

Agenda
Faculty Senate Working Meeting
February 6, 2007
Orozco Room
8:30 am to 10 am.

Opening Remarks & Approval of Nov. 7, 2006 Minutes
Derryck

Dennis

Strategic Plan

Follow-up on strategic plan discussion with Provost. Reflections, thoughts, areas for further clarification.

Academic Planning

Role of UFS (and part-time faculty) in Curriculum Subcommittees
Potential inquiry into 4+1 BA to MA system
Update on APC document
Curricular Committee Resolution

Carolyn Berman
Ed Powers
Douglas Diaz
Elzbieta Matynia

Governance

Faculty Approval of By-laws Resolution
Formalization of communication channels between senators and their constituents-faculty

Neil Gordon

Faculty Affairs

The Divisional By-laws process

Duncan Foley/
Susan
Hambleton

Update on Ongoing Activities

Disability Committee
Benefits Committee

Senators Present

Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes
Keith Buhl, NSGS
Dennis Derryck, Co-chair, Milano
Douglas Diaz, Parsons
Duncan Foley, NSSR
Terri Gordon, Co-chair, NSGS
Neil Gordon, Lang
Susan Hambleton, Parsons
Peter Haratonik, NSGS
Mary Judge, Parsons
Robert Kirkbride, Co-chair, Parsons
Lily H.M. Ling, ELC
Elzebieta Matynia, NSSR
Alan McGowan, Lang
Edwin Melendez, Milano
Tom Vasiliades, Drama

Dominic Pettman, Lang
Ed Powers, Milano
Sharon Mesmer, NSGS
Faye-Ellen Silverman, Mannes
Anezka Sebek, Secretary, Parsons

Absent

Carolyn Berman, NSGS
Doris Chang, NSSR
Kasia Gruda, Parsons
Deborah Levitt, ELC

8:45 AM

Co-chair Dennis Derryck called the meeting to order.

Mr. Derryck referenced the fruitful discussion held with the Provost on January 26th.

The minutes from November 7th were unanimously approved.

David Ford, the new Coordinator of Faculty Affairs in the Provost's Office, was introduced. David will facilitate UFS meetings and distribution of materials between the Senate and the administration.

The Senate discussed the special session held with Provost Lee on January 26. There was a general approval of its conversational format and recommendation for more such meetings in the future. This meeting centered on the participation of faculty in developing the Strategic Plan for the University; most immediately, in the area of curriculum development. The five proposed Curriculum Committees are as follows:

- Urban and Environmental Studies Group
- Media
- International Group
- Design and Social Sciences
- Management

The Senate then discussed the membership of the committees, which were not yet formalized, and the process of their formation. Some felt that there was not enough Senate representation in the groups and that the Senate had not been adequately consulted in their constitution. Others questioned the need for the Senate to be directly involved in all levels of decision making at the university, especially since the UFS is already "spread thinly" with the current workload of its committees. This led to a broader discussion of the role of the Senate with regard to policy-making at the university: for example, should the Deans and Administration consult with the UFS on matters of budget rules, or are there specific areas – governance and curriculum – where the Senate should focus its efforts? Without formal resolution, there was gathering consensus that the Senate should request periodic updates from the Curriculum committees and not seek to participate directly in their composition and activities, which have been shaped by the Provost and Deans Council. The formation of these committees represents an effort to transform the university from a loose coalition into a coherent whole: the work of the committees is to flush out opportunities for better integration across the university. How might the Senate help translate this incremental process into a broad strategic effort? How can we tap the standing resources of all faculty, full and part-time?

Academic Policies Committee

Douglas Diaz read Carolyn Berman's summary of a discussion held in the APC about the participation of faculty in the Curriculum Committees – in particular, from the perspective of part-time faculty.

The subsequent discussion addressed the expertise and intellectual depth that PT faculty bring to the university and the need for their participation in various committees (such as the Senate) that currently do not remunerate and are essential in the development of the strategic plan for The New School. Senators discussed the role of the Union and the need for due compensation of PT faculty for these efforts to prevent further establishment of a two-tiered system.

Douglas Diaz offered a brief update on the APC Space planning document, and an upcoming meeting with Shelley Reed (Senior Vice President for Information Technology), to follow up on the discussion of the IT Resolution 06/07-2 passed at the December full senate meeting.

Due to time, the Senate did not discuss the potential inquiry into the 4 + 1 BA to MA system. Also, based on the earlier discussion, further conversation of a Curricular Committee Resolution was shifted to a motion calling for reportage to the Senate by the Co-chairs of the Curricular Committees (to be introduced at the next UFS meeting, on 3/6).

Governance Committee

Neil Gordon presented UFS Resolution 06/07-3: "Faculty Senate Resolution on Faculty Approval of Divisional By-laws" (**Appendix I**)

The Senate discussed the timeline and process of work on the Faculty Handbook, Phase II. Terri Gordon outlined the following points:

There will be back and forth between divisions and the Provost Office in February.

A boilerplate has been put forward by the Provost Office.

Consensus on this document must be reached by Deans and the faculty. If approved by the faculty by vote in March, it will then go to the Board of Trustees.

According to Resolution 06/07-3, any changes made by the Board of Trustees to the divisional by-laws must be returned to the division for review. Consensus on the amended document should then be reached by the Deans and the faculty.

The Resolution passed.

The meeting ended at 10:15

Respectfully submitted by Anezka C. Sebek & Robert Kirkbride

APPENDIX I

Faculty Approval of Divisional By-laws
Governance Committee

UFS Resolution 06/07-3
Passed: February 6, 2007

Faculty Senate Resolution on Faculty Approval of Divisional By-laws

In accordance with the memo issued by the Office of the Provost on September 26, 2006, each Division has been working to assemble a draft of divisional by-laws to submit to the Provost for review. These by-laws, once approved by the Provost and the Board of Trustees, will be included as appendices in The New School Full-Time Faculty Handbook. According to the Full-Time Faculty Handbook, divisional standards should be written with the participation of the principal faculty in the division and should be approved by a vote of the principal faculty in the division (p. 30).

In order to ensure adequate faculty representation and participation in decisions regarding the creation and approval of divisional by-laws to be included in the Full-Time Faculty Handbook, the Faculty Senate hereby resolves that the following two-step process be implemented:

First, principal faculty within each division should work with their Dean(s) to obtain consensus on the draft of the divisional by-laws that is forwarded to the Provost's office. It is up to each Division to determine the appropriate means of establishing consensus, which may include a formal vote or informal procedures such as circulation and discussion of relevant documents via e-mail. Second, principal faculty in each division must have an opportunity to review amendments to the divisional by-laws recommended by the Provost. A formal principal faculty vote and approval of the final document must be obtained before it is sent to the Board of Trustees. Any changes made by the Board of Trustees to the divisional by-laws must be returned to the division for review. Consensus on the amended document should be reached by the Deans and the principal faculty of the division. Given the importance of getting the by-laws approved before the end of the spring 2007 semester so that principal full-time faculty may be reviewed, appointed, and promoted beginning in fall 2007, the Faculty Senate and the principal faculty in the divisions hereby agree to adhere to deadlines set by the Office of the Provost for review, comment, and voting on divisional by-laws.

**The New School
Faculty Senate**

**Tuesday, March 6, 2007
8:30 AM – 10:00 AM**

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| Opening Remarks (5 minutes) | Terri Gordon |
| Approval of Minutes (12/12/06) (5 minutes) | Terri Gordon |
| Senate Resolution Passed at 02/06 meeting
Governance 06/07-3 (5 minutes) | Neil Gordon |
| APC Motion to Develop a University-wide Operational Diagram
Kirkbride
(5 minutes) | Robert |
| Update on University and Space Planning (10 minutes) | Bob Kerrey |
| Update on the Strategic Plan, the Strategic Planning Task
Groups, and the Role of Full-time and Part-time Faculty
in the Strategic Planning Process (25 minutes) | Ben Lee |
| Motion for Periodic Visits to UFS by Chairs of Strategic
Planning Task Groups and the Curriculum Committee (5 minutes) | Peter Haratonik |
| Update on Phase II, the Creation of Divisional By-laws;
Conversation with Senators on Outstanding Issues or Concerns
with By-laws (25 minutes) | Eliza Nichols |
| Other Business (5 minutes)
Dennis Derryck | |

Attendance:

Aaron, Elizabeth
Berman, Carolyn
Buhl, Keith
Derryck, Dennis
Diaz, Douglas
Foley, Duncan
Gordon, Terri
Gordon, Neil
Gruda, Kasia
Hambleton, Susan
Haratonik, Peter
Kerrey, Bob
Kirkbride, Robert
Lee, Ben
Levitt, Deborah
Ling, Lily
McGowan, Alan
Matynia, Elzbieta
Melendez, Edwin
Mesmer, Sharon
Nichols, Eliza
Pettman, Dominic
Polvere, Natalie
Powers, Ed
Ross, Elizabeth
Schober, Michael
Silverman, Faye-Ellen

Co-chair Gordon called the meeting to order at 8:4 a.m. and welcomed members of the administration.

Divisional Elections. Each of the schools was asked to organize their divisional elections by April. For the UFS internal elections, there was a brief review of those eligible to run as Co-chair. Consistent with the by-laws, a nominating committee comprised of Kasia Gruda, Edwin Melendez, and Mary Judge has been composed. It was suggested that every eligible member of the Senate be included on the list for the election of Co-chairs and that individuals then exercise the option to remove their names.

The minutes of the full session held on 12-12-07 were unanimously approved. A special word of thanks was conveyed to Anezka on how well they were taken and reflected the discussions of the meeting. Special mention should also be extended for Terri Gordon's revision.

Neil Gordon presented the Governance Resolution passed on February 6th: “Faculty Senate Resolution on Faculty Approval of Divisional By-laws” (Appendix I)

The process of amending the Faculty Handbook and appendices. There was consensus among faculty of the need to establish a sound amendment process to ensure long-term involvement by the faculty in the Senate. The Vice Provost indicated that any changes to the Handbook would go through the Senate, the Provost Office and the Board. While it would be ideal to have a consensus on all changes, the challenge was to define a process that would resolve differences.

The concern of those speaking to the issue reflected the unresolved issues around workload.

Resolution on Operational Diagram for the University. A motion was made and seconded that the New School develop an operational diagram of the university. The intent of this resolution is to better enable faculty to interact with various university structures. The motion was adopted for further development by the Academic Policies Committee.

Comments of President Kerrey. The President spoke on a number issues and topics that included but was not limited to:

The progress made by Milano since their external review last year and the fine work that has been going on at Mannes.

The difficulty in planning a strategic vision for the university. We are positioned to become a university with an international orientation, with design solutions that improve the human condition.

Demolition of 65 Fifth Avenue should begin in May 2008, and the new building should be completed in 2011. Already on board as part of the team are SOM, Shelley Goldfinch, IDEO-Palo Alto and Tishman construction, one of our most generous Trustees.

The need to guarantee housing to students in order to attract them to the university.

Ongoing construction that includes the accelerated-planning-redesign of the 12th St. entry.

In response to the comments by President Kerrey, questions were raised concerning the importance of research, the research process, and how research is to be supported; the distinction between contracts and grants and who has control over the work produced. There are a series of related ethical issues to be resolved. The need for an office to support research and the creation of written procedures are all part of the broader agenda related to

the questions around research. Milano offered to share the paper they had developed on supporting and facilitating research at the university.

An update of the strategic planning process by Provost Lee. Four key areas were highlighted.

The work on changing the budget rules. The expectation is that there will be transitional budget rules for next year. It will probably take yet another year to shadow test the rules. Implementing FTE means standardizing credit requirements across the divisions. There is a full commitment to this process.

The need to change administrative rules.

The creation of the Faculty Handbook.

Curricular planning. Curricular committees have been formed and each has received their charge. The last curricular group to be formed is the design and management group. This should be done in the next week or two. The curricula committees will interact with the Administration and Budget committees.

The goal of all of this strategic planning is to unlock the creative potential of the university. It is intended to foster a university-wide perspective that will enable us to diversify strategically and plan enrollment growth. It should allow us to move away from the model by which each division tries to solve its problems in isolation. It is an opportunity to create really attractive offerings.

The Parsons proposition in which undergraduates can take 30 credits of Liberal Arts allows us to construct a revenue base that will stabilize other programs within the university. The Provost spoke to the difficulty we now face in accepting students who would like to diversify their studies. As we now operate, we do not optimize enrollment pools. Provost Lee indicated that divisions should have autonomy at the master's level but optimize at the BA and BFA level. Within that framework, the Provost reiterated the need to move away from siloed programs, to create a new space where we can create university-wide programs that actually work and attract new students. With all the other changes, we'll actually be able to stabilize to support both growth and quality. The Provost looked forward to Senate representation in this discussion.

Comments on the Provost's statements. These included but were not limited to:

The richness experienced by one faculty member who teaches at Parsons and also had the luxury of teaching Lang students; the observation that students in Fine Arts do not take enough Liberal Arts Courses.

The importance of setting up this budget framework since FTE's present a much more rational and transparent system. We know the present system does not take advantage of the type of teaching faculty members are doing.

Since Liberal Arts is a foundation in most universities, will a division be created that brings Liberal Arts together? The Provost indicated that that idea has not been thought through.

For sake of time, Peter Haratonik's motion for Periodic Visits to UFS by Chairs of Strategic Planning Task Groups and the Curriculum Committee was postponed until the April 10th Senate working session.

Vice Provost Eliza Nichols provided a brief report on the progress of the Handbook. She noted that we have more than doubled our FT Faculty since the Middle States evaluation. The work continues to be centered on by-laws, evaluation and workload.

Divisions worked on bylaws in the fall and submitted them to the Provost's office. Four schools worked very hard on Evaluation standards and were pretty much on the same page. One school fully fleshed out its governance structure. No school got to workload. It is March, and we are slightly behind. Vice Provost Nichols indicated that she will be pushing over the coming weeks to make as much progress as possible. She thanked the Faculty Senate members who have worked hard on this project.

Vice Provost Nichols spoke of the primary importance of the Evaluation and Promotion section given the deadlines of June 1st for tenure and EE-standards and criteria.

The approval process is driven by the April 19th Board meeting, with submissions to the board to be made by March 28th. Meetings with faculty will be held between now and then with the goal of approving the divisional Processes.

General faculty meetings have been held at Parsons, NSSR and Lang. With the Deans behind this document, it will go out for a faculty vote. This is a living document, and there will be a process to amend it.

Questions were raised around workload and when this section of the bylaws would be addressed. The cultures of the schools are so different that the Deans did not feel comfortable going forward with the workload document. The workload issues have raised a number of questions and concerns. To develop the workload section, we will need to conduct workload comparisons across programs. We also need to develop an ad hoc review process.

The question was raised about the decoupling of evaluation and workload. What would be the impact on those coming up for review this fall? How are joint hires going to deal with

it? How are they going to be judged? According to the standards of the home division or both divisions? Vice Provost Nichols indicated that the goal is to have an inclusive document since we are sharing more faculty and since faculty are going to be teaching in different schools.

