The New School Faculty Senate

Tuesday, February 14, 2005 8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Approval of Minutes Neil Gordon

Approval of Resolution on Facilities Robert Kirkbride

Approval of Resolution on Governance James Miller

President's Remarks Bob Kerrey

Close Meeting

Members

Elaine Abelson, ELC

Keith Buhl, NSD

Bill Coco, NSD

Dennis Derryck, Milano

Neil Gordon, Secretary, ELC

Terri Gordon, NSGS

Kasia Gruda, Parsons

Susan Hambleton, Parsons

Peter Haratonik, NSGS

Rachel Heiman, NSGS

Bill Hirst, Co-Chair, NSSR

Mala Htun, NSSR

Jose de Jesus, Parsons

Mary Judge, Co-Chair, Parsons

Robert Kirkbride, Parsons

Mark Larrimore, ELC

Lily Ling, NSGS

David Loeb, Mannes

Claudio Lomnitz, NSSR

Arun Luthra, Jazz

Edwin Melendez, Co-Chair, Milano

James Miller, NSSR

Jimmy Owens, Jazz

Bill Pace, NSGS

Edward Powers, Milano

Anezka Sebek, Parsons

Ken Stevens, Parsons

Christopher Stone, Mannes

Ben Taylor, NSGS

Gary Vena, NSD

Ex-Officio: Arjun Appadurai, Provost

Bob Kerrey, President

Eliza Nichols, Vice Provost

Natalie Polvere, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the President

Elizabeth Ross, Vice Provost

Nova Thomas, Co-Chair, NSD

Mr. Gordon

Approval of minutes. Minutes approved.

Mr. Kirkbridge

Presented resolution from Academic Policies Committee:

Whereas the University is in the process of developing an Academic Plan, be it resolved that the Academic Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate review the present proposal, seek counsel from academic administrators of the university, and report to the Senate on the present state of the Academic Plan, as well as recommendations for revisions and additions.

Resolution passed.

Mr. Miller

Presented resolution from Governance Committee. Resolution passed.

Ms. Judge

Introduced President Kerrey.

Mr. Kerrey

Search Committee for Provost: faculty, students, and trustees will be included in search committee for Mr. Appadurai's replacement. A search will be mounted for a candidate of considerable academic reputation. University structure, progress made over the past two years, transparency of budget, UAW contract, all this progress will serve to attract a pool of impressive candidates.

Noted that difficult and contentious action items over the past two years have been very draining and difficult. Cited example of Actors Studio negotiations. But reported that financial standing of university, including endowment, is much stronger. This is equally true on administrative and academic side. Noted particularly the success of deans and the clear sense of provost's job.

Expressed wish for a more inclusive search process tat includes faculty senate, faculty, and students. Wished for participation from deans, faculty, and a full range of administrators. It is not enough to ask for authority for provost: this must be carefully arranged. It is more than a question of budget side of university vs. academic side. Coordination of the two is required to deliver academic programming to students. There have been huge increases in retention rates of students, need to continue. Considerable, very important academic

transformation is underway and needs to be continued. Announcement of committee is due out at the end of the week. Mr. Kerrey circulated a draft of the provost search committee proposal.

Mr. Powers

Asked Mr. Kerrey to give a broad sense of what the provost's job should be.

Mr. Kerrey

Important to have a person with significant faculty experience, both classroom and management. Noted that authority of Provost's Office was relatively weak prior to Arjun's arrival, and tied to fact that university has shifted from continuing education to credit bearing education. Seek to arrive at the point where undergraduate liberal arts education is done jointly with ELC, Parsons, and NSGS. Collective programming needs to be done and begin soon. 3 big programs at parsons float the entire university, notably AAS program which has been notably expanded and recognized by the university. Provost will therefore need to manage the development of AAS while also managing Ph.D. program, which is a very different managing challenge. Seeks to make these changes in a non punitive, constructive fashion.

Ms. Ling

Noted that intellectual vision is as important in new provost as administrative ability. Arjun's progressive intellectual vision and renown has been a great celebratory fact: new provost equally needs to be a part of the next generation of academic thought rather than one who will enforce the status quo.

Mr. Kerrey

Agreed. Intellectual vision and capacity of huge importance. Office of Provost will need to be strengthened and prepared for the huge amount of work that is ahead.

Mr. Miller

Could Mr. Kerrey address how to make process of search more inclusive? Referred to structure of 2003, and compared it to announced structure in current search. What will be is the faculty component?

Mr. Kerrey

Administrators, Trustees, and Faculty Senate will be very important in search. Trustees must be included in a limited but key role. Administrators must also play a key role. They

will be required to negotiate an agreement on what powers the provost will have. Those powers need to be yielded to the Provost's office by the deans, budget office, etc. Finally, as many as eight members of the faculty should be on the committee, and UFS should decide how that is done. Committee should be as diverse as possible.

Mr. Stevens

Appreciated Arjun's awareness that we are operating in an international committee. Noted the strength of our graduate and undergraduate populations, and hoped that this will be specifically recognized in search.

Mr. Kerrey

Agreed in terms of population and curriculum. Lauded Arjun's internationalism in both person (is not a US citizen) and international scope and emphasis.

Mr. Melendez

1) Clarified that committee will grow to include faculty. 2) Noted existence of different governance models in universities, and outlined several current models that generate various tensions in decision making. What model will govern here?

Mr. Kerrey

Acknowledged problem: there is no institution that is comparable to us, and models that function elsewhere are not appropriate for us. We are in process of becoming a university, and heading toward a greatly strengthened Office of the Provost. Hardest objective to attain is to have real collaboration between Provost and administrators. But Mr. Kerrey does not now have a model in mind that would suit us. What is needed is a process by which clean, and speedy decisions can be made.

Mr. Melendez

Can the Provost comment on the five year plan?

Mr. Appadurai

The challenge is how to take a plan in process with great discussion and negotiation behind it and continue discussion and refinement. Felt plan is a fair statement of working intention, which deliberately is silent and leaves room for individual divisions' growth and mission. Objective in putting this plan before the board was to present a very serious, very considered, very sturdy guide to whatever happens next. Mr. Appadurai expressed the hope that this will take place.

He noted that bridge themes are very relevant: Urban Studies, Media, etc. Therefore hopes plan will provide a vision of the future, without specifying how that vision is going to be instituted. Hoped that the platform provided by the Five Year Plan will be a sturdy one to build on.

Emphasized that this is a very complex university to run, unusual in structure and ill adapted in many procedures which were built for other purposes. A candidate with real willingness to get into management and administration is required, and a valuable corrective to utopian tendencies that many academics are prone to.

Mr. Kerrey

Noted that any candidate who did not carefully read the five year plan was unlikely to get far in the process.

Ms. Judge

Requested information about timetable of search and hiring.

Mr. Kerrey

Hoped to announce search process in next several weeks. Thinks it is unlikely that provost will be hired by the time Mr. Appadurai retires. A significant difference in this search is that at least a good internal candidate will exist. Nominating process exists.

Total committee should be about twenty people, and estimates that seven or eight faculty will be included. Question of student participation is still open.

Mr. Miller

Is a search committee the right place to be reconceptualizing the role of the provost?

Mr. Kerrey

Yes, and no. There will be times when the committee will need to be reaching consensus on size and scope of the provost's office. But individual authority in concrete matters, such as faculty hiring, will need to be settled later by the provost himself. Budgetary processes will probably be a portion of the committee's work; other matters will not be.

Ms. Judge

Expressed thanks to administration members present and drew open portion of meeting to a

_1	ممما
(:	iose.

CLOSED SESSION ensued.

Ms. Judge

Invited comments.

Mr. Miller

Asked how shall Senate participate in selection of faculty for search committee? Suggested that Senate provide two members of eight members of faculty.

Mr. Melendez

Should Senate request to be the nominating committee?

Mr. Powers

Suggested that this would enhance inclusiveness.

Mr. Miller

Some faculties could elect, others aren't able.

Mr. Melendez

Proposed a representative from each division.

Mr. Hirst

Senators return to division for members, refer to senate.

Mr. Gordon

Diversity issues fail to be addressed thereby.

Mr. Melendez

Present several candidates by Friday.

PAGE

The New School

Faculty Senate

Tuesday, March 14, 2005 8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

Opening Remarks Co-Chairs

Approval of Minutes Neil Gordon

Report on the Status of the Full-Time Faculty Handbook Eliza Nichols

Consideration of Changes in the Office of the Provost Co-Chairs

Governance Issues Edwin Melendez

Senate Portal Mary Judge

Appointment of Nomination Committee for New Co-Chairs

Co-Chairs

Election of New Senators Co-Chairs

Close Meeting

Members

Keith Buhl, NSD Bill Coco, NSD Dennis Derryck, Milano Terri Gordon, NSGS Kasia Gruda, Parsons Peter Haratonik, NSGS Bill Hirst, Co-Chair, NSSR Jose de Jesus, Parsons Mary Judge, Co-Chair, Parsons Mark Larrimore, ELC Lily Ling, NSGS Edwin Melendez, Co-Chair, Milano James Miller, NSSR **Edward Powers, Milano** Cecilia Rubino, ELC Anezka Sebek, Parsons Ben Taylor, NSGS

NOTE: WE HAD NO QUORUM SO ALL OUR DECISIONS WERE MADE INFORMALLY.

Melendez/Hirst/Judge

Eliza cannot come.

Mr. Melendez

Opening Remarks.

Changes in the Office of the Provost

Neil Gordon, Michael Schober, Terri Gordon, Dennis Deryck, Anezka Sebek

Mr. Derryck

Opened the discussion on a search for the provost.

Mr. Melendez

Voiced a preference for a balance between an academician and an administrator.

Mr. Miller

Discussed centralization and the relationship the Provost has to upper officers at the University.

Mr. Powers

Stated the person must be an expert negotiator capable of collaboration.

Mr. Melendez

Brought up the issue of governance.

Mr. Coco

Spoke to the necessity of practical, classroom experience

Ms. Gruda

Spoke to the necessity of experience in a large institution.

Mr. Hirst

Expressed appreciation that Bob consulted the Senate list.

Mr. Miller

Agreed, saying he endorsed an unprecedented participation by faculty.

Ms. Ling

Questioned the make-up of the search committee.

Ms. Gordon

Stated there are 8 or 9 women on the committee.

Mr. Melendez

Confirmed that Bob Kerrey shared her concern.

Mr. Miller

Brought up the issue of faculty participation in planning for new buildings.

Mr. Derryck

Concerned that SOM have no experience in green design.

Mr. Miller

Stressed the importance of Lang and GF collaborating re: building committee.

Mr. Hirst

Questioned whether FS has a significant voice in the process since two years ago was the sole faculty member to look at plans.

Mr. Melendez

Suggested creating a resolution about process and running it past the deans.

Mr. Derryck

Questioned whether the preliminary design and studies are already complete.

Mr. Hirst

Suggested Robert should ask about the state of things.

Mr. Melendez

Brought up the issue of a Nominating Committee for the Chairs. Suggested an open, transparent process.

Mr. Hirst

Suggested appointing the present group as the nominating committee. Went over the status of the following Senators:

Keith Buhl-eligible
Bill Coco-eligible
Robert Kirkbride-eligible
Jose de Jesus-re-elected
Dennis DerryckTerri GordonJimmy OwensEd PowersAnezka Sebek-to be re-elected

Mr. Hirst

Agreed to email a confirmation regarding FS re-election. Stated that elections need to be complete before May 1st, as new Senators will attend the last meeting on May 9th.

Ms. Judge

Brought up the issue of the Portal. Voiced concern over file sharing of FS documents.

Mr. Melendez

Brought up the issue of governance.

Mr. Miller

Agreed to email the finalized survey form for the governance committee.

Mr. Powers

Wondered whether Ben Lee would be present for future discussion.

Mr. Melendez

Closed the meeting at 10AM.

