University Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

March 11, 2014

In Attendance:

1. Elaine Abelson, Lang
2. Adria Benjamin, Mannes
3. Julie Boyd, Drama
4. Ted Byfield, Parsons
5. Erin Cho, Parsons
6. Ragnar Freidank, Drama
7. Peter Haratonik, NSPE
8. David Lopato, Jazz
9. Gina Luria Walker, NSPE
10. Frank Nemhauser, Mannes
11. Richard Salcer, Parsons
12. Elaine Savory, Lang
13. Shane Selzer, Parsons
14. Sven Travis, Parsons
15. Marcus Turner, NSPE
16. Val Vinokur, Lang
17. Jurgen Von Mahs, Lang
18. Susan Yelavich, Parsons

Not Attending:

19. Emily Barnett, Parsons
20. Carolyn Berman, NSPE
21. Wendy D'Andrea, NSSR
22. Margaret Fiore, NSPE
23. Marcel Kinsbourne, NSSR
24. Julia Ott, Lang
25. Candy Schulman, NSPE
26. Earl Scott, Parsons
27. Luciana Scrutchen, Parsons
28. Chris Stover, Jazz
29. Inessa Zaretsky, Mannes
30. TBD, NSSR

I. Minutes

Ted said that the minutes from February’s meeting will be distributed before then April meeting and will be approved then.
II.  Announcements

Ted made the following announcements:

UFS Town Hall will happen on April 22 from 4.30-6.30pm in the Wolff Conference room (6 East 16th Street, room 1103). The meeting will be open to all. Ted hoped that the UFS subcommittees would come up with potential topics and talking points for the agenda.

The fossil-fuel investment forum will take place on March 19 from 6-7.30pm in the Theresa Lang Center. The event is being co-sponsored by the USS.

Frank reported the following:

UFS members Emily and Earl noted that in the new resource center faculty are being charged for copies exceeding a certain allotment. Frank said he is looking into it. He has been in touch with Pat Baxter in the PO and will find out if there is a difference between the FTF and PTF allotment.

Faculty Rob Buchanan inquired how experimental space requests are handled. Frank said the co-chairs were looking into it.

UFS member Carolyn brought up the question of the course catalogs effectiveness. This will be discussed at a later date.

Tim Marshall sent an email to the co-chairs about the faculty café in the new building. The PO is gathering some metrics about how faculty and staff will use the space and are interested in faculty thoughts about the space. They are aiming to offer food service after spring break and they want to get the word out about the space. The PO asked if the UFS felt that the space be for faculty only? Or should it be open to everyone?

III.  Resolutions

Ted reported that there were two draft resolutions to be approved (as per the agenda) but since there wasn’t a quorum that motions could not be made. It would be postponed until the next meeting.

IV.  University Faculty Grievance Committee proposed changes

Julia Foulkes, Chair of the Grievance Committee, spoke about proposed changes that the Grievance Committee (GC) would like to see in the FTF Handbook language. The proposed changes would give the Grievance Committee the authority to request additional documentation (procedural letters and every level of the grieved review) and request access to faculty dossier if deemed necessary.
The committee has reviewed about six or seven grievances. Their process has been to make a procedural assessment of the case and make a recommendation to the PO for re-review. While the committee only serves an advisory role the PO has accepted their direction in every instance. The re-review happens independently of the GC and happens through the PO.

Overall the GC has felt limited. The committee did some research and found that their charge was more or less the same as Columbia University. The GC looked at other schools as well and found that other committees have extensive access to review materials. TNS is concerned about confidentiality as there has been quite a bit of gossip surrounding negative reviews. Julia said she felt this happened because faculty who do not pass their review aren’t really given too much information about why and they end up asking their colleagues for further information. Julia felt if the procedural documents were available to the GC then at least the GC would be able to make a more informed assessment.

Julia felt that moving forward the GC would be reviewing a lot more RTA cases. RTA appointments are made specific to a job description so the letter of appointment is important for assessing the review. For example, Julia said if RTA faculty are expected to do a certain amount of administrative work but ended up being reviewed by their merit as faculty. The GC will not ask to see the dossier for every faculty but wants to have the right to do so if deemed necessary. The GC does however want access to all reports at every level of the review. Julia also pointed out that there have only been a handful of grievances which suggests that the university is doing quite well and that many potential issues are resolved before they end up with the GC. She said that the grievance letter from the faculty is the starting point for the grievance. There is no particular matrix to assess the case. The GC constructs questions based on the grievance letter. The internal process has to be exhausted before a legal process can begin.

It was acknowledge that the GC resolution could not be passed in the UFS since there was not a quorum.

Ted suggested that an ad hoc committee review this in more depth. Sven suggested that the FAC subcommittee review it instead. Peter felt that a motion should be on the floor for the next meeting.

V. Reports

Ted wanted to consider whether oral subcommittee reports were effective.

Ted said that the new commenting process on green/white paper is in place and will be in effect for next green paper about service which will be circulated after spring break.
Peter suggested that at the next meeting the co-chairs have several action items in place and make motions to approve outstanding resolutions then.

Unable to make a motion to adjourn the meeting because there was not a quorum.