

New School University

Faculty Senate

Tuesday, February 15, 2005

8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction

Ms. Abelson

Discussion

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-Chair)

Jonathan Bach, TNS

Bill Coco, ASDS

Dennis Derryck, MGS

Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)

Kasia Gruda, PSD

José de Jesus, PSD

David Loeb, MCM

Arun Luthra, Jazz

Rosemary O'Neill, PSD (Co-Chair)

Timothy Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)

Elaine Savory, ELC

Anezka Sebek, PSD

Ken Stevens, PSD

Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)

Absent

Margot Bouman, PSD

Julie Floch, MGS

Jeffrey Goldfarb, GF

Courtney Jung, GF

Edwin Melendez, MGS

Bill Pace, TNS

Barry Salmon, TNS

Ben Taylor, TNS

Ms. Abelson

Called for items for 2/22 Agenda

Mr. Loeb

Suggested responses to committee reports, or if Administration is not prepared to respond, then to make a commitment to respond at final session

Mr. Miller

Noted that Mr. Kerrey will be addressing development. Subsequent to this must be an

academic plan. Suggested a request to President to address Academic Plan, particularly with respect to new hires, and the role of faculty in academic planning, as well as to timing.

Mr. Bach

Suggested that faculty consultation on infrastructure planning should also be addressed.

Mr. Loeb

Noted that there is a question to ask about balance between growth in enrollment and development of physical plant.

Ms. Abelson

Noted that relationship to fundraising also needs to be addressed.

Ms O'Neill

Suggested need to address the role of the Senate, and place, in the conversation about Academic Planning.

Mr. Luthra

Wondered whether a procedure for raising and entertaining these issues in the senate with the administration needs to be codified.

Mr. Stevens

Requested that an update on Union Negotiations be added to the agenda.

Ms. O'Neill

Added the request for a report on Chait and Trower meetings.

Mr. Derryck

Suggested a structure of interim meetings with the administration and provost's office needs to be established in order to make the senate more effective.

Mr. Gordon

Provided an overview of election process.

Mr Quigley

Provided an overview of eligibility for election as Senator.

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon

New School University

Faculty Senate

Tuesday, February 22, 2005

8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction	Ms. Thomas
President's Report	Mr. Kerrey
Provost's Report	Mr. Appadurai
Future Business	Ms. Thomas
Discussion	

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-Chair)
Arjun Appadurai, Provost
Margot Boumon, PSD
Keith Buhl,
Bill Coco, ASDS
Dennis Derryck, MGS
Julie Floch, MGS
Lisa Formosa,
Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)
Kasia Gruda, PSD
Bill Hirst, GF
Bob Kerry, President, NSU
David Loeb, MCM
Arun Luthra, Jazz
Edwin Melendez, MGS
James Miller, GF
Eliza Nichols, Associate Provost

Rosemary O'Neill, PSD (Co-Chair)
Bill Pace, TNS
Chris Packard, ELC
Tim Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)
Elizabeth Ross, Associate Provost
Barry Salmon, TNS
Elaine Savory, ELC
Anezka Sebek, PSD
Ken Stevens, PSD
Christopher Stone, MCM
Ben Taylor, TNS
Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)
Jonathan Veitch, Dean, ELC
Toby Volkman, Associate Provost

Absent

Kristina Kanders, Jazz; David Plotke, GF; Jeffrey Goldfarb, GF; Courtney Jung, GF; Jonathan Bach, TNS; Jose de Jesus, PSD

Ms. Thomas: Welcome and Introduction

Opened the meeting at 8:35. Welcomed Jonathan Veitch, first visiting Dean to Senate. Summarized working session on 2/15. Introduced President Kerrey.

Mr. Kerrey: President's Report

1: Announced events up-and-coming; honorees for commencement.

2: Offered an update on UAW negotiations. Have been going on under Carol Cantrell's guidance since 11/9, so far focused on non-economic matters, courseload, etc. University is taking this as an opportunity to streamline and consolidate employee data. A major undertaking, but close to complete, so negotiations can go on to more difficult economic issues. New data will help on academic and financial side. 1700 PT faculty and staff on bargaining unit, 2/3 in Parsons and New School. There have been nine negotiating sessions. Meetings taking place almost weekly.

3: Reported on Academic Planning and Development. Over the past three or four years substantial fundraising has occurred. Administration is focused on 5 year plan with Deans, developing detailed academic proposals prior to fundraising. Presently attention is focused on new process: in the past Deans presented budgets and enrollment targets. Now, process focus on the question of what is the optimal size of divisions particularly for ELC. 1200? 2000? Is seminar method scaleable? If not, what do we do? Likewise at Parsons, rather than simply growing and hoping for space, administration is attempting to answer the question of optimal size for PSD. For Graduate and Performing Arts programs, the equation is somewhat different, particularly at Mannes: the conservatory can not grow. Likewise at Jazz, available space becomes a ceiling on growth regardless of whether growth is desirable.

Reported that when talking to trustees, such as at the full Board meeting tomorrow, begins by saying that there are a number of traditions that as we change we want to keep. What is changing is that the University has gone from an institution dominated by continuing non-degree education to one dominated by matriculating students. Demand thus coming on admin to provide typical undergrad services: housing (need to add 1000 units over 5-7 years) and accompanying services. This is essential in attracting new students.

What we must keep are two traditions:

1: The University in Exile started as the tradition of inviting German and Jewish French intellectuals to the US. It was an unpopular thing to do under the FDR administration then; now we need to continue to be a refuge for intellectual freedom.

2: NSU started as a revolt against the traditional university, so must be sure not to become so hidebound and traditional that we can't try something new, take risks.

Analysis of students shows that they choose us because of New York, or avoid us because of New York. This is critical. NYC is international, still; welcoming to foreigners. 1/3 of our students come from abroad. NSU has taken advantage of array of creative opportunities in NYC, for example MFA and International Affairs Programs, both owe much success to being in NYC. Very important observation about connection between academic programming and fundraising. Some academic plans are not appropriate for us in this context of being in NYC.

Emphasized that we are at an unusual point where we realize that the quality of our facilities matter a great deal, at PSD and ELC in particular, thus we need 160,000,000 of pledges to build out at 5th Avenue and do what we need to do on infrastructure. A gym, a first rate library, common space: these are what we need to attract students. University is far too tuition dependent, we need to increase endowment and endowment income.

Mr. Loeb

What is the percentage of tuition that is scholarship aid?

Mr. Kerrey

ELC is about 36 percent, PSD at about 11 percent. Willing to give numbers, don't have to hand. Becomes a real problem though when tuition is not generating cash to support programming. Feels strongly the need to consolidate university. Plans to bring Mannes and Fashion onto campus, an academic imperative that will bring public programming, interaction between students, all of which has an academic impact. 65 fifth Avenue the first and most important object, with its performance space for Mannes

Mr. Luthra

Are Jazz and Mannes at or above their optimal size?

Mr. Kerrey

Yes, Jazz even beyond. Doesn't make sense to grow and make existing facilities problem worse.

Mr. Appadurai

Introduced a number of specific comments in relationship to committee reports and the Provost's office efforts to understand and work through same.