The New School

Faculty Senate

Tuesday, April 11, 2005 8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

Opening Remarks Co-Chairs Approval of Minutes Neil Gordon 8:45 - 9:15Remarks on the University Building Plans Jim Murtha 9:15 - 9:35Open discussion 9:35 - 9:55Faculty role in the Planning Process – Other University Initiatives 9:55 - 10:05Progress on the Full-Time Faculty Handbook, open discussion Eliza Nichols Closed part of the meeting (1) Discussion about resolutions for further action(s) 10:05 - 10:20(2) Preparation for the Upcoming Election 10:20 - 10:30

Present

Keith Buhl, NSD

Dennis Derryck, Milano

Neil Gordon, Secretary, ELC

Terri Gordon, NSGS

Kasia Gruda, Parsons

Susan Hambleton, Parsons

Bill Hirst, Co-Chair, NSSR

Mala Htun, NSSR

Jose de Jesus, Parsons

Mary Judge, Co-Chair, Parsons

Bob Kerrey, President

Robert Kirkbride, Parsons

Mark Larrimore, ELC

David Loeb, Mannes

Edwin Melendez, Co-Chair, Milano

James Miller, NSSR

Eliza Nichols, Vice Provost

Dominic Pettman, ELC

Edward Powers, Milano

Cecila Rubino, ELC

Anezka Sebek, Parsons

Guests

Elizabeth Arcuri, Director of Campus Planning, Office of Facilities Services; Nadine Bourgeois, Parsons; P.J. Carlino, Parsons; Lia Gartner, Associate VP for Design and Construction, Office of Facilities Services; Gwynne Keathley, Parsons; Robert Lupone, Interim Director, NSD; Jim Murtha, Executive Vice President

Absent

Elaine Abelson, ELC; Arjun Appadurai, Provost; Bill Coco, NSD; Peter Haratonik, NSGS; Lily Ling, NSGS; Claudio Lomnitz, NSSR; Arun Luthra, Jazz; Jimmy Owens, Jazz; Bill Pace, NSGS; Natalie Polvere, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the President; Ken Stevens, Parsons; Christopher Stone, Mannes; Ben Taylor, NSGS; Nova Thomas, Co-Chair ex officio, NSD; Gary Vena, NSD

Opening Remarks

Mr. Hirst

Notified senators of divisional elections and requested that they be held by the May meeting so that new senators can attend; reviewed list of senators eligible to serve as co-chairs. Introduced Mr. Murtha and the presentation of University Building Plans; expressed Senate's wish for an open process that includes faculty input.

Remarks on the University Building Plans

Mr. Murtha

Introduced Leah Gartner and Elizabeth Arcuri. Noted that a fairly wide discussion about facilities antedates the current discussion, and the need to update this discussion with considerations of the Academic Plan. Noted that a seminar paper exists that includes much of the information presented today.

Mr. Murtha then presented an overview of the concerns and options currently under discussion for facilities planning and building at the New School. The following general principles emerged from this presentation:

A: Facilities planning needs to accommodate expected growth

B: Facilities planning needs to accommodate academic plan

C: The University doubled its square footage for academic programs in the last five or six years

D: The University looks to add 50% in the next 5-6 years

Ms. Arcuri

Presented projections of enrollment growth for 2010: 35% in undergraduate; 10% in graduate; and a significant decrease in non-credit students. Noted a 50 percent growth in full-time faculty.

Articulated with academic plan: increase of faculty, development of general education curriculum and an undergraduate experience on cross-disciplinary themes, and multi-disciplinary centers of study, as well as with a number of internal and external trends in education and the internal trends of the university. Emphasized attention placed on library as a primary destination point.

Ms. Gartner

Addressed challenges of forming an urban campus with traditional identifications of spaces with disciplines and academic values. Reviewed models and exemplars of buildings currently under consideration.

Mr. Loeb

Suggested that performance space be included.

Mr. Murtha

Referenced a suggestion from Tishman that space be kept as flexible as possible.

Mr. Powers

Questioned the use of 72 Fifth Avenue.

Mr. Murtha

Raised the issues of admissions, student support, registration, other transactions.

Mr. Melendez

Questioned how the Senate can interact with this process.

Mr. Murtha

Noted that there is enormous blank canvas in the conception of academic spaces; no decisions have been made except to open that canvas as widely as possible to faculty input regarding instruction, departmental organization, etc. Ready to figure out the mechanism for dialogue with the Faculty Senate and with faculty in general.

Mr. de Jesus

Asked about the role of internal university resources, design, architecture, etc. Noted that the cubic form planned for 65 Fifth does not specifically represent an educational identification.

Mr. Murtha

Peter Wheelwright, Chair of Architecture, was involved in the selection of architects, as was Mr. Goldberger. The architects were chosen by the Board of Trustees. Commentary on look of building is consistent with Mr. de Jesus's comments; he is in good company in his criticism that it is too generic—just a box. Noted that a model is required for fundraising.

Mr. Miller

Noted that a key to planning seems to be the move from a divisional model to a collaborative model; questioned the process of how, given this assumption, faculty input is to be taken. Is it divisional? By bridge theme? How are those bridges to be interpreted?

Ms. Nichols

Noted this question is really the reason we have a faculty senate. This rapidly changing university requires the input and discussion of the Faculty Senate to complement the processes of communication and deliberation conducted by the deans.

Mr. Kirkbride

Noted existence of several committees looking at this information; large opportunity here to share information. For example, the search for chair of TBA department at Parsons. Noted also the high level of curricular opportunities.

Mr. Powers

Noted the critical questions of accountability and responsibility—home base—are key to planning.

Mr. Murtha

Noted matters beyond our control: zoning, planning, city limits. Community opposition to the university is very strong. Financial realities are also immovable. Location is a limit: physical space is expensive. Our comparison to Columbia: we have 44 square feet per student to their 200. By comparison, Princeton has 350. But a real comparison is to NYU: their 60% tuition dependent finances to our 72%. NYU must grow to accommodate their plan; constantly seeks greater space. But within those limitations we have tremendous opportunities to work together and to plan.

Ms. Gruda

Noted enormous scarcity of space at Parsons, particularly for AAS

Ms. Nichols

Agreed AAS is very short of space, and a portion of this issue is one of the priorities at Parsons.

Mr. Buhl

Asked about the timetable on building, and whether a moving plan exists.

Mr. Murtha

Stated demolition is expected at 65 Fifth within 18 months. There is a displacement plan for everything except the library, which will require the acquisition of additional swing space.

Mr. Derryck

Noted that city filings give us a very small window for discussion.

Mr. Hirst

Thanked Mr. Murtha for his attendance, and invited Ms. Nichols to give her presentation on the handbook process.

Progress on the Full-Time Faculty Handbook

Ms. Nichols

Noted that the Provost's office has adopted nearly every single point raised by the senate. Deans have weighed in as has Human Resources and General Council. HR noted inequity between full-time faculty benefits and full-time administrative benefits. Noted inclusion of general set of principles supporting shared governance and faculty governance. Requires that divisional bylaws and divisional-level faculty governance and university policies be brought into agreement. The Provost's office will centralize and develop a process for approving and ratifying, along with a process for faculty updating and approving the handbook. Suggested that the Faculty Senate names a group to continue to work with the Provost's office on the above. Requested a timeline for same. Expressed high appreciation for the Senate's work on the handbook process.

Mr. Melendez

Expressed gratitude and praise for the deliberative work done by the Provost's office on the handbook.

Ms. Gordon

Requested that existing bylaws, unofficial though they be, be circulated throughout the divisions.

Mr. Hirst

Requested that divisions upload to UFS Site, under the header DRAFT, NOT APPROVED BY PROVOST'S OFFICE.

Mr. Hirst

Thanked Ms. Nichols, and closed the meeting to administration.

CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Hirst

Suggested a vote for co-chairs by email; that each senator vote for three candidates.

Mr. Hirst

Conducted approval of March minutes.

Mr. Kirkbride

Presented Senate resolution on facilities and planning. Amended and passed as follows:

Foreword to Resolution

Facilities is not just about buildings or physical space, it is also about community, spirit, art and intelligence. This insight applies especially to the The New School, given its outstanding history of progressive learning and activism. For this reason, the Academic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate encourages the development of a Strategic University Facilities Plan with similar principles of inclusion, sensitivity and foresight. This Strategic Plan would include the planning of new facilities at 65 Fifth Ave as part of a university-wide facilities and academics self-assessment. Design and allocation of space, for example, could be integrated with current pedagogical needs and "bridging themes" for an inter-disciplinary, inter-divisional curriculum. The Strategic Plan, in short, would reinforce in structures what we teach for the mind.

(Academic Policies Committee)

The following is a constructive proposal regarding university-wide physical facilities in order to promote an improved learning environment as the New School and our divisions expand toward the number of enrolled students projected by President Kerrey at the Faculty Senate meeting on October 18, 2005.

Across ages and levels of intellectual development, project-based learning has been proven to provide vital opportunities for multiple intelligences to emerge across diverse members of an academic institution, facilitating relative strengths of students and faculty to complement one another. Project-based learning promotes a multifaceted, goal-oriented and convivial learning environment.

Might the New School approach the goals of expanding enrollment and the realities of limited physical facilities as a university-wide project-based learning endeavor? The opportunity seems ripe to integrate the multiple intelligences of our divisions and their departments, administrators, faculty and students, to guarantee President Kerrey's stated objective to enhance the quality of learning at the New School.

In particular, might current facilities initiatives (including the planning for the new building at 65 Fifth Avenue) offer a remarkable opportunity to demonstrate all of the values that the University represents – sustainability, global and civic awareness – through a process that is at once self-reflective and visionary? Might this building represent a case study of an integrated master plan for the university – as a bold example of curriculum and community building?

We have the shared intelligence and we have the opportunity.

Facilities and Academics Resolution

(approved by Senate vote: 2/14/06)

Whereas, President Kerrey at the Faculty Senate meeting on October 18, 2005 reported on the University plans to expand university-wide physical facilities in order to promote an improved learning environment as the New School and our divisions expand toward a greater number of enrolled students.

The Faculty Senate, aware of the impact of facilities planning on the quality of the learning environment across the university, and aware of the importance of developing an integrated curriculum plan for the university that corresponds to such major undertaking, hereby mandates the Academic Policy Committee to:

Examine the planning for the new building at 65 Fifth Avenue and recommend the venues by which this important undertaking offers a remarkable opportunity to demonstrate all of the values that the University represents – sustainability, global and civic awareness; and,

Recommend how the faculty Senate can facilitate the integration of the multiple intelligences of our divisions and their departments, administrators, faculty and students, to guarantee President Kerrey's stated objective to enhance the quality of learning at the New School.

To facilitate this process, the Academic Policy will:

Organize a special session of the senate on facilities planning and the learning environment, which would include all pertinent people from the administration to share information with the Senate (The date of this special session was subsequently set for 4/11/06)

At the last meeting of the Senate, the committee will provide an end of the year report to include the following:

An assessment of the university's status for the construction of 65 Fifth Avenue and other University facilities projects

An assessment of the role and participation of the faculty, departments and divisions in the process

Recommendations for the next year's committee regarding pending matters

Addendum regarding Senate Facilities Representative (4.11):

In addition, in the spirit of James Murtha's suggestion that the Faculty Senate play a role in the planning for the construction of the new building at 65 Fifth Avenue and other facilities, the Faculty Senate should elect a representative to work with James Murtha, Elizabeth Arcuri, Leah Gartner, and other appropriate individuals, as well as with the Office of the Provost, and the Dean's Council in providing faculty input into the planning process. As a representative from the Senate, this individual will provide a cross-divisional perspective. Given the interdisciplinary academic plan and the desire to incorporate the bridge themes of the academic plan into the building plans, this cross-divisional perspective will offer an important perspective that can supplement and amplify any faculty input that may occur at a divisional level,

The Senate instructs this elected representative to meet with appropriate representatives from the Administration as soon as possible and report back on this discussion at the last meeting of the Academic Year, 2005-2006. In addition, this representative should report back to the Senate on a regular basis about how the planning process is evolving and the state of the plans for the proposed facilities. The Senate urges the Office of the Executive Vice President, the Office of the Provost, and the Dean's Council to develop a clear means of incorporating the Senate's representative in their discussion.

