

Approved and Revised Dec. 2, 2013
NYU FULL TIME FACULTY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
20 NOVEMBER 2013

PRESENT:

Hannah Brueckner (via skype from NYUAD)	Brian Mooney
Gordon Campbell	Randolph Mowry
Fred Carl	Dina Rosenfeld
Joseph Carter	Ezra Sacks
Nancy Fefferman	Nina Servizzi
John Halpin	Susan Stehlik
Neal Herman	Benjamin Stewart
Matt Leingang	Frederic Viguiet
Sylvia Maier	William Wesbrooks
Prasheila Manga	Patrick Ying
Ann Marie Mauro	

Start: 11am End: 12:30pm
Kimmel 406

The Planning Committee is a faculty elected advisory group that dialogues with SCOG and has been formed under a singular directive:

to present a recommendation to Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (“SCOG”) by February 10, 2014 regarding representation and participation of full time contract faculty within the University governance structure and their current and future communication channels that hold dialogue with decision-making authorities in New York University

SCOG will report to the Faculty Senate that will, in turn, convey their recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Since any recommendation may involve change in the composition of the Faculty Senate it may involve a change in the bylaws, which would need to be approved by the Trustees.

President John Sexton joined the meeting at 11.05 and explained the role and charge of the Planning Committee, outlined the position of the other constituent Senate Councils and expressed his long lasting full support (for the past 12 years) for our group’s goals. He stated that students felt non-tenure track faculty and students should have “credible voice” on decisions within the University, but that any addition of Full Time Contract Faculty (“FTCF”) must not dilute the student voice.

The Ultimate decision rests with the Board of Trustees, which is supportive.

He encouraged a “reasonable and persuasive” recommendation.

John Sexton promised this will get done this year.

After President Sexton concluded his remarks, he left the meeting.

The Committee discussed the following items/questions and agreed on items by consensus vote:

1. Question: Will meeting records/minutes be made public? Advantage of “deliberative privilege” versus commitment to transparency.

Committee decision: To be decided.

2. Question: Will meetings be recorded?

Committee decision: No

3. Question: Volunteers for Taking Minutes?

Secretary: Susan Stehlik, Stern, volunteered to take minutes.

Co-Secretary: Silvia Maier, SCPS, will record minutes with Susan.

4. Question: Should we have chair for organizing?

Co-chairs elected unanimously: Ann Marie Mauro and Randy Mowry.

5. Self Introductions:

Everyone self introduced with backgrounds and related experience.

6. Question: Shall we form small committee to determine procedures?

Committee Decision: To be determined.

7. Questions and discussion regarding roles and representation on the Committee:

- Who does the Planning Committee represent?
- All contract faculty
- School of Medicine suggests to distinguish full time service faculty as our community of representation.

- Suggestion: that others be included. Who?

- Committee decision: defer decision but we should check as to who voted us into these positions.

- There are multiple titles in faculty handbook, like lecturers and “payroll codes” 101, 102, 103. “Faculty titles versus actual roles,” “service versus appointment.”

- What do these payroll codes mean in practice?

- How many people are coded as what and what are the implications for benefits, grievances, and privileges?

- Categories are by School, title and entitlements. Can we get that list?

8. Question: Should we ask for more data? Everyone seems confused as to who is what or what they are categorized as.

Suggestion: list issues and request data from Cara or SCOG.

Committee Decision: Someone will get data and show by School who and how many are in which category.

9. Question/Discussion: How do we (FTCF) get added as representatives without “diluting” some other group?

FSC doesn't want to be diluted because as tenure-track and tenured faculty they have “more of a commitment to university.”

10. Summary Statement: Our job is to make a recommendation to the Trustees:

- Suggestion: we should worry about our own interest because in SCOG survey being part of FSC was not given as an option.
- here are problems with the survey.
- 27% of approximately 2000 FTCTF voted; 70% of those voted for separate council.
- Results not representative.

Committee Decision: Get results of SCOG Survey.

11. Question: Consider a recommendation that includes a new body of representation in the Senate.

Here is the timeline for our Committee work:

- Feb. 10: Committee recommendation due to SCOG
- March 24: Recommendations to FSC for review and debate
- June 4: Board of Trustees Meeting and decision.

Committee decision: because of tight timeline we need to decide on process.

12. To facilitate communication and information sharing Nina Servizzi, Division of Libraries, will set up Google group and Google sites.

13. Future Meetings

- Meetings suggested for every other week: two meetings before the holidays: week of Dec 2 and week of Dec 16.
- Doodle scheduler will be circulated.
- Decided meeting length: 90 minutes

Our member need to take a pulse on the schools and report back to this committee; but, first we need common questions and talking points on issues.

14. Homework for committee members:

- Identify key questions for our constituencies and other items for discussion
- Identify best communication strategy with our constituencies
- Identify best communication strategy for our committee

15. -Ask Cara for the following data:

- Breakdown of faculty by school
- SCOG results by school
- Get 2008 study non tenured faculty report and post on google groups

-
- 16. Google groups will be set up within a few days**

Minutes taken by Susan Stehlik and Sylvia Maier