MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 18, 2018

The New York University Continuing C-faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at 9:00 AM on Thursday, October 18, 2018 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Carter, Davis, Ferguson, Gershman, Howard-Spink, Illingworth, Jahangiri, Joachim, Killilea, Kim, Lee, Liston, Mitnick, Patterson, Renzi, Slater, Watkins, White, and Youngerman; Alternate Senators Hersh, Kleinert (for Saravanos), Lim, Mandracchia, Sahin, Shullenberger, Talib (for De Bartolo), Tourin, and Zhang (for Wang).

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting agenda was approved unanimously.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD SEPTEMBER 20, 2018

A Senator suggested including a statement that the C-FSC has access to the email addresses of all continuing contract and tenured/tenure track faculty. Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the September 20, 2018 meeting were approved unanimously as amended.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: MARY KILLILEA

See attached Document A.

A Senator inquired on the resolution passed by the Board of Trustees concerning suspension of Bylaw 81(c) to allow a faculty member to enroll in a doctoral program at NYU. He noted a copy of the resolution was not included in the packet. Chairperson Killilea responded the wording of the resolution is confidential because it pertains to an individual faculty member.

The Chair’s Report was accepted into the minutes.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION BY STUDENT SENATORS COUNCIL

Resolution on University-wide Request for Information

See attached Document B.

Rose Asaf and Bayan Abubakr presented on the Student Senators Council (SSC) resolution. Asaf noted the resolution came after the Board of Trustees rejected the resolution to allow students to serve on the Board. This is another avenue to help the University become more transparent and lead the way in transparency among private universities.

The resolution is inspired by the fact that public universities have access to the Freedom of Information Act. She stated currently there are no private universities with the same mechanism for obtaining information.
The resolution notes that federal law 20 US code 1011F requires public and private colleges or universities to disclose information to the Department of Education about their relationship with certain “foreign sources,” which includes foreign governments, businesses and individuals, or agents of any of the above.

She explained currently at the state universities of New York, there are 64 offices that deal particularly with these information requests. The SSC is currently in conversation with these offices to learn how many requests they receive per year, what the breakdown is per student, and what the fiscal motives are.

She added the SSC met with the Administrative Management Council (AMC), who responded with helpful feedback.

The SSC proposes that a committee be formed, comprised of two representatives from each council of the University Senate, a representative from NYU’s Office Accounting and Reporting, Office of Institutional Research and Data Integrity, and other relevant university actors as determined by the Committee members. The Committee will be charged with investigating and developing a mechanism for university actors, meaning students, alumni, faculty, staff, and administrators, to access information.

Asaf stated once they receive information on the number of requests being made by the state universities of New York, they will send this information to the Councils.

A Senator questioned if this resolution would be approved, given the previous request to the Board was denied and that private universities do not have to disclose all financial records. She also asked what is of particular issue to the students.

Asaf noted the resolution does allow considerable room for redactions of information. She explained there is a general frustration with transparency and accountability.

A Senator suggested if students instead asked the University for specific information, they might have a better ability to receive that information than a general request for all information.

Abubakr stated the resolution asks for a platform by which university members could request information.

A Senator asked how they would address the potential competitive disadvantage among private universities if NYU was the only private universities disclosing this type of information.

Asaf noted the generous exemptions allowed in this resolution would enable NYU to redact information that might put the University at a disadvantage. She commented in an era lacking transparency this proposal could place NYU as a leader in transparency.

A Senator asked how they defined “alumni” in the list of constituents that may request information. Asaf clarified the Committee would address definitions such as this, but in general the SSC proposed anyone with access to NYU Home would be able to request information.

A Senator asked if the SSC examined the legal boundaries of requesting information from all global site. Asaf noted the SSC is aware the laws of other countries might prevent information from being shared.

A Senator asked how many administrative hours would be needed to process these requests. A Senator asked about enforcement, since as a private university NYU would have no requirement by law to disclose information.

Abubakr reiterated the Committee would discuss and make proposals on the process and oversight mechanisms.

A Senator suggested if the resolution is not accepted, to develop a set of specific requests for information and bring to the administration.
A continuing contract faculty (c-faculty) member presented on the efforts to explore the idea of unionization of c-faculty. She stated for the past two years, a group of faculty have been pursuing grassroots outreach to faculty across NYU to learn about conditions in different schools and departments. She noted these conversations have been private in order to protecting the anonymity of faculty.

