In Attendance:

1. Elaine Abelson, Lang
2. Emily Barnett, Parsons
3. Adria Benjamin, Mannes
4. Carolyn Berman, NSPE
5. Julie Boyd, Drama
6. Ted Byfield, Parsons
7. Erin Cho, Parsons
8. Wendy D’Andrea, NSSR
9. Margaret Fiore, NSPE
10. Ragnar Freidank, Drama
11. Peter Haratonik, NSPE
12. David Lopato, Jazz
13. Frank Nemhauser, Mannes
14. Dmitri Nikulin, NSSR
15. Julia Ott, Lang
16. Richard Salcer, Parsons
17. Elaine Savory, Lang
18. Candy Schulman, NSPE
19. Earl Scott, Parsons
20. Luciana Scrutchen, Parsons
21. Shane Selzer, Parsons
22. Chris Stover, Jazz
23. Sven Travis, Parsons
24. Marcus Turner, NSPE
25. Val Vinokur, Lang
26. Jurgen Von Mahs, Lang
27. Gina Luria Walker, NSPE
28. Susan Yelavich, Parsons
29. Inessa Zaretsky, Mannes

Not Attending:

30. Marcel Kinsbourne, NSSR

New Senators for 14-15 Attending:

Anthony Anemone, NSPE
Richard Harper, Jazz
Rachel Heiman, NSPE

I. Welcome to New Senators

Elaine began the meeting by welcoming newly elected senators.
II. Minutes from April 29

Elaine asked for a motion to approve the minutes from last week. A motion was made, then seconded, and approved.

III. Matters Arising

Discussion:

Jurgen asked if the UFS received any information from Teresa about the Divestment issue. Elaine S. said those materials have no yet been received.

Susan wanted to make the UFS aware of the new GIDEST group on campus that helps faculty secure grants and is spearheaded by faculty member Hugh Raffles. There is a call for grant proposals open until October 5. The group will award grants to give faculty members and five PhD students for $25,000 each. Faculty also will receive on course release.

Elaine S. brought up a topic that was discussed at the last town hall, which was whether or not the UFS felt that the town halls should be opened or closed. One suggestion would be have half of it be open to administrators and have the other half be closed. Elaine A. said she has mixed feelings about the open forum as some faculty are inhibited to speak up when the administration is present. Peter felt that the purpose of those meetings if for questions and matters to arise, which he felt would be more likely to happen if they were closed. Jurgen felt that it depended on what topic was being discussed. He also suggested that maybe the town halls should be defined moving forward. Susan said she counted only 20 faculty in attendance who weren’t on the UFS. Candy said she counted only two PTF and suggested that the UFS make a better attempt to reach out to them. Ragnar said the he appreciated the openness of the format and is in favor of it. David liked the half open/half closed idea. Sven felt that most faculty were hesitant to speak in general in front of a room full of administrators. Ted felt that the turn out of the all the administrators was an unintentional show of force. More importantly Ted wondered what the point of the town hall meetings are supposed to be. Susan wondered if the event shouldn’t be more convivial, like a wine and cheese happy hour or something. Elaine S. said that the UFS needs to evolve into the next phase of the town hall and also needs to determine the dates for them in advance so a room can be reserved. Elaine S. suggested using the faculty/staff café in the new building if it survives. Carolyn suggested that on agenda for a future town hall be the issue of the university course catalog and how difficult it is for students to find courses. Frank said that the co-chairs would try to pick dates for the town halls when they make the calendar for the UFS meetings. Chris suggested aiming for the first half of the semester. Peter suggested making sure the dates don’t conflict with the president’s and PO’s town halls. Jurgen asked about the newly ratified communication process and wondered if this could help set the agenda for the town halls. Chris felt that the spirit of the town hall is to be open. Elaine S. felt that some sort of agenda was needed. Marcus felt that the town hall in April had a low turnout before it as an open town hall. Jurgen suggested that maybe the first one should be closed and then the second one in the spring could be open.
IV. Election Results

Susan reported on the election results.

Parsons and NSSR are not yet done with their elections.

