

New School University Faculty Senate

March 9, 2004

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction	Mr. Howell
President's Report	Mr. Kerrey
Provost's Report	Mr. Appadurai
Discussion: Role of the Provost's office	Mr. Appadurai

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC	Colleen Macklin (substitute for Christopher Mount) PSD
Arjun Appurdurai, Provost	Edwin Melendez, MGS
Jonathan Bach, TNS	Honor Moore, TNS
Sherry Brabham, NSU	Rosemary O'Neill, PSD
Laura Maria Censabella, ASDS	Timothy Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex- officio)
Julie Floch, MGS	Barry Salmon, TNS
Jeffrey Goldfarb, GF	Anezka Sebek, PSD
Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)	Roger Shepherd, PSD
Kasia Gruda, PSD	Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)
David Howell, TNS	Eli Zaretsky, GF
Bob Kerrey, President, NSU	
Jack Kytle, Associate Provost	

Mr. Howell started the meeting at 8:40

Mr. Kerrey: President's Report

1. Provost: Mr. Kerrey welcomed Arjun Appadurai and described his excitement at Mr. Appadurai taking the helm of the academic issues facing the college: our projected growth from 7,000 to 10,000 students; our five-year plan of building expansion; other plans such as bringing Mannes into the downtown campus.
2. Appointments: Mr. Kerrey announced the appointment of Ben Lee as Dean of the

Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, effective July 1st, when Dean Bernstein will return to faculty, and Sam Schacht as the Dean of Actor's Studio Drama School. He reported also on the progress of interviews for candidates at Parsons.

3. Events: Mr. Kerrey provided a resume of recent public events at the New School, and of upcoming fundraising events.

4. UAW: Mr. Kerrey announced that he has filed an appeal with the NLRB (National Labor Relations Board) asking that the recent election of the UAW to represent the university's part-time faculty be nullified on the grounds of low voter turnout and an insufficient margin of victory; and that new elections be scheduled that would redress some of the UAW's failures in designing the recent elections.

5. Identity Project: Work continues on the Segal and Gale strategic brand and identity research to arrive at a new name and branding for the New School. A further meeting will be scheduled for discussion with Faculty Senate.

Questions to Mr. Kerrey

1. In response to Mr. Gordon Mr. Kerrey explained that legal precedent exists to challenge a Union election on the grounds of low voter turnout.

2. In response to Mr. Loeb Mr. Kerrey articulated the mechanisms to a fair election that he feels were neglected: location, scheduling, and affirmative communication of eligibility.

3. In response to Mr. Howell Mr. Kerrey explained the rationale behind the Identity Project as the need for the University to define itself internally, and then to the public, as well as his desire to see rebranding completed by Convocation.

4. In response to Mr. Zaretsky Mr. Kerrey explained the consultative process by which he arrived at his decision to appeal the elections as involving meetings with the Provost, the Deans, and counsel. He described his main worry about the Union as centering on their possible non-economic demands and his preference that the properly academic issues involving part time faculty should be taken up by the Faculty Senate.

Mr. Appurdurai: Provost's Report

1. Opening remarks: Mr. Appurdurai spoke about the New School's larger mission of "principled debate" in the context of academic vision, the union, and the overall conception of the New School as a progressive institution.

2. Senate Bylaws: Mr. Appurdurai reported on his continuing review of the Faculty Senate bylaws, and the need to define the meaning of the Senate as an "advisory" body.

3. Bridge Themes/University Wide Academic Plan: Mr. Appurdurai addressed the themes of the University Wide Academic Plan. He defined five foci as a) Media and Media Arts, b) Environment, c) Culture, Market, and Trade, d) Cities, and e) Technologies of Creativity. These themes will be instituted across the university and guided by co-chaired, cross-divisional academic committees under Mr. Appurdurai's control.

4. Bridge Themes/University Wide Academic Plan: Mr. Kerry interjected a number of comments about fundraising in connection with Mr. Appurdurai's vision of a University Wide Academic Plan, accenting his conviction that there are ample donors available who need to be given a clear conception of what the university is. This is all the more necessary given the degree to which the University is undercapitalized, particularly as measured by the level of student debt at graduation. Using the example of the Fashion Industry, Mr. Kerrey illustrated how the University Wide Academic Plan can be described to a donor, as involving the entire community across the board with this 400 billion dollar industry, starting with design at Parsons and ending with an analysis of the global economics of Cotton at the Graduate Faculty.

Questions to Mr. Appurdurai

1. In response to Mr. Goldfarb, Mr. Appurdurai described a timeframe of 12-18 months to put the University Wide Academic Plan in place.

2. In response to Ms. Moore, Mr. Appurdurai acknowledged that the centrality of artistic pursuit per se can not lost in a discussion of the University Wide Academic Plan; that artistic pursuit is an end in itself supported by the University rather than as a means to teach, for example, new technologies.

3. In response to Ms. Abelson, Mr. Appurdurai commented that ULS and his academic plan are parallel efforts springing from a common impulse.

4. In response to Mr. Melendez, Mr. Appurdurai emphasized that race, integration, demographic cultural exchange and diversity will be central themes in all foci of the University Wide Academic Plan.

Executive Session

Following the Provost's report, the Faculty Senate went into Executive Session and discussed the agenda of future meetings in the absence of members of the administration.

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon

New School University Faculty Senate

April 21, 2004

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction

Ms. O'Neill

Provost's Report

Mr. Appadurai

University Identity Project

Ms. O'Neill

Present

Elaine Abelson
Arjun Appadurai
Jonathan Bach
Mary Barto
Jeffrey Goldfarb
Neil Gordon
Kasia Gruda
David Howell
Jack Kytle
David Loeb
Arun Luthra

Andy McKee
Edwin Melendez
Honor Moore
Rosemary O'Neill
Timothy Quigley
Barry Solomon
Anezka Sebek
Roger Shepherd
Nova Thomas
Eli Zaretsky

Colleen Macklin

Ms. O'Neill started the meeting at 8:40

Mr. Appadurai: Provost's Report

1. Toby Volkman: Mr. Appadurai introduced a new member of his staff, Toby Volkman, noting her Ph.D. in Anthropology from Cornell and her background at the South East Asia Social Science Research Council, the Ford Foundation, and Columbia.

