphasize need for innovation in AT/IT from various parties (library, faculty, online programs…). He urged the need to get an update from the curriculum subcommittees on their participation in the restructuring, interim space, on-line virtual school, among others. He discussed the update of the APC Space Planning Document, which included an update on the new building. Also, the newly conceived of Task Force on Socially Responsible Construction Management was discussed; the UFS recommended John Clinton's leadership. Regarding University-wide curriculum subcommittees, the status of the current groups was brought up and ways to improve their situation for information exchange with the UFS. Robert emphasized the need for, we have emphasized need for innovative vision regarding AT/IT issues, such as

an improvement to current academic virtual infrastructure to support restructuring, development of on-line learning for long term growth and short-term response to space constraints after 65 5th is razed and before the new signature building is completed. Finally, proposals were made for March meeting, including the invitation of Ben Lee to present on enrollment; invitation to Bob Gay, VP for Enrollment Management to attend to see efforts of UFS to integrate infrastructural issues (physical & virtual) with academic mission; invitation of library to present on their digital visions; announcement of release of Revised APC Space Planning Document to administration & SOM and also, to invite Joe Westphal, VP and Director of Tishman Environment & Design Center to attend.

2. Issues of Part-Time Faculty

Alan McGowan raised the issue of a working group on part-time issues, since so much time was spent discussing issues of full-time members. Bea Banu responded by saying that part-time issues were the province of the union, and therefore there was no need for such a working group. Others disagreed, saying that it would be useful to have such a group.

3**. Restructuring of the University: the role of the UFS**

Elzbieta Matynia : the UFS should discuss what role it ought to play in the university restructuring process. She suggests that UFS considers creating a working group that will identify issues and discuss how they can be effectively addressed in the senate. Alan McGowan described the presentation of newly appointed Dean of Eugene Lang, Neil Gordon at administration meetings that suggested a "NS for Liberal Arts" that would include Lang, NSSR, and NSGS. Questions what role should Lang play are raised. Elzbieta suggests that the UFS should try to improve the communication with the deans, and – perhaps -- request a privilege of attending certain Dean's meetings which deliberate on the future of the university. Robert Kirkbride points out that some of the senate bylaws haven't been recognized by some of the deans. He suggests that there should be a faculty meeting where updates are made known and a faculty rep reports to the senate. Sven Travis proposes resolution to that effect; Bea Banu points out there is no one in Provost's office that is involved with strategic planning.

University Faculty Senate

Full Senate Meeting: March 4 2008

Chaired by Elzbieta Matynia

Agenda

8:30 Welcome

8:35 Presentation of the university strategic planning – Provost Ben Lee

9:05 Questions from the senators

9:30 Discussion on the involvement of both faculty and the UFS in the process of university restructuring

10:00 Adjourn

Present

Members

Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes

Bea Banu, NSGS

Keith Buhl, Co-chair, Drama

Dierdre Boyle, NSGS

David Brody, Parsons

Emanuele Castano, NSSR

Doris Chang, NSSR

John Clinton, Milano

Alice Crary, NSSR

Onno De Jong, Parsons

Linda Dunne, Dean, NSGS

Shoshanah Goldberg, Milano

Rachel Heiman, NSGS

David Howell, Milano

Robert Kirkbride, Parsons

Mark Larrimore, Lang

Elzbieta Matynia, Co-chair, NSSR

Alan McGowan, Co-chair, Lang

Dominic Pettman, Lang

Faye-Ellen Silverman, Mannes

Paula Stuttman, NSGS

Sven Travis, Parsons

Tom Vasiliades, Dram Susan Weller, Parsons

Tracyann Williams, NSGS

Jennifer Wilson, Secretary, Lang

Ex Officio

Ben Lee, Provost

Liz Ross, Vice Provost

Ron Kassimir, Associate Provost

David Ford, Provost's Office

Visitors

Absent

8:30am Welcome

Elzbieta welcomes the Senate, and the representatives of the university administration at this meeting of the full senate.

8:35am Presentation of the university strategic planning

Provost Ben Lee presents a modified version of the strategic planning outline that President Kerry presented to the Board of Trustees on February 20, 2008, which he reports is the outcome of the last year-and-a-half of work done by the faculty, deans, and McGwire and Associates. Lee reports on the plan to increase the attractiveness of the university programs, devised by McGwire and Associates. Provost Lee states that the objective of the meetings was to create a vision of the university through discussion with many people; focusing on the themes of critical thinking, interdisciplinarity, practice and civic engagement based projects, and a strong international dimension. He mentions the three tracts that most incoming students are interested in: liberal arts, art-design school, and musical conservatory. He states that liberal arts and performance will try to merge these three dimensions of NSU that are now separate. He also says that a document will be released later regarding these topics, entitled, "A plan for the future" that focuses on the integration of the departments.