1: Enrollment targets are roughly doubling our size, 15,000 students in 5-7 years, of which 10,000 are undergraduate, 5,000 graduate. Numbers a subject of continuous debate within and without Administration, invites our committee to deliberate over them to and to respond.

2: In re: last Senate meeting, where concerns raised about uneven involvement of faculty in academic planning and with Deans, has has urged Deans to increase faculty involvement and input in colleges. Dean Veitch's presence here. Senate Leadership will be invited to Dean Provost lunch once per semester.

3: Divisional Five Year Plans. These remain very preliminary, and Deans are not prepared to share them at this time, still works in progress. So will be reworked by Deans who will say when prepared to share with wider group.

4: Seeking input from faculty – Senate and divisions. Central aspect of growth: need to develop exciting new degree programs and initiatives, thus Mr. Kerrey's point about innovation. Seeks ideas for new programs. Could focus on themes that build on being in New York. Bridge themes become relevant, such as Media.

Mr. Kerrey

This is a fine example of relationship between development and academic planning. We recognize many things in media going on across the University, which makes sense because of location in NY. The Media Bridge theme Committee has produced a preliminary document that is almost in shape to present to donors. Exciting, coherent, connects all divisions, produces substantial academic planning. Will contribute to academic and physical plant development of a number of divisions.

Mr. Appadurai

Introduces Associate Provost Elizabeth Ross, responsible for dealing with new programs and online efforts, with Eliza and Toby has a rich set of portfolios.

Bridge themes, with media as example. Shortly have in place a Bridge Committee in Urban and Environmental Studies. Intends to follow through on Bridge Themes and develop them into something meaningful. Membership of Bridge Theme Committees is public information, urges that they be taken seriously.

5: Development of New Programs that fit with existing ones or fill lacunae: welcomes input from Senate.

6: Curricular examination. Systematic evaluation of degree programs and concentrations and tracks. There are 60 such areas. In some cases, they are serious curricula; on other cases need reevaluation. Urges us to begin to think of how this evaluation should take place: combination of standard procedures, external review, etc. Process should be a

genuine give and take.

7: Committee reports. Acknowledges the work that went into same. Welcomes collaboration. Suggests that Academic Planning Committee gets involved with University-wide curricular programming. Governance: Provost's office is in the process of finding ways to make budget information more available. Looking for useful convention about what is more restricted in budget and what is shared. This will be also connected to collecting data and examining faculty load issues. Faculty affairs: work on handbook is appropriate, rank and title, appointment/reappointment policies. Chait and Trower working for us on handbook, focus meetings have taken place with Deans, Faculty Senate officers, and PSD chairs. Immediate aim to help with Faculty Handbook, which raises many large discussions and questions about governance and faculty participation and so on. Feedback still coming and as it does, Administration will bring views and issues to Faculty Senate. Has a very high opinion of Chait and Trower as nationally recognized consultants with a sharp understanding of NSU. Hopes very much to include Faculty Senate in work with same. Need to standardize employment policies.

8: What changes will allow University to become a more vibrant, attractive, institution? Workload, sabbatical, etc. Timeframe: Feb C&T have conducted focus groups. Handbook review and policy writing with Faculty Affairs Committee of Senate and Provost's office. Review of first draft in May. Revisions over summer. Finalization through senate endorsement in September 2005. Hopes to bring transparency, order, rationality, and coherence to policies; may not accomplish in 8 months, but hope to make progress.

9: Faculty growth. Administration has spent a lot of time to think through the processes of growth involved in doubling the size of the faculty. A very complex process. What has to happen when? Facilities and faculty in complex relationship. Working number of adding up to 200 new Full Time faculty. Still thinking about Part Time. Is clear that we will always have a substantial number of PT faculty, how to hire, retain, and treat well. But must increase full time faculty.

Mr. Luthra

Is there an actual definition of Part Time and Full Time?

Mr. Appadurai

Terminology varies, Administration hopes to bring greater clarity to workload and definition.

Ms. Nichols

From vantage of bargaining committee: lots of these issues will be resolved in contract. PT faculty load under negotiation. Faculty handbook needs to be a separate process; Part

Time faculty handbook will result

Mr. Miller

In re: Governance Committee, unclear how efforts with codification of charters and bylaws for each division will this interact with Faculty Handbook. In addition, negotiations with Union must impact matters of faculty governance. How do these three themes intersect?

Mr. Appadurai

Handbook and divisional drafting of charters and bylaws are compatible. Positive input from divisional governance areas very helpful. But there will be some tension between traditions and growth. Need to be sure that highly developed GF governance doesn't overshoot what happens at other divisions. Senate itself will need to tackle this issue.

Mr. Miller

From vantage of GF, worry is in reverse: a Faculty Handbook could water down robust traditions of self governance.

Mr. Appadurai

Would like to see not dilution, but rather a contribution from that robustness to a university-wide robustness. Not that easy to do, but could be informative and useful to wider process.

Ms. O'Neill

1: Very pleased to hear articulation of Academic Planning Committee to wider planning university wide. Raises issue of where shall we deliver new programs: we require being informed and enrolled in process.

2: In re: Chait and Trower; intellectual property statement? Could we have copies of?

Mr. Appadurai

Does not have a formula or processes of how to make articulation between Senate and Administration work. Would like help. Always an interesting issue of how Faculty Senate in any university connects to existing committees and structures. In some universities, receives matters at a late state of develop[ment, debates and decides yes or no. Another model is more grassroots, and we can customize, but always with the recognition that we need to balance between distance of Faculty Senate from process, and being so central that it contradicts other committees

Mr. Melendez

Handbook is a great place to try to structure this relationship. Clear time table allows us to play a clear role in that process. Five year plan very important to MGS, still don't have a divisional plan to become engaged. Critical for us to have a clear timetable as in handbook. Should be very easy to harmonize faculty and administration to reach a consensus.

Mr. Quigley

Appreciates candor and details. Faculty Affairs committee looks forward to working on handbook, though a daunting task. Shares Edwin's concern that a timetable be established to allow faculty to schedule meetings. Detail still needs clarification: status of renewable term contracts. Is that discussion reaching resolution?

Ms. Volman

Issue is part of the faculty handbook process.

Ms. Nichols

Policies are mature in GF and Milano, but renewable term contracts are university wide need to be more uniform than they are. Therefore important to include in faculty handbook. Until then the policy being circulated needs to be in place. Welcomes input from Faculty Affairs Committee

Mr. Appadurai

1: observes that establishment of new programs is an ongoing process – never going to stop, ideas welcome now, or in three months, etc.

2: Looking for a 3 year process in evaluating programs, and input welcome in particular this semester. Would like to do 6 or 8 each semester, and looks forward to ideas of how to do it. In both cases will wish to maximize contact with Deans to ensure that there is a basis for triangle of communication. Finally, we are all tremendously overextended. We would all agree on that. In view of this while academic planning and governance are in themselves huge areas, where we have to seek collaboration, the handbook is right here and now and is concrete.

Mr. Hirst

In re: schedule, this is a real limitation as there is no discussion over summer for faculty. If this body votes in favor of handbook, it could negate existing structures in divisions. There's nothing in structure that would prevent clash between handbook and existing governance structures.