2. Senate Bylaw Ratification: Mr. Appadurai reported that the Senate Bylaws have been ratified by Executive Committee of the Board and that he expects ratification by the full board on May 4. Mr. Appadurai further expressed his view that the Senate's contribution to university governance will be beyond rubberstamping and his satisfaction that we are ready to graduate from interim status.

3. United Auto Workers: Mr. Appadurai spoke hopefully of the union process. He expressed concern that the UAW and the Faculty Senate not overlap in their roles, noting that in his view that the Faculty Senate should distinguish itself from the UAW by focusing on academic issues and keeping the value, autonomy of Senate distinct from the union.

4. Faculty Appointments Policy: Mr. Appadurai noted the huge prolixity of contracts and arrangements throughout the University and the necessity, therefore, for a genuine effort to think more consistently about principles of appointment, rank, and tenure. For the moment the Provost's office is focusing on, and taking proposals to the Board for, those individuals with multiyear, renewable appointments. The current proposals do not apply to union eligible part-time faculty or faculty already holding tenure.

A. Multiyear Renewable Contracts: The important principal for this group of teachers is to make available to all divisions the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full professor (currently available only in the GF and Milano). Particular divisions, through their Deans, can decide to opt in or out. For those divisions opting in, the conversion to these titles will be of faculty who may occupy any number of types of title and according to criteria specific to each school. Provost will review Deans' recommendation and then recommend to the Board.

B. Tenure: Future work on Faculty Appointments Policy will involve tenure and seek to rationalize policy with the current reality of tenure. Mr. Appadurai recognized that this will involve controversy: some feel that these ranks are not meaningful without tenure. Mr. Appadurai disagrees, noting that throughout country ranks exist in absence of tenure.

5. Debate: Mr. Appadurai welcomed debate, and expressed confidence in progress being made the Faculty Appointment Policy Debate is welcome, but in general Mr. Appadurai sees as significant progress.

Questions to Mr. Appadurai

1. In response to Ms. O'Neill, Mr. Appadurai noted that some reservations about the Faculty Appointment Policy have been voiced by Deans, notably Dick Bernstein, but that on the whole a poll of Deans revealed strong support.

Ms. Volkman added that these reservations, which are largely about process rather than entitlement, are already reflected in Mr. Appurdurai's policy.

2. In response to Mr. Howell, Mr. Appadurai noted that although elsewhere "Associate" status usually confers tenure, the distinction is still meaningful in the absence of tenure, firstly for teachers who have given up tenure to come to Lang, and secondly as recognition of teachers who fully deserve this rank independently of tenure.

3. In response to Ms. Abelson, Mr. Appadurai explained that rank and tenure, for the moment, are being formally disassociated: the variety of faculty and position makes this a desirable desirable until the two come to seem naturally convergent. This convergence is an object, but at the end of a long road.

4. In response to Mr. Melendez's concern that the disassociation between rank and tenure may not represent real progress, Mr. Appadurai noted A) that there is normal tenure only in the GF; that everywhere in the University there is a range of variation, and that there is no clear path to rationalizing across the board; and B) that this is not only a step toward tenure, but an end in itself to supply some reliability and security across the board

5. In response to Mr. Loeb's concern that the Faculty Appointment Policy process may institutionalize troubling full-time/part-time disparities, Mr. Appadurai agreed that this is a concern that will arise in many contexts and that therefore it may be prudent to allow Deans to opt out of this process.

Ms. O'Neill: University Identity Project

Ms. O'Neill distributed the Siegel and Gale Powerpoint Presentation of the University Identity Project including proposed title of the University, titles of Divisions, and textual descriptions of the University and its divisions.

Note: presentation can be downloaded at

http://www.siegelgaledev.com/newschool/Project_Mirror.ppt

(Note that there is an underline between Project and Mirror: Project_Mirror)

Username: newschool

Password: projectmirror

Questions and Discussion about the Siegel and Gale Presentation

1. Mr. Appadurai noted that although discussion continues, less contentiously, about the textual descriptions, moreso about the names of the divisions, the objective of the discussion is to achieve the maximum consensus within a realistic timeframe, and emphasized that closure is close.

2. In response to Ms. Abelson, Mr. Appadurai noted that responses from the Lang constituency had not indicated that it was important for Lang's name to reflect that it is an undergraduate institution.

3. Mr. Goldfarb expressed the conviction that Lang's name should emphasize college and thus the identity of classical liberal arts college. He questioned the absence in the textual descriptions -- street-smart, creative, eclectic, activist -- of concepts like scholarship, serious intellectual gravity, etc..

