

Full-Time Contract Faculty Planning Committee

MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT with revisions

DECEMBER 16, 2013

2:35PM-4:15PM

Present:

Ann Marie Mauro (Co-Chair)	Randy Mowry (Co-Chair)
Mary Kililea (via phone)	Hannah Brueckner (via phone from Abu Dhabi)
Fred Carl	Gordon Campbell
Nancy Fefferman	John Halpin
Jessie Keyt	Matthew Leingang
Prasheila Manga	Brian Mooney
Vaskuki Nesiah	Ward Regan
Dina Rosenfeld	Ezra Sacks
Nina Servizzi	Susan Stehlik (Co-Secretary)
Benjamin Stewart	Frederick Viguiet
Gabrielle Gold-von Simson	Patrick Ying

1. Meeting called to order at 2.05pm, in Kimmel room 406

Meeting minutes from Dec. 2nd, 2013 revised and approved unanimously

2. Co-Chairs update:

Updated data from Peter Gonzalez (will be posted on Google group):

Total number of full time non-tenure track/contract faculty: 2420

Tenure track faculty: 2106

Schools Governance Structure Report: Request that everyone complete the Google doc by Wed 12/18 and Co-Chairs will review the responses.

Ted Madger (Past FSC Chair) and Raghu Sundaram (FSC Chair) reached out to Ann Marie and Randy via email. Co-Chairs will try to arrange an informal meeting.

3. Feedback/Discussion from Joint Meeting with SCOG and the University Senate Executive Committee meeting held Dec. 9, 2013

(Note: Meeting minutes from will be prepared by Senate note-taker and reviewed by all groups)

Key principles outlined by Senate Executive Committee reviewed by Co-Chairs:

- Administrative Senators Council and Student Senators Council would like the constituency proportions within the Senate to remain the same size [Note: There are differing opinions within the Senate constituencies about how to achieve this.]
- Faculty should be considered one group, regardless of the structure
- No one group or constituency should comprise more than 50% of the Senate

- o Representation of Abu Dhabi and Shanghai in the University Senate will be considered in the future
- a. The algorithm for calculating the number of senators from each school in the Faculty Senators Council (FSC) seems rather complicated; with special agreements for exceptions, e.g., School of Medicine
- b. Our committee needs to come up with a model and numbers for what we would recommend
- c. Suggestion to apply the current FSC model to contract faculty
- d. Current Senate representation models are primarily based on proportion of faculty; sometimes number of students is considered
- e. Suggestion from Gallatin that we have one FSC with NTT/contract and TT faculty and have each school decide how to allocate existing seats
- f. Suggestion to change the University ByLaws so all faculty are allowed to participate in the University governance
- g. NYU has a stated goal of being the number one research school...is that a condition of tenure?
- h. 4 Councils were represented at the joint meeting.
- i. Point of Information: Ann Marie & Ezra attended lunch on 12/5/13 with Provost McLaughlin and Common Days faculty. Provost would like meet with us as a group to discuss issues of concern to NTT/contract faculty after we submit our recommendation. The Provost has received comments from the Deans on the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointment Guidelines received from the ad hoc committee on the appointment, review, and renewal as well as grievance procedures. Ann Marie, Gordon, and John served on the ad hoc committee that developed the guidelines..

Motion was made to thank the Provost, accept the invitation to meet, and respectfully request the Provost provide the current draft of the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointment Guidelines to this Committee as part of data collection and fact finding process; Seconded and Approved unanimously.

4. Discussion of key questions:

- a. Should non-tenure track/contract faculty be represented within the Faculty Senate Council or its own council?

Various opinions were expressed about whether to have one or separate councils. There was no general consensus, with roughly half of members present in favor of each option, and several members undecided. The following comments were made during the discussion:

- i. If we are one council, faculty may vote for their school representatives based on whether they are NTT/contract or TT faculty. We may as well have separate councils to ensure NTT/contract faculty representation.
- ii. It is important to include a rationale for why we pick a specific model and why we did not pick others.
- iii. If we are in one council, equal numbers of representatives make sense. A concern was expressed that to be a separate council without a history will marginalize us.
- iv. The FSC recommendation that NTT/contract faculty be given 15 seats on a separate council is a message that we are half as important as the tenure track faculty.
- v. The University Senate has always gotten bigger and is okay with faculty representing 50%.
- vi. If we were two councils, how many shared committees would both councils be on?
- vii. Gallatin is against a separate council.
- viii. There is a third option that each school make its own model and decide how they work out representation or whether there are separate councils
- ix. A separate council would be readily accepted by the FSC.