Mr Appadurai

Schedule; need to stage so that real discussion is possible. In re clash: our choice – in GF, in Parsons – reveals a Gordian knot. Are we going as a University to be more than a holding company for divisions that allow them to do what they will? Process already exists to take us beyond that, and there are zero sum issues. Total autonomy is no longer possible, either for robust or less robust governance traditions. GF as example. Note, Senate's role has always been advisory and consultative, not executive. Very important

that this body be fully informed, but this cannot lead to an executive role. Therefore, although as fulsome a discussion as possible should take place, the Senate will not be able to overturn existing governance structures elsewhere. Makes recommendations to Provost, Provost to President, President to Trustees.

Mr. Derryck

This is not so far a conversation, but an imparting of information. Can this conversation occur with Senate Committees? Can we go beyond imparting information and onto conversation?

Mr Appadurai

Disagrees. Substantive conversation has taken place here. Has made substantive response. Undertakes to discuss with staff how we can do more.

Ms. Thomas

Closed the meeting with thanks to Dean Veitch at 10:05

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon

**New School University
Faculty Senate
Working Session**

**Tuesday, March 15, 2005
8:30 AM – 9:45 AM**

Agenda

Discussion

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-Chair)
Bill Coco, ASDS
Dennis Derryck, MGS
Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)
Kasia Gruda, PSD
Bill Hirst, GF
Courtney Jung, GF
Kristina Kanders, Jazz
Arun Luthra, Jazz
Edwin Melendez, MGS
James Miller, GF

Rosemary O'Neill, PSD (Co-Chair)
Bill Pace, TNS
Tim Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)
Elaine Savory, ELC
Barry Salmon, TNS
Anezka Sebek, PSD
Ken Stevens, PSD
Christopher Stone, MCM
Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)

Absent

Jonathan Bach, TNS
Margot Boumon, PSD
Jose de Jesus, PSD
Julie Floch, MGS
Jeffrey Goldfarb, GF

David Loeb, MCM
Chris Packard, ELC
David Plotke, GF

Ms. Abelson

Began meeting at 8:35

Ms. O'Neill

Reported on discussion between Senate Executive and Natalie Polvere, VP for Communications, about effort to arrange faculty discussions with Bob.

Ms. Sebek

Raised questions of structure of senate discussion with administration.

Mr. Derryck

Pursued same question

Mr. Quigley

Reported on meeting of Senate Executive and Associate Provosts; Associate Provost's offer of Secretarial Assistance; discussion of Faculty Handbook. Explained Administration's hope to assemble a team of faculty to work on handbook over the summer – with compensation – with a view to completing a draft of Faculty Handbook by the Fall.

Ms. O'Neill

Elaborated on Senate Executive's role in accomplishing planning for same.

Mr. Miller

Questioned a) whether administration explained the role of Chait and Trowers and b) who would staff planning committee

Mr. Quigley

Reported that a) this substance was not discussed and b) that although Provost suggested Senate Faculty Affairs committee, this does not seem viable and that the Senate would play a role in choosing members.

Mr. Melendez

Expressed that this is a big opportunity, a real step in the right direction.

Ms. Savory

Opined that greater definition of substance of work and workload is required before it is possible to accept involvement in process.

Mr. Hirst

Saw this as an opportunity for Senate to work independently and proactively on handbook and definition of policies. Moved that we act immediately to begin work on same.

Mr. Melendez

Seconded

Mr. Salmon

Felt that key to moving ahead on this would be to form committee to begin study of questions.

Mr. Stevens

Noted that planning is beginning for use of new space on Fifth avenue, and expressed wish that the senate become involved.

Ms. Savory

Raised issue of communication between faculty reps and their division's faculty.

Mr. Melendez

Suggested isolating one or two issues from each committee to work on specifically.

Mr. Hirst

Proposed the following resolution:

The Faculty Senate thanks the Provost's Office for its interest in revising the Full-Time Faculty Handbook. In a spirit of constructive collaboration, the Faculty Senate resolves that:

1. a committee, selected by the Faculty Senate, be charged with the task of writing a draft of a revised Full-Time Faculty Handbook,
2. the committee present to the Faculty Senate its draft of the Full-Time Faculty Handbook by September, 2005 for consent,
3. the approved draft be forwarded to the Provost.

Ms. Abelson

Called a vote and the resolution was passed 14 Yea; 3 No; Abstain 1. Adjourned meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon, as Secretary

**New School University
Faculty Senate
Working Session**

**Tuesday, April 19, 2005
8:30 AM – 10:00 AM**

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Opening Remarks	Ms. O'Neill
Status of elections to UFS	Ms. O'Neill
Nominating Committee Confirmation	Mr. Gordon
Senate Committee Update	Committee Chairs
Faculty Handbook Committee	Mr. Gordon
Minutes Approval	Ms. O'Neill
UFS Website http://homepage.newschool.edu/~ufs/	Mr. Quigley
Discussion	

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-Chair)	Bill Pace, TNS
Jonathan Bach, TNS	Chris Packard, ELC
Bill Coco, ASDS	Tim Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)
Jose de Jesus, PSD	Barry Salmon, TNS
Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)	Elaine Savory, ELC
Kasia Gruda, PSD	Anezka Sebek, PSD
Courtney Jung, GF	Ken Stevens, PSD
Kristina Kanders, Jazz	Christopher Stone, MCM
David Loeb, MCM	Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)
James Miller, GF	
Rosemary O'Neill, PSD (Co-Chair)	

Absent

Margot Boumon, PSD; Dennis Derryck, MGS; Julie Floch, MGS; Jeffrey Goldfarb, GF; Bill Hirst, GF; Arun Luthra, Jazz; Edwin Melendez, MGS; David Plotke, GF; Ben Taylor, TNS

Ms. O'Neill

Announced date of next meeting 5/11. Stressed the importance of regular attendance. Reviewed bylaws and urged review by all members. Stressed the role of collegiality, participation, and cooperation in the operation of the Faculty Senate. Emphasized importance of familiarity with Faculty Senate Bylaws in participation in Senate. Reviewed status of divisional elections.

Mr. Gordon

Announced election to the Senate of Elaine Abelson and Neil Gordon, with Chris Packard continuing as part time representative.

Mr. Quigley

Announced completion of elections at TNS but declined to name new Senators.

Mr. Loeb

Explained divisional difficulties at MCM where the dean has decided to exclude eligibility to the Faculty Senate to the extension division, currently represented by Mr. Stone.

Mr. Stone

Described the procedures for election at MCM as defined by the dean.

Mr. Quigley

Specified that UFS bylaws require oversight by UFS of divisional elections.

Ms. O'Neill

Requested that Mr. Stone report to the Executive Committee on the progress of elections in order to begin process of oversight.

Mr. Miller

Questioned whether the Faculty Senate is taking a confrontational enough stand vis à vis

administration on issues of noncompliance with bylaws.

Ms. Kanders

Reported that election process is not yet completed at Jazz and that she will take matters into her own hands to complete elections.

Mr. Miller

Graduate Faculty has completed election and will be sending Michael Schober, Claudia Lomnitz, Jim Miller, Mala Htun.

