University Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, February 3, 2015

Attending:

Zed Adams, NSSR  
Banu Bargu, NSSR  
Adria Benjamin, Mannes  
Julie Boyd, Drama  
Margaret Fiore, NSPE  
Ragnar Freidank, Drama  
Richard Harper, Jazz  
Rachel Heiman, NSPE  
Danielle Goldman, Lang  
David Lopato, Jazz  
Frank Nemhauser, Mannes, Co-Chair  
Richard Salcer, Parsons  
Elaine Savory, Lang, Co-Chair  
Earl Scott, Parsons  
Luciana Scrutchen, Parsons  
Carlos Teixeira, Parsons  
Sven Travis, Parsons, Co-Chair  
Marcus Turner, NSPE  
Jurgen Von Mahs, Lang  
Jennifer Wilson, Lang  
Inessa Zaretsky, Mannes

Not Attending:

Elaine Abelson, Lang  
Anthony Anemone, NSPE  
Erin Cho, Parsons  
Peter Haratonik, NSPE  
Nicolas Langlitz, NSSR  
Candy Schulman, NSPE  
Shane Selzer, Parsons

I. Approval of December minutes

Sven called the meeting to order and asked to wait on approving the minutes until there was a quorum. He also shared that the co-chairs decided to keep it a closed meeting so the UFS could catch up on business.

II. Earl Scott---brief statement on the new Part-Time Faculty Affairs Committee and ACT-UAW
Sven reminded the UFS that they agreed in December to create a Part-Time Faculty Affairs subcommittee. Earl is currently the PTF Union Vice President and reported on discussion he had with the union about the formation of this subcommittee.

Earl reported that the union appreciated that these topics were brought up in the UFS, since historical there has been a lot more discussion of FTF affairs as opposed to PTF affairs. He said that though there is much that only the union can handle there is still a lot of other things that can be done and after speaking with the union he was happy to report that there was no concern with the formation of the subcommittee. Since the UFS is an advisory body there really is no conflict. The union welcomes collaboration.

Discussion:
Richard S. shared that both FTF and PTF are concerned about transparency. Frank shared that the UFS co-chairs met with Emily and Earl about this. The union covers all matters of employment about PTF so the UFS just need to pay attention to what gets brought up in the new committee. Julie shared that she has a good relationship with her union shop steward and has been asking the steward a lot of questions and in a lot of cases the union isn’t able to answer them, especially in regard to the new BFA program. Elaine S. said that the PO feels that the UFS is evolving by leaps and bounds and that this is a positive thing. She felt that the UFs shouldn’t draw lines in the sand between PTF and FTF. Carlos pointed out that with the formation of this new subcommittee there is a great potential to examine the overlaps between PTF and FTF. Margaret shared an issue that has come up for her about teaching onsite or online. She claims that she wasn’t offered a choice and she wondered if FTF had the same issue. Margaret also felt it would be good to see a list of FTF affairs issues in order to compare and contrast with PTF issues. Richard H. shared that at Jazz the curriculum committee is both PTF and FTF since so many course are taught by PTF. He felt it was important to have a voice so the union can be made aware of unknown issues. Jurgen felt that the Senate Affairs committee could coordinate all of these issues in a more coherent structure. Richard S. wondered why if the PO wanted the UFS to be more important they weren’t giving the UFS more power? Sven replied by saying that the UFS hasn’t asked for more power, but that there is an openness to this discussion now. The PO has made it clear that the UFS will be involved in the salary increase information and process as a result of the discussion last semester. Sven said that the UFs is not suddenly just going to be anointed power. It was suggested that in order maximize space around the university the administration is going to up the minimum of students per class and that this is something that FTF and PTF can come to an agreement about. It was suggested that class size should be a legislative issue because course size is a pedagogical question that shouldn’t be decided by people who scheduled rooms. Lots of faculty senates have legislative
powers about course sizes. Earl made the point that the PTF union only bargains every five years so if issues come up right after bargaining is over then the issues have to wait, especially if they are noncontroversial issues. Carlos said that the UFS isn’t going to change overnight but that they do have the capacity to interfere. The salary increase issue was a good example of that. Daivd L. thought it was an interesting point that the UFS has never asked for more power and felt that maybe they needed to devote more time on that moving forward. Sven said that it takes a long time to get the subcommittees going and to figure out what the charge of each subcommittee should be. Sven thought that each subcommittee should come up with a single most important issue that they feel the UFS should have power or influence over. The idea is to create a neutral and safe discusssive environment for issues that are polarized across the university. Margaret suggested that the UF's ask for transparency about how class decisions were determined. It was suggested that asking for transparency isn’t a request for power, it’s asking the administration to do something. Sven said that each committee should identify one issue that the UFS should ask for more influence or power around. It was pointed out again that the UFS only has advisory power now, not legislative power. It was pointed out during the Middle States visit that this was weird and uncommon. One example of how the UFS could ask for decision making power would be to take a faculty wide vote about what we feel are appropriate course sizes. Jurgen agreed and pointed out again that this is why there is a Senate Affairs subcommittee, to deal with issues like these. Sven made a motion to have the Senate Affairs subcommittee do some research as to how faculty senates at other universities exercise their legislative power. The motion was seconded and then approved.

III. Other Business

Sven asked for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made. The motion was seconded and then approved.

Frank reported that it was not too early to think about co-chairs for next year. A vote will have to be taken at the May meeting. Sven will be staying on but Frank’s and Elaine’s terms are ending.

Marcus said that the UFS is at its “Fredrick Douglas” moment and that it could seize power now or will just continue its circular breathing. Sven made a motion for all the UFS subcommittees to come up with one or two issues that need to be brought to the PO. The motion is seconded and then approved. It was suggested that if the PO wanted to put its money where its mouth is then the UFS co-chairs should get course releases, with an end goal being for all members of the UFS to get course releases. The UFS should ask for course releases or payment for serving on the UFS. It was suggested that PTF remuneration may be more important than the co-chairs getting course releases. Sven said he would shape this into a request and bring it back to the UFS for approval. A motion was made and then seconded. The motion was approved. Inessa wondered who was on the PTF Faculty Affairs Committee. Sven said that the co-chairs will talk about it and report back. Luciana asked for feedback about the UC being open 24 hours since she was on the task force that decided to try that.
IV. Lyterati software for faculty annual reports and reviews

Sven mentioned the new system for faculty annual review that the university purchased called Lyterati. Annual faculty reviews have been delayed this year. He wanted to make the UFS aware of this software.

Discussion:
Jennifer wanted to talk about Lyterati since it will bring up a lot of issues about how things “count.”

Frank said that everyone on the UFS should have received an invitation to have breakfast at the president’s house and that he hopes everyone will come.

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