She stated they have done outreach at every school at NYU except the medical, dental, and law school. She noted these schools are not included in the current adjunct faculty, graduate student, or postdoc union contracts.

She added they will not take their campaign public until they have strong networks in every school. They wish to ensure all c-faculty are informed of the campaign and have the opportunity to guide decision-making and strategy.

She stated the conversations reveal many c-faculty face substantial obstacles as they attempt to build satisfying careers at NYU. She noted the shared concerns across schools and departments include salary compression, job security, and concerns on benefits. Collective bargaining is one way to offer c-faculty more leverage to negotiate for and improve working conditions.

The presenter stated a union contract would not seek to eliminate distinctions between faculty or to regulate every aspect of working lives. She noted the collective bargaining agreements for c-faculty unions in private universities typically focus on establishing salary minimums, scheduling annual increases, securing benefits, strengthening job protection, and, in cases, securing professional development funding for sabbaticals.

She noted in the past three years, Tufts, Barnard, Boston University, and Fordham have all negotiated strong first contracts. USC recently announced that their c-faculty are seeking to unionize.

She reported, as stated in last week’s AAUP report, 73% of faculty at U.S. universities are now non-tenure track.

The presenter detailed the next steps and process. She stated the group is currently talking to faculty members in different schools and departments to gain a better understanding of common interests and shared concerns. The first step once the campaign is made public will be to collect signatures to petition the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to schedule a c-faculty vote on unionization. Those signatures are confidential. Legally, one-third of all c-faculty need to sign in order to move forward.

Once a petition is submitted, the NLRB will schedule a c-faculty vote on unionization. If the vote is in favor of a union, the next step is to elect a bargaining committee from among the c-faculty. This elected committee will work together to study this situation, coordinate negotiations, and communicate the process.

The presenter noted they will survey NYU c-faculty and also study salary data and other relevant information from peer institutions to draft a list of terms for negotiation. These terms will need to be ratified by a majority of c-faculty. She commented this is one of several checks built into the process to ensure that there is work toward meaningful gains for all and that not the interests of one group ahead of another. Once terms are ratified, the bargaining committee, supported by the union, will work out a contract with the NYU administration. That contract is not legally binding until it is ratified by a majority vote of c-faculty.

A Senator commented c-faculty now have salary minimums and the same benefits as tenured/tenure track faculty. He asked what this group is specifically looking for in having a union.

The presenter responded there is an interest in securing benefits. She noted generally c-faculty are satisfied with medical and retirement benefits, but there have been concerns on changes to the tuition remission policy. In addition, there are concerns on the Annual Merit Increase (AMI) not keeping pace with cost of living, the distribution of AMI, increased workloads, job security, and transparency regarding reappointment and promotion. She offered the example of the abrupt reorganization of the School Professional Studies in the spring of 2017.
A Senator commented the work of the Tuition Remission Committee, which C-FSC members serve, and C-FSC Benefits Committee has been very effective in achieving goals without a union. He also noted C-faculty receive the same AMI as tenured/tenure-track faculty.

A Senator expressed concern on the UAW’s capacity to take into account the differences in the unique learning environments at different schools and departments.

She reported they are gathering information from faculty across schools to understand the differences in teaching schedules, etc. They would not want to advance a contract that worked in one school but not another. They are also learning from the bargaining processes for the adjuncts and graduate students.

Senators asked if all schools, except medical, dental, and law school, would be involved in the vote or only those schools that submitted at least one-third of signatures.

The presenter responded if it was decided the bargaining unit was all schools at NYU, except the medical, dental, and law school, then it would be the total number of c-faculty that determines the success of a vote, not individual schools.

A Senator stated the Council believes it is a strong platform and voice within the University and has reached many goals through dialogue with the administration. She asked if unionization would remove this platform.

The presenter noted they want full participation and representation in faculty governance and she thinks it is vital that this body continues as well as the various faculty assemblies that NYU c-faculty serve as representatives.

She stated other faculty union contracts include specific provisions that guarantee the right to participation and representation in faculty governance. The Senator expressed concern the University would not agree to this.

A Senator asked about union eligibility for c-faculty who chair departments or serve in other managerial roles. The presenter responded she believes that these faculty members would not be covered by the union contract during the time they hold a managerial position, but needs to confirm.

The presenter noted the contracts negotiated by Tufts, Barnard, BU, etc. are available online. She can also distribute to the Council.