Provost Lee announces the fourfold strategic plan which deals with the problem of dependency on Parsons, budgetary rules and process that lock resources, need to integrate graduate with undergraduate programs. He then describes the proposed strategy: to build a strong university identity that will allow interdisciplinary structures that support coordination of internal changes and create common undergraduate program. He puts

fourth the three stage solution: first phase) undergrad development; second phase) the establishment of school for performing arts and the development of graduate programs; and thirdly) re-working of graduate programs at liberal arts level. In this plan, he reports, each stage builds upon the previous one.

9:05 Questions from Senators

In response to various questions from Senators, Provost Lee makes the following comments:

Lee reports that the administration is interested in increasing foreign enrollment; in particular, there are meetings going on about Parson's study-abroad programs in China. This incentive corresponds with the increase in development in China, such as its plan to build 20 cities of the population of 1 million in the next twenty years. Lee points out that China is also interested in other liberal studies programs and that several plans to create metropolitan programs, in Paris, Tokyo and Beijing, are being proposed.

Lee also reports on Bob Gay's involvement in the abovementioned process, especially in on-line learning. Provost Lee states that Bob Kerry is participating in creating an involvement plan on this issue. Lee suggests that on-line learning is very expensive outside of boutique classes and therefore success is indefinite.

In response to another question asked about international student increase, Provost Lee comments that with the help of Kaplan and Assoc., the university is proposing an unusual program in China that would involve students spending the first year at their home university in China and then to come abroad. Lee reports that Kaplan sends students from China to England and Australia and that the university would like to become involved in this as well as extending it to universities in India. Lee also claims that because large lecture halls are no longer important to students, the faculty is proposing a year -long course on media and knowledge skills along with another on project, or practice-based education, which consists of product design skills and also, a writing course. He reports that these courses will be part of the general education curriculum.

Lee suggests that the problem with the new initiative-planning is that of the kind of values to have in a world that has no mastery and everyone has availability remain unknown. Lee claims that he has clear information predicting that people who attend specialized fields will not have jobs, and therefore the university must strive to produce more balanced students. Answering a question about the difficulty of making university development dependent

upon demographic changes, Lee responds that in order for the university to grow 50%, it must pay attention to demographics and diversify itself. This will include adjusting to the decline in PhD programs, which must be smaller and better supported. Lee states that the university's small niche MA programs have not been successful and another plan must be made. He reports that foreign students diversify the departments, but do not bring in money for the university because they are bought at a higher price. Lee claims this is an example of the squandering of the university's resources. He also reports that the university does not have the necessary resources for growth at this point, that the growth at Eugene Lang College is too fast and must be re-thought in terms of what undergraduates need. Lee comments on the facility of curriculum planning and difficulty of getting GF faculty to teach undergraduate courses. Lee suggests that Lang cut-down size of more civically-engaged and keep itself as an honors program; but he also reports that the Strategic Plan has 20 different action plans.

Lee answers a question regarding the relationship between the BA, BS and BFA programs at NSGS and then the program at BA at Lang. He states that discussions are going on about how to connect the Lang BA program with NSGS and that the issues concern credit discrepancies between the courses. Regarding the graduate programs, Lee reports that a change in notion of what is necessary in order to function in the world, is underway and that a masters program is necessary now for job placement. For this reason, non-NSSR graduate programs need to be constructed, which would result in each program having an undergrad and grad division. Lee notes that the NSSR chair situation is very weak and must be mediated through the dean who never has the time to look carefully at the department. He hopes that resources will be allocated for the suggested grad-undergrad department model resulting in strong humanities and social sciences at NSSR and simultaneously we have more integrated programs.

In response to a question raised regarding the development of first year programs on technology management and writing and also, opportunities for faculty involvement therein, Lee reports that there will be university wide faculty curriculum committees; that civic engagement and a project-base will also take part, and that the tenure review process is also putting faculty together to talk. Lee is asked how the curriculum committee will be formed, how the UFS will be a part of it; Provost replies that he will get back to the UFS about it.

9:30am Discussion of the involvement of faculty and UFS in the process of university restructuring.

At 9:45, Robert Kirkbride sends around a sample of the new space document, understood as living document that hopes for ongoing contributions and aims to becoming a resource for administration, deans, faculty and hired consultants. In developing this, the second draft, contributing faculty have been looking beyond traditional divisional and departmental turf to identify curricular and spatial overlaps, leaning together to support the university restructuring and the vision necessary to innovate in Academic technology, addressing physical and qualitative needs. The key point is to create a useful, informative resource that identifies shared needs while respecting the specific needs of each division, as embedded in its pedagogical mission.