PAGE

The New School Faculty Senate

Tuesday, May 9, 2006 8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

Opening Remarks Mary Judge

Introduce new Senators and welcome Deans

Year overview and thank you to departing Senators

Approval of Minutes Neil Gordon

Academic planning in relation to facilities

Bob Kerrey

Update on the academic plan Arjun Appadurai

Ben Lee

Status report on the Full-Time Faculty Handbook Eliza Nichols

Petition from University faculty and students regarding the selection of commencement speaker, John McCain.

Members

Elaine Abelson, ELC Keith Buhl, NSD Bill Coco, NSD Dennis Derryck, Milano Neil Gordon, Secretary, ELC Terri Gordon, NSGS Kasia Gruda, Parsons Susan Hambleton, Parsons Peter Haratonik, NSGS Rachel Heiman, NSGS Bill Hirst, Co-Chair, NSSR Mala Htun, NSSR Jose de Jesus, Parsons Mary Judge, Co-Chair, Parsons Robert Kirkbride, Parsons Mark Larrimore, ELC Lily Ling, NSGS David Loeb, Mannes Claudio Lomnitz, NSSR Arun Luthra, Jazz Edwin Melendez, Co-Chair, Milano James Miller, NSSR Jimmy Owens, Jazz Bill Pace, NSGS Dominic Pettman, ELC **Edward Powers, Milano** Anezka Sebek, Parsons Ken Stevens, Parsons **Christopher Stone, Mannes** Ben Taylor, NSGS Gary Vena, NSD

Ex-Officio: Arjun Appadurai, Provost Bob Kerrey, President Eliza Nichols, Vice Provost Natalie Polvere, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the President Elizabeth Ross, Vice Provost Nova Thomas, Co-Chair, NSD Ben Lee, Dean of NSSR

New Members Douglas Diaz, PSD Duncan Foley, NSSR Cecilia Rubino, ELC

Absent

Elaine Abelson, ELC
Neil Gordon, Secretary, ELC
Rachel Heiman, NSGS
Mala Htun, NSSR
Jose deJesus, PSD
Claudio Lomnitz, NSSR
Arun Luthra, Jazz
Jimmy Owens, Jazz
Christopher Stone, Mannes
Ben Taylor, NSGS
Gary Vena, NSD

Ms. Judge

Began the meeting at 8:45 AM

- 1. Goodbye and thanks to Senators. Welcome to new Senators
- 2. Announcement of the newly eledted 2006-07 University Faculty Senate Co-Chairs: Robert Kirkbride, Parsons School of Design: Terri Gordon, Eugene Lang College; Dennis Derryck, Milano School
- 3. Approval of previous minutes. They were approved without dissent.

Mr. Kerrey

- 1. This was an exceptionally good year. 1. Enrollment-retention of new students. The lion share of credit goes to faculty of the university and the efforts made in the classroom and planning of curricula. They deserve to take a great deal of credit.
- 2. There is a growing enthusiasm of the Board of Trustees to raise the equity for the building on Fifth Avenue. They are all enthusiastic.
- 3. Mr. Arjun Appadurai is stepping down but he proposed a five-year Academic Plan. Interim Provost Ben Lee will accelerate the academic planning over the summer.
- 4. Mr. Kerrey is relatively confident that the balance sheet has improved substantially.
- 5. Financing of residential units. Acquisition of the 20th St. Dorm. This will be the largest amount of construction going on at any time during the history of The New School.
- 6. The endowment has been increased to \$190M which is \$700,000 per year more than it was last year.
- 7. Donations have been substantial: two in particular that exceeded \$10M.
- 8. Management of the Administration-there is a hiring freeze in order to pay for the UAW contract and energy costs. All tuition increases from this last year went back into the academic effort.
- 9. We are about to launch into very detailed planning of the New Building. We want to plan for the kind of adjacency between individual programs inside of the building. The best

example of that was last week when Dennis Derryck, Joel Towers and Neil? won the grant–partnership between Milano and Parsons-solution for a contentious problem in NY City.

10. 2M for our writing program-?

----9th Ward of New Orleans to build housing

11. The new building at 65 Fifth Avenue. Academic programs will drive what goes into the new building. There will be a maximum amount of programmatic flexibility. We are hoping for a 40% net increase of sq. ftg. There will be a library, an athletic facility and an 1,100 seat auditorium, Tishman Auditorium has been good but we need a larger space. There will be 300,000 net assignable sq. ft. for classrooms and laboratories. The assignment of the purpose for the sq. ftg. has not been done. We need inity to be created with the building. Every school will have sq. ftg in the building. Parsons will be the prime beneficiary of the building. I have had a series of meetings with the Deans to discuss the relationship of the design of the building and academic program. In 30 days we will have the financial resources necessary to begin the steps toward building the building by end of fiscal year. We have 100% confidence that we can build the building.

Robert Kirkbride

(Clarification) While in general concerns I (R. Kirkbride) represent Parsons within the Senate, on the matter of facilities (and as the elected Senate Facilities Representative) I represent the Senate, and *not* Parsons.

"Nodes, Swing spaces & Backfill"

The time frame of 65 5th is more extended than presented at April 11 meeting: it will be 30 months until building is razed – possibly 2011 before building is completed. (Alone, this building will not satisfy the projected numbers). This provides an opportunity to contribute to the process of aligning the quality of the academic objectives with the physical resources necessary to support them. The extended timeline also means in the next several years, facilities projects will be smaller and capital-driven. Meanwhile, swing spaces are being scouted out (120,000 sq. ft. for Fashion), and as projects are completed in one area, others are "backfilled" in the void left behind.

"Nodes"

The shared atrium spaces conceived to facilitate collaborative project-based learning by the bridge themes are guiding a university-wide approach to common spaces (student a faculty resource areas), such as found at Parsons on 4th floor of 2 W 13.

Following the Senate meeting in April, I invited Jim Murtha, Lia Gartner & Elizabeth Arcuri to view an ongoing project under construction in 2 W 13 gallery space during 3 week window in April. (Project: small sustainable dwelling developed by junior studio in

Product Design that will represent Parsons at the upcoming ICFF and be installed in a small rural town in Sweden in June, in collaboration with the design schools of St. Etienne, France, and Konstfack, in Stockholm)

On one hand, the project demonstrates the kind of collaborative, bridge theme project described by Jim & all last meeting – certainly the kind of project that would come from Parsons. Having participated in the search for the new chair of AIDL and the new director for Int. Des., it will be the kind of challenging interdisciplinary projects to expect from Parsons in the coming years.

More importantly, even, than the project itself was the space in which it took place. It was by fluke that the gallery was available, due to delays in construction on the Sheila Johnson renovations. While it is true that the Gimbel Library is directly above the gallery space, the lifeblood of this particular venture was the adjacency of the gallery to the basement workshops. While project-based learning spaces might benefit from the adjacency of a library, they thrive with adjacent spaces for making and storage. There is a fine line between shared spaces and no-man's land, and thoughtful balance between scheduling and physical resources are vital to the success of the shared atrium spaces projected for the new building, and currently supported across the university in capital based building projects such as described in the summary of the new school capital program (06-07).

<u>Please note</u>: It is very important that this visit **not** be considered a pitch for dedicated studio spaces for all, which is certainly unfeasible. The intent was to impress the necessity of the right adjacencies for the shared spaces to bear fruit.

Regarding the use of 4th floor of 2 West 13 as a model for node-like spaces across the university:

While it is understood the financial square footage approach to shared spaces and hoteled faculty offices, what is the criteria by which these spaces are evaluated? What is the air quality? Are they accessible to (full time) faculty after 9 pm and on weekends? How might such spaces better prepare the "future of the students"?

Request to senate:

Establish the Faculty Senate Academics and Planning Group – a subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee – to have one rep from each division to facilitate flow of information about academics and facilities from senate to faculty in each division. This group would have ex-officio members from the university community (Provost's office, etc.)

Request to speak with relevant members of the university community as to the membership

of the Faculty Senate Academics and Planning Group.

Ms. Ling

Would this be a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate Committee? My concern is that the planning discussion would overtake the Academic Planning concerns.

Mr. Melendez

Co-chairs should take this on for planning next year. There is a link between the planning and the academic plan. The co-chairs should figure out how they want to structure that.

Mr. Appadurai

My report won't take long. In Mid-December we got the Board of Trustees support for the basic principles of the academic plan. Basic principles that many of you were engaged in the discussions that led to the plan. I would like to flag some things that underlie the plan strategy:

Emphasis on undergraduate education: the plan is informed by pedagogical, fiscal and physical implications and of having a large student body (this follows with questions about research etc.). A question would be how graduate studies could inform a university that would pay attention to undergraduate recruitment and retention. That has been the matter at issue. What does it do to research faculty as it exists and into the future? This is an ongoing and important issue. We face trade-offs. Bob has said often-we shouldn't begin by saying that we don't have X. It is also good to know that we cannot do everything at once. Informing Architectural principles that can be revised and fleshed out.

Bridge Themes-adjacencies-Atria. The University a few years ago was greater than its parts. Some change has occurred in the way we think about ourselves

Three bridge themes:

URBAN

MEDIA

ENVIRONMENT

These can be strengthened and revised. Media could turn into technological and philosophical terms. For a while the Bridge Themes can continue the project of leveraging the parts of the university.

Joint Hires and technicalities such as Faculty Rank and the Fulltime Faculty Handbook. Behind all of the technical aspects, is the notion that it does not help us to have too much variation in the way that faculty is ranked. The principles behind the Faculty Handbook are to create for the faculty comparable standards across the university. The relationship with the UAW has been good.

The key to success is how to properly relate and sequence and time and organize the best possible relationship between our efforts to expand our student body; integrate and connect our themes and at the same time generate those resources.

(Mr Appadurai, cont.)

Less that, that kind of building will be completely transformative for us. All the pieces of this have to be done simultaneously: students, faculty and space.

Whether the specific strategies prove to be durable techniques, the aims underlying them are sound and they are about taking the greatness of the university to set the grounds for a place that people know is very special. Ben and I and Eliza have been in discussions for several weeks about hiring, evaluation, and the new curriculum.

Mr. Lee

Major issue for me in the Provost's Office for the last two week is how to make the process of strategic planning more open. From the success of the Faculty Senate, the faculty input will facilitate this planning; to create a better liaison between Deans and Faculty Senate. A Strategic Plan has never been done and we need to establish the constituencies. Wall want to get the strategic plan vetted. I will be meeting with faculty and administrators. We are trying to include a much larger group. With any kind of strategic process, too many stake holders are cumbersome. We need to have a sequence. When I was dean of the GF, it took me 6 months to get the numbers out. This is the transformative moment for the University (for example, the Lang/ NSSR agreement). Strategic planning process will create robust structures that will make this project work.

Mr. Miller

We need Faculty participation at the divisional levels. The extent and limits of integration and centralization at the university. An effort has been made to build bridges between the divisions. We have to strike a balance that we don't sacrifice what is distinctive about the divisions. The divisions all have their independent histories. There needs to be a Faculty voice in what are the limits of centralization that affect curricular, administrative and architectural concerns.

Mr. Lee

If you think about the space issues in the building and what is important is the academic plan for that space. There are two components that have been University-wide and in the individual divisions. The 65 Fifth building is a signature space. The large picture is the

balance that needs to happen as a university-wide space. For example we recently talked about moving the GF to 79 Fifth. Then what will happen when the 65 fifth building is reopened?

Mr. Kerrey

Clarification of the Provost's search process:Ben will sign a two-year contract as provost. I hope that before the end of this fiscal year, we will announce who the new provost will be. Paul Goldberger will be stepping into a new position as Joseph Erbine scholar in Architecture. Tim Marshall will be Interim Dean of Parsons. A search committee will be formed.