4. Mr. Zaretsky agreed that this language is misguided.
5. Mr. Howell strongly disagreed with the loss of The Graduate Faculty's title.
6. Mr. Loeb expressed the concern that many at Mannes will be unhappy with of absence of "scholarship" in keywords and, notably, with the new naming of Mannes as a "school." "College", Mr. Loeb explained, has long distinguished Mannes from the other two music "schools" in New York as well as reflecting the scholarship and historical content of its development as a "college" in 1952.
7. Ms. Macklin expressed the opinion that the new names are somewhat contrived, advertising-speak. More important is the opportunity they provide to bring a discussion to colleagues from the bottom up in order to understand better what we stand for, reimagine ourselves, and identify how we "bridge" to our colleagues
8. In response to concerns raised by Mr. Melendez, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Howell, Ms. Savory, and others about the possibility of he Senate debating and making recommendations concerning the Identity Project, Mr. Appadurai advised the senate to provide feedback directly to the administration, by email, whether individually or as a senate, within the next week, as Mr. Kerrey wishes closure on this subject.
9. In response to further concerns of the same nature, Mr. Appadurai expressed the conviction that further discussion will not necessarily yield further clarity on the questions of the Identity Project. He further felt that the importance of the Identity Project can be overemphasized: it is the process of self definition that is important.
10. Mr. Appadurai further spoke to the issue of change and the ambient anxiety generated by change, expressing the conviction that it is the process of becoming a whole that is meaningful; that anxiety about change should not obscure the real issues of how we hire, promote, govern, and teach. While the Identity Project is not trivial, Mr. Appadurai stated, it is Mr. Kerrey's to decide, a responsibility specifically given him by the Board.
11. Mr. Howell commented that while about the name of the university there is consensus, and about the names of the divisions there is contention, but about the positioning statement there is general outrage. He expressed disappointment that there remains only a week for the Senate address these concerns, and wondered whether the senate have been more proactive.
12. Mr. Zaretsky offered that the real issue is not a name is integration and synergy; that the Identity Project focuses anxiety on the wrong object.
13. Ms. O'Neill expressed concern as to Siegel and Gale. Who are they? Where will dissension be acknowledged in their presentation?
14. Ms. Savory noted that the simple fact of the Identity Project report existing in

Powerpoint made it difficult to share with faculty who generally do not possess the correct software, and noted that Powerpoint as a tool of communication and analysis is frequently held in suspicion for the small amount of information its presentations usually contain.

15. Mr. Appadurai reemphasized his conviction that the Identity Project is not important enough for too much focus or anxiety.

Ms. O'Neill adjourned the meeting at 10:00

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon

**April 27, 2004
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes**

Present:

Elaine Abelson
Arjun Appadurai
Jonathan Bach
Mary Barto
Jeffrey Goldfarb
Neil Gordon
Kasia Gruda
David Howell
Jack Kytle
David Loeb
Arun Luthra

Colleen Macklin
Andy McKee
Edwin Melendez
Honor Moore
Rosemary O'Neill
Timothy Quigley
Barry Solomon
Anezka Sebek
Roger Shepherd
Nova Thomas
Eli Zaretsky

Agenda

**Greetings and Introduction
Provost's Report
University Identity Project**

**Ms. O'Neill
Mr. Appadurai
Ms. O'Neill**

Ms. O'Neill started the meeting at 8:40

Provost's Report

1. Toby Volkman: Mr. Appadurai introduced a new member of his staff, Toby Volkman, noting her Ph.D. in Anthropology from Cornell and her background at the South East Asia Social Science Research Council, the Ford Foundation, and Columbia.
2. Senate Bylaw Ratification: Mr. Appadurai reported that the Senate Bylaws have been ratified by Executive Committee of the Board and that he expects ratification by the full board on May 4. Mr. Appadurai further expressed his view that the Senate's contribution to university governance will be beyond rubberstamping and his satisfaction that we are ready to graduate from interim status.
3. United Auto Workers: Mr. Appadurai spoke hopefully of the union process. He expressed concern that the UAW and the Faculty Senate not overlap in their roles, noting that in his view that the Faculty Senate should distinguish itself from the UAW by focusing on academic issues and keeping the value, autonomy of Senate distinct from the union.
4. Faculty Appointments Policy: Mr. Appadurai noted the huge prolixity of contracts and arrangements throughout the University and the necessity, therefore, for a genuine effort to think more consistently about principles of appointment, rank, and tenure. For the moment the Provost's office is focusing on, and taking proposals to the Board for, those individuals with multiyear, renewable appointments. The current proposals do not apply to union eligible part-time faculty or faculty already holding tenure.
 - A. Multiyear Renewable Contracts: The important principal for this group of teachers is to make available to all divisions the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full professor (currently available only in the GF and Milano). Particular divisions, through their Deans, can decide to opt in or out. For those divisions opting in, the conversion to these titles will be of faculty who may occupy any number of types of title and according to

criteria specific to each school. Provost will review Deans' recommendation and then recommend to the Board.

B. Tenure: Future work on Faculty Appointments Policy will involve tenure and seek to rationalize policy with the current reality of tenure. Mr. Appadurai recognized that this will involve controversy: some feel that these ranks are not meaningful without tenure. Mr. Appadurai disagrees, noting that throughout the country ranks exist in absence of tenure.

5. Debate: Mr. Appadurai welcomed debate and expressed confidence that progress is being made on the Faculty Appointment Policy.

Questions to Mr. Appadurai

1. In response to Ms. O'Neill, Mr. Appadurai noted that some reservations about the Faculty Appointment Policy have been voiced by Deans, notably Dick Bernstein, but that on the whole a poll of Deans revealed strong support.

A. Ms. Volkman added that these reservations, which are largely about process rather than entitlement, are already reflected in Mr. Appurdurai's policy.

2. In response to Mr. Howell, Mr. Appadurai noted that although elsewhere "Associate" status usually confers tenure, the distinction is still meaningful in the absence of tenure, firstly for teachers who have given up tenure to come to Lang, and secondly as recognition of teachers who fully deserve this rank independently of tenure.

3. In response to Ms. Abelson, Mr. Appadurai explained that rank and tenure, for the moment, are being formally disassociated: the variety of faculty and position makes this desirable until the two become convergent. This convergence is an objective, but at the end of a long road.

4. In response to Mr. Melendez's concern that the disassociation between rank and tenure may not represent real progress, Mr. Appadurai noted A) that there is normal tenure only in the GF; that everywhere in the University there is a range of variation, and that there is no clear path to rationalizing across the board; and B) that this is not only a step toward tenure, but an end in itself to supply some reliability and security across the board

5. In response to Mr. Loeb's concern that the Faculty Appointment Policy process may institutionalize troubling full-time/part-time disparities, Mr. Appadurai agreed that this is a concern that will arise in many contexts and that therefore it may be prudent to allow Deans to opt out of this process.