Dean Schober indicated that the Evaluation document is an inclusive document and that there are standards for every kind of example of work.

The faculty reached a consensus in support of disaggregation of the four sections of the divisional by-laws.

Terri Gordon thanked President Kerrey and Provost Lee for their input and Vice Provost Nichols for her help and support with the Handbook and divisional by-laws.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Anezka Sebek and Dennis Derryck.

Appendix I

Resolution
06/07-3
February 6,
2007

Faculty Senate Resolution on Faculty Approval of Divisional By-laws

In accordance with the memo issued by the Office of the Provost on September 26, 2006, each Division has been working to assemble a draft of divisional by-laws to submit to the Provost for review. These by-laws, once approved by the Provost and the Board of Trustees, will be included as appendices in The New School Full-Time Faculty Handbook. According to the Full-Time Faculty Handbook, divisional standards should be written with the participation of the principal faculty in the division and should be approved by a vote of the principal faculty in the division (p. 30).

In order to ensure adequate faculty representation and participation in decisions regarding the creation and approval of divisional by-laws to be included in the Full-Time Faculty Handbook, the Faculty Senate hereby resolves that the following two-step process be implemented:

First, principal faculty within each division should work with their Dean(s) to obtain

consensus on the draft of the divisional by-laws that is forwarded to the Provost's office. It is up to each Division to determine the appropriate means of establishing consensus, which may include a formal vote or informal procedures such as circulation and discussion of relevant documents via e-mail. Second, principal faculty in each division must have an opportunity to review amendments to the divisional by-laws recommended by the Provost. A formal principal faculty vote and approval of the final document must be obtained before it is sent to the Board of Trustees. Any changes made by the Board of Trustees to the divisional by-laws must be returned to the division for review. Consensus on the amended document should be reached by the Deans and the principal faculty of the division. Given the importance of getting the by-laws approved before the end of the spring 2007 semester so that principal full-time faculty may be reviewed, appointed, and promoted beginning in fall 2007, the Faculty Senate and the principal faculty in the divisions hereby agree to adhere to deadlines set by the Office of the Provost for review, comment, and voting on divisional by-laws.

PAGE

PAGE 1

**The New School
Faculty Senate**

**Tuesday, April 10, 2007
8:30 AM – 10:00 AM**

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

Opening Remarks & Approval of Minutes (2/06/07) (5 minutes) Kirkbride	Robert
Elections (5 minutes) Melendez	Edwin
Academic Policies (10 minutes) Space Planning Document Motion for Periodic Visits to UFS by Chairs of Strategic Planning Task Groups and the Curriculum Committees	Diaz/Matynia Peter Haratonik
Governance (30 minutes) UFS Bylaws (Summary and discussion) Childcare Policies	Neil Gordon
Summary & discussion of Recent vote on Evaluations & Criteria and 4/6 meeting on Phase II follow-up (10 minutes)	Terri Gordon
Faculty Affairs (20 minutes) Amendment Process Discussion	Duncan Foley
Other Business (10 minutes)	

Present

Elizabeth Aaron
Carolyn Berman
Dennis Derryck
Douglas Diaz
Duncan Foley
Neil Gordon
Terri Gordon
Katarzyna Gruda
Susan Hambleton
Peter Haratonik
Robert Kirkbride
Mary Judge
Alan McGowan
Elzebieta Matynia
Edwin Melendez
Deborah Levitt
Dominique Pettman
Edward Powers
Anezka Sebek
Faye-Ellen Silverman
Tom Vasiliades

Absent

Keith Buhl
Lily Ling
Sharon Mesmer

Visiting

Aleksandra Wagner, Benefits Committee, NSGS
Tracyann Williams, Benefits Committee, NSGS

Co-chair Robert Kirkbride called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

Mr. Kirkbride thanked his fellow co-chairs, Dennis Derryck and Terri Gordon, for their dedication to the Senate this year. He mentioned that a summary of the work undertaken by committees, as well as work to continue into the next academic year, would be available at the final meeting. As there will be a fairly large turn over in Senate membership, this document will ensure continuity.

Kevin Nesbitt, Director of Part-Time Faculty Affairs, Office of the Provost, reported in on part-time faculty issues. Mr. Nesbitt gave an update on the UFS multi-year contracts (See **Appendix I: Multi-year Appointment Memo**). This is a new process that enables faculty who have taught for 10 semesters or more to apply for a three-year contract. The multi-year contracts offers faculty security. According to Mr. Nesbitt, multi-year faculty will serve on committees and will become critical to the future of the Senate. Early next year, the UFS will be asked to hear about evaluative peer reviews processes. This is not an up-or-out process. Faculty members who do not pass a multi-year review will remain in their current status and may reapply in the future.

Edwin Melendez, Chair of the Nominating Committee, gave an update on the Co-chair election process. To be eligible for Co-chair, senators must have served on the Senate for one year. He added that senators choosing to run for a second two-year term must be re-elected by their divisions.

Elzbieta Matynia, Co-chair of Academic Policy, reported on the draft of the Space and IT Report compiled by Academic Policy (**Appendix II: Integrated Academic Policy, Space, and IT Planning Report**). This report summarizes the specific space and IT needs of NSSR, Lang, NSGS, Milano and Parsons. Ms. Matynia stated that this effort represents an important beginning. The document will be circulated among senators and will be forwarded to other bodies dealing with space/AV issues across the university and may have an effect on planning.

Co-chair Terri Gordon thanked the APC for their invaluable work and commended the committee on this excellent compilation of divisional needs.

Mr. Kirkbride added that the draft document will be posted on the UFS website.

A general discussion of the document and space needs ensued. Mr. Kirkbride mentioned that IDEO representatives are meeting with people across the university and that an IT discussion with Shelley Reed is underway. Mr. Powers pointed out that the performing arts schools are not represented and need to be included in the document-in-process.

Peter Haratonik made a motion for Strategic Planning Chairs to make regular periodic visits to the UFS. He added that he would bring this to the attention of the chairs of the

Curricular Planning groups at next week's meeting.

The Senate unanimously voted in favor of the motion.

The discussion turned to the role of the Senate and whether or not it should remain an advisory body. One senator pointed out that major progressive American universities have a legislative role.

Edwin Melendez made a motion to incorporate the language of UFS Resolution 06/07-1, "Faculty Senate Resolution on Shared Governance, Faculty Representation, and Faculty Assembly," into Section C of the bylaws. Ms. Sebek read the resolution aloud.

Following general discussion, Duncan Foley proposed an amendment to the motion, suggesting that the governance committee integrate appropriate sections of the resolution into the amended UFS by-laws to be presented to senators for a vote before the end of the academic year.

The amended motion passed unanimously.

Neil Gordon presented a resolution calling for the trustees to comply with Article X of the UFS Bylaws creating an Office of the Senate, a physical dedicated space, and administrative support.

Mr. Gordon then turned to the UFS By-laws and opened the question of faculty representation on the Senate, specifically, whether or not the following restrictions should apply: full-time faculty representatives must be principal faculty with Extended Employment/tenure or on EE/tenure-tracks; part-time faculty representatives must hold multi-year contracts. Current faculty serving on the Senate would be grandfathered in.

A general discussion ensued. It was pointed out that some divisions have few full-time faculty (Mannes has 3 and Drama has none) and that there will not be many multi-year faculty in the coming year. Some felt that criteria should be open and that faculty should define their peers and elect them to the senate. The body agreed to keep requirements for the Senate as they are.

Larger issues arose from the discussion: the role part-time faculty play in the university and remuneration of part-time faculty serving on the Senate. These are issues to be taken up next year in the Senate.

Mr. Gordon reported in on the Benefits Committee constituted by the UFS co-chairs. Two faculty members serving on the Benefits Committee, Aleksandra Wagner and Tracyann Williams, were visitors at the meeting. The Benefits Committee is addressing work-life issues, including maternity leave, childcare and elderly care, and tuition reimbursement.

A discussion of current childcare policies ensued. The need for more progressive policies that are in line with liberal colleges and world-class universities was emphasized. Issue was taken with the use of the word “disability” to refer to pregnancy. A suggestion was made that the university join a tuition exchange program with similar, small liberal arts colleges. The body agreed to pass a resolution suggesting an amendment to the Faculty Handbook. The resolution will be circulated by e-mail, and all comments should be sent to Neil Gordon.

The Co-chairs thanked the Benefits Committee for their tremendous efforts.

Mr. Foley presented a potential process amending the Faculty Handbook. The Board of Trustees has final responsibility for establishing University policy in the Handbook. The Senate would serve as the central agenda setting body for all amendments to the Faculty Handbook. All suggested amendments would go to the Faculty Affairs Committee for discussion. Upon discussion, the Senate would then forward proposed amendments or alternative proposals to the Board of Trustees. If the Board did not accept a proposed amendment recommended by the Senate, they would formulate objections in writing.

The proposal was endorsed by the Senate.

Mr. Kirkbride asked Co-chairs of the standing committees to send final resolutions to the Co-chairs for circulation, comments and a Senate vote.

Ms. Gordon summarized the *ad hoc* review process to be in effect for the next three years, and senators discussed the process, particularly questions of rank, salary bands, and the June 1st deadline for faculty to choose tenure or EE tracks.

The Co-chairs suggested setting up a special meeting with Vice Provost Nichols to discuss the *ad hoc* process.

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Anezka Sebek and Terri Gordon.

Appendix I: Multi-year Appointment Memo.

February 14, 2007

TO: Deans and Directors

FROM: Eliza Nichols
Vice Provost

RE: Review of Part-time Faculty applying for Multi-Year Appointments

The ACT-UAW Collective Bargaining Agreement provides for a process for Part-time Faculty to apply for a ***Multi-Year Appointment***.

You'll remember that in November, we informed all Part-time Faculty of the application process. About 60 part-time faculty university-wide expressed an intention to apply; 47 of those actually submitted application materials as of February 1.

After describing Multi-Year Appointments, this memo outlines the review process for those applicants for Multi-Year Appointments.

ABOUT MULTI-YEAR APPOINTMENTS:

What are multi-year appointments? Part-time Faculty Multi-Year Appointments are for three years, with a presumption of continuing reappointment to that status.

Who can apply? Applicants must be "annual faculty" appointees (that is, those who have taught more than 10 semesters at the university) who have taught at least some credit courses.

What is the purpose of the Multi-Year Appointments? Part-time Faculty on Multi-Year Appointments will assist in the process of shared governance so crucial to carrying out the mission of The New School and its divisions. These appointments will single out those Part-time Faculty whom we regard as academic leaders.

What benefits does a Multi-Year Appointee receive? Multi-Year Appointees receive greater security in maintaining their base loads and related benefits. In addition, they are the only Part-time Faculty eligible to serve on university-wide committees. There is no change in their teaching rate.

What happens if an applicant is not approved for a multi-year appointment? If not

appointed, the applicant remains an annual appointment (unless serious concerns were raised during the review process). Faculty can re-apply in a later year.

THE STAGES OF THE MULTI-YEAR APPOINTMENT REVIEW:

Dean's Report on Sustainability. Before reviewing the specific applications, the Deans examine the areas of expertise represented to determine whether those areas can sustain Multi-Year Appointments. That review was completed in December, 2006 for this year's applicants.

The Review Committee. According to the ACT-UAW agreement, the Review Committee must consist of faculty. In future years, Part-time Faculty who already hold Multi-Year Appointments will most likely serve on the Review Committee for applicants for Multi-Year Appointments along with principal full-time faculty. But at this time, since there are not yet any faculty who hold multi-year status, the deans have agreed to convene an ad hoc review committee made up of some of the members of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee from the New School for Social Research as these faculty members have substantial experience. Because some applicants this year are in the humanities, design, and the performing arts, we have supplemented that Review Committee with a few full-time faculty from other schools.

The Review Committee will make its recommendations to the Deans and the Provost no later than April 30, 2007.

What criteria will the Review Committee use? The Review Committee will consider the academic qualifications and performance of the applicants on the basis of a demonstrated standard of excellence in teaching, professional accomplishment, and university service. As noted above, the Review Committee will seek Part-Time Faculty members who are excellent teachers, who have remained active in their fields, and who have shown a sincere commitment to the university and a desire to participate collegially in governance.

Appendix II: Integrated Academic Policy, Space, and IT Planning Report

Academic Policies Committee
University Faculty Senate
April, 2007

At this juncture so critical for our University, when ideas and initiatives leading to its transformation into a more cohesive institution of higher learning are being discussed, the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Policies has decided to take a look at the closely-related issues (crucial for any academic institution) of the existing university infrastructure and the intellectual-pedagogical objectives of the University's various academic divisions.

The driving force behind this exercise was our concern that physical space, further extended and enhanced by IT infrastructure, be taken into account in the thinking about a more integrated approach to teaching at the University. While the need for certain kinds of space such as smart classrooms, offices for faculty, places for quiet study for our students, libraries, and general-use computer centers is shared by the entire university community, there are the specific needs of each division, which are embedded in their own pedagogical mission and which ought to be taken into account and brought to the attention of the community.

The document we have put together is a *work-in-progress*, as we did not have an opportunity to receive full input from all corners of our school. Obviously, it is NOT intended to supersede any other space, academic, or IT-planning initiatives. Rather, we would like to complement them, by opening up yet another line of communication and discussion between the faculty, administration, and hired consultants regarding the issues of the University's academic and space planning.

While the future building at 65 5th Avenue provides an immediate and specific context for crystallizing the pedagogical vision of The New School, more broadly it represents a valuable opportunity for developing a holistic approach to an interim and long-range strategic planning process, with faculty members as its integral participants.

APC 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)

New School for Social Research
(Report drafted by Elzbieta Matynia)

When one looks at the university space as whole, one would have to agree that the current space-related situation of the NSSR is perhaps the most difficult to discuss, since the division's space status is *in transition*. In August 2007 all but one departments (Psychology) are facing a major move, two blocks uptown from 65 Fifth Avenue, to 79 Fifth), and what's *current* now, will *not* be current a few months from now. Despite the discussions and informational meetings with the architectural team designing the space, and various internal meetings concerning the move, there exist significant and understandable anxiety on the part of the faculty, students, and administrative staff regarding this *trading of places*. This current document is not able to grasp all possible problems that may emerge in the fall, and therefore it ought to be updated once the move is completed, and once the new life in a new building has settled down. Only then will we be able to see whether it serves its purpose (and promise!), and provides a supportive environment for research, teaching, advising, and all the kinds of work, activities, and projects that the NSSR is known for.

I. Mission

The mission of The New School for Social Research—which derives from American progressive thinkers, the legacy of the University-in-Exile, and the critical theorists of Europe—is grounded in the core social sciences and broadened with a commitment to philosophical and historical inquiry. In an intellectual setting where disciplinary boundaries are easily crossed, students learn to practice creative democracy—the concepts, techniques, and commitments that will be required if the world's peoples, with their multiple and conflicting interests, are to live together peacefully and justly.

NSSR/ the University/ the city/the world.