My comment on the staging of the new building. As the university has grown over the past few years, one of the great challenges is that we're going to be short some space. We will possibly construct the building in two phases so that we can build the bottom floors and open as early as Fall 2009. The rest by 2011. There may be a lack of common space and atriums where we hope to bring together the various bridge themes. We could accelerate construction of common space to open by 2009. It is impossible to lease library space.

Mr. Melendez

One of our concerns is that we saw that the construction of the new building-how the academic side will fit into this plan. Involvement of the Faculty Senate is improving this process.

Mr. Kerrey

Bad news is that you have a lot questions, the good news is that so do we. For example: in the planning, Fashion may come down to this campus. The property values are quite high where they are. With Mannes, property values on the Upper West side are cheaper than the village. I am about \$30M away from raising funds. Mannes will be high on the list coming out of that.

Mr. Powers

Faculty Handbook subcommittee. Newer and Jr. Faculty are the ones that are put at risk. Demands we pay and opportunities we give to Junior Faculty. Part of the whole enterprise. How does this all fit together.

Mr. Appadurai

These are well-taken comments. I am very aware that new hires are the canaries in the mine. It would be great for the most established faculty to be the canaries. But it would be very bad news to put them under impossible conditions. Retention is hugely on our minds. We get very good faculty which means that they will also be seen by others as very good

faculty. We need to distinguish the question of faculty participation which is by nature broad. And participation by smaller units. I urge you not to sly from local participation. They are not one and the same.

Ms. Judge

Shift of the agenda to the issue of the petition generated by Eugene Lang students to call upon Mr. Kerrey to withdraw Senator McCain's attendance to the 2006 Commencement.

Mr. Hirst

Clarification: this is not meant as a forum on why Bob Kerrey selected Senator McCain. Should the Faculty Senate take this up as an issue? This was done through email but first it was a physical petition.

Mr. Kerrey

I personally feel that invitation should not be withdrawn. I remember that this was the first thing that I had to do as president of this university. Since I've come here, the president makes this decision. This is not a decision made by a committee. The faculty of the university recommends the honorees; we try to achieve a balance between the honoree schedules and their disciplines. The commencement speaker has been the prerogative of the president.

Mr. Loeb

Ask people to think about the petition and that the process is what it should be. There is, however, a sentiment that the selection should reflect the values of the university. We should have a clear idea about the process.

Mr. Kerrey

I selected Mr. McCain after his appearance on Meet the Press.

Mr. Kirkbride

Perhaps there should be a distinction between being invited as a commencement speaker, who is welcome to express any range of viewpoints (supporting free speech and open debate), and a recipient of an honorary degree, who would represent the ethos of The New School University, its social and intellectual legacy.

Mr. Kerrey

The challenge is to get someone to get someone of stature to give a commencement speech. For example, I gave the commencement at the U. of Nebraska and they objected to a commencement speaker who is a Democrat.

Mr. Miller

The process is known, I would suggest that we as a senate need to put in a motion about that.

Mr. Powers

This is an honorary degree and the distinction that should be made is the one that Robert mentioned.

Mr. Kerrey

We should give the students an opportunity to meet with Senator McCain

Mr. Hirst

Jim's motion that senate endorse the present process\

Mr. Kerrey

Mr. McCain is getting an honorary degree. He was invited to speak. First was Barak Obama. Both say yes and/or both say no.

Mr. Larrimore

We are not in a position to establish the process

Mr. Melendez

We are in a position to recommend and alternative second speaker.

President Kerrey

That would be a modification of the process. The commencement speaker would then not be chosen by the President, but would emerge from the candidates under consideration of an appointed committee.

Mr. Derryck

I would love to see a protest and freedom of speech. I move that we table the motion.

VOTING TO TABLE:

Unless there is rewording of this that speaks to "the alternative would be"

Mr. Hirst

First: to table the process.

VOTE:

8 to table
15 opposed

THE VOTE ON MODIFIED MILLER AMENDMENT, which states: the Honorary Degree Committee (the committee which confers honorary degrees) will have veto power, if the President chooses a commencement speaker the Committee has not recommended. The President's choice will be subject to final approval by the Honorary Degree Committee.

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED

NOTE: It was not resolved whether or not commencement speakers should automatically receive honorary degrees.

Ms. Nichols

Jane Jacobs was invited to be the commencement speaker twice at the New School and the condition was to get an honorary degree and she didn't want that.

Faculty Handbook update: The senate, the deans and the officers, approved the most significant overhaul of the draft, we took out all of the details that had to do with criteria for review, weights and measures, definitions of scholarship, all the things that we agreed had to be at the division level. The board is reviewing the handbook in two phases:

Phase I-

Employment Contracts-Tenure and Extended Employment is now available to all divisions. This will no longer be controlled through one division. The consequences will be discussed in Phase II.

Workload

Evaluations

Clock Relief

The Major concern was to pass these through the board. The trustees feel very good about having had the opportunity to discuss these issues.

Mr. Hirst

Each division can decide on this option.

Ms. Nichols

It's not a right, it's an option and is pending a Phase II review of the board. Other things we didn't get to that will be discussed in May/June or September.

We will need a Faculty Senate Summer committee to have consultation from the faculty. We need continuity between spring and fall.

Regarding Junior/Joint faculty policy-we really need to think about where we are and look at the kind of work that faculty do here and give to Jr. Faculty such as curriculum design, review and to count it as scholarship and teaching.

New Senator?

There are now big problems at the New School that have to do with the chain of command. It sounds like the appointment policy is still vague.

Ms. Nichols

We don't have a department structure across the board. We have to do everything at once. Shared governance is important and we don't have faculty governance in all the schools.

The first phase is to come up with a governance structure. We have hired 70 in the last three years most Junior faculty. We are hiring another 20 by this fall.

Mr. Melendez

Eliza made a presentation at Milano about different Employment structures. What about tenured employment?

Mr. Appadurai

This has been in the air for a long time. Extended Employment is marked tenure. Tenured employment is held by an independent US body-they are not statutory, they are

professional. Tenure has to do with the rules that protect academic freedom as opposed to security in the job. I hope that there will be a full-fledged discussion on Tenure. The idea was to selectively open the discussion. This is not a conversion policy for fulltime faculty. This is something that could be argued for by deans. Whatever tenure may be. At the moment the board's understanding is, is that we cannot grow our fulltime faculty across the university by petition from divisional deans. Let's say we're looking at Parsons. The idea is that the dean requests a position for a tenure track search. This is the same process for conversion. It was a strategic decision. It opens the door without opening the flood gates.

Mr. Loeb

In reference to the discussion of tenure-anecdotally-we lost one promising junior faculty when they accepted a position at another school with tenure.

Mr. DeJesus

Throughout this year, we have been working to unify the divisions. I am happy about Eliza's word that the way of approaching reappointments. We are now focused on making things uniform. Perhaps we should self-identify the culture per division which (Mr. DeJesus cont.)

would bring a lot of aspects that would be different. As I look at the overall plan for Parsons-the possibility of hiring tenured faculty at Parson-it starts to be perceived to change this culture. Will they be there until they die? How do you reconcile the musicians, artists etc.?

Mr. Appadurai

The working out of this will happen subsequent to my term.

Mr. Lee

I don't know the situation at the divisions to make a comment. One of the major concerns is to recruit faculty from other schools. Increasing the quality of the faculty across the university was the main concern. Setting up the process by which we do this is important. I've been very aware of the issue of tenure across the university.

Ms. Nichols

The reason to have these different categories is to have flexibility. This gives us the possibility of having choice. You don't deny any division tenure. There will be a certain amount of politics around tenure. The main point was to create opportunities to chairs, deans and faculty.

Ms. Gruda

Is this like opening the flood gate of tenure by bringing in new tenured faculty only?

Mr. Appadurai

There are some worries on the part of the board. There are fiscal considerations. Let's take the phrase "flood gates" off. Tenure requires assessment. My feeling is that in principle, we just heard about the importance of divisions. We need guidance from the divisions. The idea was to allow the deans and internal procedures to make the argument. It is not closed to anybody. Those worthy of tenure in the culture of their own division need to make the case. Is the idea to create a caste system? No.

Ms. Gruda

What about new hires and the existing faculty?

Mr. Appadurai

The Dean of Parsons will be in a position to consider people in the division for tenure. And it will be open to both. In both cases, the Dean will make the room for discussion.

Ms. Gruda

For example all the new hires in architecture will be tenured.

Ms. Nichols

There is a chicken and egg thing now. What you have is a "what about me and who am I measuring up to?" fight. You cannot have tenure reviews without committee structures. It is much easier when someone has been reviewed once, twice, three times than to say this person has been here 30 years who has never been through a process that does not exist.

Mr. Buhl

What about my division. What about having fulltime faculty in my division.

Mr. Appadurai

This is open to any unit. The drama school is special in that it does not have any fulltime faculty.

Mr. Buhl

We have so many people that don't fit into any category. I'm going into my 24th semester, I've been a chair for 7 years and I still don't fit into any category and I would love to.

Mr. Appadurai

Proper process and consideration-this is all connected. As a whole, the relationship of the part-time faculty, for this university to mismanage that is to mismanage our future. The idea was to add the tool of tenure to the process. If there was a robust procedure at Parsons, for example, then we will take that. The idea was to create an option. It will take time. Use this so that it strengthens the divisions. This is not easy.

Mr. Melendez

Principles have been approved in the handbook but one of our recommendations of leaving this to the divisions has been endorsed. This is an opportunity to affect the process. We need to reach a balance between the goal of the work we all do and to get new blood for our university. The Faculty Senate summer committee needs to put bones into this flesh.

Ms. Judge

Anezka Sebek will be secretary next year

Meeting adjourned at 10:40AM

Respectfully submitted by Anezka C. Sebek

PAGE 4

Rev. September 12, 2006

The New School

Faculty Senate: Working Session

Tuesday, September 12, 2006 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

66 W. 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

Opening Remarks and Introductions

Terri Gordon

Approval of Minutes Dennis Derryck

Goals for the Senate this year:

Faculty Affairs Dennis Derryck

Status Faculty Handbook

(see attached Executive Summary and Provost Memo)

Governance Terri Gordon

Facilitate establishment of Divisional Policies and Standards

Academic Policy Robert Kirkbride

Facilities/Space Strategic Planning

Review of Faculty Senate By-Laws

Other Business Terri Gordon

Committee Membership

Deadlines for September 26 Meeting

Suggestions from Senators

Members

Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes Carolyn Berman, NSGS Doris Chang, NSSR Dennis Derryck, Milano Douglas Diaz, Parsons Duncan Foley, NSSR Julia Foulkes, NSGS Neil Gordon, ELC Terri Gordon, NSGS Susan Hambleton, Parsons Peter Haratonik, NSGS Mary Judge, Parsons David Kanter. Parsons Robert Kirkbride, Parsons Elzbieta Matynia, NSSR Alan McGowan, ELC

Edwin Melendez, Milano William Milberg, NSSR Dominic Pettman, ELC Edward Powers, Milano Anezka Sebek, Parsons Tom Vasilliades, NSD

Absent

Keith Buhl, NSD
Kasia Gruda, Parsons
Lily Ling, NSGS
Arun Luthra, Jazz
Sharon Mesmer, NSGS
Jimmy Owens, Jazz
Cecilia Rubino, ELC
Christopher Stone, Mannes

Gary Vena, NSD

The Meeting came to order at 8:40 a.m.

Ms. Gordon

Provided a brief history of the Senate and its productive relationship with the administration. Introduced the forthcoming Senate web presence on Blackboard and noted that there will be areas for communication and discussion.

INTRODUCTIONS all around.

Ms. Gordon

Outlined the MAIN TASKS OF THE YEAR:

To review and understand the Full-time Faculty Handbook
To facilitate the creation of Divisional Policies and Standards
To provide input on Academic/Strategic Planning
To take part in the conversation on Space/Facilities
To review and revise the Faculty Senate By-laws

Major or minor agenda items may be added by Senators.