University Identity Project

1. Ms. O'Neill distributed the Siegel and Gale PowerPoint Presentation of the University Identity Project including proposed title of the University, titles of Divisions, and textual descriptions of the University and its divisions.

Note: presentation can be downloaded at

http://www.siegelgaledev.com/newschool/Project_Mirror.ppt

(Note that there is an underline between Project and Mirror: Project_Mirror)

Username: newschool

Password: projectmirror

Questions and Discussion about the Siegel and Gale Presentation

1. Mr. Appadurai noted that although discussion continues, less contentiously about the textual descriptions, more so about the names of the divisions, the objective of the discussion is to achieve the maximum consensus within a realistic timeframe, and emphasized that closure is close.
2. In response to Ms. Abelson, Mr. Appadurai noted that responses from the Lang constituency had not indicated that it was important for Lang's name to reflect that it is an undergraduate institution.
3. Mr. Goldfarb expressed the conviction that Lang's name should emphasize college and thus the identity of classical liberal arts college. He questioned the absence in the textual descriptions -- street-smart, creative, eclectic, activist -- of concepts such as scholarship, serious intellectual gravity, etc
4. Mr. Zaretsky agreed that this language is misguided.
5. Mr. Howell strongly disagreed with the loss of The Graduate Faculty's title.
6. Mr. Loeb expressed the concern that many at Mannes will be unhappy with the absence of "scholarship" in keywords and, notably, with the new naming of Mannes as a "school." "College", Mr. Loeb explained, has long distinguished Mannes from the other two music "schools" in New York as well as reflecting the scholarship and historical content of its development as a "college" in 1952.
7. Ms. Macklin expressed the opinion that the new names are somewhat contrived, advertising-speak. More important is the opportunity they provide to bring a discussion to colleagues from the bottom up in order to understand better what we stand for, reimagine ourselves, and identify how we "bridge" to our colleagues
8. In response to concerns raised by Mr. Melendez, Ms. Thomas, Mr. Howell, Ms. Savory, and others about the possibility of the Senate debating and making recommendations concerning the Identity Project, Mr. Appadurai advised the senate to provide feedback directly to the administration, by email, whether individually or as a senate, within the next week, as Mr. Kerrey wishes closure on this subject.
- 9: In response to further concerns of the same nature, Mr. Appadurai expressed the conviction that further discussion will not necessarily yield further clarity on the questions of the Identity Project. He further felt that the importance of the Identity Project can be overemphasized: it is the process of self definition that is important.
- 10: Mr. Appadurai further spoke to the issue of change and the ambient anxiety generated by change, expressing the conviction that it is the process of becoming a whole that is meaningful; that anxiety about change should not obscure the real issues of how we hire, promote, govern, and teach. While the Identity Project is not trivial, Mr. Appadurai stated, it is Mr. Kerrey's to decide, a responsibility specifically given him by the Board.
11. Mr. Howell commented that, while there is consensus about the name of the university, there is contention about the names of the divisions and outrage about the positioning statement. He expressed disappointment that there remains only a week for the Senate to address these concerns, and wondered whether the senate should have been more proactive.
12. Mr. Zaretsky offered that the real issue is not a name but integration and synergy; and that the Identity Project focuses anxiety on the wrong object.

13. Ms. O'Neill expressed concern about Siegel and Gale. Who are they? Where will dissension be acknowledged in their presentation?

14. Ms. Savory noted that the simple fact of the Identity Project report existing in PowerPoint made it difficult to share with faculty who generally do not possess the correct software, and noted that PowerPoint, as a tool of communication and analysis, is frequently held in suspicion for the small amount of information its presentations usually contain.

15. Mr. Appadurai reemphasized his conviction that the Identity Project should not be the focus of too much anxiety.

Ms. O'Neill adjourned the meeting at 10:00

Respectfully submitted,

Neil Gordon

New School University
Faculty Senate
May, 2004
12:30 PM --1:30 PM
66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Introductory Remarks	Mr. Quigley
President's Report	Mr. Kerrey
Discussion: University Identity Project	Mr. Kerrey

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC	Brian McGrath
Arjun Appurdurai, Provost	Edwin Melendez, MGS
Jonathan Bach, TNS	Honor Moore
Sherry Brabham	Timothy Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)
Julie Floch, MGS	Laura Maria Sensabella
,Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)	Barry Solomon, TNS
Kasia Gruda, PSD	Anezka Sebek, PSD
David Howell	Anwar Sheikh
Bob Kerrey, President, NSU	Roger Shepherd
David Loeb, MCM	Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)
Colleen Macklin (Substitute for Christopher Mount)	

Mr. Quigley: Introductory Remarks

Opened meeting at 12:25

1. A Brief History of the Faculty Senate. Mr. Quigley provided a brief history of Faculty Senate, from its inception at a Faculty Advisory Council meeting on March 5, 2002 to the present.

The aim of this initiative was to establish Faculty in a more central role in academic policy making at the University. To this end, discussions between Provost Elizabeth Dickey David Howell led to a March 6th meeting, called by Mr. Howell and Bob Beauregard, in which Mr. Howell, Mr. Beauregard, Jeff

Goldfarb, and Ann Snitow took the lead in initiating a series of meetings among faculty from across divisions. This in turn led to the formation of an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Governance. By April 12, 2002, the initial proposal for a University Senate had been drafted, and in May a small steering committee from the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee, which included Jim Miller and Anwar Shaikh, met with the President and Provost to discuss the formation of a permanent forum for faculty voice in university governance.

On May 16, 2002, an agreement was reached by Bob Kerrey, David Howell, Christopher Johnson, Rosemary O'Neill, Timothy Quigley, Anwar Shaikh, Sam Schacht, and Peter Wallace to dissolve the FAC and create a democratically elected interim committee, the University Faculty/President Committee (UFPC) for the 2002-2003 academic year, charged with the creation a permanent faculty governance structure.