The New School for Social Research is a graduate school that provides an intellectual environment that nurtures future scholars, university teachers, and researchers. Our kind of graduate thrives – as the mission statement stipulates -- in an ***intellectual setting where disciplinary boundaries are easily crossed***. This has made the NSSR a congenial platform for collaborative work with other divisions, and one where new linkages are continuously developed, by faculty, students, and our research centers. Most of our events (conferences, talks, presentations, discussions) geared to the university community are traditionally opened to the larger New York public, especially when it comes to distinguished foreign speakers.

We are the home of four major *research centers* (the Schwartz Center for Economic Policy Analysis, Transregional Center for Democratic Studies, International Center for Migration, Ethnicity, and Citizenship, Hannah Arendt Center), four *international projects* (Janey Program in Latin American Studies, Journal Donation Project, Bombay Observatory, South Asia Project), and three major internationally-recognized *scholarly journals* (“Social Research”, “Culture-State-Society”, “Constellations”).

II. NSSR and its specific space needs

Besides the obvious prerequisite—smart seminar rooms where the classes take place -- NSSR has specific – though also obvious -- needs.

NSSR Academic Community: flexible conference spaces

For a school that deals with ideas, the best setting is an academic version of the public square, or agora, i.e., a flexible conference room. This is a setting in which ideas can be presented, submitted to the scrutiny of the academic community, and challenged. **A set of conference rooms** that vary in size provides for us the necessary space for students to test their strengths in public presentations and debates; whereas one sizable conference room would be necessary for our school to remain a key player in the debates of the nation-wide social science community. Such a space is necessary to host major intellectual events, including those open to the New York public. Adequate conference space is a lifeline for our school to maintain and grow its international reputation, and for our students to succeed on the academic job market. We have to have it if we want to attract the best students and faculty. Without such a space, the highly respected initiatives we are known for would die, and our prestige would evaporate.

Faculty—the issue of adequate office space:

A separate need is related to faculty **office space**. In the case of our division, our offices are a direct extension of our classrooms. This is **where we work individually** with our students: discuss their work, conduct individual study programs, and conduct advisory sessions. Our school is recognized for its faculty’s commitment to working individually with the students. We know that this is our tradition and our advantage vis-à-vis other schools; it cannot be accomplished without adequate office space. But while thorough advising (on MA and Ph.D theses) is a large part of our faculty responsibilities, the “production” of impressive scholarship is also expected of members of the graduate division. Clearly it is not just in the personal interests of any given faculty member, as the creative accomplishments of the faculty members constitute a magnet attracting the best graduate students, and strengthen the position of the University in the world of the academy at large. In the context of the problems many of our faculty members face with the cost of decent housing in the city, most of the NSSR faculty uses the office space to conduct both advising and research. Thus adequate office space is of great importance for the proper

functioning of our division in advancing its mission.

Students —the issue of space for quiet work on campus:

The situation of affordable housing is of course an issue for our students as well. Many of them come to school for an entire day, and need to use off-class time to conduct their studies. There is already a dearth of space for students' activities on campus, but quiet study space is of particular concern to graduate students. This particular matter emerged recently as an issue of major discontent after the NSSR students' representatives saw the newly-designed space for quiet study in the new 79 Fifth building. Though perhaps esthetically pleasing, the space was much smaller than the one on 65 Fifth, outfitted with hard plastic seating benches, open to other communal spaces, and therefore not really quiet. In view of the upcoming move, and in order to avoid additional costs later, the Faculty fully supports students in their request to address the matter urgently.

AV/IT needs

The IT infrastructure in the 65 Fifth Avenue building was poorly developed, often did not work, and for the equipment to arrive on time, one had to make very advanced notification and follow-up with multiple confirmations. The new quarters on 79 Fifth are to be free of these headaches, we are told, as we are moving to a universe of smart classrooms.

III. The move & trading places

The anticipated date for the move from 65 Fifth Avenue to 79 Fifth Avenue is August 2006. In the 18-storey building there will be seven floors occupied by the New School. (5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, 18). NSSR is allotted three and a half floors: 7—shared with Parsons, 9, 10 and 11.

The move causes a natural unease within the NSSR community, as with any change, but also because the School is in fact losing space, at least in terms of square footage. We know that the faculty offices will be smaller, though perhaps better designed. Whatever we have at 65 Fifth will move to smaller spaces: smaller offices, smaller classrooms, and smaller conference spaces, which are also going to serve as classrooms. And it is that last category that is of special concern to us.

Right now, at 65 Fifth Avenue, we have access to three different conference spaces: The Wolff Conference Room, which seats 100 people (the room is very wisely & widely used and shared with the rest of the university community); Swayduck Auditorium, which seats 215 people, and addresses the needs of all divisions of

the university;
The Machinist room, which can seat 50 people.

At 79 Fifth we will have access to:

One conference room that is to replace both Wolff and Machinist. It seats 65 people, and with the use of a movable partition will also be used as two classrooms. **There is a natural anxiety that the classroom needs will take precedence over conference needs.**

There will also be a separate conference space – a mini-auditorium—that will replace Swayduck, except that it will not seat 215 people but again only 65.

This seriously undermines our mission, with its indispensable commitment to well-publicized, well-attended, invariably interdisciplinary lectures, panels and symposia that are often open to the public.

Administrative staff – work space at 79 Fifth

Finally, the University does not exist without its support staff. The plan presented to the NSSR community indicates that the secretaries, student advisors, etc., will be sharing an open work-space with Bloomberg style cubicles. **Many at NSSR question the Bloomberg view of how work ought to be done in a corporate world when applied to the university, especially in regard to the confidentiality principle.**

Many at NSSR are concerned that what is good for the corporation may not be good for the university. Transparency, a collaborative spirit, and team-work are important, but we also deal with confidential files, and we have to take into account issues of confidentiality (grades, personal data, references, complaints & grievances, financial records).

Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts
(Report drafted by Dominic Pettman)

Mission

Eugene Lang College offers interdisciplinary liberal arts education distinguished by small, seminar classes. Creative, self-motivated students develop skills in critical thinking, writing, and understanding theory as well as gain practical experience in an exciting urban environment. Intellectually adventurous graduates are thus equipped to take on leadership roles in fostering cultural and social change in a diverse, global society.

Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts

From its inception in 1985, Eugene Lang College has occupied a unique position in the

intellectual community of The New School. Sharing the New School's founding values of principled academic freedom as well as its debt to the European intellectual movements brought to America by a generation of exiles, the college values the most rigorous conception of scholarship and the ideals of free speech, social justice, and intellectual engagement. Embracing, like The New School, a century of U.S. educational innovation, the college prizes both disciplinary excellence and interdisciplinary eclecticism. Within these values, Eugene Lang College measures itself by the undergraduate education it provides to its students—by its central concern for students' development as critical thinkers willing to engage questions across disciplinary boundaries and as informed citizens committed to defining and realizing the public good.

Overview

The absence of space is the number one complaint among our students and increasingly, among our faculty. The new building will address many of these needs, but until such time as it is ready we need an interim plan for accommodating our increasing numbers. Students are pushing for gathering space beyond the courtyard and cafeteria, as well as better studio and theatrical facilities. This year, Lang's faculty will outgrow the offices in the 11th Street buildings, forcing us to look elsewhere for space. And it is becoming increasingly difficult for us to hold many of the committee meetings necessary to run the College. While everyone acknowledges that we will be "squeezed for space" in the coming months/years, we must do a better job of planning for the near future if we are to avoid higher levels of attrition, which would be counterproductive to our mutual aspirations.

Media/AV/IT

For Lang faculty, the AV and IT situation currently ranks as its biggest concern. As the entire university moves toward a new multi- and inter-media environment, certain political and/or pragmatic issues emerge in the context of a strong liberal-arts pedagogy. The Lang building itself has upgraded and improved in terms of facilities in the last year, in that smart rooms have become noticeably smarter. (Access to these smart rooms is a different issue, given the overall space squeeze.) Given Lang's seminar-based curriculum, we are in need of sufficient medium-sized smart rooms with embedded and integrated facilities for projection, audio, and internet access. With increases in enrollment, and concomitant increase in lecture courses, we also need to secure and upgrade some larger auditoriums. (Wollman, for instance, the signature room for Lang, doesn't even have a computer, currently relying on laptop links.)

Certain key issues include:

site specific problems (e.g., wifi failure, projector disconnections, slow or no maintenance, baroque infrastructure and ad-hoc solutions)

fiefdoms of responsibility and unclear troubleshooting options
the systemic dependence on AV (some of the staff are very helpful, but a class should not depend on someone remembering to unlock the audio cabinet, or bring the remote control)
no clear distinction between AV and IT (and we might ask, in this era of digital convergence, why there *is* a prevailing distinction between them)
a sense that the 7 day advance notice for equipment requests is too long and inflexible
little faculty input concerning important decisions, such as installed software, codecs, region-codings, and other compatibility issues
distance learning, online courses, and other “scaleable” enterprises are currently hamstrung by DRM, IP and copyright policies. More faculty and grad-student input could avoid many of the current problems which make teaching online – within the New School’s technical system (Blackboard, Banner, etc.) – a non-starter for many of those with a serious stake in digital learning.

Humanities and Social Sciences

The bulk of classes at Lang fall within the purview of Humanities and Social Sciences, meeting twice a week in seminar groups of between 10-22 students. Due to popular demand and increased enrollments, some concentrations have been obliged to scale up to lectures of up to 60 students. In either scenario, finding amenable rooms has been a struggle, as all the divisions compete for precious smart-rooms and even the most basic of pedagogic facilities (e.g., climate control). Given the focus on seminars, however, it is paramount that we have enough medium-sized rooms, so that students are not obliged to sit in two circles – one around the table, and one around the walls – which has the unfortunate architectonic effect of excluding people from the discussion. Wollman Hall and the Tischman Auditorium are valuable spaces, which are fully utilized by Lang faculty and students for special events and meetings, however more traditional lecture halls – designed with pedagogy in mind – would be welcomed, especially by the larger concentrations.

Performing Arts

Lang has a respected arts program and theater concentration, which hosts four productions per academic year. Each production period requires ten days for the performance itself, and five weeks prior to performance week. The performance space must be larger than the stage area, have an audience capacity of 100+, and include lighting rigs, PA system, as well as secure storage for props and costumes. In addition to these four productions, senior work includes up to eight more modest performances per academic year. Moreover, acting and directing classes require a large space (minimum 30’x 30’), with a non-concrete floor. It should also be acoustically sound, with storage space for props (including some furniture) and mats. This space is also needed for rehearsals outside of class time. The dance program requires a minimum studio size of 60’x 30’; marley over a sprung floor; full length mirrors; piano; ballet barres; sound system; and dressing rooms.

Sciences

The Science, Technology and Society concentration has done wonders with its single multi-purpose lab on the 4th floor of the 11th Street building, however they are in dire need of more labs for courses in chemistry, biology, and physics. Ideally the new signature building would boast either specialized labs for such purposes, or “smart labs” which can adapt effectively and efficiently to different subjects, requiring distinct and/or flexible layouts, technologies, equipment and facilities. Our psychology faculty could also benefit from a lab environment.

Students

The current population of Lang students is 1,200, and they often complain of a lack of gathering spaces for eating, meeting, events, activities, union work, newspaper work, and socializing. The new signature building may eventually take some pressure off this problem, but in the meantime, projected growth (over 1,400 students by Fall 2010), means that we need more general and dedicated spaces for students than the current configuration (i.e., the cafeteria in the 11th Street building, and two offices in the basement). Increased and enhanced dorm spaces are another issue, but perhaps do not fall under the mandate of this document.

Faculty

Other than AV/IT and workload concerns, the top issue with Lang faculty is office space; or rather lack thereof. Full-time faculty currently share one office and one computer with two other colleagues, which of course creates havoc and confusion during the teaching week. Many part-time and adjunct faculty have no office access whatsoever, and are obliged to meet students in the crowded cafeteria, or in neighborhood cafés (which has quite a financial impact). As with student numbers, Lang is also experiencing growing pains with new faculty. In Fall 2007, we will be adding 12 tenure-track or term appointments, and yet there is nowhere in the 11th Street buildings to house many of these new colleagues. When the most fundamental facilities are stretched to this degree, it seems idealistic to mention a faculty lounge, but such a resource would of course be a welcome addition for employees who currently rely on the serendipity of corridor encounters to continue various vital conversations concerning research, teaching and service.

Summary

As an intimate-yet-growing liberal arts institution, Lang College requires (in equal precedence):

more seminar rooms (accommodating up to 25 people)

smarter seminar rooms (with embedded AV/IT equipment)
more and improved performance and rehearsal spaces/studios
more and improved scientific labs
more and improved office space for faculty
more conference rooms for administration
more gathering spaces for both students and faculty (information commons)

Of course we understand budgetary realities, and realize that these requirements will be addressed in different ways according to different exigencies and timetables; in concert and consultation with the needs of other divisions. The signature building will no doubt be a boon for New School staff, faculty and students; however the logistics of expanding in the world's most expensive real-estate market will no doubt be a challenge, requiring pragmatism, ingenuity, co-operation, and a certain amount of patience.

This document represents only the first step by Eugene Lang College in a wider conversation between all the divisions about how best to address both shared and specific needs, in order to move forward as the "new" New School.

SEQ CHAPTER \h \r 1The New School for General Studies (Report drafted by Carolyn Vellenga Berman)

Mission

"The New School for General Studies serves the intellectual, cultural, artistic, and professional needs and interests of adult students."

Unique among institutions for adult learning, the New School for General Studies combines credit and non-credit students in an environment conducive to intellectual rigor and creative passion. It offers a B.A./B.S. and a B.F.A. for students who wish to complete degrees begun elsewhere. It confers professional degrees, including an M.F.A. in Creative Writing; an M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language; an M.A./MS in International Affairs; and an M.A. in Media Studies. Finally, it offers undergraduate certificates in creative arts therapies, film production, screen-writing, culinary arts, teaching English as a second language, media management, and documentary media studies.

Departments range from traditional arts and sciences centers (Social Sciences, Humanities, Languages) to centers for artistic and professional training (Media Studies, Writing, Visual and Performing Arts, Music, Business, and Culinary Arts). It also includes institutes such as the Vera List Center.

B.A. students typically include dancers, actors, and other artists who are ready for a second

career, as well as aspiring writers and film-makers. Non-credit students include members of the Institute for Retired Professionals, a peer-learning community with study groups in science, psychology, public affairs, history, literature, the arts, and area studies.

SPACE REQUIREMENTS

The New School for General Studies is primarily housed in 66 West 12th Street, which has 24 classrooms. Since 2006, we have shared classrooms with Eugene Lang College. We now schedule classes Monday-Thursday only from 4 pm on, in our building and in 8 classrooms at Lang (66 W. 11th St.). (Lang uses both buildings until 4 pm, reserving 2 rooms in the evening.) We also consistently schedule classes on a “leftover” basis in 65 Fifth Avenue. **[how many?]**

Most of our administrative and faculty offices are in 66 West 12th Street. The Media Studies department is housed on the Parsons building, and some of its classes are scheduled there. Two departments (ESL and Visual and Performing Arts) have offices in 68 - 5th Ave. Culinary Arts classes usually take place in a leased space at 131 West 23rd Street.