Ms. Gordon noted that there will be three standing committees on which all Senators will serve:

Faculty Affairs Governance Academic Policy

Mr. Derryck

Outlined the role of Faculty Affairs. Noted that this is the first revision of the Faculty Handbook in 10 years.

Ms. Gordon

Outlined the role of Governance.

Noted that the Senate made good progress on the full-time Faculty Handbook last year. The Senate elicited feedback from faculty in all divisions and worked very hard in conjunction with the faculty, chairs and deans to review the Handbook. The Senate sent a list of recommendations to the Provost's Office (*Executive Summary*) Almost all of these recommendations were integrated into the revised Handbook (*Provost's Memo*). Both of these documents are attached to the agenda. They will be posted on the Faculty Senate site.

Noted that the Handbook has almost entirely been approved by the Board of Trustees and will be available on the Provost's website soon. There are outstanding pieces to be approved by the Trustees, primarily in the area of human resources.

Emphasized that the major task this semester is for each division to draw up Divisional Policies and Standards that will serve as appendices in the Handbook (*Phase II*). Mentioned major items to be included in Divisional Policies, such as faculty workload and criteria for appointment, reappointment and promotion. Noted that the Senate is committed to facilitating this process.

Mr. Foley

Requested a copy of the Board minutes.

Mr. Melendez

Stressed the importance of the task of the creation of Divisional Standards.

Ms. Gordon

Noted that, according to Ms. Nichols, Vice Provost, the approved sections of the new Handbook will be posted on the Provost's website shortly. Mentioned that Divisional Policies must be approved by a vote by the faculty at each division.

General discussion of the present draft of the fulltime Faculty Handbook and the process of board approval.

Ms. Gordon

Suggested that one member of each divisional governance committee be a Senator. Reviewed the work of the Faculty Handbook Summer Working Group chaired by Ms. Nichols and assembled by the Senate co-chairs. Mentioned that the performing arts schools have assembled a similar working group.

Mr. Powers

Noted that each division has its own processes.

Mr. Kirkbride

Pointed out that some of the divisions do not have guidelines for their own governance.

Mr. Melendez

Noted that the University Senate is a place for both part-time and full-time faculty.

Mr. Kirkbride

Offered a summary of the agenda for the Academic Policy committee. The primary objectives include strategic academic and facilities planning. Suggested that the Senate invite Mr. Lee to present Strategic Academic Plan on October 10th.

Mentioned that, parallel to the work with the handbook, the Provost established a facilities working group over the summer that broadly represents the university community. As with the Governance Committee, the Academic Policy Committee will gather information about strategic academic and space planning initiatives from each division. This will facilitate circulation among previously disconnected members of the university community.

Mr. Melendez

Noted that the Co-chairs last semester met with Ben Lee and that the building has to be within the context of the academic plan.

Mr. Kirkbride

Noted that the work that we do in the University Faculty Senate, which will be gathered from various floating groups in the divisions, will be reported to a central committee. This committee will channel information among the various participants in the process, connecting to the Provost's office.

Mr. Derryck

Considered the role of the University Faculty Senate in the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Kirkbride

Noted that the time frame has gone back from 30 to 18 months and the small window of opportunity to participate in this process. As step-by-step deadlines are not as clear as they are for the Handbook work, the committee work is very important.

Ms. Matynia

Brought up the role of faculty in the emergence of themes in the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Kirkbride

Mentioned that Facilities is inseparable from Strategic Academic Planning.

Ms. Gordon

Requested that Senators sign up for committees and asked Senators to bring membership lists of any relevant divisional Governance and Academic Planning/Space committees to the next meeting so that faculty members may communicate across divisions.

Mr. Diaz

Suggested that, on behalf of David Kanter at Parsons, he would like to discuss issues concerning technology in which faculty should have a voice.

Mr. Kirkbride

Noted that this will be part of the facilities committee.

Mr. Diaz

Asked what the structure is for organizing committee work.

Mr. Derryck

Answered that chairs for committees are usually appointed. The chair has the responsibility to establish the process for work.

Ms. Gordon

Noted that there should be continuity across the divisions with specificity about the distinguishing factors for each division.

Meeting adjourned at 10 a.m.

~Respectfully submitted by Anezka Sebek

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE 6

New School University Faculty Senate Working Session

Tuesday, September 13, 2005 8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-chair) Keith Buhl, ASDS Bill Coco, ASDS Dennis Derryck, MGS Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary) Terri Gordon, NSU Peter Haratonik, NSU Bill Hirst, GF Mary Judge, PSD Robert Kirkbride, PSD Mark Larrimore,, ELC Lili Ling, NSU Edwin Melendez, MGS James Miller, GF Ed Powers, MGS Anezka Sebek, PSD Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-chair)

Ms. Abelson

Opened meeting at 8:45. Welcomed, announced her resignation and that of Nova Thomas and Rosemary O'Neill as Co-chairs. Noted absence of quorum. Outlined Faculty Senate goal of dialogue with Administration and contribution to discussion.

Led discussion of Senate elections.

Mr. Miller

Advocated for immediate amendment of bylaws to allow election to proceed.

Bill Hirst

Moved that bylaws be amended to allow one of three co-chairs be elected from first terms senators.

Mr. Powers

Corrected that bylaws do not require amendment, simple agreement suffices, as bylaws do not specify that co-chairs need to be second term senators.

Elections were conducted

Ms. Abelson

Announced election of new co-chairs: Ed Melendez, Bill Hirst, Mary Judge.

Mr. Melendez

Suggested that Union Negotiations be on the 9/17 agenda as a discussion item.

Ms Thomas

Queried whether the existing Senate subcommittee structure is sufficient to review the new Senate Handbook.

Mr. Miller

Suggested that a wider review at the Senate level is required.

Mr. Hirst

Suggested that FS ratification procedure needs to be thoroughly debated by senate.

Discussion ensued regarding this procedure. Resolution was achieved that the Executive Committee will present a resolution on this procedure to the Senate at next meeting.

Respectfully submitted, Neil Gordon

The New School **Faculty Senate Working Session**

Tuesday, September 26, 2006 8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

66 W. 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

Opening Remarks and Introductions

Robert Kirkbride

Approval of the minutes from May 9, 2006

Committee updates: review of members and missions

Faculty Affairs

Dennis Derryck

Review Faculty Handbook

Governance

Terri Gordon

Report on status of various groups addressing Divisional Policies and Standards

Review of Faculty Senate By-Laws

Academic Policies

Robert Kirkbride

Report on status of various groups addressing Academic and Space planning

Status report: 65 5th Ave + University Space Planning

Robert Kirkbride

Other Business

Upcoming deadlines

Suggestions from Senators

Robert Kirkbride opened the meeting with an introduction to the three standing committees of the Senate: Faculty Affairs, Governance, and Academic Policy; each senator will be a member of one committee.

The approval of the minutes of the May 9th meeting was suspended as the group felt that the minutes of full Senate meetings (with officers and senators) should be approved at full Senate meetings, whereas minutes of working meetings (senators only) should be approved at working meetings.

Dennis Derryck raised the issue of the nature of minutes. Following a general discussion of the substance and form of minutes, the senators agreed that the minutes from working sessions should contain a summary of discussion and debate and a precise record of motions passed and decisions made. They determined that full sessions, on the other hand, should serve as fuller transcriptions of the sessions. This led to the issue of recording full Senate meetings. Alan McGowan pointed out that there was new software (Nuance, for example) that could transcribe recorded material. The senators agreed the officers should be consulted on the question of recording full sessions; they felt that working sessions (Senators only) should not be recorded and that for these meetings only the general sense of the discussion ought to be noted.

The issue of attendance of senators was raised, and it was decided that a senate meeting notice should go to new senators.

Mr. Derryck then turned to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Susan Hambleton and Duncan Foley are co-chairs of the Faculty Affairs committee. The charge of the committee is to review the Faculty Handbook and divisional standards that will serve as appendices.

Members of the Faculty Affairs Committee are the following: Mr. Derryck, Mr. Foley, Ms. Gruda, Ms. Hambleton, Ms. Ling, Mr. McGowan, Mr. Milberg, and Mr. Stone.

A general discussion ensued concerning the process by which the Full-time Faculty Handbook was assessed. The Senate has not seen the edited version of the Handbook. It will be posted on the Provost section of the University web page.

A question was raised concerning the authority of the Senate; the co-chairs clarified that we are an advisory, not a legislative, group. However, the Senate has been recognized as a place of debate. The committees are important as the faculty provide a parallel source of information flow and strengthen the legitimacy of the process by which decisions are made.

It was noted that the Provost visited Milano recently and discussed a joint effort with

faculty in regard to the new building.

Terri Gordon moved the discussion to the Governance Committee, which is co-chaired by Neil Gordon and Doris Chang.

Each division gave a brief report concerning the governance structures of their Division and the process by which divisional policies and standards are to be created or amended.

New School for General Studies

There is a Governance Task Force made up of six faculty members and the Associate Dean, serving *ex officio*, which is working in conjunction with the deans and the Executive Committee on the divisional standards and the creation of a Faculty Senate.

Parsons

Parsons instituted a Faculty Senate in the spring and has put together a draft of Parsons Standards Guidelines that includes Governance Structures and Procedures and Workload Responsibilities and Expectations.

New School for Social Research

NSSR has had a Charter for a number of years, which is currently under revision. Space and academic policy issues are taken up by an executive committee.

Milano

Milano has instituted a full governance structure, which has been ratified by the faculty and submitted to the Dean.

Lang

Lang completed a governance structure last year. The appointments committee will be meeting for the first time this week; there is or will be a subcommittee devoted to standards of tenure and promotion.

The Performing Arts Schools have an interdivisional working group that has met once with the deans and Vice Provost Eliza Nichols.

Mannes

Mannes has had statutes since 1999. There is an elected Executive Committee and a bylaws committee made up of the three full-time faculty members.

Drama

Drama, which has no full-time faculty, has an Interim Policy Committee that submitted a governance model to the Provost Office in June. The Curriculum Committee is comprised of the chairs.

It was pointed out that there is no connection or conversation between the UAW (the parttime union) and the Senate.

The co-chairs requested of the senators that they provide a list of point persons in their divisions in the following areas: Academic/Strategic Planning, Governance/Divisional Standards and Policies, and Facilities/Space. These point persons are to serve as liaisons for the faculty across the university.

Mary Judge reported on space planning at Parsons.

There is now a Provost Advisory Committee on space and strategic planning, which was boiled down from a larger group. The current group consists of: Paul Goldberger, Joel Towers, Lisa Brower, and Robert Kirkbride. It is understood that there is a strong connection between academic and facilities planning.

Robert Kirkbride gave an eloquent presentation on the relationship between form and content as it relates to our planning. A general discussion followed. The following points were made:

The time line is rushed, with ground-breaking perhaps taking place in eight months. This might be unrealistic.

There will be an attempt to make this a "green" building.

Pedagogy is not yet structured into the Strategic Plan.

The group felt that the following questions remained and that we should try to get answers to them.

What is the role of the Senate and the Faculty in the planning process?

What sections of the Handbook has been approved, and what was the process by which the Handbook was approved?

The Senate and the Dean's Council should be more integrated; should we be invited to each other's meetings?

When will we see the plans for the new building?

The meeting adjourned at 10:10.