- x. We shouldn't let our work be framed by external constraints (e.g. what will please the FSC, what will please the University leadership, etc.). They disagree. We should then recommend what we believe is best in principle. Because bylaws will be reformed for the long run.
- xi. If we have a separate council, we would be second-class citizens. Feels strongly should have one council and expressed disagreement with a "they" and "we mentality as it sets up an adversarial relationship. As one faculty, we are many departments, and most work together very well.
- xii. Many NTT/contract faculty have been here for many years and have a vested interest in the university.
- xiii. AAUP white paper recommends we have only 1 council similar to most universities.
- xiv. Any way to create credible voice is preferred as referenced by Sexton's opening speech; questioned what real power do any of these Councils have.
- xv. The threat to the tenured faculty is that no other Senate group is ceding any ground,
- xvi. If there are separate councils, we are probably going to agree on everything.
- xvii. Following the four principles set by the Executive Committee, one member suggested the following numbers:
 - 1. Increase the Senate to 100
 - 2. 29 Students an increase of 4
 - 3. 16 Deans
 - 4. 6 Administrators
 - 5. 5 Officers
 - 6. 44 faculty senators (22/22 tenure
 - a. 4 at large senators with 1 at large senator for SCPS
- xviii. If the FSC vote was 17 to 3 against including us in the existing council, what is probability of success?
- xix. The tenure track is not making a good choice to exclude us, but that does not matter...let's be a separate council.
- xx. Is the FSC effective? Will it represent our interest? Let's have our own and try to make it work.
- xxi. We should have one council with proportion balanced.
- xxii. The Deans wanted equal representation...no other Council supported it
- xxiii. The AMC does not see a reason for putting a cap on the Senate number
- xxiv. If the battle is between us and the FSC...let's join the one that supports us
- xxv. FSC is not the only voice on the Senate. Other councils may be amenable to having one faculty council.
- xxvi. The nature of "them" and "us" will be perpetuated with two separate councils
- xxvii. We should focus on what's best for the university and our students, which is one unified faculty, and one council.
- xxviii. We shouldn't take the path of least resistance...the decision we make today will affect the university for several years.
- xxix. We should have one council...there is a big shift in the Medical School and the researchers are getting the grants. The tenure track will need the non-tenure track to deliver the research.
- xxx. The question was raised: what does communicating with our school constituencies mean? Answer: We will decide how to proceed at a future meeting.
- xxxi. We should talk more about this charge and debate it more....and think about what we need to do....if we want one council and think it is best we should go for it...if we need more time we should ask for it. Feel very strongly it should be one council; most schools have one faculty council within their school; the system is too convoluted now.

- xxxii. Agreement we need to do what is good for the university; still fluctuating on same versus separate councils.
- xxxiii. Decisions made by ALL faculty in many schools.
- xxxiv. If we are one council, numbers should be the same.
- xxxv. There is no difference between NTT/contract and TT faculty on a functional level.
- xxxvi. We should gauge the thinking of our TT colleagues within our schools.
- xxxvii. We need to come up with our own key principles, such as:
 - 1. The number of tenure track faculty should not diminish any further and be at least 50%.
 - 2. We are one faculty with complementary roles, e.g., we teach, run departments, do research.
 - 3. Non-tenure track/contract faculty would not vote on matters related to tenure.

[Note: At 4:07pm, there was consensus to extend the meeting until 4:15pm to finish the discussion and set the next meeting dates.]

Next Steps:

Co-Chairs will:

- 1. Request FSC representation formula from Bonnie Brier.
- 2. Email the Provost, accept his invitation to meet, and request the Full-Time Non-tenure Track/Contract Faculty Guidelines for Appointment
- 3. Follow up on university website to post minutes
- 4. Send a Doodle poll to schedule two meetings in the January: #1) Week of January 13th, and #2) week of January 27th, 2014.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.