Here are preliminary answers to the Academic Policy Committee’s Questions:

1. What kind of pedagogical spaces do we use? Most of our classes are seminars at the 15-35 student level. Faculty and students in all our programs increasingly require classroom technology for presentations of work and research. Classrooms need to be smart and standardized, for a fluctuating part-time faculty. We have special needs for Media Studies (technology for student work, research, and presentation), language courses (language labs), visual arts (studio), performing arts (dance room with mirrors), music (sound systems, pianos), and culinary arts.

We offer a number of public programs, many of which require auditoriums (79 events in spring 2007). These are scheduled in Tishman (66 W. 12th St.), the Theresa Lang Center (55 W. 13th St., 2nd floor), and Wollman (65 W. 11th St., 5th floor). We also schedule smaller presentations (i.e. readings).

Up to 20% of our courses take place on-line. **[add IT needs here? there are no incentives for faculty to develop on-line courses or training in on-line teaching?]**

2. How do these spaces meet current needs? Our buildings are now at maximum capacity. Juggling part-time faculty schedules with classrooms is a challenge; about 8 classrooms were overcrowded or inappropriate in the past year (e.g. language class in a

computer lab). (Our credit programs are large: the B.A. program enrolls as many students as Lang; Media Studies enrolls 450; International Affairs enrolls 96 students.)

The inability to schedule classes during the daytime makes it hard to serve some adult students (e.g. parents with young children, elderly students, those who work in the evening). Some students now compensate by taking courses on-line; others go elsewhere.

In addition to renting space, we use a room in 65 Fifth Ave. for dance classes; it is the only open room with padding and mirrors to which we have access.

3. What is the current use and need of other space (administrative, research, community)? Office space is currently adequate for full-time faculty, but there is no room for expanding programs within our primary building. For the most part, part-time faculty have little association with their own departments; neither mailboxes nor web pages link faculty to the departments in which they teach. About 390 part-time faculty members share a new “resource room” with 4 computers and numbered mailboxes (a posted directory matches numbers to names). Departmental links would foster a greater sense of community for faculty and students.

Faculty members and credit students rely upon privileges at the library consortium, particularly NYU library, for research. Noncredit students do not receive library privileges.

We have no space for our students to interact, meet with advisors, or work in groups. (The IRP uses a dedicated classroom for lectures, community, and group work.)

4. How do classrooms meet our pedagogical needs? Very few classrooms in 66 W. 12th are equipped with technology or A/V capabilities. The technology is not standardized, and classrooms come with widely varying technological support and capabilities.

Noise, light, and furniture are also concerns for our seminars dependent on lecture and discussion. Music students have no access to practice rooms; they often practice in temporarily empty classrooms with pianos.

[the “knowledge union” – computer center – is inadequate; add tech concerns]

CONNECTING WITH UNIVERSITY PLANNING THEMES

Two of the 5 themes of the university’s long range plan intersect with current master’s programs in the New School for General Studies: Media Studies and International Affairs. Our Media Studies department is currently housed in Parsons. It may make sense for it to move to the new building at 65 Fifth Avenue. Our quickly growing International Affairs program could also be a cornerstone of the envisioned university-wide program.

The unique niche of The New School as a whole is its special strength in the arts and social sciences. We should honor these strengths by developing related programs in the humanities and sciences. Humanities would foreground the history of the arts (including writing) and social sciences; science courses would foreground methods shared with social scientists and social questions (e.g. the environment) as well as technology (e.g. physics and computer science). We hope that university planning will tap the strengths in our division, including those of part-time faculty members, as it develops an integrated university-wide curriculum.

Milano the New School for Management and Urban Policy

(Milano's Space Planning Committee prepared this report on 12/11/06: Howard Berliner, chair; John Clinton; Ed Powers; Nidhi Srinivas; and Tatiana Wah)

In response to an April 2006 External Review commissioned by the Provost's office, Milano is reviewing its mission, curriculum and organization to update its focus and to connect more fully with university wide directions including collaboration with other divisions, undergraduate components and international linkage.

The current mission statement presented to the External Review Team last Spring may well be changed as a result of this review. It is as follows:

Mission

Milano the New School for Management and Urban Policy motivates and prepares students of diverse backgrounds to be leaders of social and organizational change. The curriculum enables students to make innovative contributions to the public, non-profit and private sectors based on a practice-orientation that provides them with action-oriented knowledge and skills. Teaching, research, and sponsorship of public inquiry and debate enable the school to stay relevant to ever-changing organizational and public policy issues. True to the progressive and cosmopolitan traditions of the New School, Milano is committed to helping people, organizations, and communities from the local neighborhoods of New York to regions of the world, realize their potential.

The mission which guides all programs was developed to respond to a changing context, one defined by diverse student enrollment, a professional environment in which sector, geographic and functional distinctions have blurred or disappeared, and a need exists for different skill set combinations for different professions. The school's educational goals focus on providing students with a combination of policy and management skills to equip them for work in changing national and international urban centers. Rather than train students for narrow careers, discipline by discipline, a Milano education combines hard

skills in management and analysis with a commitment to diversity, ethics and social responsibility, and supports professions to build civic institutions in support of democratic society.

SPACE REQUIREMENTS

Milano is housed in Fanton Hall occupying the 3rd-7th floors of 72 Fifth Avenue. The building provides a larger conference room, the 3rd floor Cohen room (can seat 50-60 for row by row gatherings), small conference rooms on the upper floors, faculty and administrative offices. The 7th Floor conference room (seats 16 around large tables) also includes the Uris Resource Center providing books and periodicals related to the school's work and interests.

Here are our preliminary answers to the Academic Policy Committee's Questions:

1. A seminar rather than a lecture approach characterizes many of the Milano classes. A great deal of small group and team work takes place both within the classrooms and as part of course assignments. The Urban Lab and organizational change applications require facilities for small group meetings.

Classrooms providing multiple chair and table arrangements are essential. Consistent with Milano pedagogy, classrooms need to be "smart" including built-in projectors, screens, and multiple outlets for lap top use. Modular furniture is the most desirable. Overhead projectors, vcr/dvd/tv equipment and flip charts are used in many of the classes. Faculty and student power point presentations are a feature of many classes.

Milano and the Center for New York City Affairs sponsor multiple public presentations, debates, and forums. Organized student groups sponsor programs. In each case, "presentational" and event facilities of varying size are necessary ranging from Milano's Henry Cohen Conference Room to facilities at 12th Street and 55 W. 13th.

2. All but the smallest seminar classes currently use 65 Fifth Avenue. Not many of these rooms in that building conform to the spatial needs identified above.

Current needs of the division for "presentation" space are currently met in part through the present availability of Swayduck, the Machinist conference room, and the Wolfe Conference Room (these, of course, will be lost for use in the near future and would need to be replaced in some form).

3. As is noted in the section on Management and Policy, present space in Fanton Hall (72

Fifth Avenue) is basically adequate for present administration and faculty with the expectation of some growth through joint and basic new faculty hires. Additional space for student interaction (especially with the loss of 65 Fifth Avenue), for student interaction, advising and group/team/lab group use would be desirable.

4. Faculty members are deeply concerned about adequate technical support and network capacity. Many courses have a “sightline” component and on-line courses are expected to increase in number.

Library resources and internet access are essential to the work of each of the programs at both Master’s and PhD level. Such resources and access enhance classroom activity, the research needs of students, and their capacity to complete individual and group assignments.

CONNECTING WITH UNIVERSITY PLANNING THEMES -- Management and Policy,

One of the 5 themes in the university’s long range plan is MANAGEMENT AND POLICY. To initiate work on the development of this theme the Milano Faculty is proposing that Fanton Hall (72 Fifth Avenue, Building H) become the University Center for Management and Policy as well as the home of the Milano School. Provost Ben Lee in a September faculty meeting emphasized the importance of Milano providing leadership for the definition and development of this Theme.

As the home of the Milano School, the building is already adequately established for administrative, faculty, conference and student use although more student study and group work space would be desirable. The Center for New York City Affairs is also housed there and its work is supportive of the Theme. The Uris Resource Center on the 7th floor can be developed further to provide, books, journals for the students and faculty in the building and to support the Center.

We propose a new use for Fanton Hall as a prototype center for one of the five University themes, the Center for Management and Policy. Given that the largest contingent of New School faculty currently working in these areas already is in the building, inviting colleagues from other divisions to co-locate is an efficient way to develop the concept of a center in preparation for the Signature building.

The Center itself would especially focus on organizations offering innovative solutions to enduring social problems within civil society, government, and business. The Center would study these organizations through a mix of analytical and quantitative tools, management theories, process and social design expertise. The Center would also serve to coordinate University offerings in such policy content areas as health, housing, education, community

and economic development, social welfare, the environment, and other policy related areas.

Our proposal is that full time faculty throughout the university who work in the areas of management and policy, independent of current divisional affiliation relocate in Fanton Hall. Currently, Milano space has 14 offices filled with non-Milano staff and faculty. Our projection is that Milano growth in the next five years will fill 4-5 of these offices leaving 9-10 offices available for non-Milano Faculty. (This assumes no use of the 3rd floor now occupied by University Admissions, but which could provide an additional 8 offices if growth in Management and Policy was faster than projected. This assumes no use of the basement, first and second floors of the building currently slated to be used as the University Welcome Center). In addition to the closed offices mentioned above, some space can also be made available to assist the use needs of part time faculty from various schools

The advantages of enabling Fanton Hall to house the University Center for Management and Policy would be the expected collaboration and synergies between faculty from different divisions with similar interests. It would allow students to share a space with faculty with common interests and in so doing encourage cross-division understanding and course enrollment. This approach would also feature the availability of resources that are aimed at students and faculty of management and policy in resource centers throughout the building.

In collaboration with others, current Milano faculty would seek to provide intellectual leadership and research to assist in the development of the university wide Management and Policy theme. Milano currently has Master's and PhD students in these fields. This collaborative work can serve the development of business and management curriculum at the under-graduate level throughout the university and assist in the development of proposed 5 year joint bachelors/masters degrees. Work at Master's level in the various divisions can draw from the common work of the center.

While additional student space would be welcome, the current needs of different student populations can be met here especially in the interim after the 65 Fifth Avenue building is not available. We envision that undergraduates and full time graduate students would use space during the day. This space could later be used by the largely evening Milano students and those from other schools who would also find a natural home there.

While we believe that the space would be adequate for the Center's work over the interim years until the Signature building is completed at 65 Fifth Avenue, basic class room requirements would not be met in the Fanton Hall building as currently configured.

Parsons The New School for Design

(Report drafted by Douglas Diaz)

Mission

Parsons focuses on creating engaged citizens and outstanding artists, designers, scholars and business leaders through a design-based professional and liberal education.

Parsons students learn to rise to the challenges of living, working and creative decision making in a world where human experience is increasingly designed. The school embraces curricular innovation, pioneering uses of technology, collaborative methods and global perspectives on the future of design.

Parsons has been a forerunner in the field of art and design since it's founding in 1896. In recent years, the School has strongly promoted technological skills development. By mastering computer graphics, computer-assisted design, interactive multimedia, digital imaging, and a host of other technological tools, Parsons' graduates are on the leading edge of an ever-evolving design world.

Parsons rigorous programs and distinguished faculty embrace curricular innovation, pioneer new uses of technology, and instill in students a global perspective in design. The result is an educational experience that is authentic and contemporary. The young designers who graduate from Parsons School of Design are unquestionably the real things.

Overview

Parsons' students, faculty and administrators are dispersed throughout the "campus" in Greenwich Village, the Fashion District and so forth. Our students chart around to almost every single building that The New School occupies, due to the nature of the curriculum, and the individual needs of every program/ discipline that we house. While it is impossible to think of a single structure that can contain all of these programs and people, we must turn our attention to the nature of use, quality and needs to understand how can we successfully carry out our stated mission.

To fully address the qualitative and quantitative needs of space at Parsons, we must look beyond the "number ratio" of students to square footage, especially in the context of a design/art education where the needs vary according to the production of work. The ability to explore, imagine, criticize, reflect and challenge, to say nothing of inventing/ anticipating future needs, depends on a delicate balance between resources that enable and not restrict.

Facilities

As a design/ art school with diverse programs and expertise our needs for facilities are complex. There are needs for space, equipment and support facilities that will enable students to produce the types of work that Parsons has become known for, while also looking to the future and determining areas of growth. In order for Parsons to stay at the forefront of educating designers and artist, we need to provide adequate support, and facilities as key components in reaching this mission.

A quick evaluation of our current use of space, facilities and equipment, depict a severely over grown and taxed situation. This is true both from a quantitative and qualitative perspective. For instance in review documents from NASAD (National Association of Schools of Art and Design), we have been asked to improve our facilities due to the lack of safety (shop facilities) or adequate rooms to support existing curriculum.

Quantitatively, we constantly have a need to find adequate classrooms for our classes, at times these conflicts are not resolved until well into the semester. This is both an issue of scheduling as well as lack of space. We often do not have appropriate room to match curriculum needs, most noticeably “smart” classrooms that can support spaces for presentation, production of work, discussion and research.

A recent presentation to the Senate by Cynthia Lawson (Director and Faculty member, Integrated Design Curriculum), made evident the basic need for more space, serious consideration of adjacencies, understanding of the pedagogical nature of design and art and dire need for vision as we look towards the future of design/art education.

Qualitatively our facilities are out-dated. Most labs have equipment (analog and digital) that are not at the cutting edge. Classrooms are often too small, with failing furniture, sinks and other amenities (wireless internet service, heat, lighting, and air conditioners) that do not function properly. There are also rooms that may satisfy one function, but are not able to accommodate the range of activities necessary to teach studio base courses.

Beyond the classroom, we do not have ample space for libraries, shops, common areas (places for students to gather, critique each other’s work, or even produce work), spaces to display work in a permanent and collective manner. Likewise faculty and administrative staff do not have proper offices, both from a quantitative and qualitative perspective. In most cases, faculty and staff share spaces that are too small for one single office, let alone for two.

The Sheila C. Johnson Design Center will begin to address some of these concerns, but not the major need for the types of production and learning spaces that align with new interdivisional curriculae currently in development across the university. The new Sheila C. Johnson Design Center will address the presentation of Parsons to the public.

Media/AV/IT

In most cases, Parsons' media, AV and IT needs require upgrading. Most classrooms do not have the appropriate equipment and in some cases, the wireless network does not work, making it difficult to do presentations, lectures and critiques. While the University has provides support at centralized locations (such as the KU at 55 West 13), there is not adequate support to address last minute needs or technical challenges that arise during class time. This is particularly problematic with the number of part time instructors who may or may not be able themselves to remedy the circumstance. Valuable in-class time is lost.