Provost Lee interjects that indeed this is very valuable document, but there is a governance issue that needs to be addressed. He states that the UFS is in a consultative relationship to the university, and that there is a strictly legal difficulty involving the participation of the part-time faculty in the senate as exemplified by the Yeshiva case. He stresses the seriousness of the issue and that the UFS ought to revise its by-laws. Provost Lee then reads a statement, concerning this issue, prepared by the university counsel. (The senate by-laws put the UFS in a consultative relation to university, through the Yeshiva and domestic labor laws; the administration wants the UFS to deal with this issue. Everything that is done is precedent.

9:55am Discussion

David Howells suggests that there is much for the UFS to learn about implications of labor issues but at the time of the formation of the UFS, hundreds of hours were spent dealing with this issue. He also notes that there was no union at that time.

The UFS schedules a meeting to deal with these issues on March, 25th 2008 at 8:30am.

The chairs will request the statement for the university counsel, and ask for a meeting. In the meantime the copies of the UFS by laws will be re-sent to all Senators.

10:00am Adjourn

The New School
University Faculty Senate
Tuesday, April 8, 2008
8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

(Ninth session of the 2007-08 Senate)
Chaired by Keith Buhl

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Rm. 712

Agenda

8:30 Welcome and approval of the minutes

8:35 Report by the Faculty Affairs Committee
Promotion issues
Work on the Faculty Handbook
Benefits matters

9:20 APC : Performing Arts Task Force report

9:40 Election of the chairs for the UFS 2008-09

9:40 General Discussion

Present

Members

Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes
Bea Banu, NSGS
Keith Buhl, Co-chair, Drama
Dierdre Boyle, NSGS
Richard Boukas, Jazz
David Brody, Parsons
John Clinton, Milano
Alice Crary, NSSR
Onno De Jong, Parsons

Shoshanah Goldberg, Milano
David Howell, Milano
Robert Kirkbride, Parsons
David Marcinkowski, NSGS
Mark Larrimore, Lang
Elzbieta Matynia, Co-chair, NSSR
Alan McGowan, Co-chair, Lang
Faye-Ellen Silverman, Mannes
Ken Stevens, Parsons
Paula Stuttman, NSGS
Sven Travis, Parsons
Tom Vasiliades, Drama
Tracyann Williams, NSGS
Joan Woodcock, Parsons
Reggie Workburn

Visitors
Stephania de Kenessey

8:30 am Welcome

Keith Buhl welcomes senators.
Alan McGowan reports on the grievance; stating that he has asked the administration for evidence, and that none can be found, thus the matter has been closed. He reports that the grievance filed against the senate regards an alleged senate discrimination against part-time faculty. The Senate members agree that this situation is very unclear and that further clarification is required regarding the lapse between grievance and statement. Alan McGowan further claims that the grievance may be discarded at present, but a further problem exists for the senate regarding part-time faculty participation. He refers Senators to the minutes of March 4th meeting and the summary of Provost Lee's statement.

Discussion ensues over this issue. Specifically, senators express work over senate participation during summer recess, particularly regarding the new building. Alan McGowan mentions upcoming co-chair elections and the advising process that will occur between existing co-chairs and soon-to-be-elected senators.

8:35 am Report by the Faculty Affairs Committee

1. Promotion issues
2. Work on the Faculty Handbook
3. Benefits matters

Alice Crary and David Howell present on issues concerning full-time faculty 1) ad hoc reviews 2) process that governs those reviews as described in faculty handbook which requires several changes. Alice and David report on the amendment issue of fourth-year probationary reviews, explaining that a starting point for FAC's conversations with the PO was the observation that, while there is considerable text regarding tenure and employment tendencies, there is nothing on fourth year, leaving the structure of PP reviews to individual divisions Alice and David describe discussions with the Provost Office about how, given that future tenure and EE reviews are to be held at the university level, there is a serious need for guidelines for fourth year reviews to ensure adequate consistency and fairness across divisions. A further topic of discussion mentioned by Alice and David was the need for a procedure for post-EE reviews, parallel to post-tenure reviews, to capture the university's commitment to giving faculty with EE job security. A final topic was the need for changes to the FH to eliminate inconsistencies in the description of ISR.

David Howell reports that during his meetings with Ron and Shannon, both have agreed to these points. It is then necessary that the issues job-security is clearly resolved; that the specific terms of tenure and extended employment are clarified: that this must be part of the re-crafting of the faculty handbook. David reports on the history of his meetings with the

Provost office.

