

**Forum #3**  
**November 30, 2005**                      **10-11 a.m.**

Attendees:

By-Laws members (\*: sub-committee members also)

Bruce Bryski*	Sharon Cramer* (chair)	John DeNisco*
Marie Ferarro*	Kate Hartman*	
Tony Hotchkiss*	Judy Miller*	Mark Warford*

Others:

Stan Dickson, Emeriti, Past Chair College Senate Registrar's Office	Gail Hartman,
Mary Ann Hurliman, Registrar's Office Emeriti, Psychology	Jack Morganti,
Senator Heather Maldonado, University College Paterson, Elementary Education and Reading Camille Spyra, Butler Library	Wendy

Introductions were provided to the Senate Forum #3.

**Professor Emeriti Stan Dickson** (Speech Language Pathology and Audiology) began with a prepared statement. Stan was the first vice-chair of the College Senate and the second chair of the Senate for five years. He shared the history of the Senate. He explained the origin of the College Senate which, from 1971 and onwards, has always has been a multi-stakeholder body (faculty, staff, and students).

He shared his viewpoint that the faculty are the heart of the governance group. He sees that the responsibilities of the faculty (as identified by the Board of Trustees) as the heart of the governance function. He identified the roles of others on campus (professional staff, administrators, students). He identified the limitations of the multi-faceted group. He also spoke of the failure of many of the members of the governance members to solicit input from their constituencies. His proposal was to reconsider the structure of governance on our campus, such that there be formed an administrative council, with four groups having separate senates – faculty, professional staff, students and administrative. His prepared statement was read, and will be shared with the campus (and the committee).

**Mary Ann Hurliman** (Registrar's office) and Gail Hartman (Registrar's office) shared a prepared statement. Her issue was to follow-up from the April 28, 2005 Senate, and make a case for the representation of the classified staff on the Senate.

**Professor Emeriti Jack Morganti** (Psychology) raised numerous concerns about the lack of workability of the Senate in the following ways, based on his experience on the Senate:

- The unworkable size of the Senate
- The notion of having “new” units be represented
- The failure of the members of the Senate to be in the driver’s seat on setting the agendas for the Senate – he remarked that the administration is setting the agenda for the Senate
- He reluctantly agreed with the proposal of Stan Dickson, so that the issues of the faculty could be raised and thoroughly discussed.

**Commentary** was added by Stan Dickson and Sharon Cramer. Stan shared a description of the role the Senate took in the face of a projected cut of 70 faculty members. Stan described how members of the College Senate took leadership roles and headed off the projected lay off of faculty to address a budget crisis in the mid-1970’s.

**Associate Professor and Dept. Chair Wendy Paterson** (Elementary Education and Reading) volunteered to speak. She referred to the history of the Senate, and spoke of the historical growth in a positive direction. She has seen less decisive, more engagement on the part of a variety of voices in the Senate over time.

Based on her own experiences, she has had an opportunity to consider how faculty members and professional staff members differ in terms of what they must “do, learn, be.” The issue that she addressed is the notion of maintaining the “forum” reality of our campus. “Diversity, inclusiveness, and democratic governance.” Bring the issues to their constituencies – perceptions of what the Senate is all about. This is not what it is all about – what it is supposed to be, not necessarily what it has become. Student issues, curriculum, fees, technology fees – different perspectives are heard and entertained. An inclusive and diverse Senate is more responsive to the originators than anything else.

Representations change, agendas change, leadership of the Senate change, but the agenda of the Senate is set. The consultation nature of the Senate with the administration seems to lead to more just result for more people, than the adversarial nature of the Senate. Hopefully, it won’t be a question.

**John DeNisco** asked his question, as a University College Senator: what would be ideal?

*Stan Dickson:* separate Senates

*Jack Morganti:* the Senate has not been a workable body for a long time, because it has essentially been a rubber stamp for administration.

*Wendy Paterson:* Diversity and thought process.

*Mary Ann Hurliman and Gail Hartman:* Did not know to whom to go. Kate Hartman brought up the issues of the calendar and the benefits of having individuals from the enrollment management areas present when this discussion took place.

*Wendy Paterson:* Numbers as the basis of determining representation can be seen as very misleading, in part because there are overlapping constituencies. Senate is not just what meets on Fridays once a month, but how governance

takes place on campus throughout the year. She viewed “including the constituencies” as the key issue.

*University College – Heather Maldonado:* Overlapping issues may be evident but individuals often address a single topic in a unique way. Representatives need to be able to run for office and serve. She indicated that she anticipates a need to represent University College on the campus, as it is likely to continue to involve more people on campus, in one way or other.