Mr. Quigley

Requested clarification from GF as to terms of office for representatives.

Mr. Coco

Described current state of chaos at ASDS pending completion of negotiations over future of school. Proposes that election can not occur until clarity is achieved as to make-up of faculty for the coming year.

A motion was proposed and passed to approve this delay.

Mr. Stevens

Reported that elections at PSD are laboring under lack of clarity.

Ms. Sebek

Confirmed that Faculty Advisory Committee has been meeting to establish process; that nominating committee exists; that chairs are nominating faculty.

Ms. O'Neill

Elaborated reasons both for delays, announced that voting will take place on May 2nd through 6th, and that results will be available for the May 11th meeting.

Ms. O'Neill

- 1) Announced two members of Nominating Committee: Ken Stevens and Jonathan Bach, and deferred the announcement of third member.
- 2) Reported on progress of Academic Planning Committee; announced that committee will be meeting today with Provost and will report on this meeting at May 11 Meeting

Mr. Quigley

Reported on Faculty Affairs Committee which will be meeting with Provost to discuss Faculty Handbook

Mr. Miller

Requested that divisional governance rules be distributed to senate and posted on FS Website.

Ms. O'Neill

Reported that Co-chairs are selecting a committee of 4-5 faculty members to serve on the Faculty Handbook committee.

Ms. Jung

Requested clarification as to committee formation and nomination of officers.

Mr. Miller

Questioned whether Faculty Handbook committee requires wider ratification.

Ms. Savory

Raised further questions as to procedure and received clarification from Mr. Quigley.

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon

New School University Faculty Senate

**Wednesday, May 11, 2005
8:45 AM – 10:10 AM**

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction	Ms. O'Neill
President's Report	Mr. Kerrey
Provost's Report	Mr. Appadurai
Digital Library Presentation	Ms. Browar, Mr. Allen
Senate Report	Ms. O'Neill
Discussion	

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-Chair)	Rosemary O'Neill, PSD (Co-Chair)
Arjun Appadurai, Provost	Bill Pace, TNS
Jonathan Bach, TNS	Christopher Packard, ELC
Bill Coco, ASDS	Timothy Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)
Julie Floch, MGS	Barry Salmon, TNS
Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)	Elaine Savory, ELC
Kasia Gruda, PSD	Anezka Sebek, PSD
Courtney Jung, GF	Ken Stevens, PSD
Bob Kerrey, President, NSU	Christopher Stone, Mannes
Arun Luthra, Jazz	Ben Taylor, TNS
Edwin Melendez, MGS	Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)
James Miller, GF	

Guests

Lisa Brower, University Librarian
Allen Jones, Director of the Digital Library
Liz Ross, Associate Provost
Natalie Polvere, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the President

Absent

Margot Bouman, PSD; Dennis Derryck, MGS; Bill Hirst, GF; José de Jesus, PSD; Kristina Kanders, Jazz; David Loeb, MCM

Ms. O'Neill

Opened the meeting at 8:45. Introduced two guests: Lisa Brower, University Librarian; Allen Jones, Director of the CET

Acknowledged that those in Faculty Senate and university have consistently shown commitment to faculty governance, and raised the question of what is the voice of the Faculty Senate? Expressed view that the voice is developing, and emphasized responsibility of those continuing in the FS to strengthen voice. Noted strength of bylaws and the headway represented by standing committees. Processes are in place; positions have been taken, and we need acknowledge the importance of our foundation and the need for time and practice in strengthening the voice of Faculty Senate.

Mr. Kerrey

Opened by noting the imminence of commencement, with 1600 students graduating and the upcoming AAS trunk show on May 12. Reported Board approval of construction budget; detailed the work upcoming. Noted current fundraising goal of 34,000,000 this year; reported 80% success. Noted that 20% of 65 Fifth Avenue budget is already in hand. Actors Studio: took responsibility for the decision to sever contract with Actors Studio Inc. over issue of governance and control of curriculum. A joint statement is forthcoming in which the two parties will define the amicable nature of parting of ways. Thanked FS members for participation, spoke to how useful FS has been for his own learning curve about NSU. Opened floor to questions.

Mr. Appadurai

Reported on Academic Planning process. Constituencies have met throughout university to work on Academic Planning; serious iteration has already taken place; most decisions on the divisional level – such as hiring – involve a discussion of large issues of academic planning and bring Provost's office into close touch with Deans and faculty, notably providing him with a sense of the Deans' individual relationships with their faculty and an understanding of the concerns of the university as a whole. The agenda for the summer is to connect enrollment goals -- goals for growing faculty and full time faculty, aiming toward targets of doubling student population to 15,000 and adding 200 new faculty – to develop a more precise 3-5 year plan to connect these growth goals with our larger academic mission. Hope to accomplish, by September, to create a document that spells out a more precise academic plan on that level, Invites FS to play a role in this

process. Summer will be a very, very busy time in working on this, in attaching so many precise strategic components to these objectives. Noted that in making this plan Provost will be drawing on all the concerns that have come to their attention, and will be conducting a very serious evaluation process that they hope will become and institutional routine, allowing a continuing evaluation of programs, divisions, etc. Noted progress in Bridge Themes, as effort to find where interests and foci that were shared by various constituencies in the university which, in turn, has many implications: how do these adjacencies affect planning, space, hiring, etc. Noted that adjacencies are a tool to aid in planning, not a zero sum game.

Mr. Kerrey

Added on negotiations with UAW and expressed that conversation proceeds well. Observed in Re Mr. Appadurai's comments on growth of student body that our own dependence on tuition makes the enrollment targets very important in terms of budget. A conversation on optimal size, particularly at Parsons and Lang, needs to take place. Felt that the optimal ratio is 2:1, undergrad to grad. Noted growth in traditional undergraduate enrollment and commensurate rise in selectivity. Needs of these traditional undergraduates differ from BA student at NSU – for example, demand for a gym and library and common space and dormitories, which are across the board insufficient at this time. Noted the huge price of real estate in this neighborhood. Will announce a new and serious capital campaign to meet these needs which require a serious increase in endowment and therefore non-tuition income that can support faculty and students. Committed himself to openness in discussion on optimal size of University.

Mr. Miller

Addressed to Mr. Appadurai a question re procedure of deliberation: is it wise to present the same document to faculty and Board at the same time; does this not create the impression that document is fixed and decided before discussion with faculty has had time to take place? Noted impression that pressure to present documents leads to insufficient substantive input from faculty.

Mr. Appadurai

Acknowledged Mr. Miller's concerns, and spoke to the constraints of the process, such as the curiosity of Governing boards; the demands of progress as opposed to the long timelines of academic processes of deliberation; the risk of leadership change during same; the necessity to make hiring decisions. How do we move forward in a serious and thoughtful way while ensuring that faculty feels as vested as possible. Noted that even when the administration comes to a plan, it will always be in some ways provisional. The objective, then, of the summer is to arrive at the point where we have an object of serious deliberation.

Ms. O'Neill

Requested update on the issue of one year hires.

Mr. Appadurai

Responded that 54 new hires are authorized (9 still pending at Board) Parsons has an impressive number. One year hires are multi-year renewable.