Alice reports that during her last meeting with the Provost, in mid-March, they did not have the text on these issues (i.e., the post EE reviews and ISR) prepared as she and David expected. She reports that the Provost, in consultation with the Board has actively decided against and now are working with IPCEPC subcommittee of the board to submit a memo in April of work and text in June. Alice reports that they are thinking to change the review so that it looks as if the program and not the person is being reviewed. However, she insists, extended employment and tenure-track still needs to be clarified. Although Alice and David are concerned that for collegiality and fairness of post-probationary reviews, that the Provost office should be working together with them. But this is not their opinion. Alice reports that she persuaded them to be concerned with the structure of post-probationary reviews so that our job-candidates have disclosure of the process. Alice asks the UFS to help with these issues. Alice brings up two further issues: 1) deans-provost working on the two stage process through the Board in which there are two things on the agenda: a) definition of term appointments b) openness about faculty support and professional development, equity leaves and sabbaticals, pre-extended employment.

Discussion ensues.

Keith Buhl informs about the upcoming UFS co-chair nominations and the elections. The will be conducted via e-mail and the new co-chairs will be announced at the next UFS meeting.

TracyAnn Williams reports on the developments related to the matters of faculty benefits. She reports that the meetings of the University Benefits Committee have been very problematic. For example, there have only been two meetings, called only a week or less ahead, which made it very difficult for anybody else but those who work as administrators to attend. Consequently, these meetings have poor faculty attendance. TracyAnn reports that the meetings do not allow for inclusiveness and that a majority of its members are working in the human resources. She said that there has been a lot of talk about health care issues. She also describes her own concerns with relying on the consultants and her hopes that these matters will be addressed at the next meeting of the group on May 19th.

9:20am APC: Performing Arts Task Force report

Robert Kirkbride suggests that more time be allotted for future Senate meetings.
He then gives a brief introduction to Richard Boukas' presentation. He comments that within the space document there is a potential curricular and space-need overlap among New School divisions extending across the performing arts (Mannes, Jazz, Drama) to Parsons and potentially NSGS as well. He reports on an initial conversation in February with Ben Lee to set up a Performing Arts Task Force to link these two issues (space and

curriculum). This has subsequently become quiet. Since then, Robert says, the conversation has shifted and now he is mainly speaking with Stefania de Kenessey (Lang) who was approached by Provost Lee to chair the task force. Stefania, attending the UFS meeting to witness Richard's presentation, clarified that she has not yet been formally charged with this task. Robert hopes that an open relationship can be sustained to capitalize on the skills and continuing efforts of faculties on these divisions.

Richard Boukas presents his slide show and urges Senators to look at the corresponding documents. He insists that accountability in upper administration, regarding the new building, is necessary. Richard claims that it is imperative to set a context for this task force, requiring proper representation and a democratically established agenda so that the administration's projected enrollment growth can best be facilitated. Richard then walks the Senators through the photos of the Music hall at Colorado, including the recital salon, greenroom, a flexible theater, observatory, smart classrooms, piano-tech labs, etc.

9:40am Election of the chairs for the UFS 2008-09

Keith Buhl says that instructions for nominating process will be sent via email and he hopes that the nominations will be determined before the next meeting.

10:00am Meeting adjourned

The New School

University Faculty Senate

Meeting of Senators only October 1, 2008

Minutes

David Howell chaired the meeting and opened it at 8:35. Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the last meeting were approved as written.

David then said that this was basically an organizational meeting, that we had to elect additional co-chairs of the Senate, and select chairs of the Standing Committees – which consist of Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), the Academic Policy Committee (APC), and Governance.

There was some discussion of the role of the chairs, and we raised the possibility of suspending the part of the by-laws that call for three co-chairs, since for a while there seemed to be only one other nominee (David Howell had been elected in the Spring). In the end, however, there were two nominees, Johanna Woodcock from Parsons, and James Miller from NSSR and Lang. Upon a request from the floor, they were elected by acclamation.

David then turned to the discussion of the Standing Committees, as well as the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Research, which had been suggested at the previous meeting.

Jim Miller then raised the issue of the involvement of the part-time faculty in the Senate, given the question that had been raised by the administration last year. David responded by saying that he had talked with both Ron Kassimir and Liz Ross about this, since the issue had greatly impeded the work of the Senate last year. He reported that they actually wanted part time faculty involved, and that we only had to be careful not to talk about issues, such as work load for part time faculty, that were in the purview of the union. To deal with the issue, for example, David stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee will deal with the full time faculty handbook, and therefore ought to have only full time people on it.

Jim Miller then raised the issue of part-time involvement in educational policy and curriculum issues, since the administration had fought for their non-involvement in these areas during the union negotiations. Alan McGowan pointed out that it may have been the case, but that on the ground part time people, at least at Lang, were involved in curriculum discussions. Keith Buhl pointed out that some divisions, Drama for example, did not have anything but part time people, and so of course they were included in curriculum discussions.