The lack of flexibility at the moment of selecting software, hardware and technical support is cumbersome to the pedagogical needs of many departments and in particular those for whom the digital realm is central to their work. For instance, the Communication and Design Technology department has had their own servers to support the types of work, research, exploration and presentation that the University at large has failed to provide. In some cases, it is difficult to keep up with the needs of specialized departments such as this one. But overall the failures of the AV/IT point towards the lack of understanding of what faculty and student's needs are as a whole.

There are shining moments within the provision of support, specifically, the ARC resource Center in 2 West 13th street. Here faculty can check out equipment on an immediate need basis and they provide excellent support for technical problems. This would appear to be a model to address one of the many problems facing AV/IT at Parsons.

Lastly, there are many talented and insightful faculty and staff, who already use the equipment and facilities, that could help serve as advisor for these problems. It would be a matter of tapping into the personnel resources in order to provide solutions from within.

Students

New York City provides an inspiring backdrop to design innovation: as corollary, there needs to be places for reflection, making and testing. Parsons has a student population of more than 3400, dispersed through several buildings in different locations in the city. To promote design as an endeavor that merges artistic skill, critical thinking, and proactive social engagement, there is a need for facilities that accommodate current and future uses, including spaces for gathering, exhibition, and the provision of a campus life.

As part of their curriculum needs, Parsons students are required to take courses in facilities across the University. While this provides many of the interactions and overlaps that make Parsons a vibrant place to be, it also greatly affects the ability of our students to produce and share the kind of work they should be making. Likewise the lack of dedicated studio

space for students negatively impacts their learning and makes it difficult to teach at times, since at any given time students can only present what they can carry – and not the full arc of their conceptual development.

Labs, shops and other spaces that enable learning, production and sharing are major concern for our students, who spend a large part of their time going between classrooms to lockers to classrooms. Storage or lockers are also a common source of complaint, especially given the assignments and work they are asked to do.

Faculty

Current classrooms do not meet the pedagogical needs of faculty. It is often difficult for faculty to demonstrate, evaluate, critique and hold discussion that relate to the work students are producing due to the quality of space they teach in.

Likewise, if faculty, both full and part time, do not have adequate office space, it is difficult for them to meet with students and provide the type of support necessary in the teaching process. In some departments there are mailboxes and some common spaces, but this is not uniform nor adequate.

Under these conditions, cultivation of a collegial atmosphere among faculty (and students) is exceedingly difficult. Beyond the immediate task of teaching there are few spaces that support the range of gatherings necessary to support day-day operations and planning sessions.

Summary

Parsons space, facilities and media needs are expanding. To keep track of the complexity surrounding these issues, we need to take into account the number of students, faculty and administrative personnel utilizing and servicing these facilities. These numbers describe a grim picture that is felt commonly in the spaces we inhabit daily: it is held together by doubled faculty commitment (as seen in the number of contact hours outside of class). We simply have out grown our facilities and have not provided the adequate planning to address the expected growth in the short and long term.

We need better and more:

- + dedicated studio space for students
- + smarter classrooms (AV/IT)
- + equipped lab and workshop spaces (to meet the needs of particular disciplines and departments)
- + office spaces for faculty and administrators
- + gathering spaces for students

- + gathering spaces for faculty (that can also serve as spaces to meet with students)
- + gallery and presentation facilities to show case the work done.
- + conference spaces to hold symposiums, lectures and other public events
- + aesthetically and functionally appropriate spaces for a design/art school.

These are just a few of the key items that should be taken into account as we think of the future needs, use and growth of Parsons. While realistic assessment of budgets, policies and visions might redirect some of these points, there are critical thinkers, artist, designers and architects that are capable of addressing these issues systematically from within, to provide creative solutions. Parsons has a plethora of resources that are under utilized; in this particular case it might serve us well to capitalize on our in-house strengths.

Based on the Senate Resolution 06/07-2, a section on IT (Information Technology) is in development for eventual inclusion.

<http://parsons.edu/about/index.aspx>

<http://parsons.edu/about/history.aspx>

http://homepage.newschool.edu/~ufs/artDesignspaces_UFS_TNS.pdf

See the document above for further clarification on potential solutions in addressing overlapping programmatic spatial requirements in relation to pedagogical needs to art and design curriculums.

“The Sheila C. Johnson Design Center will give Parsons a tangible urban presence that will greatly impact the experience of students and visitors alike... The center will become as much a source of identity to the school as any campus quad.” Paul Goldberger. <http://parsons.edu/news/detail.aspx?pType=0&nID=120>

PAGE

PAGE 25

The New School Faculty Senate

**Monday, May 7, 2007
8:30 AM – 10:00 AM**

66 West 12th Street, Room 510

Agenda

Welcoming Remarks (5 minutes)	Dennis Derryck
Summary of Resolutions (15 minutes)	
Governance Committee Office of the Senate (UFS Resolution 06/07-4)	Neil Gordon
Benefits Committee Faculty Benefits and Childcare Resolution (UFS Resolution 06/07-8)	Neil Gordon
Faculty Affairs Committee Procedures for Amending the Faculty Handbook (UFS Resolution 06/07-6) Salary Transparency and Full-time Faculty Rank (UFS resolution 06/07-7)	Duncan Foley
Academic Policies Committee (no presentation necessary) University-Wide Operations Diagram (UFS Resolution 06/07-5)	
Discussion of Resolutions with President Bob Kerrey and Provost Ben Lee (20 minutes)	
Update on Handbook: Status of Approval with Trustees and Summary of May 4 th meeting (20 minutes)	Vice Provost Nichols
Election of Co-Chairs (15 minutes)	Edwin Melendez
Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)	Dennis Derryck

Closing Remarks (10 minutes)

Terri Gordon and

Robert Kirkbride

Present

Members

Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes
Carolyn Berman, NSGS
Keith Buhl, Drama
Doris Chang, NSSR
Staff,
Dennis Derryck, Co-chair, Milano
Douglas Diaz, Parsons
Duncan Foley, NSSR
Neil Gordon, ELC
Terri Gordon, Co-chair, NSGS
Kasia Gruda, Parsons
Susan Hambleton, Parsons
Peter Haratonik, NSGS
Mary Judge, Parsons
Robert Kirkbride, Co-chair, Parsons
Deborah Levitt, ELC
Lily Ling, ELC
Elzbieta Matynia, NSSR
Edwin Melendez, Milano
Alan McGowan, ELC
Dominic Pettman, ELC
Edward Powers, Milano
Anezka Sebek, Secretary, Parsons
Faye-Ellen Silverman, Mannes
Tom Vasiliades, Drama

Ex Officio

Bob Kerrey, President
Ben Lee, Provost
Eliza Nichols, Vice Provost
Natalie Polvere, Deputy Chief of
Office of the President
Elizabeth Ross, Vice Provost
Michael Schober, Dean, NSSR
David Ford, Provost's Office

Visitors (incoming 07-08 Senators)

David Brody, Parsons
Johanna Woodcock, Parsons
Sven Travis, Parsons
Ono de Jong, Parsons

Absent

Sharon Mesmer, NSGS

At 8:40, Co-chair Dennis Derryck called the meeting to order.

Mr. Derryck offered "end of year comments" (Appendix I) that briefly summarized the year's progress in the Senate's work and engagement with the Provost's Office and Administration to envision the "new New School." He then recognized the efforts of the co-chairs of each of the committees: Duncan Foley and Susan Hambleton in Faculty Affairs, Neil Gordon and Doris Chang in Governance, Douglas Diaz and Elzbieta Matynia in Academic Policy. He then turned discussion to the summary of the resolutions recently

passed by the UFS.

Neil Gordon summarized the approved resolutions from the Governance Committee and Benefits sub-committee, including, respectively, the “Office of the Senate” (Appendix II) and the “Faculty Benefits and Childcare Policies” (Appendix VI). Speaking on behalf of the Benefits Subcommittee, Mr. Gordon recognized the challenges of financial and legal constraints, but emphasized the need for the New School to be progressive around these issues for faculty recruitment and retainment, and included that the subcommittee would be willing to continue its work with administration in the 07-08 academic year.

President Bob Kerrey stated that he would examine the Benefits resolution and offer a response, remaining in consultation with the UFS.

Duncan Foley then thanked members of the Faculty Affairs Committee and summarized the two resolutions proposed by the committee and passed by the UFS: “Procedures for Amending the Faculty Handbook” (Appendix IV), and “Salary Transparency and Full-time Faculty Rank” (Appendix V).

The “Resolution on an University-Wide Operational Diagram” (Appendix III), proposed by the Academic Policies Committee and passed by the UFS, was not read or summarized as it had previously been introduced and discussed in the March full Senate session.

Mr. Derryck then invited Provost Ben Lee to comment.

Mr. Lee summarized that there would be a summer retreat of the Provost’s Office to digest the work of the curriculum subcommittees and interdivisional programs, and with input from outside consultants, the Provost’s Office would undergo restructuring, according to Best Practices. With the current load of faculty evaluations and promotions, the Provost’s Office and the Deans are considering holding off on hiring new fulltime faculty. For the 07-08 academic year the budget process will remain in the divisions. Mr. Lee continued that the “White Paper” (outlining Strategic Planning for the University) and commitment to social engagement were well received by the Board of Trustees. A Student Senate will be established by the end of this semester. Regarding the planning of the new building at 65 5th Ave: members of Administration and the Provost’s Office had visited interesting spaces in the past 1.5 months that bode well for programming the new building (Pixar, Stanford d-studio), and IDEO had provided illuminating feedback from student uses. The December Board of Trustees meeting is considered a critical point for presenting on these various points.

Mr. Kerrey stated that the Administration of the New School will focus next year on changing the way it thinks and talks about the budget, in order to build the interdivisional programs. As an example, there is currently difficulty in organizing the administration of

the Environmental Studies Program.

Mr. Derryck requested the timeline on implementation of the FTE budget system.

Mr. Lee responded that it will take effect the following year (08-09). The incremental budget system will take at least a year to be eliminated, to achieve a comprehensive, university-wide view.

Mr. Powers asked if the curriculum subcommittees will be active during the summer.

Mr. Lee and Ms. Ross replied that as reports come in the next few weeks the Provost's Office will determine how to proceed.

Ms. Matynia inquired as to what would be the first initiatives this coming year, resulting from this work.

Mr. Lee responded that the primary focus over the summer would be how the new academic plans would drive programming of the new building.

Mr. Kerrey and Mr. Lee departed the meeting.

Edwin Melendez then conducted election of the UFS Co-chairs for the 07-08 academic year.

Vice Provost Eliza Nichols then summarized the approval of the Evaluations and Promotions document by the Board of Trustees. Ms. Nichols then offered a summary of the special session with the UFS on May 4: the boilerplate approach to the Governance section of the Faculty Handbook, Phase II, had proceeded quite far. The Workload section is more problematic, but its discussion will continue next year. Shared Governance could be achieved by the end of next year. Further data is necessary to develop the Workload section, which is likely a two year proposition. Regarding the Promotions & Review process, a memo detailing the timeline will be distributed (May 16): this includes a one-time-only dossier due-date of August 27 and subsequent notification date of June 1 instead of the standard March 1. Post Probationary reviews will be conducted within the divisions under the auspices of the Deans.

Alan McGowan proposed the following motion regarding the UFS Office and Secretary, which was seconded and unanimously passed by the UFS: "In order to comply with Article X of the University Faculty Senate Bylaws, the UFS formally request that funds be allocated in this and next year's budgets for a fulltime secretary, hired by the Executive Committee, and dedicated office space."

The minutes from the February 6th and March 6th Senate meetings were unanimously approved.

The UFS briefly discussed changing the time of meetings for the upcoming year, from 8:30-10 am to a more convivial lunchtime slot of 12-2: conflicts were cited by Mannes and Lang representatives. The scheduling issue will be revisited at the outset of the new Senate.

A “legacy document” summarizing and projecting each committee’s activities was distributed (Appendix VII).

Co-chairs Terri Gordon and Robert Kirkbride then offered final comments, with introduction of several newly elected senators, and gratitude extended to various members of the Senate for their contributions, including:

Anezka Sebek (Parsons, outgoing) and Alan McGowan (Lang), for secretarial support

Mary Judge (Parsons, outgoing), for her work on the UFS website

Kasia Gruda (Parsons, outgoing), for her perseverance as longest standing member of the Senate

The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Derryck at 10:05.

APPENDIX I

Dennis Derryck's end of year comments

Last October, we as co-chairs welcomed Ben Lee as our new provost at what was his first formal meeting with the Faculty Senate.

We spoke then of the history of the senate , its creation and the difficult challenges we all faced. I say we since the challenges are ones we as faculty must jointly share with the administration, and they with us, if the New School is to move forward.

We spoke then of the difficult decisions we will face as we create a shared vision of the institution; of the strategic plan in which the Provost was in the early stages of conceptualizing its process. We in the Senate were concerned as to how we would be included in that and all the other decision-making process that were about to be part of this change management process. We were concerned then as to the meaning of shared governance, the Faculty Handbook; Divisional governance structures and Divisional standards for appointment and promotion. We were concerned that as we worked on these areas, we would be guided by the principle of transparency and that we could strive for collegial solutions to the disputes that could or would arise.

Today's meeting is a measure of the progress we as a body has made. It is also a measure of the working relationship and respect we have had for the Provost's office and that which they have shown to us as a body. With his schedule he has found time to add additional meetings and we in turn with our schedules have found time to have these additional conversation. I think it reflects well of both sides.

In many ways today's resolutions are a reflection of the progress we as a senate have made. Embedded in the resolutions is a measure of both progress and the continued dialogue and conversations we continue to engage in with the Provost's office. They resolutions reflect the ongoing principles of transparency and of seeking collegial solutions to difficult tasks.

As we manage change, and that is what we are all engaged in as we define the new New University, assumptions underlying that change will be challenged. Our Provost stated it differently at the well-attended town hall held some three weeks ago. To quote him, "if the document on the new New School looks the same in the fall, then the process is not working."

It is important to acknowledge the work of the Chairs of the committees. They and their committee members have given more hours of thoughtful insights as they seek to make the University a better place.

Governance Committee co-chairs – Neil Gordon & Doris Chang (Also: Neil Gordon for

the benefits and childcare committee and amending the by-laws
Faculty Affairs Committee co-chairs – Duncan Foley & Susan Hambleton
Academic Policies Committee – Elzbieta Matynia & Douglas Diaz
Space Planning - Robert Kirkbride

There are others we will thank in the closing portion of this revised meeting schedule.

Let us move to the first item of the agenda – the summary of resolutions all passed by the Senate since its last meeting.

APPENDIX II

Office of the Senate Resolution

UFS Resolution 06/07-4

Governance Committee

Approved 4.10.07

University Faculty Senate Resolution on an Office of the Senate

The UFS Senate hereby resolves that the Board of Trustees comply with Article X of the University Faculty Senate Bylaws which calls for the creation of an office of the Senate, a physical dedicated space, and administrative support. The UFS resolves that this Article be put into practice by May 6th, 2007.

