Emergency Representative Assembly Meeting
Thursday, November 11, 2010
3:15-4:15 PM, Room C-314

Minutes

RA Representatives Present: George Ebhardt, Andrew Baddish, Norman Burns, William Jiang, Stacey Balkan, Kelly Keane, April Adams, Dominic Ciaccio, Amy Ceconi, Phil Dolce, Keith Chu, Mauro Marzocco, Lenore Lerer, Margaret Hayes, George Cronk, Paul Eckstein, Joe Sivo, Brant Chapman, Fred Golub, Linda Seidman, Lynne Richardson, Mike Martinez, Francis Schmidt, Paul Wolfe, Bridget Connolly, Joanna Campbell

BCCFA Officers Present: Peter Helff, Tobyn De Marco, Alan Kaufman, Laurie Hodge, and Donald Reilly

1. Don Reilly called the meeting to order at 3:15 PM.

2. A discussion of the ongoing situation with the current administration began. This discussion included a summary of some of the most common complaints against President Ryan and his administration: Joan Szabo’s forced retirement; Dr. Ryan’s insistence that Joanna Campbell be removed from her office as ADC; past attacks on Nursing faculty; poor or inappropriate responses by the administration when faculty complained about deteriorating school facilities; the administration’s current approach to Dual Enrollment, an academic issue which had not been discussed by the Faculty Senate, and an initiative which is currently supervised by Public Relations, a non-academic office. During previous meetings about these issues, members of the BBCFA had called for a vote of No-Confidence in Dr. Ryan.

   • Peter Helff discussed the potential political implications of a No Confidence vote at this time and recommended a vote of Censure. Tobyn DeMarco explained that a Censure is an official reprimand issued by the faculty. This act says that the faculty find fault with the President’s actions and expect him
to change his behavior in the future. It opens the door for dialogue and is and a precursor to a vote of No Confidence which calls for the President’s removal. A discussion of reasons to support a No Confidence votes or a vote to Censure Dr. Ryan ensued. This discussion included, but was not limited to, the following remarks.

- A vote to Censure it is a “sign of weakness.” Who cares about the larger political arena? A No Confidence vote should be pursued.
- Another member agreed that the political situation should be ignored. We should vote “No Confidence.” The board will not support us, so we might as well vote “No Confidence.”
- A vote of Censure will have more beneficial results—see Harvard and New School results of vote of No Confidence. The vote of Censure does not preclude a vote of No Confidence.
- Peter Helff reminded RA members that a vote of No Confidence would have to be followed by immediate action in the form of a work “slow-down”—i.e., working to the contract.
- An RA member refuted this explanation of what has to follow No Confidence vote: the vote of No Confidence” DOES NOT have to translate into a “slow down;” it can indeed be effective without risking our programs, etc. Additionally, we need to broadcast this far and wide—media, etc.
- The vote to Censure differs from a vote of No Confidence in that it informs the board of trustees that the faculty want him removed; however, it does not call for immediate action in the form of a work “slow-down”—i.e., working to the contract. We should give the board the option to remove him (etcetera) without forcing the issue. The board will then have the option to eliminate or censure. Additional benefit of a vote of Censure is the ability to take a prefatory step toward No Confidence while not playing all of our cards so to speak.
- Some were concerned about how junior faculty would react to the call for a No Confidence vote.
- One member asked for two clarifications: 1. Clear statement from union leadership regarding the outcome of the vote, etc.; 2. Honest evaluation of the vote passing in the general faculty. Said member was also concerned as a junior faculty member, and a member of the NJEA, because 10, 000 teachers were recently laid off. What if the administration/board responds similarly to the junior faculty at BCC? Will the BCCFA support them? Alan Kaufman and Peter Helff responded with a strong confirmation of support.

3. The following motion was made: The Executive Committee requests a meeting of the BCCFA for a vote of Censure—a statement to the president (and ostensibly the board as well) that the faculty are “disgusted” with the president.
4. A motion was made to call the question. A voice vote ensued. The motion was carried overwhelmingly. There was a single vote against.

5. Don Reilly, RA Chair, restated the motion: **The Executive Committee requests a meeting of the BCCFA for a vote of Censure—a statement to the president (and ostensibly the board as well) that the faculty are “disgusted” with the president.** He put the motion to the RA and explained voting procedures: a vote of “Yes” would be interpreted as a vote in support of a general meeting to call for a vote of Censure against Dr. Ryan and a vote of “No” would be interpreted as a vote against. Votes were cast using written, closed ballots.

6. Ballots were counted by Joan Cohen with Don Reilly’s help. Don Reilly announced the results to the RA: 23 “Yes” votes and 6 “No” votes. The motion to recommend Censure was approved.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15.

Respectfully submitted by Stacey Balkan, Brant Chapman, Kelly Keane, and Don Reilly