It was pointed out that the Senate may have more “teeth” than it would appear, being only an advisory committee, since the administration needs approval of the Senate, in reality, of the faculty handbook.

David also reported that he had raised the issue of Senate contact with the Board of Trustees of the University with Ron Kassimir, and that he was receptive to the idea.

Discussion then ensued concerning the roles of each committee, and the issues they would take up. Consensus was reached on the following:

Faculty Affairs: Revision of the full time faculty handbook

Academic Policy Committee: Reorganization of the University, Academic Technology, and involvement of part-time faculty in educational policy and curriculum discussions.

Governance: Revision of Senate by-laws, governance problems anticipated by the reorganization of the University, and relationship with the new University Student Senate.

There will also be an ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Research.

The Committee Chairs were then selected; Faculty Affairs will be headed by Jim Miller, Academic Policy will be chaired by John Clinton, and Bea Banu and David Brody will chair Governance. Emmanuele Castano will head the ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Research.

A sign up sheet was then sent around, and people selected committees. With so many people absent, it was decided to also send an email to everyone, asking them to list committees on which they wish to serve. The co-chairs will look over these committee memberships, making sure there is balance on each one (it is possible that some people may be asked to serve on a different committee than the one they chose), and finalize the list. That list will be sent around separately from these minutes.

David then turned our attention to the next meeting, with members of the administration. Jim Miller made the point that the administration should be asked by the Senate to talk about their space plans, since with the demise of the new building space is a major issue. Richard Boukas agreed, saying that the plans of the University to have more liberal arts students take performance classes put significant pressure on performance space.

It was agreed that the co-chairs will work with the administration in getting the relevant members of the administration – Leah Gardner, James Murtha, and Joe Westphal – to attend appropriate meetings of the full Senate (meaning that members of the administration attend as well as Senators).

On a suggestion by Richard Boukas, it was agreed that all committees should meet before November 11, and be prepared to report to the Senate.

David announced that we had to make some scheduling changes, due to Joe Westphal's schedule. We agreed that the meeting of the full Senate scheduled for October 14 would be held on October 21 instead, and that the one scheduled for December 2 would be held on December 9.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am

Alan H. McGowan
Secretary

The New School

Faculty Senate

Full Senate Meeting October 21

Minutes

The meeting was chaired by Jim Miller. He opened the meeting at 8:30, saying we were starting a new regime of promptness. He also said that the co-chairs had met last Thursday, and decided to pare down the meeting, putting off until the next meeting issues of the faculty handbook, part time faculty, space planning, and faculty research.

Provost Joe Westphal then gave a short report, saying that although he has been here for only a short time, and does not know the finances as well as he will, he thinks the university is in a good situation. Endowment is down, but less than others, as the university went into cash ear. We are doing as well as can be expected. The memo which put strong constraints on spending alarmed some, but we are OK. Bob Kerrey has reduced the amount which he expects to raise. This downturn was so sudden that we had to react quickly, which made it more difficult.

On a question from David Howell, Joe said we are planning to go ahead with new hires.

Dimitri asked about the new building; Joe responded by saying the main problem is we have to borrow money, which is difficult now. We have not cancelled the new building, but will have to wait and see. A question is how do you build smaller and still be able to add to it at a later date.

Jim asked about the enrollment targets. Joe responded that they are roughly the same as they had been, but that he needs to sit down with the deans and make sure that we have a good admissions policy, and that we are marketing ourselves successfully. It will make us stronger in the long run if we get better students. Universities across the board are facing more students who need financial help.

Richard Boukas raised the issue of on-line classes, to which Joe replied that he had launched online programs very successfully, and was in favor of them. He was trying to find out how we were doing on faculty development for online courses.

Joe then reported on the new Academic Plan. As of now, it is essentially the plan that Ben Lee talked about last year. We have to make some changes in the way we are structured to allow students to talk classes across the university. In surveys, we find out that students want to explore the broader curriculum, and take courses across the University. We can do a better job of recruiting students by utilizing departments, and by strengthening the

department structure. Everybody must be involved in this.

What is emerging as a college of arts and sciences, under which will be a group of departments. The departments will come in part from NSSR, NSGS, etc. We would have social sciences, humanities, math, science, political science, economics, and so forth. Almost all of these departments already exist, and we may also decide to create new departments. Departments will have Ph.D., MA, and BA programs.

One proposal, he said, was to create a Eugene Lang honors college, which might better serve the mission of Lang. Neil Gordon commented that it would be seminar based, interdisciplinary, and rooted in civic engagement.