The Article reads as follows:

Article X

Office of the Senate

There shall be an Office of the Senate under the general supervision of the Officers. The Office of the Senate shall be located in space provided by The New School, and it shall be managed by a part-time staff administrator who shall be appointed by the Co-Chairs and compensated by The New School. Among other things, the Office of the University Faculty Senate shall maintain copies of these Bylaws and all amendments thereto, a list of the members of the University Faculty Senate and their years of service, copies of the minutes of the meetings of the University Faculty Senate, records of all elections, and current statements of each academic division describing its rules and procedures for electing its representatives to the University Faculty Senate.

APPENDIX III

Operational Diagram Resolution

UFS Resolution 06/07-5

Academic Policies Committee

Approved 4.29.07

University Faculty Senate Resolution on an University-Wide Operational Diagram

To promote clarity and transparency in the workings of The New School, the University Faculty Senate resolves to work with administration, faculty and students to develop an interactive university-wide operational diagram. Such a diagram would provide an invaluable standing resource for daily operations of committees, governance, and innovative problem solving, enabling a member of The New School community to familiarize her/himself with the infrastructure of the university and identify where and how s/he can participate in improving the learning environment. Due to its focus on pedagogical, physical and IT infrastructure, the Academic Policies Committee will facilitate development of this diagram, logically housed on a webpage to promote interactivity. To develop the process and design, the APC will tap internal resources (faculty and students) and work in tandem with administrative resources (P3 group). Since the structure of the diagram would be directly linked to, and potentially supportive of, development of the Governance section of the Faculty Handbook, work would continue with the 07-08 Senate.

APPENDIX IV

Amendment Procedures Resolution

UFS Resolution 06/07-6

Faculty Affairs Committee

Approved 4.29.07

University Faculty Senate Resolution on Procedures for Amending the Faculty Handbook

The adoption of a Faculty Handbook establishing uniform ranks and personnel policies for New School Faculty calls for a workable procedure to amend the handbook. This procedure should ensure the widest possible open discussion of proposed amendments and an opportunity for the formation and expression of both administrative and faculty opinion. It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate, in cooperation with the Provost's Office, draft procedures for amending the Faculty Handbook to be presented to the Board of Trustees together with the parts of the Handbook addressing Divisional governance and workload. These procedures should reflect the following principles:

The Board of Trustees has the final responsibility for establishing University policy through the Faculty Handbook.

Any interested party, including individual faculty, Divisions, the Senate, and the Provost's Office shall have the opportunity to propose amendments to the Handbook.

The Faculty Senate and its Faculty Affairs Committee shall be the initial forum for discussion of all proposed amendments to the Handbook. No proposed amendment should be voted on by the Board of Trustees without a reasonable time for discussion by the Senate, including an opportunity for the Senate to formulate a considered opinion on the issues and present alternative proposals to the Board of Trustees. In the case of disagreement over proposed amendments, both the original amendment and alternatives formulated by the Faculty Senate should be presented to the Board of Trustees with an opportunity for advocates of all positions to state their case in writing and, when appropriate, in person.

In case the Board of Trustees or its committees do not accept a proposed amendment to the Handbook recommended by the Faculty Senate, the Board of Trustees shall formulate its objections to the amendment to the Senate in writing, and, when appropriate, in person.

APPENDIX V

Salary Transparency Resolution

UFS Resolution 06/07-7

Faculty Affairs Committee

Approved 4.29.07

University Faculty Senate Resolution on Salary Transparency and Full-time Faculty Rank

The Senate endorses the repeated commitments of the Provost's Office to publish salary band ranges of New School faculty appointments, and calls on the Provost to follow through on this matter. The Senate notes that the procedure for assigning full-time faculty to new ranks which had a promising start in the Fall of 2006 appears to have stalled, and calls on the Provost to complete this process.

APPENDIX VI

Benefits Resolution

UFS Resolution 06/07-8

Benefits Committee

Approved 4.29.07

University Faculty Senate Resolution on Faculty Benefits and Childcare Policies

Work/life issues for NSU handbook resolution

The New School has long been synonymous with and committed to progressive ideals, teaching, and policies that reflect its unique position in academia and the world. In the last several years, the university has begun positioning itself more emphatically, as well, to be a world-class academic research institution through the hiring of faculty. In the university's ongoing commitment to the members of its community, it is necessary to examine some of the policies pertaining to the faculty, regarding benefits and certain leave policies.

1. We believe that the exponentially skyrocketing costs of raising and educating children in New York cannot go unaddressed by a progressive institution like The New School. We propose an increase of the primary, secondary, and college benefits to either a higher cash level or a percentage of the total. For example, New York University provides up to \$2000 per dependent child, whereas Columbia pays up to 35% of primary tuition (on a sliding scale with the benefits decreasing as the faculty member's salary increases).

We request that this benefit extend to all area schools rather than only those in New York, recognizing that a significant percentage of our faculty live outside of Manhattan.

We request that this benefit extend to educational and daycare expenses rather than just private schools, as the current policy states.

We request an extension of this benefit to undergraduate colleges, despite location, given the university's rising profile and entry standards that make it competitive with a vast array of American colleges. We recognize that other universities like Columbia pay 50% of college tuition anywhere in the United States. We propose that the university seek reciprocal tuition waivers with equivalent universities across the country or join a consortium like Tuition Exchange which helps schools "exchange" college students, allowing some to receive tuition of up to \$23,500.

2. The language originally in the faculty handbook regarding maternity and childcare leave benefits should be reinstated (see attached *Childcare Leave*). As it stands, the current policy states that faculty will receive up to twelve weeks of unpaid leave in keeping with the guidelines of the Family Medical Leave Act. This policy is grossly out-of-step with other institutions to which The New School is often compared and to which we compare ourselves. If we are, indeed, a "great" institution, it is necessary to be comparable to other institutions, particularly when it comes to recruiting, competing for, and retaining faculty.

Columbia University, for example, clearly states that the FMLA is inadequate support. Their current "infant care leave" policy grants up to six months of paid leave to the parent (including same-sex domestic partner) of the biological or legally adopted child. The "secondary parent" can also be granted full or partial leave. The university will also arrange for a reduced courseload or partial leave of absence if the leave period exceeds six months, but for a period of no longer than two years (with accompanying documentation). New York University, on the other hand, bases its leave policy on years of service. Once this formula has been exhausted, faculty can apply for up to three months of paid leave. NYU

also offers faculty up to \$5000 to cover expenses related to the legal adoption of a child.

Secondly, we are aware that faculty have been creating ad-hoc family leaves – by negotiating with their superiors – as a way to supplement the current policy. As a result, faculty across the university obtain different “deals,” resulting in an inequitable situation dependent on individual relationships. Although many of the benefits we are requesting can be interpreted in the language of the faculty handbook, the current version lacks transparency and has resulted in the uneven distribution of benefits – through no fault of the parties involved. Such transparency is critical because individual faculty members may not realize that they have access to particular benefits. In addition, transparency helps to avoid a situation in which individual deans and department chairs are left to interpret what does exist and may arrive at different interpretations. Further, the American Association of University Professors recommends that leave and benefits policies be formalized, stating that “Studies of junior tenure-track faculty indicate that the pressures result not only from time demands created by conflicting responsibilities, but also from uncertain or conflicting expectations on the part of senior faculty concerning the standards for tenure. On some campuses, an implicit model of total dedication still exists, requiring faculty members to demonstrate that work is one’s primary, even sole, commitment. Such expectations must be clarified and modified to recognize the realities of the lives of faculty members who wish to raise children while pursuing an academic career.” Finally, having a more generous and consistent leave policy ensures legal equity and fairness throughout the university.

3. The university should assist faculty members in finding appropriate child care and elder care. At New York University, for example, the Office of Work-Life Services acknowledges that “when employees are able to balance their at-work and out-of-work responsibilities and meet their health and wellness goals, they are more productive...Work-life services are designed to improve workplace morale and contribute to improved recruitment and retention.” To this end, this office facilitates arrangements for elder and child care through the maintenance of a database of organizations and other services. Similarly, the Office of Human Resources at Princeton University maintains a *Child Care Resource List* that is comprised of accredited and/or registered child care providers, listed by county and includes addresses and telephone numbers.

4. Increasingly, faculty members are called upon to care for elderly parents and other family members. [This tends to be more characteristic of mid-career or senior faculty than of junior faculty.] Some faculty members may also be “sandwiched” between responsibilities for children and parents simultaneously.

Just as we recommend an institutional commitment to providing quality child care benefits, we also strongly recommend a commitment to supporting faculty members in providing quality care to elderly parents or to other family members. Benefits provided to faculty to deal with relatively young children should be extended to faculty who must care for ill family members and partners as well. NYU, for example, offers emergency dependent care (reimbursing 50% of costs for caregivers on call up to 50 hours per year). Specifically, faculty should be able to:

Obtain a leave of one semester for a close family member who is ill or work half time with full benefits for a semester in order to care for a family member.

Add time to the tenure clock if they are caring for an ill family member

As in other situations such as the timing of sabbaticals and unpaid leaves, the timing and duration of such leaves should be determined by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the administration. Faculty members on family leaves should receive consideration with respect to salary increments, insurance coverage, retirement annuities, and

the like, comparable to the benefits available to faculty members on other types of unpaid leaves, such as those for public or private service outside the institution. We feel very strongly that the university's academic community should not have to guess at what the policies are and how they should be applied.

Childcare Leave

Full-time faculty, regardless of sex, may take advantage of policies that are designed to assist them in taking care of a newborn child or a newly placed adopted child or a foster care child newly placed as preparatory to adoption. These include Childcare Disability Leave, Work Load Relief Plan, and Half-Time Appointments for Parents, all of which are described below.

A pregnant full-time faculty member is entitled to a **Childcare Disability Leave** of absence for the period surrounding the birth of her child during which her doctor certifies that she is unable to work. The University treats disabilities arising from pregnancy and childbirth like any other nonoccupational disability. The faculty member receives full salary and benefits under the University's policy for Medical Leave (see below).

Faculty members are expected to request medical leaves for childbirth and child care leaves sufficiently early to permit their departments and schools to plan for their absence. A faculty member who will be giving birth should include written documentation from her physician stating the anticipated duration of the disability. If the actual period of disability differs from the original projection of her physician, she should submit new documentation from her physician so that the medical leave can be changed.

In order to provide relief to faculty members faced with the additional demands of being the primary care-giver to a newborn child or newly placed adopted or foster child less than three years of age, the University's **Workload Relief Plan** permits one semester of workload relief from classroom teaching and administrative committee work, or two semesters of half relief from such duties based on the individual's normal yearly workload at full salary. The period of Workload Relief must begin within the first year after the birth or adoption of the new child. Workload relief is not considered a leave as faculty members are expected to make themselves available for their customary responsibilities of student consultation and advising.

Financial support for workload relief of classroom teaching, necessitated by having to hire appropriate part-time replacements, is the financial responsibility of the division in which the individual applying for Workload Relief is a faculty member. The division shall remain financially responsible for the faculty member's salary during the workload relief period.

To qualify for workload relief, the faculty member must be the parent primarily responsible for the care of a newborn child or a newly placed adopted child or a foster care child newly placed as preparatory to adoption. Faculty may employ a day-care provider and still qualify as the primary parent. In all circumstances, only one parent may be considered primarily responsible for the care of the child. If both parents are full-time faculty at the University, each such eligible faculty member can qualify sequentially for workload relief. If the full-time faculty member is a Chair or Director, s/he will rotate into a full-time teaching appointment for the duration of the workload relief, and there will be assigned an Interim Chair or Director in their place.

Normally the first semester of workload relief will be the semester in which the temporary disability leave for childbirth is completed, the semester in which the adoption takes place, or

the semester in which the birth takes place. If these events occur between semesters when classes are not in session, the first semester of the workload relief typically will be the following semester. Normally at least three months before the start of the first semester in relief, a faculty member wishing to request workload relief for parenting under this plan should inform his or her Chair and/or Director in writing, certifying that she/he is the primary caregiver and stating her/his intentions to take one full semester or two half semesters of relief. Details of the workload relief arrangement must be decided in consultation with the Chair, Director, or Dean.

This policy is not intended to replace leave available to faculty members who are eligible for leave for the birth of a child, an adoption, or foster care placement under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. FMLA shall run concurrently with workload relief as either intermittent or reduced workload leave. Eligible faculty members may still elect to take unpaid FMLA leave if they wish to provide no service while providing care for their newborn child or for an adoption or foster care placement.

To assist full-time faculty while raising a family, the University allows those who have young children to retain their full-time status, and its associated benefits and privileges, while providing half-time service, for a maximum of two years. To be eligible for a **Half-time Appointment for Parents**, the faculty member must be primarily responsible for the care of a child under the age of nine and plan to devote the time freed up by the appointment to that responsibility. Each year of a half-time appointment is treated as a half-year in determining the faculty member's up-or-out date or contract length, depending on the nature of their appointment. Full-time service, either before or after holding such an appointment, is counted in the normal manner.

While they are on a half-time appointment, faculty perform half of their normal responsibilities and are paid half of their normal salary but remain eligible to participate in the University's fringe benefits programs for full-time faculty. Faculty on such an appointment may not work for compensation outside of the University. A half-time career appointment is authorized by the Provost on the recommendation of the Chair and/or Director and Dean. Faculty may hold such an appointment as long as they meet the eligibility requirements for it and annually inform their Chair and/or Director and Dean of their intention to continue to serve in a half-time capacity. The faculty member may return to full-time service upon providing timely written notice to their Chair and/or Director and Dean. During the duration of a faculty member's half-time appointment, the Department or Program in which their position is held retains the other half of the faculty member's appointment.

APPENDIX VII

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

FACULTY AFFAIRS SUB-COMMITTEE

Members:

Dennis Derryck (Milano)
Duncan Foley (NSSR) Committee Co-chair
Katarzyna Gruda (Parsons)
Susan Hambleton (Parsons) Committee Co-chair
Lily Ling (NSGS)
Alan McGowan (Lang)
Faye-Ellen Silverman (Mannes)

2006-2007

The Faculty Affairs Committee began their term by collecting early drafts of divisional appendices to the Handbook and then coordinating the subsequent Senate's response to the procedures being used to ratify the Faculty Handbook and its appendices. An extension of our work was to urge the formation of a fourth committee to the Senate, a Benefits Committee, working on an ongoing basis to oversee the issue of leave for faculty (maternity, paternity, or otherwise).

The Committee ended our term by recommending two draft resolutions to the Senate. The first covered a working procedure towards the ability to amend the Handbook – whether this is from an individual, faculty Senate, or the Provost's office. While it is understood that the Board of Trustees has final responsibility in establishing policy, the Faculty Senate as well as Faculty Affairs Committee will be the initial forum for discussion of all proposed amendments, with a goal to provide open discussion as well as fair advocacy of the issue on both sides.

The second resolution calls on the Provost to publish the promised salary band ranges of New School faculty appointments as well as assign full-time faculty new ranks, an action long since stalled from the Fall of 2006.