During the 2002-2003 academic year, bylaws were drafted by a committee made up of Tim Quigley (Chair), Elaine Abelson, Mary Barto, Ed Powers, and Diana Wright.

During 2003-2004 Academic Year, the Interim Faculty Senate continued work on the bylaws, aided by Hiram Gordon, Gregory Spence, Jack Kytle, and Sherry Brabham. The bylaws were ratified in May of 2004.

2. The Near Future of the Faculty Senate. Mr. Quigley outlined a number of issues and challenges facing the senate.

- Elections to fill empty senate seats must be completed by fall.
- Officers, to replace Mr. Quigley and Mr. Howell, must be elected at the first Senate Meeting in the fall.
- Identification of Faculty Senate office space (per bylaws Article X).
- Selection of senate office assistant. (Article X)
- Compensation for part-time faculty.
- Compensation for Senate officers.
- Creation of local faculty governance structures in each division.
- Clarification of the process for bringing issues to the Senate. (When is it appropriate and most helpful for the Senate to weigh in on an academic issue?)

3. Final Remarks. Mr. Quigley emphasized the great debt the Senate owes to Provost Arjun Appadurai in his reading of the bylaws, and to Bob Kerrey for his support and challenge. Mr. Howell interjected an appreciation of Mr. Quigley's key work in the Senate.

Mr. Kerrey: President's Report

Development Committee. Mr. Kerrey reported on the increasingly important role of the

development committee. An inventory of all building spaces is underway, and planning is taking place for a number of projects including the rebuilding of 65 Fifth Avenue

Academic Strategy. Mr. Kerrey reiterated his view of the key importance of undergraduate education in building the University.

University Identity Project

Mr. Kerrey emphasized the importance of the University's public identity in view of the high degree of external confusion as to who we are. He discussed the need for a short, nuanced description of the University and its divisions as reflected in the Siegel/Gale research presented at

http://www.siegelgaledev.com/newschool/Project_Mirror.ppt
(username: newschool; password: projectmirror)

In response to a great deal of discussion about the Identity Project in which, to a greater or lesser degree, dissatisfaction was conveyed to the President from each division, Mr. Kerrey reiterated his central conviction that it is absolutely essential that change be effected in the names of the University and its divisions, and in the University's identity. Further, he reiterated that he is mandated by the Board of Directors to make this change, and that while he is interested in and receptive to discussion, he intends ultimately to fulfill this responsibility with an executive decision.

Further Discussion

Compensation of Part-time Representatives. In response to general support for compensation of part-time Senate Representatives and Ms. Sensabilla's particular suggestion of compensation at a rate of \$1000 per year, Mr. Appadurai questioned whether elected leadership at the University should be compensated at all. Mr. Kerrey warned as to the political complexity of this issue as illustrated by his experience on the US Senate. Mr. Goldfarb emphasized the particularity of the University's reliance on part-time faculty, and the necessity to reflect that reliance in compensation for work on the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Quigley at 1:30

Respectfully submitted,
Anezka Sebek and Neil Gordon

New School University

Faculty Senate

September 28, 2004

8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

66 West 12th Street, Orozco Room (712)

Agenda

Introduction

Mr. Quigley

Senate nominations and Voting

Ms. O'Neill and Mr. Quigley

Present

Elaine Abelson-Lang
Elaine Savory (after voting)-Lang
Jonathan Bach-International Affairs,
New School
Neil Gordon-Lang Chair
Kasia Gruda-Parsons
David Loeb-Mannes
Arun Luthra-NS Jazz
Edwin Melendez-Milano
Rosemary O'Neill-Parsons
Timothy Quigley-New School

Barry Salmon-New School
Anezka Sebek-Parsons.
Nova Thomas-Actor's Studio
Courtney Jung-Graduate Faculty
Jose de Jesus-Parsons, foundation
Dennis Derryck-Milano
Margot Bouman-Parsons
Bill Coco-Actor's Studio
Ben Taylor, Writing Division-New
School

Mr. Quigley: Introductory remarks

Senate's construction over three years has resulted in the structure of three Co-chairs and one secretary. Noted good rapport among members including ex officio members. Co-chairs responsible to work together to establish agenda which may involve some collaboration with President and Provost, but will remain nonetheless independent. The necessity of setting up a rational process for election to provide guidance for individual schools. Creation of subcommittees to handle substantive academic issues involved in the refashioning of the New School Community's academic culture. Issues brought before this body by the Provost's Office.

Tenured rank
Joint Appointment
Hiring policy
Reappointment policy

Model: a substantive collaboration on all matter of issues.

Ms. O'Neill

Noted the spirit of collaboration that has characterized this group, not only among senators but with ex officio members. Advised members to note the communication skills that allow progress to be made in the ambient culture of the University's governance. Read the pertinent article on elections from bylaws.

Ms. O'Neill and Mr. Quigley

Took nominations for new Co-chairs and secretary. Balloting was conducted, and votes were counted by two members who were not in nomination for any position.

Announcement was made of the election of

Co Chair	Elaine Abelson
Co Chair	Rosemary O'Neill
Co Chair	Nova Thomas
Ex Officio	Tim Quigley
Secretary	Neil Gordon

Discussion continued

On the question of how agendas are set; what is the proper role of consultation with the administration in setting agenda; the selection of appropriate items for discussion.