A Senator raised concerns regarding the lack of strength in collective bargaining if not all schools are involved, including the medical school, dental school, and law school. The C-FSC has representatives from all schools, including these three, and she believes it is what makes this body so strong. She commented, for example, if the only collective bargaining unit is Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) faculty, it would not secure meaningful change for c-faculty.

The presenter reported before the union goes public, it strives to have widespread support across divisions.

It was suggested the grievance committee examine the identified major concerns of faculty and address these issues through the grievance policies and practices.

**PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE**

Recommendations of the T-FSC and the C-FSC in regard to: Meyers Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty

See attached Document C.

Senator White presented on the joint recommendations.
A Senator raised concerns over the time limit for committee deliberations, which is not stipulated in the policy. It was noted this would be a change to the Faculty Handbook.

A Senator suggested the Council be more involved in the development of these policies at the school level. White stated the Committee ensures the faculty at the school have reviewed the policy and the proper process at the school level was followed. In addition a representative from the school assists the Committee in the review of the policy.

The recommendations were passed by vote of the Council. They will be sent to the T-FSC for their vote and if approved, will be sent as joint recommendations to the Provost.

Amendments to Twenty-One Principles regarding School Policies for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty

See attached Document D.

Senator White presented the amendments to the Twenty-One Principles. She noted this document was developed by the C-FSC and is considered a working document and additional principles may be proposed as needed.

A Senator recommended adding a statement that these principles do not apply to Nursing, Dentistry, and Medicine, as is stated in the footnote in the Faculty Handbook. It was decided to not include this statement since these are only guidelines.

The amendments were passed by vote of the Council.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

See attached Document E.

Vice Chairperson Slater noted the Communications Committee still needs to elect its Chair.

Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:

Administration & Technology

Senator Kleinert noted the Committee’s first action item is to invite Len Peters, Vice President and Chief Information Officer, to a Council meeting. The topics of discussion would include the safeguarding of data information. It was suggested to first ask if Peters plans to attend a University Senate meeting to present on this topic.

Educational Policies & Faculty/Student Relations

A Senator inquired on the authors of the answers provided on spring admissions. Senator Illingworth responded the impression the Committee received is that some answers were from MJ Knoll-Finn, while others were through conversations with the various Deans’ offices.

In response to questions on compensation for summer courses, Illingworth reported it is variable from school to school and department to department. A Senator suggested the compensation equal the buy-out rate for courses, for instance if the buy-out rate is a 17% decrease, the additional course rate be a 17% increase.

A Senator commented the summer courses related to the spring admits program are different than the summer sessions, which are largely taught by adjuncts.
It was noted the Senate Committee on Organization & Governance (SCOG) is trying to gain an understanding of the main issues related to the spring admits program, including concerns over workload, summer teaching, and compensation. It was recommended to bring these issues to the Provost's Office.

It was also suggested to discuss AMI with the Provost Office, specifically the variability amongst the schools regarding the process used to award AMI. There is also concern regarding the reporting of AMI at 2.5% when the actual average AMI at the school level is 2.0%.

**No Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:**

Finance & Policy Planning
Governance
Personnel Policies & Contract Issues
Graduate Program Committee

**Reports at Meeting:**

There were no additional reports at the meeting.

The reports were accepted into the minutes.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Funding for Special Travel Needs**

A Senator reported on the issue of faculty members not being able to use professional development funds to bring their child to a conference, particularly in the case of single parents. It was noted some universities have special funds to support this.

At the Senate Financial Affairs Committee (SFAC) it was mentioned there is discussion underway for a special travel fund in these cases for tenured/tenure track faculty but not for c-faculty.

The Benefits Committee will explore with the Work Life Office and the Finance Committee with SFAC.

**Survey on Faculty Salary**

The Finance Committee is looking into putting together a basic survey to be sent to all c-faculty to collect data regarding salary. This would include questions related to school, length of contract in calendar months, compensation, gender, and academic rank. The Committee will also reach out to the T-FSC and AMC to encourage them to survey their constituents.

A Senator suggested the Council ask the administration for equity reports similar to the Faculty of Arts and Science report. It was suggested to bring this to the Provost Office.

**Special Guests at Upcoming Meetings**

Chairperson Killilea announced President Hamilton will attend the November meeting and encouraged Council members to submit questions and/or discussion points for the Steering Committee to send prior to the meeting.