Suggested Agenda 2007/2008

1. Continuing review and oversight of faculty issues as affected by the Handbook as well as other administrative policy.
2. Review and amendment of Handbook issues as they are presented to the Senate. This may well be particularly helpful given the administration's plan to alter and expand curriculum throughout the University

GOVERNANCE SUBCOMITTEE

Elizabeth Aaron (Mannes)
Doris Chang (NSSR) Committee Co-chair
Neil Gordon (Lang) Committee Co-chair
Terri Gordon (NSGS)
Edwin Melendez (Milano)
Sharon Mesmer (NSGS)
Anezka Sebek (Parsons)
Tom Vasiliades (Drama)

Mission Statement

1. To collect, compare and analyze the divisional governance structures and bylaws in those divisions which have instituted such; to report to the UFS on same; to ensure, with the UFS, that shared governance with articulated structures and bylaws exists in each division.
2. To conduct a review, in view of the UFS' past two years' experience, of the UFS bylaws; to collect input from the UFS; to propose emendations as necessary.

Overview 2006-07

The Governance Committee reviewed governance structures of the various divisions and wrote up two resolutions calling for shared governance across the university (Resolution 06/07-1 and 06/07-3).

The Committee reviewed the UFS by-laws and proposed suggested amendments.

Amendments were approved the by Senate at the final meeting of the year on May 7th, 2006. The amended by-laws need to be ratified by the Board of Trustees.

Finally, the Committee wrote a resolution calling for an Office of the Senate with administrative support. The Senate should formally request that this be included in the university budget in the fall.

Suggested Agenda 2007/2008

1. Continuing review and oversight of Shared Governance structures throughout the university.
2. Review of Senate role as advisory or legislative; self-definition of Senate's role; advocacy for same.

3. Annual review and amendment of bylaws with particular attention to the evolving composition of the faculty.

The New School Faculty Senate

Tuesday, September 11, 2007

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

(Opening session of the Senate) Working Session

Chaired by Elzbieta Matynia

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

Agenda

Introductory remarks

Introductions of the senators

Election of the co-chair

Senate Committees (three standing committees)

Faculty Affairs

Governance

Academic Policies and Space

Emerging issues task group

Senate Executive Committee

(Nominations for the *secretary of the Senate*)

Plan for the year: projects

Ensuring the implementation of the Senate's resolutions

Continuation of projects launched last year

New matters of concern suggested by the senators

Next working session of the Senate:

Discussion of proposals submitted by the committees

Senate Webpage: introducing Sven Travis

9. Suggestions for next agenda

Present

Members

Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes

Bea Banu, NSGS

David Brody, Parsons

Keith Buhl, Co-chair, Drama

Emanuele Castano, NSSR

John Clinton, Milano

Alice Crary, NSSR

Doris Chang, NSSR

Rachel Heiman, NSGS

David Howell, Milano

Onno de Jong, Parsons

Robert Kirkbride, Parsons

Elzbieta Matynia, Co-chair, NSSR

Alan McGowan, Co-chair, Lang

Dominic Pettman, Lang

Faye-Ellen Silverman, Mannes

Sven Travis, Parsons

Thomas Vasiliades, Drama

Susan Weller, Parsons

Tracyann Williams, NSGS

Jennifer Wilson, Secretary, Lang

Joanne Woodcock, Parsons

(22)

Absent

Sharon Messmer

Paula Suttman, NSGS

2 senators from Jazz (to be elected)

1 senator from Milano

Visitors

no visitors

Elzbieta Matynia opened the meeting by welcoming the new members of the senate, outlining the brief history of the University Faculty Senate (UFS), and sketching the senate profile. As described in the senate by-laws, the UFS is comprised of 27 elected faculty members from all eight academic divisions of the University. The distribution of representatives is as follows: Parsons: 6, the NSGS: 5, NSRR: 4, Lang: 3, Milano: 3, Mannes: 2, The Drama School: 2, Jazz: 2.

This year 16 senators are full-time faculty members, and 9 are part-time members of the faculty. At this point the senate is made up of only 25 senators, as elections at the Jazz School for its two senators have not yet taken place. Efforts are under way to address that situation.

The senators were invited to familiarize themselves with the contents of the welcome packet, which includes the names of all current senators, dates of the scheduled sessions of the 2007-08 senate, the by-laws of the senate, and the resolutions passed by the senate last year.

An explanation was offered for the potentially confusing designations of *Full Senate Sessions* versus *Senators only Sessions*. The *Full Senate Session* means that among those

who attend are ex-officio members: i.e., the president of the university, the provost, and one of the deans designated by the deans' council to be their representative. The "*Senators only*" phrase indicates a working session of the senate without the participation of members of the university administration.

After these initial remarks, Elzbieta Matynia introduced herself and Alan McGowan as two of the co-chairs of the senate who -- along with Peter Haratonik -- had been elected to share this position at the last session of the 2006-07 senate. The situation had changed recently when Peter Haratonik was asked to step in to run the Media Studies Program at NSGS, a time-consuming obligation that has made it impossible for him to be fully engaged in the work of the senate. Therefore the election of the third co-chair was to be on the agenda for the day's meeting.

After these introductory remarks, the senators introduced themselves. Alan McGowan then presided over the election of the co-chair, noting that it ought to be at least a second-year senator, but one who had not been a co-chair in the prior year. The candidacy of Keith Buhl, a part-time faculty member representing the Drama School, was proposed, and by unanimous vote he was elected as the third co-chair of the senate.

Since the first meeting of the senate was an organizing session, Elzbieta moved on to the key ways in which the deliberations and work of the senate are conducted. She described the objectives of each of the three standing committees (as defined by last year's senate): *Faculty Affairs*, *Governance*, and *Academic Policies and Space*. She introduced the persons proposed to chair each committee, and asked the senators to indicate on which committee they would prefer to serve. Here are the main points mentioned:

The task of the Governance Committee is:

1. To collect, compare and analyze the divisional governance structures and bylaws in those divisions which have instituted such; to report to the UFS on same; to ensure, with the UFS, that articulated structures and bylaws for shared governance are established in each division.
2. To conduct, in light of the UFS's past two years' experience, a review of the UFS bylaws; to collect input from the UFS; to propose amendments as necessary.

Last year's ***Faculty Affairs Committee*** came up with the following suggestions for the 2007/2008 agenda:

1. To continue review and oversight of faculty issues as presented by the Handbook as well as other administrative policy.
2. To review and amend the Handbook issues as they are presented to the Senate, especially in context of university-wide curricular changes.

Also:

- Issues of promotion -- need to be articulated
- The role of the part-time faculty: how to make them a real part of the university community; how to make them aware of the fact that they are represented.

The Academic Planning and 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 the university.

1. Support of Academic Planning, which includes the invitation to University *Curriculum Committee* co-chairs to update UFS on planning progress; clarification of proposed 5-year BA/MA programs; clarification of pedagogical ramifications and of the resources necessary to support interdivisional appointments, initiatives and courses (e.g. university-wide lectures);
2. Support of IT initiatives, which includes development of the *University-Wide Interactive Operational Diagram*; faculty support and training in IT;
3. Support of Space Planning, which includes 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 to pertinent members involved in the planning to update the UFS).

The three standing committees have constituted themselves, and – after some discussion— they are chaired by the following senators:

The Governance Committee -- Doris Chang & Tom Vasiliades;

The Faculty Affairs Committee -- Alice Crary & David Howell;

The Academic Planning and Policy Committee -- Robert Kirkbride.

In the discussion that followed, a few matters were raised by the senators:

1. The Student University Senate, in development since 2003, will hold its first election this October. Their by-laws are based on the University Faculty by-laws, and they are very interested in communicating with the faculty senate.
2. The question of minutes and a minutes-taker. Minutes are taken at each meeting, and the sense of the senate was that we need to have a separate person, not one of the senators,

assigned to this task. The minutes-taking is a very absorbing job, and effectively prevents that person from participating in the deliberations of the senate assembly.

The resolution to request assistance from the Provost's office with the taking of minutes at our meetings – a motion by Robert Kirkbride seconded by Alan McGowan -- was passed unanimously.

The chairs will be talking about it with the provost office, as well as about implementing the separate resolution passed last May about providing a dedicated place for the office of the senate, and hiring a part-time person who would provide administrative support for the office of the senate.

The final matter raised was the senate website, and the introduction of Sven Travis, a senator and full-time faculty member of Communication, Design and Technology at Parsons, who volunteered to revamp and manage the senate web page.

Session was adjourned at 10:03 A.M.

New School University Faculty Senate

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

(Second session of the 2007-08 Senate) Working Session

Chaired by Elzbieta Matynia, Alan McGowan, Keith Buhl

,

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

Agenda

Opening Remarks

Introduction of UFS Secretary

UFS operating budget.

Update from the Benefits Committee

Reports from UFS Standing Committees

Faculty Affairs Committee

Discussion / Remarks

Academic Policies Committee

Discussion / Remarks

Governance Committee

Discussion / Remarks

Other Business

The co-chairs called the meeting to order at 8:40. The co-chairs announced that they were having a meeting with the Provost immediately following this meeting. They indicated that for the 2008/09 academic year that they were hoping the UFS would have an office and assistance with minute-taking, as well as a small budget for hosting receptions, etc. Jennifer Wilson was announced as secretary for the 2008/09 year.

Tracyann Williams recapped the Benefits Committee report. She responded to a comment made by the President at the May meeting by explaining that the institutions used in comparison with TNS in the report were chosen because they are often mentioned in comparison by members of the upper administration. (After this recap, a Senator commented that the real point of comparison should be with institutions that have similar endowments.) The substance of the report dealt with the following:

benefits for dependent children in primary, secondary and higher ed. The report suggests that the University establish consortia with other universities and colleges; extend tuition benefits to faculty who live outside NYC and offer benefits for educational and daycare expenses for younger children.

reinstatement of maternity and childcare leave benefits. The report argued for more generous benefits in this area, citing Columbia's policy of granting 6 month leaves or reduced course loads for up to two years and NYU's policy of tying leaves to number of years served and its policy of allocating \$5,000 to facilitate adoptions. An important issue here at TNS is that different divisions and different programs within divisions make special arrangements with individual faculty. The current system is, thus, neither equitable nor transparent.

benefits for childcare and eldercare. For instance, a policy which would grant leaves for up to one semester for either type of care and the creation of a childcare facility at least partially funded by the University.

The Benefits Committee was concerned that faculty not be penalized for stepping away from their careers in order to fulfill their familiar obligations. It also argued that the 'ad hoc-ness' of the current practices must be eliminated in order to insure equity. The University needs to try harder to retain the full-time faculty which it has worked so hard to recruit in the last few years. Better benefits would help with retention and, as another Senator stated, with recruitment.

There was a discussion about the benefits proposal.

Some Senators mentioned a need to look at the retirement benefits currently available to assess if they are adequate.

It was noted that administrators had raised concerns last year about the need for equity for full-time upper-level administrative staff.

There was discussion about conducting further research in order to ballpark costs before proceeding, as well as involving the Office of Human Resources.

The consensus was that the UFS wanted to work closely with the administrations to move forward on changing current policies and practices in the areas cited in the report.

Alice Crary and David Howell reported on the work of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

(i) One of the most pressing issues was to find out exactly what the status of the UFS's resolution on amending its by-laws is.

In fact, it was noted, the whole concept of 'response from the administration' was in need of clarification. The UFS needs to develop a process for presenting its resolutions to the proper authorities and getting a response.

It was suggested that the UFS's website might be used to publicize the resolutions and to put subtle pressure on the administration to respond in a timely way.

(ii) Another task for the committee will be to follow up with the administration on the status of all the resolutions coming from the UFS in the 2006/07 year including the status of the Faculty Handbook, the divisional appendices and the workload document. To this end:

The committee is also trying to find information about the status of the Ad Hoc University Promotions Committee, e.g. membership, time table for reviews, nature of the peer review, etc.

The committee would also investigate the process of assigning rank.

The co-chairs of the Faculty Affairs Committee said that the FAC would be soliciting areas of concern from faculty and it would publish a list of these concerns.

There was discussion following the Faculty Affairs Committee report.

One of the Senators suggested that one concern was exactly what the term 'advisory' meant when applied to the UFS.

Another Senator suggested that the UFS needed to develop a strategy for approaching the administration, a strategy that used a language that the administration would understand and respond positively to. It was suggested that the appeal be made to improving the public presentation of the university.

One of the UFS's co-chairs noted that the administration seemed to hold the UFS in higher regard recently because the administration realized that the UFS could play an important role in making the University work well as it grew in size and complexity. One Senator suggested joining the AAUP as a step in guaranteeing that the faculty would be listened to.

Robert Kirkbride reported on the work of the Faculty Affairs Committee. He commented on some general issues before starting his official report. For instance he suggested that the lack of response from the Provost's Office might be an effect of their being understaffed.

He also suggested that we look at the documents that the Senate is producing as 'legacy' documents for development into the future.

The Academic Policies Committee's mission is to be a clearing-house for faculty on issues concerning facilities and information technology. The committee has come up with a new abbreviation "AT" which is a contraction of IT + AV. So the Committee deals with academic planning, space planning and AT.

- (i) On task for this year is for this committee to check on the progress of the curriculum committees. The Provost's Office needs to create links to these committees. To go forward Academic Policies needs clarification on such issues as divisional consolidation, joint hires, program mergers, etc.
- (iii) Another issue for APC is the need to create an operation diagram for IT at the University and have it available on the website. This needs to be tied to space planning documents.
- (iv) On the IT front, faculty needs support and training on IT, uses of smart rooms and on the use of the digital library
- (v) The primary goal of the committee will be to monitor and support faculty input in the new building process. It was suggested that the UFS should invite members of the planning committee in to report periodically. Members include Shelley Reed, Paul Goldberger, Lisa Brower, and Joel Towers. Currently SOM is working with IDEO on developing the new building program. The UFS needs to plan to have some of its members alert and available during summer months since a lot of planning tends to get done during that period. IDEO, which tends to be very bottom up, has generated some ideas which are being circulated in divisions for comment. One of the Senators pointed out that as yet no acoustician has been hired and this is a big concern for the music schools. Kirkbride replied that the current plans are somewhat generic and much of the new building is still 'undecided.' Plans now include having 'thematic chains' connect areas of the building, but the chains are not specified.

Doris Chang and Tom Vasilaidis reported on the work of the Governance committee.

- (i) The first task they undertook this semester was to survey the divisions on the progress that had been made in the area of governance last year. The five areas of concern flowed from the several resolutions about governance passed by the UFS last year. Those areas are: divisional by-laws, process of amending divisional by-laws, shared governance, faculty representation, and the structure of a general assembly.
- (ii) The status of each divisions is:

Eugene Lang College has established its governance structure and passed its by-laws.

Mannes College has also passed governance structure and revised its by-laws.

Parsons has an interim assembly of delegates who are not elected by appointed. The by-laws have been drafted but are on hold until next spring.

Milano has a draft approved by a committee but the dean and faculty have not ratified the by-laws as yet.

Drama has just had 5 academic area chairs appointed from its part-time faculty. They constitute a Curriculum Committee. The director is waiting for a performing arts group to be formed before preceding in developing a governance structure.