Dimitri asked about NSSR, would it be abolished? Joe responded by saying that it would be abolished only in the sense of moving the departments to a larger context. We would no longer have joint appointments; the legitimacy is in the departments. By adding new programs, can lessen the work load; this will be financed by a larger undergraduate student body.

Onno remarked that this would make The New School a very generic university, and take away some of the identities that exist. Joe responded by saying there is some danger of that, but we have to guard against it. We cannot be everything for everybody, and particularly in the graduate programs we have to retain uniqueness.

Emanuele commented that removing the name NSSR may have dramatic consequences and may not be a good idea; I came here to be at NSSR. Joe responded by saying that was a very good point, and that he was thinking about it; one thing we could do was to group the departments under a name such as NSSR.

Joe further said that he came into a plan that was going nowhere, and since Bob asked him to move it forward, he was doing that.

Jim asked about the role of the Senate, to which Joe responded by saying that its role was crucial. There is a new Academic Policy Committee of the Board, with whom he intended to work very closely, and was looking for approval to go ahead and engage the faculty in this discussion.

Mark Larrimore stated that we already have an interdisciplinary culture; how are we going to maintain this with a department structure? Joe responded by saying that was a very good question; most of his colleagues are trying to move away from departments. We are going to have to have more interdisciplinary programs, like Environmental Studies, and create incentives for them.

Joe said that he would come back to the Senate after he has presented this to the Board..

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am.

Alan H McGowan
Secretary

The New School

Faculty Senate

Senators Only Meeting November 13

Minutes

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the October 21st meeting were approved.

Jim Miller reported on a meeting he and Johanne had with the Provost's office (David was unfortunately not able to attend). They were given a draft of the changes in the faculty handbook, but were told they could not circulate them. The big change was the elimination of extended employment; people will be grandfathered in who have been offered that choice, but going forward there will be no extended employment.

Upon a question from Richard Boukas, David Brody responded that it was an alternative to tenure; in extended employment, scholarship was only good, not excellent. David also said that he was concerned that The New School is turning into a very traditional university.

Jim Miller said that the alternative now to tenure is term employment; people could only be fired for institutional suitability reasons.

Jennifer Wilson said that elimination of extended employment is important, and asked who is involved in making this decision.

Alan McGowan stated that this raises serious issues of who is eligible for tenure, which is particularly important for people in the natural sciences and mathematics.

There ensued a discussion in which it was pointed out that last year's procedure on review and promotion was very messy, that different universities have different standards for tenure, and that it was important that the divisions be involved in this decision making. Also it was pointed out that there are multiple things in transition, and that all of this has to be considered very carefully.

John Clinton reported on behalf of the AFC about the issue of space planning, and wanted to make sure that the document prepared last year on space planning was given to the Provost's office.

Emanuele Castano reported that the research task force was not yet in existence, but that he was forming it.

Jim Miller then introduced the following motion, the purpose of which is to have faculty involved in discussions in each division. He stated that the Provost welcomed such a motion.

In response to the planned restructuring of the University, and in an effort to facilitate consultation with faculty across the Divisions, we propose that the following steps be taken:

1) We ask that the Deans of each division convene a committee of representative faculty to submit recommendations for academic reorganization to each division's full faculties by January 30, 2009.
2) After each division's faculty has met to discuss various plans for restructuring the University, we ask that each division's Dean forward a summary of the faculty's considered opinions on reorganization to the Provost and the Faculty Senate by April 1.
3) The Faculty Senate will convene a subsequent meeting with the Provost and the Deans of each division, in order to discuss the recommendations from each division in a cross-divisional context.
4) Throughout this process, we suggest that the Provost make representatives from the Faculty Senate an integral component in his deliberations, either by including Senators in any ad-hoc committee on reorganization that he convenes, or by working with an ad hoc committee on reorganization to be formed by the Faculty Senate.

Upon a second to the motion, it was carried with one abstention.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00

Alan H. McGowan
Secretary

The New School

Faculty Senate

Minutes September 16, 2008

Co-chairman David Howell opened the meeting at 8:35, proposing the following agenda:

Election of two additional co-chairs, since only he and Alice Crary were elected last year, and Alice has had to resign for personal reasons.
Elect co-chairs of standing committees, and devise a process of establishing membership.
Presentation by Joe Westphal, our new Provost
Substantive issues for consideration by the Senate this next year.

This agenda was accepted by the Senate.

David then read from the by-laws some sections concerning our duties. Those duties included: Working with the board of trustees on issues of concern to the faculty; deliberate and discuss concerns of faculty and communicate them to the administration; these concerns are those that involve more than one division.

David then went through the representation from various divisions; there are several that need to have elections to determine their representation.

It was decided that the next meeting would be October 1, since September 30, which is on our schedule, is Roshashona.