Julie reported that Drama reached out to their alternate to step in for Julia next semester since she will be teaching on Tuesdays morning but the alternate is unable to serve so Drama is in the process of holding a new election for an alternate.

Jazz’s new representative is Richard Harper.

NSPE’s new representatives are Anthony Anemone and Rachel Heiman.

There are no new representatives for Lang.

Wendy shared that NSSR just got three nominees to accept so all that is left to do is vote.

Frank said that the co-chair elections are supposed to be done by a sealed ballot but since there are just three people nominated and three spots he suggested that a vote might suffice. He said that there were several other nominees but they could not stand for election. The nominees for co-chairs are Elaine S., Frank, and Sven. Frank asked if anyone would like to make any other nominations. Frank asked for a motion to elect the ballot as it stands. A motion was made and seconded, and then approved.

Jurgen thanked Ted for his service to the UFS.

V. Committee Reports

Senate Affairs Committee Report - Susan

Susan said that the Senate Affairs committee made an attempt to find out how often faculty bodies across the university met. In addition to tracking the election process, Susan felt that she would like to see James Dodd’s suggestion from the town hall be implemented, which was the suggestion that faculty bodies across the university meet with one another.

Discussion:
Adria echoed this “one voice” sentiment and hoped that it would continue to grow strongly in the coming years. Sven shared that the Parsons Faculty Council used to include both PTF and FTF but they mutually decided to separate, which a clause in the by-laws that necessitates that PTF be consulted on large matters. Wendy pointed out that faculty don’t really know much about each other across the university and thought maybe it would be helpful if representatives from the divisions reported to the UFS about what was going on in their divisions. An official report from each division might be interesting.
Scholarly Communications Committee Report - Chris

Chris reported that this committee met to brainstorm ideas for pop up ad hoc events and likes the idea of divisional representations. He felt that the UFS could use this to set the agenda for the first town hall by inviting the representatives of the divisional bodies to come to the town hall and talk. Chris said that he also met with Robert G. in the PO to learn about what the PO is doing to support research opportunities for faculty. He also shared that the PO Research Council is actively looking for a UFS member to serve on the committee.

Discussion:
Ted suggested that faculty need to push back and ask for better service in regard for sustained research help. Gina shared that the real big thing with research grants is the relationship the divisions have with the development office. Carolyn pointed out that the PO is aware that the current research support structure hasn’t been working and they are trying to fix it. Elaine S. said the UFS needs a strong representative to serve on this committee. Margaret said that the UFS also needed to determine a representative for the Curriculum Committee.

Faculty Affairs Committee Report - Elaine A.

Elaine A. shared that issue that have come up in this committee are faculty service load as reported by the COACHE survey. The lesson that was learned from that survey was that the service load is more or less equitable across the university. The issue of workload also came up. The PO FAC has been talking about what research and creative practice is and how it is understood. The Grievance Committee is being handled by Julia Foulkes and the PO directly. And the process was recently changed. Now the members of the GC can see all the letters at every level of the review and they can request further information is they deem it important.

Learning Environments Committee Report - Peter

Peter shared that Richard S. will be attending the next University Facilities Committee meeting and will report back. Peter felt that since there are a lot of moves and capital projects across the university that a lot of issues will come up. Peter felt it would be helpful to have a list of all university meeting dates for the semester. Richard S. shared that he was disappointed that the meeting was happening so late in the semester as they have a lot planned for the summer.

Academic Affairs Committee Report - Jurgen

Jurgen reported that the committee met to talk about issues of faculty workload. They spent the semester deciding on what their mission should be. They joined forces with the Faculty Affairs Committee since they were also discussing workload and service issues. Jurgen met with Bryna to get more information. He also thanked Ted for the new website he created for electronic commenting on the service green paper. Commenting on the green paper closed on May 23. The Academic Affairs committee is meeting later today to develop a preliminary agenda for next year. They also plan to develop working groups within the committee to
discuss workload and advising. Candy said that they also need to address PTF workload issues.

VI. Vision for Senate

Elaine S. suggested that this topic be tabled for the fall.

Peter said that he was looking forward to reading the Middle States report to see how the faculty were represented and suggested that the co-chairs use that information to start with in the fall.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and then approved.