PAGE

PAGE 4

The New School Faculty Senate

Tuesday, October 10, 2006 8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction (5 minutes) Dennis Derryck Approval of Minutes Dennis Derryck Senate Objectives 2006-2007 (5 minutes) Terri Gordon Overview of New Developments (10 minutes) **Bob Kerrey** Discussion (10 minutes) The University's Strategic Planning Process (20 minutes) Ben Lee Discussion (15 minutes) Status of the Faculty Handbook (5 minutes) Eliza Nichols Discussion (5 minutes) Other business

Members

Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes

Carolyn Berman, NSGS

Keith Buhl, NSD

Doris Chang, NSSR

Dennis Derryck, Milano

Douglas Diaz, Parsons

Duncan Foley, NSSR

Neil Gordon, ELC

Terri Gordon, NSGS

Kasia Gruda, Parsons

Susan Hambleton, Parsons

Peter Haratonik, NSGS

Mary Judge, Parsons

Lily Ling, NSGS

Elzbieta Matynia, NSSR

Alan McGowan, ELC

Edwin Melendez, Milano

Edward Powers, Milano

Dominic Pettman, ELC

Anezka Sebek, Parsons Tom Vasilliades, NSD

Ex-Officio:

Natalie Polvere, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the President Elizabeth Ross, Vice Provost Michael Schober, Dean, NSSR

Faculty Senate Meeting October 10, 2006 (Full Senate) Minutes

Co-Chair Dennis Derryck welcomed everybody to the first full Senate meeting (Senators and University officers). He gave a special welcome to Provost Ben Lee to this first formal meeting as Provost with the Faculty Senate. Co-Chair Derryck then gave a short history of events that have led to the evolution of the Senate. (A full copy of his report is appended to these minutes). In addition to identifying the challenges ahead, he stressed the importance of transparency and the need for collegial solutions to disputes that may arise.

Co-Chair Terri Gordon welcomed Deans Natalie Colbert and Michael Schober. (A full copy of her report is also appended to these minutes.). She then proceeded to review the functions of the three standing committees, each of which had already met this semester. Faculty Affairs will deal primarily with the Handbook and its Appendices. The Governance Committee is intended to collect, compare and analyze the Divisional governance bylaws. Its main goal will be to establish shared governance across all Divisions. It will also conduct a review of the Senate bylaws and propose amendments as necessary. The third standing committee, Academic Policy, will deal with space planning and its relationship to the academic plan. Its ultimate objective is to improve the quality of the learning environment and to enhance the coordination between academic and facilities planning. Finally, Co-Chair Gordon reported on the Senate web page, which will be maintained by Mary Judge. The earlier site, created by Tim Quigley in 2004, will serve as an archive.

President Bob Kerrey reported on the state of the University. Some of the points he highlighted included, but were not limited to, the ongoing strategic planning process, the shortfall in the enrollment targets this year, and the financial implication of this shortfall. He spoke to the substantial growth by one-third of the University's endowment (now approximately \$200 million). As noted in his comments, this growth is important because of its impact on the operating income of the University. As part of his report, President Kerrey commented on the status of the planning of the new building at 65 Fifth Avenue. He indicated that at the December board meeting the trustees would approve the architect, the building, and the financial plan. He stressed the importance of faculty involvement in the planning of the building. His projected date for the building's completion was estimated to be in fall of 2011.

President Kerrey also mentioned administrative changes. They include Ben Lee as Provost, Michael Schober as Dean of NSSR, Tim Marshall as Dean of Parsons, and Doug Shapiro as the new institutional research officer. The President also announced that New York State had certified three new majors at Eugene Lang College: psychology, economics and

philosophy. As part of his general comments, he noted the impact of gifts to the University, which include a Masters in Creative Writing and a Masters in Social Sciences at NSSR. Construction of the Sheila Johnson Center is progressing. President Kerrey also spoke to the efforts at improving communications with the outside world. This would include the new Lang web site, working to improve our catalogues, and the newly initiated contract with Blackboard. Also included as part of his comments was the cost of Health Net, the first increase in five years.

Provost Ben Lee report focused on the strategic planning process (see full text in appendices). In response to a question about signature courses in the interim, the Provost suggested utilizing the structure of the university lecture courses that Eliza Nichols has been involved in creating. He indicated that there is increased demand on the part of Parsons students to take management programs, which could probably only be accommodated by BA/MA programs, since there is no room in the curriculum as it now stands. He expressed the view that these kinds of programs be situated in the new "signature" building. In speaking on the bridge themes, Provost Lee indicated that no one would "own" the programs. He sees that we could create something "de novo" as we look at university wide programs.

In further describing the strategic planning process, the Provost described a process that included the Dean's group as a whole. While not definitive as to the final structure of the strategic planning process, he did indicate that it would be very large, with about six or seven committees. The question he raised concerned how best to manage these strategic planning committees. He did express the view that they should be co-chaired by someone from the administrative and academic side. The Provost also spoke to the inclusion of the Student Senate to bring about a university wide conversation, the need to strike a balance between university-wide and individual Division processes and the ability to report on all of this each semester.

In response to a question about the need for university-wide support for research, the Provost indicated that graduate research has to be built on a robust undergraduate foundation.

A conversation ensued about the kind of students Design Technology is attracting. The program already has 10 or 15 Parsons graduates. In a conversation about hiring, it was felt that the Design Technology students are very strong, but that it would be ideal to have students who have acted or who can write or compose music. In a BA program with 120 hours, students, however, do not have time for this. A BA/MA program could potentially address this problem.

Other questions posed to the Provost concerned the process of working on the handbook and the need to come up with more of a structure as we move along, something that would take the concept of shared governance to the next level. The President spoke to the need for

less structure of another kind given the numerous meetings we all attend.

The Provost indicated that it would take at least a year to change the budget rules and expressed his willingness to work with the Faculty Senate as a whole. How that would best be structured was left to be worked out with the Associate Provost and the Senate's Executive Committee.

The Provost mentioned some of the accomplishments over the last six years. These included the UAW contract, the Faculty Handbook, and, more recently, the creation of a Task Force on Quantitative Reasoning and Science throughout the University and the Provost's web site.

Co-chair Derryck noted the commitment and time required to be a member of the Faculty Senate.

Vice Provost Nichols noted the deadlines on the Faculty Handbook. The completion of this work was linked to appointment reviews. As presented by the Associate Provost, the completion of the Handbook must be done in time for The Educational Policy Committee of the Board on February 7, 2007.

In defining their challenges and tasks, the Vice Provost indicated that the UAW contract has had an impact on curriculum development, hiring of faculty, and reappointments. In undertaking all of this, she reiterated the need for the Senate to be involved.

Mr. Derryck closed the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

Appendix A Report by UFS Co-chair Dennis Derryck

I want to be brief in my welcoming remarks. I would like to welcome you all – President Kerry, Provost Ben Lee and the administrative staff, and to my fellow members of the faculty senate, to this the first joint meeting of the Senate faculty and the Administration.

First, I am positive that as President Kerry looked at the agenda, he fully understood why he was given much less time than Provost Ben Lee. It is not that we take you for granted Bob, but rather, this was the first formal occasion for our new Provost to meet with this body. In fairness, we thought we should provide him as much time to begin a dialogue with the Senate as a symbol of his welcome. Furthermore, as someone stated to me, Bob will take whatever time he wants independent of what we allocated him.

We truly do want to welcome our new Provost, Ben Lee. We see ourselves as partners with you in building on the work of many. Beginning first with those involved in the March 2002 meeting between Provost Elizabeth Dickey, - David Howell, Bob Beauregard and Jeff Golfarb, Ann Snitow. They were the ones who created the initial Ad hoc Faculty Committee on Governance that evolved into the faculty Advisory Committee. There is also the work of others such as - Rosemary O'Neil. Tim Quigley, Anwar Shaikh and for the work of those involved in the creation of the Faculty Senate by-laws in spring of 04

We have accomplished a great deal, on what may seem so basic, simple, and obvious since 2004. Some of it involved defining simple relationships. How do we relate to Deans? How do we agree on structure and process and time lines? More important, what do we mean by shared governance? Once we come to an agreement on shared governance, how do we put it in place?

We welcome you Ben in an environment where progress has been made and you and we, the Senate have an opportunity to build a future we can be all proud of given the history and culture of this university.

We need, almost immediately, to think through the processes that will allow us to create a shared vision on the academic future of this institution. We need to think through the processes that will allow us to participate in and assist in the translation of that vision into a strategic plan that will be developed over the coming months

These are responsibilities we wish to share with you knowing full well that there will be always difficult decisions to be made – all of which we may not agree. We would however like to see our footprints embedded in the vision, the strategic plan even after all the difficult decisions that you, Bob and the trustees make.

All of this will be proceeding as we digest the recently published handbook, create and put

in place governance structures within our schools while establishing divisional standards.

We have consistently stated a set of guiding principles with which we would like to operate with you and President Kerry. These we articulated as we began the development of the faculty handbook and these principles still hold true -- shared governance, peer revue, transparency, the acknowledgement of differences, and a collegial means to resolve any disputes that may arise.

We welcome you, not simply as our new Provost but as a partner as we move forward. Those of us who have been at meetings with you since your appointment are very much encouraged that we can work together. Given the university's history there is no reason why together we would not want to embrace the tradition of the New School founders and as partners and make this university the best that it can be.

We thought we would take a few minutes to provide you an overview of our plans for the year. Terri will provide an overview of our goals for the year. Terri

Appendix B Report by UFS Co-Chair Terri Gordon

Senate Objectives 2006-07

I. Standing Committees

The three standing committees have each met and have written up mission statements for the current year. I will briefly summarize the goals for each committee. These goals are drawn from the mission statements of the three committees.

1) Faculty Affairs committee (Duncan Foley, NSSR and Susan Hambleton, Parsons): Faculty Handbook

The Faculty Affairs committee, which is co-chaired by Duncan Foley and Susan Hambleton, identified two major tasks:

- 1) To gather early drafts of divisional handbook appendices so that the committee can review them to catch major inconsistencies and omissions.
- 2) To coordinate the Senate's responses to the procedures being used to ratify the Faculty Handbook and its appendices.

In order to accomplish the first point, the Faculty Affairs committee is asking members of the committee to circulate drafts of divisional handbook appendices to the committee whenever they become available - with the understanding that these drafts are unapproved works-in-process.

2) Governance (Neil Gordon, Lang and Doris Chang, NSSR): Divisional Governance Structures and the UFS Bylaws

The Governance Committee, co-chaired by Neil Gordon and Doris Chang, defined for itself the following charge:

- 1) To collect, compare and analyze the divisional governance structures and bylaws in those divisions which have instituted such; to report to the University Faculty Senate 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 Faculty Senate's past two years' experience, of the UFS bylaws; to collect input from the Senate; to propose emendations as necessary.

3) Academic Policy (Douglas Diaz, Parsons and Elzbieta Matynia, NSSR): Academic/Strategic Planning and Facilities/Space

The Academic Policy Committee, co-chaired by Douglas Diaz and Elzbieta Matynia, aims to support university-wide academic and space planning initiatives by providing a clearinghouse within the UFS 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. A central objective for the committee is to increase the quality of the learning environment of The New School by enhancing coordination between academic and facilities planning within and across the divisions of the university. 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 case study in developing a long-range holistic strategic planning process in which faculty are integral participants.

In order to reach this goal, individual members will gather information from the various academic and facilities planning groups in his/her division to summarize and discuss during committee meetings. The committee will generate a summary of the general discussion and any resolutions to propose at the next University Faculty Senate meeting.

This information includes general data (data identifying divisional concerns), contextual data (concerns related to planning the new building at 65 5th Avenue) and strategic data (interim and long-range planning).

II. Website

Because the Faculty Homepage servers will continue, we have decided to use the Faculty Senate webpage created by Tim Quigley in 2004: HYPERLINK "http://homepage.newschool.edu/~ufs/" http://homepage.newschool.edu/~ufs/. The website will provide an archive for the bylaws, approved minutes, committees, etc. Mary Judge has generously offered to maintain the site.

Amy Minter is working with James Uhrich of the Office of Information Technologies to set up a group on MyNewSchool for the Senate that will allow for group e-mails and interactive discussions.

We will send out an e-mail with the website address as soon as it is up and running.

Appendix C Report by Provost Ben Lee

Opening remarks:

I intend to work closely with the Senate Executive Committee to determine a process for involving the Senate in strategic planning. My expectation is that the Senate will provide the requisite leadership with the faculty so that we can get broad participation in the process.

OUTLINE FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING

OVERVIEW

This White Paper constitutes a first attempt to spell out a process of strategic planning for The New School as a university. In inaugurating this process, we intend to seize a moment in which the goal of creating an academic identity for the university, built upon the strengths and missions of its constituent divisions is taken as "common sense" by much of our diverse community. The Paper focuses on 1) articulating the broad goals for strategic planning; and 2) describing a process by which this planning happens.