Respectfully submitted,
Anezka Sebek and Neil Gordon

New School University

Faculty Senate

Tuesday, October 5, 2004

8:30 AM – 10:30 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
Discussion	

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-Chair)	Arun Luthra, Jazz
Arjun Appadurai, Provost	Edwin Melendez, MGS
Jonathan Bach, TNS	Rosemary O'Neill, PSD (Co-Chair)
Margot Bouman, PSD	Bill Pace, TNS
Bill Coco, ASDS	Timothy Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)
Dennis Derryck, MGS	Barry Salmon, TNS
Julie Floch, MGS	Elaine Savory, ELC
Jeffrey Goldfarb, GF	Anezka Sebek, PSD
Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)	Ken Stevens, PSD
Kasia Gruda, PSD	Ben Taylor, TNS
José de Jesus, PSD	Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)
Courtney Jung, GF	
Bob Kerrey, President, NSU	
David Loeb, MCM	

Absent

Bill Hirst, GF; Jay Bernstein, GF; Neil Gordon appeared for Elaine Savory (Lang), who arrived at 9:40

Ms. O'Neill: Opening Remarks

Ms. O'Neill welcomed everyone and offered remarks on the nature and expectations of the Faculty Senate. She noted our charge is no longer to create a senate structure but to effectively deliberate on academic planning and policies, and to contribute to the ongoing development of New School University. We emphasized that we begin work this year in a spirit of productivity and collaboration.

Mr. Kerrey: President's Report:

The President commented on the strong state of the University as we open our Fall semester. Five new Deans are in office at Parsons, GF, Lang, Milano, and new leadership at the Actors Studio. The new Provost is in place with expanded authorities to manage the academic standards and quality of the university. There are ambitious plans for fundraising, notably for Parsons and its complex. 79 Fifth Avenue is under lease, and additional plans are under way for residential facilities; Chelsea dorms opened in the fall, and discussion is under way to effect changes in hiring, faculty housing, for ambitious programs being developed by Deans, and the facilities for writing programs. The India-China institute, a center planned by Arjun Appadurai, Provost, and Benjamin Lee, Dean of the Graduate Faculty will be established with funding provided by the Starr foundation.

The University will require a whole range of new services for our students, especially Lang and Parsons, all to provide a desirable environment for New School students. We will have to build new athletic services, library services, cultural services.

On the current status the UAW in New School University, Mr. Kerrey reported that the University is deliberating on the next step given the significant negotiating decisions and matters of principal,. He agreed to keep the Senate posted on future decisions and actions.

Mr. Loeb

Requested elaboration about situation at Mannes with respect to the Union.

Mr. Kerrey

Explained that the question is whether part time staff at Mannes are management and therefore excluded from Union.

Ms. O'Neill

Asked whether ongoing, preliminary conversations with the Union will curtail expansion plans.

Mr. Kerrey

Answered that the only effect is the boycott of public events.

Ms. Floch

Requested an update on Identity Project

Mr. Kerrey

Reported his decision to ensure that each college be united with a New School Brand. The New School logo will emphasize this. Divisions will be able to emphasize their own name, but not without association with "The New School". The logo will be unveiled on October 20, 2004 to the Board. No significant changes will occur until fall 2006 when it will be deployed.

Mr. Stevens

Raised questions as to the use of graphics in the new branding; hoped that a healthy dialogue would be held.

Mr. Kerrey

Responded with enthusiasm as to the flexibility of this new logo.

Mr. Taylor

Referred to the MFA Writing Program's inability to mount public programs due to the union sponsored boycott of public events.

Mr. Appadurai

Expressed the administration position that these events belong to the core of our academic culture and practice.

Mr. Loeb

Recounted similar experiences with master classes at Mannes that -- while not credit-bearing -- are significant opportunities for students.

Mr. Appadurai

Expressed that we are in a transitional period, a period of uncertainty, and we will need to watch how this progresses.

Mr. Appadurai: Provost's Report

The Provost opened with recognition of the Senate's potential as the deliberative and advisory body of the Faculty. He encouraged the Senate to ask what it means to think,

deliberate, discuss, and advise this administration as a faculty. That means finding an interesting balance between the interests of each constituency and becoming a faculty that is able to think about all the schools and divisions collectively and not only the separate matters. Senators will have an obligation and a temptation to speak for their local constituents but are challenged to think more broadly.

Mr. Appadurai discussed the Bridge Themes as a way for us to reflect on our curriculum and our hiring. The themes are not meant to establish a rigid guideline, nor to exclude other important issues.

Noted three substantive matters currently in train.

1: Full Time Faculty

In 1997, the University had 129 FT and 2059 PT faculty. In 2003 (the most recent year for which we have reliable data) the ratio is 169 : 1849. There is great consensus between Administration and Deans that we need to strengthen full-time faculty in this ratio.

In New York City, with the tremendous talent pool, it would be foolish not to take advantage of that wealth of talent by hiring professionals to teach part time. But increasing full time faculty will enhance our reputation and effectiveness, provide greater access to more fine teachers, and allow us to create a more coherent curriculum in the divisions and in the University.

2: Joint Full Time Hires

Lacking the resources to make all appointments to which the University aspires, our strategy is to operate in such a way so that each new hire will meet the needs of more than one division. This year we have 14 authorized searches, and 14 new hires, our maximum amount, and of the 14, ten are joint appointments between 2 divisions.

Noted problems. A) Special needs for a division: when divisional needs are serious, well argued, and defined, they will be recognized. But noted that joint hires do not float above the normal curriculum, but also can fulfill special needs: interdisciplinary positions are also disciplinary positions. B) Procedures: Deans are working hard on procedures for these hires from advertising to promotion.

3: Rank and Title

Criteria are being sketched out for a coherent system of rank and title for all new time full time hires. Rank and title will be an option for current FT faculty members. Deans are working on criteria for assessment and suggestion for each faculty member.

Mr. Luthra

Spoke in relation to ratio of FT:PT faculty at Jazz. Noted that throughout the University

there is an extraordinary willingness among PT faculty to participate in governance.

Mr. Appadurai

Recognized Jazz as a model of how things can be done.

Mr. Goldfarb

Expressed how impressed he is by progress, rapid progress -- “maybe too rapid.” Tremendous inertia has been broken by the Provost’s office, and the faculty has to figure out ways to meet the challenge in which the wisdom of the faculty can shape the agenda. Subcommittees need to be formed to study the Bridge Themes.

Ms. O’Neill

Noted that the creation of committees will be on the agenda of our 10/19 faculty meeting.