Ms. Jung

Asked to what extent the hiring next year will be directed by the bridge themes?

Mr. Appadurai

Responded to the extent that Dean's find Bridge Themes consonant with intra and inter divisional needs as a way to bring our faculty together more naturally than is currently the case.

Mr. Packard

Wondered whether the Faculty Handbook Subcommittee will be participating in the academic planning taking place over the summer.

Ms. O'Neill

Noted that Faculty Handbook Committee is not a senate subcommittee. This committee is comprised of faculty from the Seante and faculty at large from Lang, Parsons, TNS, and the GF. The Executive Committee was asked to recommend faculty for this summer project by the Provost's office.

Mr. Appadurai

Affirmed the participation of the Faculty Handbook Committee in the work over the summer.

Introduced Lisa Brower and Allen Jones and his presentation of the Digital Library.

Ms. Brower

Conducted introduction to the work at Library. Launch of information literacy curriculum and availability of instruction. Noted new position of Undergraduate Librarian who will promote the use of library and learning resources specifically at Lang; an important strategic move. Also in progress is acceleration of acquisition development and undergraduate resource development. Important grants have been received to work on archival material.

Introduced the Digital Library as mutual space that would overcome balkanization of libraries and consolidate the management of huge digital resources. Noted that an increase in electronic literacy is tied to an increase in library foot traffic.

Mr. Jones

Presented the digital library. Power point presentation available on website?

Ms. O'Neill

Reported on the results of divisional elections. New School for Drama will be delayed until the fall. Milano elections are in progress. Jazz is still unclear. Mannes is still in progress. Results will be posted on Website when the elections are completed. The Executive Committee is recommending that a standing election committee be established early this coming year to work with schools on voting process and calendar for elections.

Mr. Stone

Reported on difficulties in conducting elections at Mannes, and confusion as to the role of the Dean in these elections.

Ms. O'Neill

Affirmed the Executive Committee's intention to work with Mannes to settle this problem

Mr. Miller

Inquired as to the status of Faculty Senate Office.

Mr. Appadurai

Offered that space is the limiting factor.

Ms. O'Neill

Emphasized that the Faculty Senate Office is a very important symbolic statement about the Senate's stature in the school. Pointed out the existence of the Faculty Senate Website.

Ms. O'Neill

Discussion items.

1) Executive committee recommends that election of new officers take place at the first

meeting of this next year. Noted that the executive committee will need to be reconstituted in large part.

2) In re standing committees, the new Executive Committee will need to replace members as needed, and establish new leadership as needed.

Ms. Sebek

Reported on the Faculty Handbook Committee. Established that it is a collaborative effort that spans the entire University. Reported on membership: three senators, (Edwin Melendez, Anezka Sebek, Bill Hirst), five other members (Rachel Heiman, Val Vinokurov, Jennifer Wilson, David Brody, Lisa Grocot). Three additional faculty have agreed to participate as needed: Rikki Abzug (Milano), Michael Schober, (GF), and Noah Isenberg (TNS). Eliza Nichols and Ms. Sebek chair, and Kathy Trowers is the consultant. Three meetings will take place over the summer. When the document is prepared, a special Senate meeting will review the draft.

Ms. O'Neill

Conducted approval of minutes, which were approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon

**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

**New School University
Faculty Senate
Working Session**

**Tuesday, September 27, 2005
8:30 AM – 10:30 AM**

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC
Keith Buhl, NSD
Bill Coco, NSD
Dennis Derryck, Milano
Terri Gordon, NSGS
Peter Haratonik, NSGS
Bill Hirst, Co-Chair, NSSR
Jose de Jesus, Parsons
Mary Judge, Co-Chair, Parsons
Robert Kirkbride, Parsons
Mark Larrimore, ELC
Lily Ling, NSGS
David Loeb, Mannes
Arun Luthra, NSJCM
Edwin Melendez, Co-Chair, Milano
James Miller, NSSR
Jimmy Owens, NSJCM
Edward Powers, Milano
Anezka Sebek, Parsons
Ken Stevens, Parsons
Ben Taylor, NSGS

Guest: David Brody, Faculty Handbook Committee

Absent

Neil Gordon, Secretary, ELC; Kasia Gruda, Parsons; Susan Hambleton, Parsons; Claudio Lomnitz, NSSR; Bill Pace, NSGS; Christopher Stone, Mannes; Nova Thomas, Co-Chair ex officio, NSD

Mr. Melendez

Called meeting to order. The procedure for approving minutes using the Faculty Senate's web site was explained.

Mr. Hirst

Introduced a resolution on the procedure for approving a revised Full-Time Faculty Handbook.

Mr. Miller

Seconded the resolution.

Discussion

The Senate discussed the resolution section by section, with Mr. Melendez soliciting positive and negative comments on each section. Issues raised, discussed, and resolved were:

a) The role part-time faculty should play in the approval process. Several Senators strongly urged that input from part-time faculty was important, both because of their distinctive perspective and because some eventually join the Half-Time or Full-Time Faculty. A motion was made, seconded, and approved that part-time faculty should not only join in the discussion when the Faculty Senate and its committees review the draft of a revised Handbook, but also have an equal vote when the Faculty Senate decides on its final approval.

b) The availability of the current draft of the revised Faculty Senate. Inasmuch as the Faculty Senate decided that both full-time, half-time, and part-time faculty would participate in the discussion about the Handbook, the Senate felt that wide distribution was necessary.

c) The difficulties of having a full and fair discussion in each division when many of the divisions' governance structure is either non-existent or vague. It was resolved that

Senators from each division in which this is the case should discuss with their Dean an appropriate structure for engaging faculty in a discussion about the revised Handbook.

d) The appropriate number of assemblies. The resolution called for university-wide assemblies of faculty in order to encourage cross-divisional discussion. In the end, it was decided that two would be appropriate.

e) The nature of the vote needed to forward the draft of the revised Handbook to the Provost's Office. There was disagreement as to whether only a majority, a two-third majority, or unanimity at the divisional and Faculty Senate level would be necessary to move the draft forward. The major worry was that one or two divisions should not feel that the other divisions did not fully take into account their concerns when casting a vote. A motion was made, seconded, and approved that the vote remain as in the original document, which required a 2/3 vote. It was clarified that this 2/3 majority could apply to the document over all, or in the case that it failed, to each section of the document.

f) The issue of a secret ballot. The original resolution required each division to employ secret balloting. Although some Senators felt that the Senate should not dictate to divisions how they governed, a motion was introduced, seconded, and approved that the secret balloting should remain in the resolution.

The final, approved resolution is attached.

Mr. Miller

Introduced a motion to consider a resolution concerns the rights and responsibilities of full-time and half-time (that is, non-union) faculty in the event of a strike.

The motion was seconded.

The following points of discussion ensued:

It was felt that the recent e-mails from the Provost contained language that could be construed as threatening. More to the point, the e-mails seemed to assume that non-union faculty have the responsibility to continue to teach their own courses and to help by teaching courses taught by striking faculty.

Several Senators reported conversations with their Department Chair or other academic administrators about the need to cover classes in the event of the strike. Many Senators were concerned that these conversations simply presupposed that non-union faculty would participate in such an undertaking.