The Paper builds on the academic plan produced by the Provost's Office in December 2005 in two ways:

it links important themes and topics in the world to already existing programmatic, curricular and faculty strengths across The New School; and it links academic planning to budgetary, facilities, administrative and organizational strengths and priorities

This initial version of the Paper is the collective product of the Deans and Directors of the eight divisions and the Officers who staff the university's administrative core. Our immediate goal is to broaden the range of input by disseminating this draft to key components of The New School community while concurrently beginning to work in some of the areas articulated in the Paper.

The New School is at a propitious moment with the opportunity to develop and provide new educational pathways for students that lead into an ever more interconnected world. To take advantage of this requires a strategy for change and development that is at once consistent with The New School's historical mission of critical thinking and social engagement and at the same time more closely tuned to the needs of students in the 21St century.

To provide the types of skills needed for the future, a new approach to post-secondary education that challenges tradition is needed. Today's young adult is likely to work for several different employers over his or her lifetime. Most will have more than one career. Or, the career they will have will not develop along a linear path of promotion and advancement. They may have to work longer hours, and they may well have to move around more. This trend, already evident in developed economies of the West, will become more prevalent and more disruptive in developing economies as the forces of industrialization and urbanization move more and more people out of traditional settings into new economic roles.

The New School is ideally suited to confront these new challenges. Having emerged from and responded to the global dynamics of the 20^{th} Century, The New School was initially defined intellectually by a critique of higher education's role in supporting the United States' role in World War I and the creation of a new model of adult and continuing education that combined the arts with progressive democratic values. The next transformation was the creation of the University-in-Exile at the beginning of World War II as a response to the global rise of fascism and its threat to democracy. We thus added graduate PhD programs in the social sciences and philosophy and laid the foundation for The New School to become a full-fledged university.

In the last fifty years The New School has added many separate academic units to its founding bases of adult and graduate education. Parsons, Mannes, Drama, Jazz, Lang, and Milano added both undergraduate and professional tracks to our adult and graduate programs, even as the popular image of The New School remained tied to its origins and the University-in-Exile. The result is a unique combination of professional, graduate, and undergraduate programs that gives us an unprecedented opportunity to respond to the challenges of higher education in a rapidly globalizing world.

We see The new New School as built around Design (Parsons), Performance (Mannes, Drama, Jazz), and Liberal Arts (NSSR, NSGS, Milano, and Lang), a combination that not only fits our history, but is unique among institutions of higher education. While other institutions struggle with the legacy of the classic liberal arts curriculum, we see a rising global demand for undergraduate and graduate programs that enrich "design" with the social sciences and expand liberal arts to include design and performance. The tremendous global demand for design-trained students is perhaps most visible in countries like India and China where engineers and scientists are needed to design the cities and environments of the future. Unlike the "vertical" integration presupposed by the general education debates in the United States, we intend to go global by combining our performance schools with the creative energies of our liberal arts and design programs.

In addition to this academic focus, the University is in excellent fiscal shape to create The new New School. Today the University's endowment, which was negligible until 1980,

stands at \$200 million. Half of the university's investments are in unrestricted funds, producing superior liquidity. Annual fundraising now averages \$35 million with approximately \$100 million in contributions in the last 3 years alone.

Today the University enrolls nearly 8,000 FTE (full-time equivalent) students up from just over 6,000 in 1998, an increase of one-third. Most of this growth has occurred among undergraduates, who have increased by 45 percent to 5200 FTE. During the same period, The New School has doubled student housing.

Fiscal and physical progress is most clearly reflected in occupied real estate, which has more that doubled in the last decade to 1.3 million square feet. Owned real estate reached an estimated market value of \$400 million with outstanding debt of \$80 million. Further expansion is reflected in the commitment to building a new 500,000 square feet academic building at 65 Fifth Avenue.

This building will create a new physical signature for the University on Fifth Avenue at the core of The New School's urban campus. It has been envisioned from its inception as a university building, linking and integrating currently disparate educational efforts. However, we have come to realize in the last year that the building will remain an empty metaphor without the development of an academic plan and a coordinated, efficient, and effective strategic planning process.

In developing this plan, we seek to move beyond our historical division-based academic planning to create new and innovative university-wide programs, which will strengthen current educational offerings, as well. The academic plan will provide the foundation for determining enrollment goals, the allocation of new facilities, and the creation of a multi-year financial and development plan. As we review academic programs, we will also evaluate divisional and university-wide administrative structures and processes, re-aligning these, as necessary, to support our academic goals.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The last two years have made it increasingly clear that The New School is at a historic juncture as it tries to create The new New School for the twenty-first century. For several years, we have been committed to constructing an academic building at 65 Fifth Avenue, but it has only been during the last year that we had the beginnings of a corresponding academic plan. In December 2005, then Provost Arjun Appadurai took the first steps towards such an academic plan in a document which proposed a set of bridge themes whose development would form the backbone for academic planning.

In the spring of 2006, the deans began meeting informally with some of the officers and President Kerrey in what can now, with hindsight, be seen as the beginnings of strategic planning. The deans began to meet weekly with the newly appointed Provost, Benjamin

Lee, and one of their recommendations was that the biweekly Deans and Officers meetings be devoted to strategic planning and that this group becomes the locus for strategic planning for the university.

At the same time, it became increasingly clear that strategic planning of the magnitude being considered would require the support of the entire university. Jim Murtha, the Executive Vice President, presented the preliminary building plans to the Faculty Senate in April 2006, thereby initiating the university-wide discussion on facilities planning. A similar presentation on the library took place at a Deans and Officers meeting in June.

The academic deans (NSSR, NSGS, Parsons, Milano, Lang), began meeting on a weekly basis last winter and were joined by the performance deans and directors (Drama, Jazz, Mannes) in the spring. These weekly meetings continued through the summer. I In addition, there were three two day retreats focusing on curricular development and facilities planning around the new library. These meetings produced a growing consensus that the overall direction for strategic planning would be to create The new New School around performance, design, and the liberal arts.

The New School has had two major periods that have defined its intellectual mission: its founding in 1919 and the creation of the university-in-exile in 1933, which led to the establishment of the Graduate Faculty and our first PhD. Programs. Since then, the university has added Parsons, Mannes, Milano, Lang College, and the Jazz and Drama programs. But, despite other features of the University's success, these programs have never been fully integrated into an overall educational mission for the university. The Deans felt that performance, liberal arts, and design reflected the diverse strengths of the university and allowed it to distinguish itself from liberal arts colleges and research universities, with the liberal arts-design interaction providing an unprecedented opportunity to build a unique educational identity.

The performance-liberal arts-design discussions were reinforced by the participation of Geoffrey Freeman, a library consultant from Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson, and Abbot, at a daylong Deans' meeting. One of the leading library consultants in the United States, Freeman insisted that the most important component in library planning was the intellectual vision that motivated it: what kind of educational experience would the library embody. He noted that compared to other universities and colleges that he had worked with, where there were often conflicting vested interests, The New School had a unique opportunity to create a cutting-edge building and library design that would embody our vision of the unique educational experience available at The New School.

The Deans retreats focused on curriculum and program development; reviewing curricula in urban, international, and media studies, quantitative skills, and writing. Course syllabi formed the basis for discussion and allowed the group to see exactly what was taught and how. It was quickly discovered that in areas such as urban studies, we already had the

makings for a cutting-edge program with our existing courses and faculty. The deans suggested that there were four academic areas where we had considerable faculty and curricular resources that could be built up into university-wide programs: urban studies, media studies, international affairs, and management and policy. Two others, capitalisms and democracies and design and social sciences were added later.

The Deans further agreed that these programs should be developed with a five-year Bachelor's/Master's option in mind. They felt that integrating undergraduate education with professional training would provide an attractive alternative to the standard liberal arts curriculum and provide a way of developing graduate programs that were better integrated with undergraduate needs. As noted, one of the critical problems facing higher education is its lack of connection with the current job market. Programs providing a balance of theoretical and practical preparation can be employed to address this gap. Fortunately, The New School has a blend of both kinds of faculty talent.

However, the initial enthusiasm was muted with the awareness that the present administrative and budget rules worked against creating new and innovative university-wide programs. For example, it was not clear, under the current structure, how to fund or allocate revenue for such programs, or how to hire into programs that would be supported by several divisions. In order to move forward on the academic plan, we need to create a strategic planning process that integrates the academic and space development with major budget and administrative reforms.

PARAMETERS FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING

Strategic planning for The New School will involve several interrelated components: academic planning (including curricular development); facilities planning; the creation of new budgeting administrative guidelines; and an enrollment plan over time. These planning themes will need to be supported by a detailed financial plan and a development program. Creating an effective strategic plan will also require creating a university-wide conversation that involves the active participation of trustees, board members of the various divisions, faculty, administrators, and students. In effect, we are a creating a strategic design process for the university that will create the discussions necessary to sustain it. The initial reaction from board members and faculty has been overwhelmingly enthusiastic.

The Provost will present this outline of the academic plan at Board of Trustee and Board of Governors meetings, the Faculty Senate, and to divisional faculty and administrative staffs this fall.

I. THE ACADEMIC PLAN

The academic plan will focus on creating a sustainable narrative linking performance, design, and the liberal arts and the development of new programs. The creation of a

university wide narrative will require establishing a university-wide conversation that reaches out to trustees, board members, faculty, and students.

This effort will lead to a major transformation of our undergraduate programs with new sequences and majors that link existing schools and also provide direct entry by freshmen and transfer students. New Bachelor's programs will have direct links to Master's degrees, providing for a 5-year Bachelor's/Master's sequence. We will use the development of urban studies as a prototype for the development of programs in media studies, international studies, management/policy, design and social sciences, and capitalisms and democracies.

As we develop these programs we will look to set quality standards that ensure students receive the best possible education we can provide. We will examine our methods of evaluation and place a clear emphasis on those which meaningfully foster connection between preparation in the classroom and the world of employment beyond, thereby emphasizing the experiential learning so demanded by modern professional life.

We will examine existing courses and plan new ones to ensure sufficient progression within the curriculum so that students can develop a degree of specialization in fields of interest. As we examine the diversity of current offerings, new combinations will be possible as duplication, particularly in lower level classes, is reduced. We will use different size classes (lectures, seminars, and studios) to meet pedagogical appropriateness and student demand.

New offerings will provide explicit linkages among the existing divisions by providing course sequences in modules for all undergraduates. We will endeavor to make the liberal arts more accessible to Parsons students, for example, and make design more accessible to Lang and New School undergraduates. The key is that the pathways will need to be explicitly mapped and become visible to all students: the goal will be to provide our students with a rigorous, progressive education amidst the interconnection of the University's unique strengths.

In our academic planning we will explore a set of distribution requirements for all undergraduates. This will be especially important for Parsons students. The Dean of Parsons is already planning to reduce the complexity of the Parsons degrees and this effort can be linked with the University's plan for a robust set of common courses with specific educational objectives. Changing this picture will require taking a step back to think about the courses all undergraduates should take. We will need to address the question of whether our liberal arts students receive too generalized a preparation and whether they should have more structure in their liberal arts programs and/or requirements.

II. BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE

Our present budget and administrative rules reflect our history as an eclectic collection of quasi-independent divisions. We basically calculate and allocate revenues on a divisional per head basis, with cross-registrations calculated through a modest "balance of trade" agreement. The incremental revenues are differentially allocated according to whether the division is in "deficit" or not; deficit divisions are allowed to keep a lower percentage of the increase and are penalized until they close their deficit.

The present budget rules reflect our history where tuition revenue is tied to the student's division. These rules do not always lead to an efficient allocation of resources, and mitigate against the possibility of university-wide programs. The University budget rules need review and change just as the academic programs do. There needs to be a new budget model for allocation of resources to academic programs based on a measure other than headcount, such as FTE or credits, and we will consider a variety of options.