Mr. Kerrey

Told of how administration is communicating to staff and trustees qualitative aspirations. Last spring he wrote to the trustees saying that there can be no great university without a great undergraduate college.

Mr. Goldfarb

Agreed that the development of the college was a key to the aspirations of the New School to be a fine and more unified university. He suggested that this will best be achieved by drawing upon the strengths of other divisions, using the achievements and promise of the arts divisions in art and design, and drawing upon the strengths of the Graduate Faculty in the social sciences and philosophy. In its special relationships to the arts and the social sciences, with its distinctive divisional strengths, Eugene Lang can be one of the leading liberal arts colleges in the country.

Mr. Appadurai

Responded that the University of Chicago model of “looking for a few good men” is one with mixed results. Best and the brightest is not the best criterion.

Mr. Kerrey

Raised question of how we recognize those programs such as AAS which are generating subsidies for other programs? Senate must have the capacity to look at that issue in order to make certain that those schools that are enormously important financially get funded and get taken care of.

Noted that the University generates as much tuition, net, as MIT, even though we have 5

million in endowment (2 percent tuition revenue) and they have 80 million, thus 250 percent. Indicates the strength of the University. If we can come to terms with internal issues we can increase the source of non tuition revenue.

Mr. Melendez

Propose that we focus on what we are going to establish as a committee infrastructure, with 3 committees as above. Faculty affairs, curriculum, and internal governance.

Ms. Jung

Voiced that experience with joint faculty hires has been bad, partly because of ad hoc nature, partly because relationships between institution remain unformed. Feels this is being reproduced in that the new joint hires are coming into institutions with relationships that are still not formalized. Many of the new joint hires are Junior Faculty.

Mr. Appadurai

Explained that Deans are instructed to hold off on requesting new joint appointments if they are not ready for that task. There is a need to build a culture of understanding between the divisions and to look closely at setting up the criteria for excellence.

Ms. Gruda

Expressed need for a deepened understanding between divisions and noted a large discrepancy in faculty compensations between different divisions i.e. GF and Parsons.

Mr. Kerrey

Thanked everyone for helping create the common bell schedule, noting how useful for fundraising is the demonstration of efficient use of our resources.

Mr. Appadurai

Thanked the Associate Provost, Eliza Nichols and Toby Volkman, Deputy Provost and Chief of Staff.

Ms. O'Neill

Concluded the meeting at 10:15 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon and Anezka Sebek

**New School University
Faculty Senate
Working Session**

**Tuesday, October 19, 2004
8:30 AM – 9:45 AM**

66 Fifth Avenue, Room 720

Agenda

Present

Elaine Abelson, ELC (Co-Chair)
Margot Bouman, PSD
Dennis Derryck, MGS
Jeffrey Goldfarb, GF
Neil Gordon, ELC (Secretary)
Kasia Gruda, PSD
José de Jesus, PSD
Courtney Jung, GF
Bob Kerrey, President, NSU
David Loeb, MCM
Arun Luthra, Jazz

Edwin Melendez, MGS
Rosemary O'Neill, PSD (Co-Chair)
Bill Pace, TNS
Timothy Quigley, TNS (Co-Chair, ex-officio)
Barry Salmon, TNS
Anezka Sebek, PSD
Ken Stevens, PSD
Ben Taylor, TNS
Nova Thomas, ASDS (Co-Chair)

Absent

Julie Floch, MGS; Courtney Jung, GF; Elaine Savory, ELC; Jay Bernstein, GF; Jonathan Bach, TNS; Bill Coco, ASDS; Chris Packard, ELC

Ms. O'Neill

Opened the meeting with two agenda items: to form faculty committees; to discuss errors in the October 5th minutes.

Corrections to October 5th Minutes

Mr. Goldfarb

Objected to misrepresentation of his remarks in the October 5th minutes, offered corrections. Raised issue of communication of this misrepresentation elsewhere in the University.

Mr. Quigley

Remarked on the difficulty of the rumor mill; noted that quick communication and correction of the official record is required

Mr. de Jesus

Noted the need to use senate as platform for clarification of ideas.

Mr. Loeb

Emphasized the importance of setting up a mechanism for preventing this kind of error

Mr. Stevens

Hoped that beyond procedural responses, the Senate would act in a spirit of overcoming a set of familiar adversarial behaviors during this time of critical transition. There is a lot to overcome to institute a collaborative approach to our work, which is an unfamiliar style.

Ms. O'Neill

Called for any further correction to the minutes.

Formation of Senate Committees

Ms. O'Neill

Noted that the Executive committee has formed these committees in conformity with bylaws

Outlined the three committees to be formed

I Academic Planning:

II. Faculty Appointments:

III. Governance:

Noted that need to function as committee and subcommittees without attempting to represent single division; our charge is to bring inter-divisional interests to table. Charged committees to begin by identifying key issues from faculty point of view and how committees can shape those issues; to address how these issues to be discussed within each school . Committees will then put together a proposal on how each will address thee serious issues before them; this proposal will be discussed with the Provost

prior to next meeting. Recalled Mr. Appadurai's recommendation to the Senate that it avoids the temptation of speaking for our colleagues; rather than speaking to them

Mr. Miller

Questioned that committees are to be of equal size . The issue of faculty governance the primary issue before us and may mean defending mechanisms in place: in GF the faculty make decisions about hiring and governance. This is a particular issue that requires representation from every division in order to ensure that at this moment of transition a common playing field be instituted. We must marshal our divisions and impose a collective collegium to avoid having governance imposed from on high. No written bylaws exist for many divisions. Our power in transparency with each other, and clarity.

Ms. Thomas

Noted our first responsibility to gather information.

Mr. Melendez

Agrees with committee structure and long term agenda of same. Noted that the Provost is already making decisions on faculty appointment; Senate priority should be issue of interdisciplinary focus of the appointments being made. A Dean's governance structure exists; the Senate needs to find points of interaction so as to have timely input as decisions are being made. We are right now really running behind decision making process

Ms. O'Neill

Noted that the Senate bylaws require a Dean's presence as ex officio; a dean's presence has been solicited..