There was general agreement that such assumptions on the part of the Provost and other

administrators were not justified and that faculty should have the right to act on their consciences without consequence.

Several Senators wondered about the effectiveness of the resolution. They were concerned that it would alienate the administration, while providing little protection to faculty.

After some minor changes to the resolution, it was decided that a vote should take place over e-mail.

The resolution is attached.

New School University
Faculty Senate

Tuesday, October 18, 2005
8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction

Mr. Melendez

President's Report

Mr. Kerrey

Provost's Report

Mr. Appadurai

Discussion

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC
Arjun Appadurai, Provost
Sherry Brabham, VP, Chief of Staff
Keith Buhl, NSD
Neil Gordon, Secretary, ELC
Terri Gordon, NSGS
Kasia Gruda, Parsons
Susan Hambleton, Parsons
Peter Haratonik, NSGS
Bill Hirst, Co-Chair, NSSR
Jose de Jesus, Parsons
Mary Judge, Co-Chair, Parsons
Bob Kerrey, President
Robert Kirkbride, Parsons
Mark Larrimore, ELC
Lily Ling, NSGS
David Loeb, Mannes
Arun Luthra, NSJCM
Edwin Melendez, Co-Chair, Milano
James Miller, NSSR
Eliza Nichols, Associate Provost
Jimmy Owens, NSJCM
Edward Powers, Milano
Cecila Rubino, ELC
Anezka Sebek, Parsons
Ken Stevens, Parsons
Ben Taylor, NSGS
Jonathan Veitch, Dean, ELC

Absent

Bill Coco, NSD; Dennis Derryck, Milano; Claudio Lomnitz, NSSR; Bill Pace, NSGS; Christopher Stone, Mannes; Nova Thomas, Co-Chair ex officio, NSD

Mr. Melendez: Opening Remarks

Opened the meeting at 8:40. Welcomed visiting Deans: Jonathan Veitch (ELC), Ben Lee (NSSR), and Linda Dunne (NSGS).

Minutes were distributed, approval for next week.

Mr. Kerrey: President's Address

The President commented on the strong state of the University as he finishes his fifth calendar year. He discussed the University's progress in terms of coherence and quality; noted that our financial position is improving and that our endowment increased 50 percent to 6 million, which is still small, but going in the right direction.

Mr. Kerrey reported progress in the challenge of building infrastructure for university growth. Discussed alumni relations: \$38,000,000 was raised last year in cash and gifts; only a million from former students; this is the reverse of other universities. Only three of fifty members of board of trustees are former students. Academic programming is critical to donors; there is a need to tell donors what we are doing. The President gave the example of Len Riggio, CEO of Barnes & Noble, who is in negotiations to make a gift to writing MFA and writing at ELC.

Mr. Kerrey discussed the notion of cross-divisional work; writing as a "bridge" area across the university. Other cross-divisional areas: media and design. These areas are places where people can get excited to support with large gifts. This is a huge change from when he arrived: the establishing of fundraising goals and priorities.

An important priority: to grow the size and quality of full-time undergraduate population. Mr. Kerrey asked, what is the ideal size for ELC and Parsons? A figure of 10,000 undergraduates is meant to spark debate.

He then spoke about the annual process. It was modified in two ways:

In the past, the budget process was only about budget numbers. Now each school presents target of growth and budget process driven by a) enrollment growth; b) academic issues.

Enrollment and budgetary targets were set in an accelerated process that allows adjustment to real enrollment numbers.

Mr. Kerrey thanked the Senators for their participation. He closed by reporting on round-the-clock negotiations with the UAW; the agreement is still not there, but administration and union both hope to wrap up negotiations without strike. While no details can be announced in public, negotiations have been in exceptionally good faith.

Mr. Powers

Inquired as to progress of branding process.

Mr. Kerrey

Stated that it much more coherently describes who we are. Acknowledged that some problems exist in the graduate programs—International Affairs, Writing, and Media Studies will be made more independent in branding. But problems are all possible to solve. The real test will be how we communicate and what we communicate. This is connected to the enrollment process. All faculty need to be clear to communicate not who we used to be or who we want to be but who we are, with real communication of our strengths.

Ms. Gruda

Suggested that in planning for the next academic year, AAS is an example to study. We doubled enrollment that exceeded targets, and yet received no support from administration. Extreme space limitations exist, and insufficient support.

Mr. Kerrey

Called AAS an extraordinarily important program with huge support in the administration. The number one program in terms of enrollment growth and in other important parameters.

Mr. Owens

Asked about the many new buildings we are acquiring, whether they are rentals or purchases?

Mr. Kerrey

Answered that they are both. Our largest building project is 65 Fifth. 79 and 72 Fifth are leased. The residential unit in Chelsea is leased with an option to buy. NYU is the largest private university in the country, with 50,000 students. Being in the same neighborhood is good news but we are competing with them.

Mr. Owens

Noted that the Jazz and Contemporary Music program is running out of space.

Mr. Hirst

Returned the discussion to the budget program. Requested elaboration on the academic criteria as part of the program.

Mr. Kerrey

Responded that “Nothing is off the list.” Qualitative, objective peer review analysis is part of the budget process. The opportunity is afforded by the University to begin new academic programs, interdivisional enrollment, bridge themes. For example, linking NSSR and Parsons Fashion program.

Mr. Appadurai: Provost’s Report

The Provost spoke about the University Budget Committee meetings, where Deans will present proposals. The first will not be about enrollment, but short statements from the Deans about priorities. The administration will respond so that there is a framework. It will be very specific. The second will concern targets and costs. We need a vision that the schools can share. Only after this will enrollment be discussed, and other budgetary concerns, in the context of academic priorities.

Mr. Appadurai addressed four points:

1) The Handbook Process resolution.

He thanked members of the Handbook committee and Senators and Deans for their work on this very important effort. He asked the Senate to recommend faculty to serve on the working group. He noted that the Senate is an advisory body. Senate procedures for the discussion of the Handbook blur the distinction between advising and governance.

He welcomed Faculty Senate recommendations, but any recommendation has to reflect the sentiments of the faculty as a whole. This body cannot reflect individual divisional concerns. He noted the deadline of 12/15/05.

2) Shared governance

Having looked at the shared governance proposal, Mr. Appadurai felt that the role of the Senate is to ensure that the faculty have sufficient say via appropriate governance faculties, so that the Deans make informed recommendations to administration. There are many mechanisms in each division to communicate to Deans, and at the end

of the day that faculty must come to the Dean. It is not useful or safe for the Senate to make its own recommendations or dictate divisional governance. If there is a different understanding, then discussion is needed.

3) Bylaws

The emendation process must be followed.

4) UAW Negotiations

The Provost hoped that this point can be engaged collegially in the context of the good faith, intense UAW negotiations. This is a centrally important negotiation, and the administration hopes for the best outcome. "Petition" is of concern with regards to full-time faculty: without disagreeing with the spirit behind the resolution, Mr. Appadurai disagreed that this is a matter of "personal conscience." He stated that personal conscience is a tricky concept. There are presumed obligations in a formal employment contract with the University. He hoped that personal conscience would play a role in evaluating that obligation.