III. ENROLLMENT PLANNING

Because of our historical business model, enrollment planning has too often been considered in terms of revenue and growth. The best reflection of this tendency is our counting headcount rather than student and faculty FTEs. We should begin immediately to measure enrollment with more precise methods than we have used to date. The methods should enable us to plot our future in a way that everyone can understand.

We now need to refine our approach to enrollment planning. We need more subtle measures and descriptors of the kind of enrollment we want. We need to understand the connections among all our undergraduate offerings and how the new offerings we envisage in urban, media and other areas will fit in.

IV. FACILITIES PLAN

Three years ago, with the support of the Board, the University contracted with Cooper Robertson architects to develop a master plan for University facilities. The plan, which is yet to be completed, encompasses more than the new academic center. Given its size, however, the new building will stand at the core of any plan. Alex Cooper presented to the Board of Trustees on two occasions and the master plan effort was informed by a University-wide committee of faculty and administrators. Several university seminars featured discussions of the master plan effort.

This effort slowed somewhat in 2005-06 seeking greater specificity on educational organization, along the lines outlined above in the academic planning section of this document. The master planners will need direct input on the projected numbers of FTE students in both majors and academic departments in order to develop a "program" for the new building and other facilities we may need.

The present architectural plan for the signature building represents a synthesis of the master planners work and a vision in which academic themes create university-wide programs across the current divisions. As we re-engage this effort, we do so based on the presumption that the building will be built around a philosophy of teaching and learning, housing a library, auditoria, an athletic facility, and flagship university-wide programs. In contrast to the facilities plans featured in the campaigns of some of our competitors, such as NYU and Columbia, the library and auditoria offer us an unprecedented opportunity to define and promote The New School's unique learning opportunities and artistic and intellectual creativity and accomplishment.

V. FINANCIAL PLANNING

We have developed two iterations of a long-term financial plan and reviewed each with a Trustee subcommittee. This effort is supported by an outside financial consulting firm called PRAG. The financial plan assembles several sets of information into a multi-year analysis. Revenue from tuition, student housing and estimated proceeds from gifts are shown together with the costs of financing the signature building and new student housing facilities and other capital needs. These elements are assembled in a manner to test the University's ability to maintain its creditworthiness as it makes greater investments in physical facilities.

This fall we will develop a third version of the plan that illustrates our ability to adjust our annual budget in light of a possible enrollment downturn or other budget problem. We will create flexibility within the university at the local levels by coordinating our planning and adroitly managing our risk at a university-wide level.

IV. DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

The University concluded its last capital campaign in 1998. Recent fundraising successes and the need for large investments in facilities imply a new campaign in the near future. We also need to institutionalize our alumni outreach efforts to build enduring sources of giving for the future. Because of The New School's fragmented organizational history, building this alumni base is a major challenge. With most enrollment growth having occurred in the last decade and a half, there are fewer sources to draw on among mature and more financially capable alumni.

We have improved steadily in our outreach to Trustees, alumni and other friends. Stewardship has improved markedly and a step-by-step process of additional management improvement is underway.

Development efforts need to be closely coordinated with the other aspects of strategic planning to insure that the effort to secure gifts coincides with and supports the other major elements in strategic planning.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

Building upon conversations with the Deans and Officers, the strategic planning process has begun in full force with the opening of the school year.

The Deans and Officers group now meets biweekly and is chaired by the President. This group will function as the Steering Committee for the Strategic Planning effort. Bob Kerrey, Ben Lee, Jim Murtha, Sherry Brabham and Doris Suarez will staff this committee and work to synthesize the efforts of the task forces.

The Provost meets weekly with the Deans and the Executive Vice President meets biweekly with the Vice Presidents. Among other actions items, these meetings will bring information forward to the Steering Committee and serve to reinforce the work of the Strategic Planning Task Forces.

TASK FORCES AND COMMITTEES

There will be several task forces established to support and move this planning process in essential areas such as: budget and administrative change, enrollment planning, academics, architecture and facilities planning.

It is proposed that in order to insure that both the academic and administrative aspects of planning remain closely coordinated, each of the Strategic Planning Task Forces be cochaired by a senior Officer and a Dean or other senior academic person.

The most immediate next steps will be to lay out a detailed plan of the task forces, with goals, charges, timelines, and membership. We intend to work closely with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to determine a process for involving the Senate in strategic planning activities. We will seek representation from the university community, including students, trustees and administrators, as well as faculty, to ensure broad participation in the process.

Updated versions of this outline will be ongoing as the planning progresses and the mission, goals and timelines are articulated. We welcome your comments, thoughts and suggestions. Please send to: HYPERLINK "mailto:provost@newschool.edu? subject=Provost%20White%20Paper%20Comments" comments.

1	1	0	3/	0	6
1	1,	U.	וכ	v	U

Closing remarks:

We have not yet determined the task forces and committees I mention in my strategic planning report. I expect this work to be completed soon however.

- PAGE 17 -

The New School Faculty Senate

Tuesday, December 12, 2006 8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room, Room 712

Agenda

Opening Remarks (5 minutes) Robert Kirkbride

Approval of Minutes (5/9, 10/10) and (5 minutes) Robert Kirkbride

Senate Resolutions Passed at 11/7 meeting

Governance 06/07-1 Doris Chang IT 06/07-2 Douglas Diaz

Update on University Planning and 65 5th Ave. (5 minutes) **Bob Kerrey**

Academic Policies Committee (10 minutes)

Update on Academics/Space/IT Planning Document
Academic & space planning initiative at IDC/Parsons
Cynthia Lawson

Update on status of Strategic Planning Task Groups and

introduction of the Building Task Group. (5 minutes)

Ben Lee

Building Task Group Report (5 minutes)

Paul Goldberger

(10 minutes) Lia Gartner

AV/IT presentation (20 minutes) Shelley Reed

Other Business (time permitting)

Dennis Derryck

Childcare policies

Spring Town Meeting/Reception

Present

<u>Members</u> Ex Officio

Elizabeth Aaron, Mannes Bob Kerrey, President Carolyn Berman, NSGS Ben Lee, Provost

Keith Buhl, Drama Eliza Nichols, Vice Provost Doris Chang, NSSR Natalie Polvere, Deputy Chief of

Staff,

Dennis Derryck, Co-chair, Milano Office of the President Douglas Diaz, Parsons Elizabeth Ross, Vice Provost Duncan Foley, NSSR Michael Schober, Dean, NSSR

Terri Gordon, Co-chair, NSGS

Kasia Gruda, Parsons

Susan Hambleton, Parsons Visitors

Peter Haratonik, NSGS

Mary Judge, Parsons Lisa Browar, University Librarian Robert Kirkbride, Co-chair, Parsons Lia Gartner, Vice President for

Design,

Deborah Levitt, ELC Construction and Facilities

Mgmt.

Paul Goldberger, Joseph Urban Lily Ling, ELC Professor of Edwin Melendez, Milano Design

Alan McGowan, ELC Cynthia Lawson, Parsons

Dominic Pettman, ELC Shelley Reed, Senior Vice President

for

Edward Powers, Milano Information Technology Anezka Sebek, Secretary, Parsons Lillian Sartori, Assistant Vice

President for

Faye-Ellen Silverman, Mannes Information Technology

Tom Vasiliades, Drama Joel Towers, Associate Provost for

Environmental Studies

Absent

Neil Gordon, ELC Elzbieta Matynia, NSSR Sharon Mesmer, NSGS

Co-chair Robert Kirkbride called the meeting to order.

Mr. Kirkbride thanked the standing committees for their work and reviewed the agenda of the meeting, which focuses on the Academic Policy Committee.

The minutes from May 9th and October 10th were unanimously approved.

Two Senate Resolutions passed at the 11/07/06 UFS meeting were presented to the group for comments.

Doris Chang presented Governance 06-07-1: "Faculty Senate Resolution on Shared Governance,

Faculty Representation, and Faculty Assembly" (Appendix I)

Douglas Diaz presented IT 06/07-2: "University Faculty Senate Resolution on Information Technology" (Appendix II)

The Senate discussed the current IT situation across the university and the need for improvements in communications. Shelley Reed invited the participation of and feedback from faculty in IT matters.

President Kerrey gave an update on building planning.

Mr. Kerrey spoke to the multiple simultaneous construction projects envisioned and reported in the following on the new building at 65 5th Avenue:

40% of the funding has been raised for 500,000 square feet although 700,000 sq. ft. is the target building size.

At the last board meeting, an architect was selected: Roger Duffy of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill.

The building will be constructed according to the highest environmental standards possible. We are considering an 11-1200 square ft auditorium and performance spaces.

The demolition of 65 5th Avenue should take place by May 2008, and construction should be complete by 2010-2011.

A contract with IDEO would be useful as they have experience in design consultation and could create a conversation between all members of the university community.

There will be a 30-month interim period in which we will be without the common area space (cafeteria, reading area, auditorium) at 65 5th Avenue. We will have to have a conversation to determine how to recreate this space on a temporary basis.

Mr. Kerrey addressed the question of the University's endowment, stating that we continue to make progress.

Douglas Diaz gave an update on the Academics/Space/IT Planning document. Space is integral to the educational and intellectual mission of the University. The objective is to produce a document bringing together the space needs of all divisions.

Each division is responsible for answering a series of questions concerning their space use and needs. Ed Powers has supplied a template from Milano, which includes a mission statement and an evaluation of space requirements. Of the assessments of the divisions, half are complete. The APC hopes to have a complete document before the start of the spring semester.

Cynthia Lawson gave a presentation on the academic and space planning initiative at IDC/Parsons.

Beginning with the premise that Arts and Design learning can be broken down primarily into four categories - lecture, critique, making and research - Ms. Lawson suggested that we design new spaces, Integrative Learning Environments, that would integrate these different kinds of learning. She also emphasized the importance of social spaces, which facilitate peer-to-peer learning; adjacencies; and flexibility in our use and design of spaces.

An abridged version of the presentation will be available on the UFS website.

The senators and officers engaged in a general discussion concerning various space options, such as shared labs between divisions, and the benefits of hiring an outside design consultation firm such as IDEO.

Provost Lee gave an update on the status of Strategic Planning Task Groups and an introduction to the Building Task Group.

Mr. Lee mentioned that he was impressed with the work the ACP has done and provided the following updates:

The White Paper on strategic planning has been circulated.

A tighter working relationship between the Provost Office and various administrations has been established. The Deans meet now for two hours every week, and the Deans and Officers meet every other week. The White Paper represents a consensus of the Officers and Deans.

A series of task groups is being put together to provide a tighter interface between the administration and the faculty. The task groups will be headed by a Dean and Officer, and the curricular groups will have heavy faculty representation. Task groups are to include:

- a Provost task group on Curricular Development. Curricular groups are envisioned in the following areas: Urban, International, Media, and Design and Social Sciences, and Management
- a task group to strengthen academic programs/credit requirements

- a task group on the budget
- a task group on enrollment planning and marketing
- a task group on architecture and facilities planning
- a task group on financial planning and development

We need to move to a different kind of budget planning over the next four years. The present budget program mitigates the effect of university-wide programs.

The larger community must be considered in our construction of the signature building. What will a global, urban university look like in NYC? We need to create a signature building that will be open to the community and will encourage community experience.

Paul Goldberger gave a report on the Building Task Group, which was convened by the Provost. Its essential goal is to coordinate academics with administrative and physical planning. Mr. Goldberger found IDEO a welcome addition to the process. They will serve as facilitators and help us figure out what we want to be as an institution. They are skilled at allowing institutions to look at themselves with a fresh eye, and they are committed to forging points of connection between the aesthetics of design and the social science of design. They can help us create a new model for an urban institution. We want a building that integrates us into the city.

The meeting ended at 10:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Anezka C. Sebek

APPENDIX I

Governance Resolution: Approved November 7, 2006

Resolution 06/07-1

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.

APPENDIX II

IT Resolution: Approved 11.7.06 Resolution

06/07-2

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.

PAGE

PAGE 2

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