Mr. Miller

Pointed out that conventionally deans represent faculty; at NSU deans represent administration. Many deans will welcome being empowered by faculty; others won't. The faculty governance committee will need to examine how deans interact with the administration

Mr. Luthra

Noted Jazz's example of Dean advocating for program.

Ms. O'Neill

Announced preliminary roster of committees

Discussion Ensued

On various matters pertaining to rosters of committees and their charges: equal representation, workload, reservation of rooms, email lists, particularities of faculty governance at Jazz, necessity for representation from performing arts divisions. Several alterations in rosters were made and approved by the senate, and final assignments were announced:

I Academic Planning:

Jonathan Bach, The New School
Julie Flock, Milano
Jeff Goldfarb, Graduate Faculty
Rosemary O'Neill, Parsons, Chair
Elaine Savory, Lang
Ken Stevens, Parsons
Nova Thomas, Actor's Studio

II. Faculty Affairs:

Elaine Abelson, Lang
Kasia Gruda, Parsons
Courtney Jung or David Plotke, Graduate Faculty
Arun Luthra, Jazz
Edwin Melendez, Milano
Tim Quigley, The New School, Chair

III. Governance:

Bill Coco, Actor's Studio
Dennis Derryck, Milano
Neil Gordon, Lang
David Loeb, Mannes School of Music
Arun Luthra, Jazz
James Miller, GF, Chair
Barry Salmon, The New School
Anezka Sebek, Parsons

Mr. Luthra

Requested progress report on issue of compensation for Part Time faculty serving on Senate

Ms. O'Neill

Responded that no progress has been made

Mr. Luthra

Noted that Union contract at Jazz specifies such compensation; wondered at source of same for University wide service

Ms. Abelson

Noted that in this case, failing to compensate Part time members on Senate from Jazz would be failing to observe the union contract

Mr. Plotke

Questioned whether the Senate is defined as a committee under the Union contract.

Mr. Quigley

Noted that this is more than just a union issue as it affects other Part Time faculty who are not yet unionized.

Ms O'Neill

Adjourned the meeting at 9:45.

Respectfully Submitted
Neil Gordon

**New School University
Faculty Senate
Working Session**

**Monday, November 8, 2004
8:30 AM – 9:45 AM**

location?

Agenda

Preparation for reports from Senate Committees at Faculty Senate Meeting on Tuesday, December 14th, 2004

Present

Barry Salmon THS
Dennis Derryck MGS
Elaine Savory Lang
Edwin Melendez Milano
Ken Stevens PSD
Rosemary O'Neill Co-Chair PSD
Nova Thomas Actors Studio
Timothy Quigley TNS

Bill Coco ASDS
Jeffrey Goldfarb GF
Anezka Sebek PSD
Jim Miller GF
Courtney Jung GF
Kasia Gruda PSD
Jose de Jesus PSD

Absent

David Plotke, GF; Margot Bouman, PSD; Bill Pace, TNS; Ben Taylor, TNS; David Loeb, MCM; Chris Packard, ELC; Arun Luthra, Jazz; Jonathan Bach, TNS; Bill Hirst, GF; Julie Floch, MGS; Jay Bernstein, GF; David Plotke, GF

Ms. Abelson, as Chair, opened the meeting at 8:40.

Mr. Quigley

Reported on Faculty Affairs Committee. Summarized Provost's proposed policy for rank and title; noted language specifying wide faculty involvement in process. See Appendix 1: Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Mr. Miller

Noted language "affected faculty" in proposal for participation; questioned vagueness .

Mr. Stevens

Questioned definition of “scholarly activity.”

Ms. Abelson

Noted issue of extended renewal of contracts and the necessity for full review.

Mr. Quigley

Noted same repeatability of full five year review at Parsons.

Mr. Melendez

Described process as just short of tenure.

Mr. Quigley

Noted that titles as proposed by Provost’s office are without specific content; that the faculty and Deans are called don to provide meaning for them.

Mr. Miller

Questioned the participatory nature of the process concerning titles. Expressed concern regarding the confluence of processes of rationalizing titles and unionization; noted that titles can remove faculty from union eligibility. Noted need for collaborative relationship between faculty and Deans.

Mr. Miller

Reported on the committee on governance. Noted that faculty governance is key to middle states and to the ambition of thinking like a university. See Appendix 2: Report of Committee on Governanced

Mr. Goldfarb

Urged that each committee make clear proposals as modeled by Mr. Miller’s committee.

Mr. Miller

Urged that the Faculty Senate work to return the conversation of these issues to the individual faculties.

Mr. Stevens

Noted need for university-wide discussion.

Ms. Savory

Wondered how a discussion of rank and title at Lang can be brought to the Faculty Senate.

Ms O'Neill

Presented the report from the Academic Planning Committee. See Appendix 3: Report of the Committee on Academic Planning.

Mr. Goldfarb

Noted that this committee's work is to look at curriculum inter-divisionally and look for opportunities for collaboration.

Mr. Quigley

Noted that the joint appointment policy at Provost's office seems to be under evolution.

Mr. Miller

Felt that the issues of collaboration are also issues of governance requiring self-governance procedures.

Ms. Abelson

Reviewed and finalized order of presentations at forthcoming Faculty Senate meeting on December 14th.

Closed the meeting at 10:10

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon

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	Mr. Appadurai
Faculty Committee Reports	
Faculty Issues	Mr. Quigley
Academic Planning	Ms. O'Neill
Governance	Mr. Miller
Discussion	

Present

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

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; 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 Milano and GF, key players. Very interested 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 same 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 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.

Mr. 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 that subsidy must be accomplished by those programs that can produce revenue 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 cross-cutting 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 “minimally” frustrate this process. 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 come to 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 communicates with constituencies, the stronger participation becomes.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Neil Gordon