David then introduced Joe Westphal, the new Provost of The New School, who made the following presentation.

Joe related that he took on the labor of Ben Lee in strategic planning, and has moved it faster and in a more comprehensive fashion. He has been moving quicklyu to move Ben's agenda forward.

Joe related that Ben spoke to the faculty in October, saying that we had become siloed as divisions, and that students found it difficult to move across the divisions. In addition, graduate education across all divisions had run deficits, and were being challenged as a result of those deficits. Growth in the university was in Parsons, not in other divisions, which caused an imbalance. The liberal arts themselves have become very scattered.

I have been involved in Environmental Studies, and in and out of conversations about the strategic plan. We are very close to having a strategic plan for the university in hardened form, which will not be very different from the plan that Ben had put forward in his

meeting. We have been very specific about some divisions; the challenge has been to take a look at the university wide programs or what we are calling interdisciplinary studies. We are also looking at how promotion and tenure would work in these programs.

We are working to bring graduate and undergraduate programs closer together, integrating gthe arts and liberal studies, and making opportunities for students to move across the divisions.

There are other initiatives we are working on. One is an emphasis in the provost's office to help faculty with their research efforts. At present the vice president does not deal with proposals that emanate from the faculty. We don't have an ability to help faculty with their research and to help with opportunities for funding. We need to do this and manage and support proposal writing and financial help.

We also need to improve our process to evaluate faculty progress. I do not know if this will involve changes in the faculty handbook, but if it does, we will certainly work with the Faculty Senate.

Also the provost's office should include academic technology and enrollment management. The academic side of the house should be involved in enrollment targets. As well, educational technology is very important to faculty, and we will look for ways to involve faculty in this area as we seek to improve services.

At the conclusion of Joe Westphal's remarks, David asked about the issue of part time faculty, saying that the issue, as raised by the administration, had derailed the work of the Senate. Stating that there was actually talk of our needing to revise the by-laws, he said it was very important for us to resolve this issue.

Joe responded by saying he was fairly relaxed about this issue, that his understanding was that the boundary was over the conditions of employment, which were the purview of the union in terms of part time faculty. He said that he had to stay away from these issues, and that he had no problem with discussions with part time faculty as long as they stayed away from these issues. He said that when he was Chancellor of another system, the Senate wanted to make sure they were the voice of the faculty on academic matters, and he agreed with that. He also stated that he had regular meetings with union representatives.

In response to a question, he said that the discussion of revisions in the full time faculty handbook probably ought to take place with full time faculty. He also said that he had no problem with part time faculty being involved in curriculum discussions, in fact, he would encourage it.

Joe and Ron Kassimir, who was also present during this discussion, then left.

David Howell pointed out that we need a clear role for the Senate, given all the changes that are going on. In a discussion, Emanuele Castano suggested a committee to deal with research issues, given its importance to the university; Sven proposed a review with Joe about what happened last year, since the Provost did not respond to any of our initiatives.

It was decided that David and Alan would meet soon to determine the next meeting.

Next meeting: October 1, place to be determined.

Alan H McGowan
Secretary

Academic Policies Committee
Summary for 2006-07

Members:

Keith Buhl (Drama)
Carolyn Berman (NSGS)
Douglas Diaz (Parsons) Committee Co-chair
Peter Haratonik (NSGS)
Mary Judge (Parsons)
Robert Kirkbride (Parsons)
Elzbieta Matynia (NSSR) Committee Co-chair
Dominic Pettman (Lang)
Edward Powers (Milano)

Summary of 2006-07 Activities

Mission statement:

The Academic Policy Committee aims to support university-wide academic space and IT planning initiatives by providing a clearinghouse within the University Faculty Senate for faculty to circulate information surrounding these issues, and to ensure that facilities matters are considered in tandem with the pedagogical objectives of the divisions and university.

Space Planning Document

Demonstrating the APC's mission, this document was the centerpiece of the committee's work across the year; it was intended to offer a faculty perspective in support of early and interim planning stages for the new building at 65 5th Avenue. The committee considered the proposed new building as a valuable case example of broader university-wide facilities and academic planning. Individual members gathered information about academic and facilities initiatives from "point people" in her/his division to discuss during committee meetings. Faculty (Cynthia Lawson, Parsons) were invited to present their findings and ideas at APC meetings. This information was summarized by committee members and included in the final document as divisional "chapters." A working draft of the document was distributed to senators at the April 10th Senate working session, to members of the planning consulting firm IDEO, and subsequently to faculty at-large, administration and the Provost's Office.