Mr. Melendez

Invited discussion point by point.

Mr. Hirst

Spoke about serving on the Handbook committee; the handbook is in very good order. Accepted the Senate's advisory role; wished to assure that our advice is clearly articulated and clearly heard. Deadline: sympathetic to its necessity, but finds 12/15 very short.

Responded to the shared governance resolution: agrees that the Deans' role is not clearly enough articulated and correction is needed.

Mr. Melendez

Suggested splitting the debate into two issues: deadline and procedure.

Mr. Miller

Voiced concerns with the deadline.

Mr. Loeb

Responded that a lot of time, effort, and money have gone into the Handbook. It is more than ten years since the last. We all hope it is not a process we will have to go through again soon. The Handbook has a contractual role, including discipline, obligations, constraints. Without due discussion, this has something of the nature of an imposed contract.

Mr. Melendez

Responded that the substantive issue is whether this conversation can occur by 12/15. This requires a negotiation with the Provost's office. The Senate wishes to ensure a broad cross-divisional participation. The deadline we propose reflects our view of the process.

Mr. Appadurai

Asked if, and how late, the deadline could be moved? Agreed with Mr. Miller that it is not a two month or four month project. Stated that this process is not final: there is constant adjustment possible.

Questioned the incorporation of the Senate with the Deans. Urged that this issue and the deadline issue remain distinct.

Mr. Melendez

Asked could we agree on a timeframe as follows: feedback collected by Senate by 12/15?

Mr. Hirst

Responded that resolution states that divisional deliberation be finished by 12/15. Unfortunately, January does not allow deliberation. But we are not that far off as to deadline.

Mr. Appadurai

Suggested that Deans' deliberative process with faculty can include the Senate, rather than the Senate trying to include Deans.

Mr. Melendez

Proposed that faculty meetings be convened jointly with Deans for discussion.

Mr. Appadurai

Had no objection, but warned that this cannot work at all times in the future. We cannot connect the Senate and Deans into one gigantic governance machine.

Mr. Lee

Responded that the NSSR had no problem in calling and having joint meetings; they had already started the process.

Ms. Dunne

Expressed some doubt that the University will be able to work effectively in this mode, but will certainly look to Senate members of her school for feedback. It is a complicated process that requires careful approach.

Mr. Veitch

Agreed that legitimacy is required.

Mr. Hirst

Understood Mr.Appadurai's concern; nonetheless wished not to set precedent of an unelected body creating a Handbook without due consultative process.

Mr. Kirkbride

Suggested use of subcommittees as a way of digesting relevant issues in the Handbook and thereby conveying responses to the Senate.

Ms. Nichols

Stated that the Handbook is in very good shape; a few controversial or problematic matters shouldn't hold up the entire process.

Reminded the Senate that for 12 years the faculty have had no recourse, and that it is essential that there be a document like this.

Mr. Miller

Urged for delay.

Mr. Kerrey

Had no objection to delay. If 8 weeks is not enough, then what about 12, or 16? If the endpoint is to establish the Handbook, its legitimacy, and the University's authority to establish it, good. But how long does that take? We need to be clear about the scope of work before setting the time frame and deadline.

Ms. Ling

Reminded the Senate that there is no governance charter in place, and that it takes time to assemble and deliberate.

Mr. Kerrey

Proposed creating this governance structure.

Ms Ling

Was in agreement.

Mr. Kerrey

Inquired as to timeframe.

Ms Ling

Stated that 8 weeks, which include Thanksgiving, is impossible.

Ms. Dunne

Noted that she is Dean of a division without governance structure. All the Deans are in agreement that we can have meetings with full faculty by 11/15. The process is to collect feedback, not to produce or approve policy, and this is possible to do. We can go forward to work on governance *and* the faculty Handbook.

Mr. Loeb

Agreed that at Mannes, this process can take place. Reiterated that legitimacy is the important issue.

Mr. Appadurai

Reacted to these issues. A good Senate is not replaced by strong governance structures. We need to disentangle the important job being done by the Senate with this task: they are not inextricably involved. The Senate was elected in a painstaking process, is consultative, and is required to be in constant touch with its faculties. It is a serious body that is building itself; let us go as far as we can in deliberating about this deadline while not conflating that with the fact the Senate is developing itself internally.

Mr. Hirst

Stated the opinion that the current outline is sufficient.

Mr. Lee

Responded that the Deans will convene before the next Senate meeting, and begin discussions.

Mr. Hirst

Urged that we have “something” to the Provost by the 15th.

Mr. Melendez

Summarized the decisions. Made note that the handbook can be subject to further revision after deadline.

Mr. Miller

Urged that Deans attend all Senate meetings, if this is acceptable to the Provost.

Ms. Nichols

Responded that this is not a problem; our impression is that the Provost is not welcome during working sessions.

Mr. Buhl

Remarked that an agenda was not made for the second time.

Mr. Melendez

Adjourned the Senate at 10:24.

PAGE

PAGE 2

Draft - Minutes have not been approved by the University Faculty Senate

New School University Faculty Senate

**Tuesday, December 14, 2004
8:30 AM – 10:30 AM**

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction	Ms. Abelson
President's Report	Mr. Kerrey
Provost's Report Appadurai	Mr.
Faculty Committee Reports	
Faculty Issues	Mr. Quigley
Academic Planning	Ms. O'Neill
Governance	Mr. Miller
Discussion	

Members

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-Chair)
Arjun Appadurai, Provost
Jonathan Bach, TNS
Margot Bouman, PSD
Bill Coco, ASDS
Dennis Derryck, MGS
Julie Floch, MGS
Jeffrey Goldfarb, GF
Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)
Kasia Gruda, PSD
Bill Hirst, GF
Jose de Jesus, PSD

Courtney Jung, GF
Bob Kerrey, President, NSU
Kristina Kanders, Jazz
David Loeb, MCM
Arun Luthra, Jazz
Edwin Melendez, MGS
James Miller, GF
Rosemary O'Neill, PSD (Co-Chair)
Christopher Packard, ELC
Bill Pace, TNS
David Plotke, GF
Timothy Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)
Barry Salmon, TNS
Elaine Savory, ELC
Anezka Sebek, PSD
Ken Stevens, PSD
Christopher Stone, Mannes
Ben Taylor, TNS
Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)

Ms. Abelson: Chair's Opening Remarks

Opened meeting at 8:40. Introduced new members from Lang, Jazz, and Mannes. Noted this the first meeting where substantive issues are to be aired, and the goal of creating dialogue around a series of interlocking issues is to start. Reviewed establishment of three committees, names of participants, chairs, and charters [see committee documentation]. Appreciated that enormous work has been done; that we know more about ourselves than any time in our history, and we have begun to think and talk and colleagues in terms of our own divisions and other parts of our university. Emphasized that our agenda is to ask how we as a Faculty Senate can contribute to the discussion of these key issues in the university.

Mr. Kerrey: President's Report

Opened by noting that Provost Appadurai and the University's Deans are working on modified five-year academic plans for each division, due on Wednesday, December 15. Reported on plans for significant expansion and improvement of physical plant, notably Parsons, and Lang of which both face imminent need for considerably improved spaces. Noted that the challenge of change is more and more full time students, and while it would be a mistake to abandon historic mission of adult education,

public programming and national debate, the challenge is to meet this historic needs while evolving as a university.

