University Faculty Senate Meeting  
Tuesday, May 19, 2015

Attendance:

Elaine Abelson, Lang  
Charles Allison, TNS  
Adria Benjamin, Mannes  
Julie Boyd, Drama  
Margaret Fiore, NSPE  
Danielle Goldman, Lang  
Richard Harper, Jazz  
Rachel Heiman, NPSE  
David Lopato, Jazz  
Frank Nemhauser, Mannes, Co-Chair  
Richard Salcer, Parsons  
Barry Salmon, NSPE  
Elaine Savory, Lang, Co-Chair  
Luciana Scrutchen, Parsons  
Earl Scott, Parsons  
Carlos Teixeira, Parsons  
Sven Travis, Parsons, Co-Chair  
Jurgen Von Mahs, Lang  
Jennifer Wilson, Lang

Not Attending:

Zed Adams, NSSR  
Anthony Anemone, NSPE  
Banu Bargu, NSSR  
Erin Cho, Parsons  
Ragnar Freidank, Drama  
Peter Haratonik, NSPE  
Nicolas Langlitz, NSSR  
Candy Schulman, NSPE  
Shane Selzer, Parsons  
Marcus Turner, NSPE  
Inessa Zartesky, Mannes

I. Frank began meeting. There were three major points of discussion for the meeting.
1. Discuss proposals that co-chairs made about amending the bylaws
2. Discuss Jurgen’s proposal for executive committees
3. Vote for co-chairs for next year

Discussion for Amendment to Bylaws:

Jurgen didn’t think it was in opposition to anything. Margaret wondered what effect on Tim’s thinking the recently negotiated PTF contract had. Sven said that is a PTF was voted in now it’s a more productive time frame since the negotiations were complete. Julie felt that since Drama was only PTF she was so clueless about things that were happening around the university until she joined the senate and albeit reluctantly, she was in agreements with the amending the bylaws and compromising with the administration. David L. felt there was a conceptual problem with the way it was proposed and doesn’t necessarily feel that the UFS should have proportional representation. He thought it made more sense to say that there should be representation of both PTF and FTF. He didn’t feel that the number should be managed. Frank felt that working with the PO might become more difficult if they didn’t and that a lot of the relationship would be shut down. Sven said that it was a compromise by both parties. Jurgen agreed that the bylaws should be formulated in a more inclusionary way. He understood the want to keep the relationship negotiations separate but didn’t want to end up constraining the UFS too much in case no one wants to serve as co-chairs in the future. Sven noted that the term “proportional representation” has come up a lot, and that it was complicated. He felt the UFS needed to be careful not to dilute itself as a body of FTF representation. Elaine S. said that the fact that Tim and Bryna went back on their original feelings of having no PTF co-chair is a big deal. Elaine A. said that the co-chairs don’t represent a job category, they represent the UFS. Adria said that the UFS is an evolutionary process and would continue to evolve as the university evolved. Richard S. said that the UFS was expected to be that but he doesn’t think they are there now.

Frank read the proposed bylaws, stating that “co-chairs may be FTF or PTF but no more than one PTF can be elected as co-chair during the academic year.”

Sven said the UFS could further amend it to require that one PTF be co-chair each year. Richard S. said he could understand the reason for two to one. Sven said if they put in the requirement that one PTF must be co-chair it would completely change the election process. Sven wanted to approve the sentence as originally written so that the UFS could vote as one body for the three co-chairs. He didn’t feel that the UFS would have any issues with the PO if they did this. He said that if they decided to change the language should that it required one PTF to serve than they couldn’t hold elections today since the co-chairs would have to go back and tell the administration. David L. reminded everyone that Tim said he would “loath” to pay a PTF to be co-chair. Sven didn’t feel like Tim used that language. Sven said it would cost the PO much more money to remunerate the FTF. David was just saying that it was easier to perpetuate the current situation. It was
suggested that the UFS was currently in a certain moment with the administration to make progress. If it amended the language then it would be sending a hostile message to the administration. Sven felt that the PO likely wouldn’t squabble over remuneration for PTF if elected because it would bring a lot of attention to administration in a bad way. Carlos pointed out that the PTF did have the union and that the FTF didn’t have anything like that. He felt it was important to bring forward the voice of the FTF and he wanted the UFS to remain the place for that. Frank asked for a proposal to accept the change to the bylaws. The proposal was seconded and then approved. Sven asked to take a vote on whether Mannes/Jazz/Drama should be considered separate or as Performing Arts. A motion was made to consider Performing Arts as one school. The motion was seconded and then approved.

II. Vote for Co-Chair

Frank distributed ballots distributed and asked if there were any additional nominations from the floor.

Each of the nominees make brief statements:
Charles Allison, FTF, TNS
Barry Salmon, FTF, TNS
Adria Benjamin, FTF, Performing Arts
David Lopato, PTF, Performing Arts
Richard Salcer, PTF, Parsons
Sven Travis, FTF, Parsons

The ballots were counted. The co-chairs elected for academic year 2015-2016 were Adria Benjamin, Barry Salmon, and Sven Travis.

III. Proposal for PTF and FTF Executive Committees

Jurgen discussed his proposal for PTF and FTF executive committees. He said that the committees would be their own constituencies vote inclusively. They would define their tasks and would be elected by the UFS. He felt this would create sufficient separation but representation. He called for a motion to establish executive committees, and another motion to create a voting process which can be done online since there wasn’t enough time to discuss everything in detail.

Discussion:
Margaret wanted to know why there needed to be co-chairs and executive committees. Jurgen felt that the UFS should create task-oriented committees year to year. The executive committees would be more related to employment categories. Sven felt that the suggestion overly complicated things, especially if there were still PTF and FTF Faculty
Affairs committees. Jurgen said the faculty affairs committee would be replaced. Frank reminded the UFS that they still need to approve the minutes. Richard S. was concerned about the multi-layeredness of the proposal. Sven pointed out that they would elected committees and might be good for discussing things like salary increases. Carlos was concerned about creating two places of agency, which would fragments things. He felt that the UFS should begin focusing on few issues instead of having so many committees. Jennifer was concerned that the UFS might lose track of other issues by restructuring the committees. It was suggested that there were other places where the UFS could generate issues of its own, instead of just responding to issues. Richard H. wanted to know what the problem was that the UFS was trying to solve. He was also concerned about the multi-layering. If there were two executive committees then it would make things more difficult. Luciana didn’t see it as multi-layered. She felt it would be good to have committees staggered over the summer. Elaine S. was concerned about the term “executive” because then what are the co-chairs for. She also didn’t like the division of PTF and FTF. Sven thanked Jurgen for writing the proposal and said that it was clear that the current committee structure wasn’t working. The committee structure is not working so this is great food for thought. He also thanked Elaine S. and Frank for their service as co-chairs.

A motion was made to accept the minutes from the previous UFS meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

A motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded and approved.