NSSR has revised its by-laws, approved them and sent them to the Provost.

NSGS has focused on developing by-laws for the appointment and reappointment process. The faculty has approved this section of the by-laws. Part of a governance structure is embedded in that section of the by-laws. The issue of the governance structure was tabled because it was felt that the concept of executive faculty and departmental participation in governance did not fit the current structure of the division.

One of the co-chairs noted that it was important to find out how the administration felt about the notion of 'shared governance.' It seemed that some deans were working from a different set of assumptions about governance. Another Senator thought that we should assume that there is general agreement about shared governance. It is important that we represent things in a positive way.

One of the Senators asked who the deans' representative was to the UFS? It is important to have the deans' participate in this discussion. Two Senators from Parsons noted that for the first time the departmental chairs were faculty and they were part of the interim governance structure. One also felt that the more the governance bodies participate positively in the work of the divisions the more they will share power. It will develop naturally. One Senator noted that the deans now have more power and that having a procedure for appointing deans would be a step in the right direction.

One of the co-chairs of the Governance Committee suggested some issues for the UFS this year: how best to represent the faculty's issues to the administration and how to get information from faculty on their interests and concerns.

A bigger issue is how best the UFS can insert itself into the governance of the University. This item needs to be on a future agenda. One of the co-chairs of the UFS asked that the Senators send agenda items, ideas and suggestions, via email to one of the co-chairs

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 a.m.

PAGE

PAGE 5

The New School University Faculty Senate

Tuesday, October 16, 2007

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

(Third session of the 2007-08 Senate) Full Session

Chaired by Elzbieta Matynia, Alan McGowan and Keith Buhl

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

Agenda

8:30	Welcome	Alan McGowan
8:35	Faculty Review and Promotion Process	Provost Ben Lee
8:50	Discussion	
9:10	President's Report	Bob Kerrey
9:20	Discussion	
9:30	Report on New Building	Robert Kirkbride and representatives of SOM and IDEO
9:45	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
Tracyann Williams, NSGS
Jennifer Wilson, Secretary, Lang
Johanne Woodcock, Parsons

Ex Officio

Bob Kerrey, President
Ben Lee, Provost
Liz Ross, Vice Provost
Ron Kassimir, Associate Provost
David Ford, Provost's Office

Visitors

Elizabeth Arcuri, Director of Campus Planning
John Aubry, Assistant University Librarian
Lisa Brower, University Librarian

Kevin Dugan, Lang student reporter

Lia Gartner, Vice President for Design, Construction, and Facilities Management

Colin Koop, SOM

Christopher McCready, SOM

James Murtha, Executive Vice President

Shelley Reed, Senior Vice President for Information Technology

Shannon Salinas, Director of Full-Time Faculty Affairs, Provost's Office

Absent

October 16, 2007 Minutes Taken by David Ford

Faculty Review and Promotion Process and Discussion:

Provost Ben Lee talked about the Principal Faculty Review and Promotion Process. A memo, titled *Principal Faculty Promotion Process and Timeline* was handed out to the senators. Mr. Lee indicated that this is a modified version of the document that he presented in the spring. It will be presented to the University's Board of Trustees (BOT) this fall. The BOT has requested that the Provost implement three new levels of oversight for this faculty review and promotion process.

The review process began last spring with the deans and faculty. An ad hoc process was being used due to time constraints, and the fact that each of the candidates for "expedited" tenure review had, or had been offered tenure at the institutions from which they had been hired. The Provost Office was considering using faculty who have had tenure at other institutions to be part of the "expedited" tenure review process. The BOT decided that due to the importance of the proposed appointments, and more importantly because this process was an important step in establishing a sense of mission and intellectual identity for the university, as well as creating a quality benchmark for faculty review, a more systematized approach be put in place. The expedited reviews process is limited to 13 faculty being reviewed this year.

The University will review over 100 principal faculty during the next four years for tenure, promotion, and extended employment. The pool of tenured New School full time faculty available to do reviews was used for reviews in 2006-07, and will not be available for these faculty reviews in 2007-08. Mr. Lee mentioned US News & World Report's statistics ranking the New School as third lowest out of a pool of 262 National Universities for its low percentage of full time faculty (32%). Mr. Lee believes this can be viewed as a strength for The New School as it begins its creation of tenure. It is part of The New School's unique identity. He stated that tenure review creates identity and establishes intellectual standards, and that this process will help inform the discussion of The New School's programmatic and curricular development. Mr. Lee emphasized that his goal has been to get the strongest possible representation from the divisions on the tenure review committees that have been created.

Shannon Salinas mentioned that Mr. Lee is preparing an official statement to all faculty with an update on the review process by November.

There was a suggestion that the Senate create a special subcommittee to be involved and stay apprised of the review process. It was agreed that the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee would be the best arm of the UFS to represent the concerns of the faculty. The Subcommittee should liaise with Ron Kassimir, who has been designated as the Provost Office's senior staff point person for the Faculty Senate.

In response to a question, Mr. Lee mentioned the Institutional Suitability Review is about excellence for the institution. It is an internally driven process. A standard of excellence is addressed in the Full Time Faculty Handbook.

David Brody inquired why divisional governance structures proposal documents were not commented on by the Provost. Provost Office staff responded that they had not received those documents. It was agreed that the documents would be sent again, and that the Governance Subcommittee should liaise with Liz Ross.

Mr. Lee commented that there is a University Subcommittee for Faculty Review. It is procedural only. The members of the subcommittee are not looking at faculty documents and dossiers.

A senator mentioned that faculty have expressed concern that they have some input regarding the review process. Mr. Kirkbride asked specifically to what extent chairs are, and will be involved, and able to give input in the review process. Ms. Salinas said that faculty will have very limited input. This is because the deans represent and present the faculty members under review to the review committees. The deans will take into account the chairs' reports, but the chairs will not have a direct role in the review process.

Mr. Kirkbride then mentioned that there will be a series of public presentations (Town Hall meetings) this fall on topics such as plans for the signature building and accompanying academic initiatives, the new and transitional libraries, and academic planning.

President's Report:

Mr. Kerrey stated that he thinks it's the right thing to do to move to a university-wide tenure system. He explained that the university is now creating structures and systems, because it has never been done before. He asks that faculty identify conflicts and concerns for him and Ben, to assist them in making recommendations for final decisions on the faculty review and promotion process. The goal is to make the process as fair as possible, and minimize the effects of politics. Mr. Kerrey wishes to have a process that reflects the values of The New School. He believes that the review process can "enliven" the discussion about the planning and the creation of the new signature building. The building would bring Mannes and Fashion on campus, if possible, notwithstanding valid arguments to keep them near Lincoln Center and 7th Ave., respectively.

Mr. Kerrey has told the BOT that The New School needs to make undergraduate cross-divisional education a priority. He asked, "What kind of undergrad curriculum will TNS put together by 2011?"

Mr. Kerrey mentioned that he is looking for a hook to inspire potential donors. He is trying to establish in the minds of potential donors a connection between the creation of the

signature building and the academic activity that will take place in the new building. He stated that The New School's location is the most exciting aspect of the university. He believes that "noise is a critical aspect of The New School's and New York City's existence," and he wants the building to reflect the noisy life of NYC. Mr. Kerrey's "spiel" to inspire external potential donors currently is that, "New York is in this building." Visitors to the signature building will hear music, drama, and debate. "We want wild," Mr. Kerrey said. He drew comparisons to the design and atmosphere of the Whole Foods store on Houston & Bowery streets. He thinks the New School should retain the Culinary Program and house it on the first floor of the new building, because, "Food is part of the New York City experience."

The planned amount of academic space in the new building will double the current amount of academic space. This will be necessary because The New School is planning to grow enrollment by 45%. Mr. Kerrey envisions that The New School will have programs that have interconnections to biology, chemistry, physics, and engineering, even if mainly in the service of environmental studies.

After viewing the proposed open atrium spaces of the new building, one senator raised a concern regarding potential suicides and security, in general. Mr. Kerrey said that balance must always be struck, so that the new building doesn't become a secure, but sterile, environment. The goal is for the building to be used in a dynamic way.

Lisa Brower commented that in a December meeting, she and a colleague will explain plans for future digital collection. She envisions robust digital services to support faculty teaching needs and the existence of electronic reserves capability. There are plans to create the university's own digital products from the library's own holdings, and then the university community will have to be educated in the use of digital products.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00am.

University Faculty Senate Resolution on Information Technology

There is a growing concern about the condition and operations of Information Technology (IT)* across the university learning environment, with issues ranging from conditions experienced in the classroom and on-line, to interim and long-range strategic IT planning. The University Faculty Senate resolves that its Academic Policies Committee negotiate a forum and process by which faculty and administration can work together more effectively to address the following question: How do we make the technology in the university best serve the students, faculty and learning environment? This plan is conceived in tandem with the APC's continuing investigation of and recommendations for improved integration of academic and facilities planning, and the UFS further believes that this process should be initiated in the immediate future to support the scheduled move of NSSR from 65 5th Avenue to 79 5th Avenue.

Primary concerns include: Decisions regarding equipment and interactivity are currently made without input from faculty – including both your average and knowledgeable users. IT infrastructure and so-called “smart rooms” are not functioning well from day to day. The protocol of the AV/IT department can cause disruptions, by interrupting class time to perform maintenance without regard for instructors or students. To address these issues, several divisions have established independent satellite IT support, with valuable impact. However, where this may temporarily relieve local conditions, it has underscored that the impact of AV/IT on the classroom is a matter that must be addressed as a university. If the strategic vision of the university is centered on enhancing interdivisional collaboration, we must not only have the spaces that support such collaborations – *the spaces and systems must work well*.

A university-wide dialogue on IT would address the following objectives and concerns:

Macro planning issues: participation - tapping the tacit knowledge base in faculty to support interim needs and long-range university vision

Technology needs-based assessment across all departments and divisions
Increased faculty input concerning important decisions, such as installed software, codecs, region-codings, and other compatibility issues
What is the outreach that exists around IT – is there current outreach to faculty to improve conditions?
Faculty support and training
An interim strategy for improving IT throughout physical and virtual university facilities.
What is the future of IT – the long term plan – as envisioned in the new building at 65 5th Ave?
Are there ways to achieve our IT goals more efficiently and at less cost to the university?

Micro planning issues: service logistics - improving the immediate learning environment

Site specific problems (e.g., wifi failure, projector disconnections, slow or no maintenance, baroque infrastructure and ad-hoc solutions)
Unclear troubleshooting options

Increased availability of, and access to, equipment

Improved equipment functionality and maintenance

The systemic dependence on AV (some of the staff are very helpful, but a class should not depend on someone remembering to unlock the audio cabinet, or bring the remote control)

Distance learning, online courses, and other “scaleable” enterprises are currently hamstrung by DRM, IP and copyright policies. More faculty and grad-student input could avoid many of the current problems which make teaching online – within the New School’s technical system – a non-starter for those with a serious stake in digital learning.

* IT is seen here to include both AV and IT matters.

IT Resolution: Approved 11.7.06

Resolution 06/07-2

November 6, 2006

**Faculty Senate Resolution on Shared Governance,
Faculty Representation, and Faculty Assembly**

One of the founding principles of the Faculty Senate has been to ensure meaningful faculty participation in institutional governance. The Faculty Senate Governance Committee, building on the work of last year's committee, is in the process of analyzing the governance structures that are in place at each division. Our analysis reveals significant differences across divisions in the form and function of faculty representative bodies. In some instances, these differences are justified by the diverse histories, sizes, and faculty responsibilities of different divisions. In other cases, the differences reflect disparities in divisional responses to the recent changes in administrative policies, particularly those involving faculty appointments and reappointments.

To guide the development of policies and procedures for faculty participation during this time of transition, the Faculty Senate hereby resolves that the governance structures in each Division reflect a commitment to three principles: shared governance, faculty representation, and faculty assembly.

First, we understand the notion of shared governance to imply faculty involvement in the determination of educational policies (curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, degrees granted, those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process, and the budgetary implementation of these matters), faculty status (appointments, reappointments and promotion), selection of academic administrators, and policies and procedures governing salary increases. Second, faculty representatives should be elected by the faculty to represent their views at the central governance body of the division, such as a Faculty Senate or an Executive Committee. Finally, a structure for general assembly, either as a whole or through representation, should be outlined to provide a forum for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. For divisions where all members of the faculty do not meet on a regular basis, this may take the form of a Faculty Senate at the divisional level.

The Faculty Senate hereby resolves that all divisions have transparent governance structures in place by the end of the academic year. The specific structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the Deans, Directors, Chairs, and Faculty of the institution.

University Faculty Senate Resolution on Socially Responsible Construction Management

In keeping with The New School's commitment to social responsibility and sustainability, as reflected in its pedagogy and the planning of the new signature building, The Academic Policies and Space Planning Committee proposes that the University Faculty Senate:

facilitate faculty collaboration with the university administration to devise a process that encourages social responsibility in planning, designing, financing, constructing, furnishing, decorating, and implementing systems/programs for university facilities, centered on the new signature building, while achieving pedagogical and other institutional goals, containing costs, and adhering to schedule; the process would commence with planning demolition of 65 Fifth Avenue and ongoing facilities planning.

engage faculty expertise and student interest to develop parameters by which contractors, suppliers, and other vendors would be evaluated for their commitment, both historically and in connection with the New School construction project, on the basis of such established standards of social responsibility as the criteria employed by the Global Reporting Initiative, the United Nations Global Compact, and, where relevant, guidelines developed by such bodies as the World Business Council for Sustainable Development.

cultivate research and teaching opportunities related to social responsibility generated by the construction project as a central goal.

appoint a task force to operationalize the objectives stated in items 1-3 above, authorizing the Academic Policies and Space Planning Committee to develop criteria for task force composition and to identify task force members for senate approval.

Background for the Proposed Resolution:

In recent years, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has gained visibility, as concern about corporate practices grows more widespread. Although social responsibility in construction has achieved recognition as a beneficial practice among certain national governments and United Nations agencies, it is only now emerging as an explicit goal in US building projects.

The pursuit of a model of social, environmental, and fiscal responsibility in construction management would highlight the signature building as a material expression of the values The New School represents, and may provide a rich array of research and teaching

opportunities to assist other institutions.

This effort would engage prospective suppliers of structural, systems, services, decorative/furnishings material and labor in seeking to assure that the building reflects recognized socially responsible practices, while achieving pedagogical/institutional goals, containing costs, and adhering to schedule.

One goal would be to identify issues that affect the commitment by a higher education institution with a progressive mission to attempt to realize a “responsible” project on such a scale in a highly complex urban setting. Another goal would be to advance the understanding among supplier organizations of the challenges of constructing such a facility. The effort might serve to inform relevant public policy in this domain. In addition, ongoing projects might provide opportunities for student (and faculty and staff) engagement as learners, leaders, activists, practitioners. Presumably, the process would engender decision tradeoffs relative to design, schedule, and costs, and transparency regarding these tradeoffs could inform future policy and practice. Vendor competitions and visibility opportunities might generate additional institutional and community benefits.