Lang, for example, has doubled its size over the past ten years, and requires increased student services, residential services, health services. The same is true for parsons as well as for increasingly young New School students: all require libraries, Athletic facilities, indoor common space, a stronger sense of campus. If Mannes is to be brought on campus, we need a significant performance space. This is the continual challenge: as we become more of a traditional university not to become a traditional university but to grow while retaining our traditional missions.

The University has signed a lease for 79 5th Avenue, where the Graduate Faculty will move into this facility in order to enable us to begin process of rebuilding 65 fifth which, in turn, that will accommodate both growth and quality needs in Parsons and Lang. New spaces present tremendous opportunity to create academic programming. Will add 300,000 square feet to the university; will consolidate the campus with signature buildings and a real sense of place both internally and externally. Substantial fundraising: 200,000,000 for 65 Fifth, 20,000,000 for 79.

Hoped that faculty is fully engaged in and enthusiastic about academic planning as presented by deans in their five-year Plans. Lots of pressure on Provost, Dean, and Senate to accelerate academic planning and programming. Challenges: lead time of new programs for catalog: this January deadline for fall 06, at the latest March 1 for printing. We need to be thinking about new programs, to use critical advantage of being in New York. We can develop distinct advantage over NYU and Columbia — these are our competitors because already in New York. Need to think creatively about how to give the best undergraduate experience. Doesn't want to short change Milan and GF as key players. Very keen interest in joint degree programs, BA/BFA (81 students) enormously impressive. Not advertised or marketed, a difficult program to enter or to stay in. Only recently hired Adrienne Marcus to advocate for them. High achieving highly motivated students. A signpost of where this university needs to go.

Mr. Appadurai

Reported that planning is moving to a different level and both Provost and Deans and expressed welcome for input from Faculty Senate. Provost's office intends to read Faculty Senate Committee reports carefully and respond carefully, but asks that

we note timeframe issues and the need to share ideas and concerns across the University in an accelerated pace. This spring a very important time to consider academic planning, need to start early with this Senate both in matters of process and substance.

The administration is planning to provide a map for the coming three to five years. Space and capital improvement will be driving forces. A lot of institutional changes are being made in parallel, there is need for a lot of good faith, a lot of planning, a lot of listening. The spring is a very key time for the intermeshing of new ways of working together, collaborating, talking. We need a sturdy, robust, trust-based set of tools to achieve to consensus about important change and processes.

Ms. O'Neill

Asked if the Senate may have a sense of 5-year plan that we can plan in parallel?

Mr. Appaduari

Hoped to have it available by mid January.

Mr. Kerrey

Assured that the administration lay out a modifiable and flexible planning process. Current five-year plan has been exceeded in some ways (student numbers) and altered in other ways (Parsons' original emphasis on grad programs shifted with new Dean to undergrad). New programs require tracking and modifying. The budget process requires flexibility in terms of new ideas and new programs and correction of mistakes due to our excessive reliance on tuition revenue rather than endowment. Thus the idea is to create an annual process to institute and track change. The administration has hired Cooper Robertson [sic] to do physical plant programming. Increases confidence from the donor community.

Ken Stevens

Noted the importance to address the Union Negotiations openly and in this body; asked for a sense of union's impact on resources.

Mr. Kerrey

Responded that negotiations are ongoing on continuous basis, currently at the stage of collection and sharing of data.

Reports of the Faculty Committees

Mr. Quigley

Report of Faculty Affairs Committee.

Ms. O'Neill

Report of the Academic Planning Committee

Mr. Miller

Introduced documents distributed to Governance Committee.
Introduced Dennis Derryck.

Mr. Derryck

Noted that process moving from corporate conglomeration to a university is in fact a governance issue. The context of our current development is that of self-governance, middle states, and union negotiation. Emphasized that we must understand that context to have this conversation and dialogue.

Mr. Miller

Report from the Faculty Governance Committee and presentation of the Resolution of the Faculty Senate on Faculty Self-Governance.

Emphasized that "thinking like a university requires providing faculty with the public space to think and decide on key issues of their government."

Mr. Derryck

Noted that the faculty needs the space not to respond to administration's initiatives but to participate fully in the formulation of those initiatives. How are these spaces to be created? Need a space where Deans council, Faculty, and Senate can be brought in. This is the necessary dialogue required before the next senate meeting.

Mr. Melendez

Noted the tremendous amount of work and the breakthrough of the way in which the Senate operates. Suggested change of terminology "self governance" to "shared governance."

Mr. Goldfarb

Recognized that administration can not respond immediately. Noted however that what minimally is required for us to be a university from the point of view of the faculty – space for discussion. Asked for agreement on this point. Noted that Mr. Kerrey's description of the institution's competitive strength of connection to the city: in this sense the faculty of the university is a body of people who are connected to New York, and that the academic planning should use, as efficiently as possible, the faculty's connection to New York. Would appreciate being able to hear in this meeting that the administration shares our concern to establish a shared space.

Mr. Kerrey

Responded that the Senate itself is a demonstration of the administration's commitment to establishing such a space. Preliminary responses include that Mr. Kerrey does not support a Dean's Council. Sharing budget information is a terrific idea – some is personal, some is proprietary, but up to those two points a transparent budget is practical and desirable. UAW negotiations, too, will have real impact. Noted that there are some things in the University that will never make money, always be subsidized. But those programs that can produce revenue must support that subsidy, and in turn, those programs need allocation of capital to them. Noted that regularization of appointments came right out of self-study.

Mr. Appadurai

Noted that these reports are serious, detailed, overlapping, and require thoughtful study. Saw of crosscutting issues. Stated that there has been a challenge to move forward that could not wait for Senate to constitute itself as working body. Identified key points: 1: Conversation has begun, seriously, in the University and Senate will be a part of this. 2: Addressed structural issue of how the Senate relates to deans. Felt that a Deans council seems another, unnecessary level. 3: Notes that organizational structures across the university vary. Finding solutions to this is not a quick business, and we need to work on this, starting here.

Mr. Kerrey

Expressed determination to frustrate this process in a minor way. Would like to have a place where these discussions to go on, and wishes the Senate to be that place.

Mr. Appadurai

Expressed appreciation for the Committee Reports

Mr. Quigley

Noted importance of having a Dean present at every Faculty Senate meeting, per bylaws.

Mr. Kerrey

Noted need to formalize that one of the members will be present and then report back.

Mr. Appadurai

Proposed that deans should be present at the Senate and that some of Senate leadership attends the Dean's meeting.

Mr. Kerrey

Emphasized that undergraduates are a very important foundation for the University, and a population that must be grown coherently.

Mr. Miller

Proposed moving briskly to produce Faculty Governance guidelines division-by-division. Noted the tension between the wish for accelerated planning and that for participatory planning.

Mr. Appadurai

Proposed that the more the Faculty Senate communicate with constituencies, the stronger participation becomes.

NOTE: The meeting continued for some short time beyond this end of the recorded minutes.