IT (Information Technology) Resolution 06/07-2

At early stages in developing the Space Planning Document, it became apparent that IT (Information Technology) at the University should be addressed

as an integral part of space and academic planning. The committee prepared the UFS IT Resolution 06/07-2. The committee subsequently met with Shelley Reed (Senior Vice President for Information Technology) and Lillian Sartori to discuss the IT Resolution in late February and plans to meet again in mid-May.

Motion for inviting Curriculum Committee Co-chairs to report to UFS

To ensure faculty/UFS awareness of the work of the Curriculum Committees (established by the Provost and Deans), a motion was made (and passed) at the April 10 Senate working session to request periodic updates from the committee Co-chairs.

Operational Diagram Resolution 06/07-5

During the process of planning for the new building and Phase II of the Faculty Handbook, it became clear that the New School community would greatly benefit from an interactive operational diagram to enhance transparency of and participation in the day-to-day workings of the university. This resolution was passed by e-vote on April 29th.

Summary of Suggested Agenda for 2007-08

1. Support of Academic Planning

Invitation of Curriculum Committee co-chairs to update UFS on planning progress
Clarification of proposed 5 yr. BA/MA programs
Clarification of pedagogical ramifications and resources necessary to support interdivisional appointments, initiatives and courses (eg university-wide lectures)

2. Support of IT initiatives

Development of the University-Wide Interactive Operational Diagram
UFS website requires an administrator: could this be an addendum to the UFS Office Resolution 06/07-4?
Faculty support and training in IT

3. Support of Space Planning

Focus on the library – interim and ultimately at 65 5th – and its manifestation of academic ideals. The new building as a case example of university-wide space and academic planning Invitation of pertinent members involved in the planning to update the UFS.

p2007-08 APC Members:

Richard Boukas (Jazz)
Keith Buhl (Drama)
John Clinton (Milano)
Onno de Jong (Parsons)
Rachel Heiman (NSGS)*
Robert Kirkbride (Parsons) Committee Chair
Mark Larrimore (Lang)*
Dominic Pettman (Lang)*
Cecilia Rubino (Lang)*
Faye-Ellen Silverman (Mannes)
Sven Travis (Parsons)
Susan Weller (Parsons)*
Paula Stuttman (NSGS)*

*served portion of year

Mission

The Academic Policy Committee aims to support university-wide academic space and IT planning initiatives by providing a clearinghouse within the University Faculty Senate for faculty to circulate information surrounding these issues, and to ensure that facilities matters are considered in tandem with the pedagogical objectives of the divisions and university.

Summary of 2007-08 Activities

Revision of Space Planning (APC) Document:

The current revision incorporates the results of concerted faculty and administrators efforts within and across divisions of The New School to support programming for the signature building and the developing university-wide programs. The APC Document includes more detailed information from 7 of the 8 divisions (missing only Drama), and an important report on the history of Information Technology ("Social Technology and the Future of The New School") with proposed action steps. Also included is the history of senate resolutions and initiatives generated by the AP Committee. As a living document, this will be revised next year to gather "floating" data that is fresh from the programming process.

Work related to the programming of a new building at 65 5th:

The AP Committee worked with the Provost's Office to support a series of design charrettes (including faculty and students) and public forae centered on the new building. While the future building at 65 5th Avenue has provided a stimulus to sharpen the pedagogical vision of The New School, more significantly it has represented an opportunity for developing a holistic approach to an interim and long-range strategic university-wide planning process, with students and faculty as integral participants. In spite of recent adjustments to the plans and scheduling of the new building, these energies and skills are central to making the ongoing re-envisioning of The New School a success, ideologically and pragmatically.

Established the Socially Responsible Construction Management Task Force (UFS

Resolution 07/08-1):
The pursuit of a model of social, environmental, and fiscal responsibility in construction management would highlight the university's planning and construction activities as a material expression of the values The New School represents, providing a rich array of research and teaching opportunities. Chaired by John Clinton (Milano), the Task Force will conduct its first Student Research Forum on May 6, 11-2 pm, highlighting student projects across the university that engage sustainable construction issues.
Initiative to establish a Performing Arts Space and Curriculum Task Force:
To support development of new programs across the performing arts divisions (with overlaps to Lang, Parsons and NSGS), the APC advocates the participation of faculty familiar with the academic and facilities needs.

Going forward: Objectives for 2008-09

Academic: New/ongoing Academic planning around new structure of the university
Physical facilities:
UFS/APC response to student resolution on energy
Subsequent revision of APC document
The new building as ongoing case example of university-wide space and academic planning
Survey of existing university facilities as pedagogical exercise (SCRM)
Establish task force for IT issues:
Faculty support and training in IT
Development of the University-Wide Interactive Operational Diagram
Work to improve online teaching conditions

Academic Policies Committee
Summary for 2007-08

Established the Socially Responsible Construction Management Task Force (UFS