There is also a proposed plan to invite Sabrina Ellis and/or Marty Dorph to discuss human resource structures and reporting lines.

**ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.
C-FSC—Chair’s Report  
Chairperson Mary Killilea  
Report as of October 18, 2018

1. Welcome

The year is off to a good start. Thank you to all the committees for getting off to a quick start this year and electing your chairs.

As a reminder, all Senators and Alternate Senators are encouraged to attend C-FSC meetings and to participate fully in all discussions, as well as raising issues for discussion. Our Rules state that only Senators, or Alternates who are representing absent Senators at a meeting, may vote.

2. Steering Committee Upcoming Meetings

The steering committee will have the first meeting with Provost Fleming next Thursday October 25, 2018, and our first meeting with President Hamilton next Friday October 26, 2018. If you have any items that you would like us to address during these meetings please let me know.

3. October 3, 2018 Board of Trustees Meeting Updates

I have attached the memo from Terry Nolan informing the C-FSC of important votes of the Board in their October meeting. These votes included:

- a resolution was passed at the meeting concerning suspension of Bylaw 81(c) to allow a faculty member to enroll in a doctoral program at NYU.
- Approval of Honorary Degree Candidates
- Approval of Named Professorship at Tandon
- Approval of Renaming of a Center at FAS
TO: Steering Committee of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council

FROM: Terrance Nolan, Secretary

CC: Carol Morrow, Karyn Ridder

DATE: October 8, 2018

RE: Resolutions Passed at October 3, 2018 Board of Trustees Meeting

Please find attached copies of resolutions passed at the October 3, 2018 meeting of the New York University Board of Trustees that pertain to the academic operations of the University.

For your convenience, below is a list of the attached resolutions:

- Approve Honorary Degree Candidates
- Approve Named Professorship
- Approve Renaming of Center

Attachments
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

HONORARY DEGREE CANDIDATES

WHEREAS, the New York University (the “University”) Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees (the “Board”) has recommended the candidates as set forth below as potential recipients of honorary degrees for the University’s Commencement Exercises in May 2019 or for a subsequent University Commencement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board approves the granting of honorary degrees to the following candidates, in each case subject to the President and/or his designees offering the degree and the Candidate’s acceptance of the terms of the offer for the degree as established by the President and/or his designees:

Elizabeth Alexander
Lamar Alexander
Jill Biden
Fabiano Caruana
Kenneth Frazier
Abdel Kader Haidara
Carla Hayden
Patricia Horoho
Douglas Lowry
Steve Martin
Ginni Rometty
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

APPROVE NAMED PROFESSORSHIP

BE IT RESOLVED, that the William R. Berkley Professorship in Engineering be established in the Tandon School of Engineering, retroactive to August 1, 2018; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that Dean Jelena Kovačević be appointed the first incumbent of this professorship, retroactive to August 1, 2018
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

APPROVE RENAMING OF CENTER

WHEREAS, the Center for Experimental Humanities in the Graduate School of Arts and Science (until 2016 the FAS John W. Draper Interdisciplinary Master’s Program in Humanities and Social Thought) is a degree-granting program of interdisciplinary study that offers the “Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies,” which stretches beyond the humanities and centrally involves the social sciences; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Science, in consultation with the Center’s faculty and with the approval of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, has recommended to the Provost of New York University (the “University”) that the Center be renamed the “Program in Experimental Humanities and Social Engagement”; and

WHEREAS, the Provost of the University approves the renaming of such center.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of the University approves renaming of the Center for Experimental Humanities the “Program in Experimental Humanities and Social Engagement,” effective October 3, 2018.
Resolution on the University-Wide Request for Information

WHEREAS, since 1967, the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) has provided the public the right to request access to records from any federal agency.

WHEREAS, federal agencies are required to disclose any information requested under the FOIA unless it falls under one of nine exemptions which protect interests such as personal privacy, national security, and law enforcement.¹

WHEREAS, federal law 20 U.S. Code § 1011f requires public and private colleges or universities to disclose information to the Department of Education about their relationship with certain "foreign sources," which includes foreign governments, businesses and individuals—or agents of any of the above. This applies when the relationship entails a value above $250,000.

WHEREAS, per 20 U.S. Code § 1011f, the disclosure report will indicate how much money came from contracts or gifts attributable to a particular country, a description of any conditions or restrictions placed on the gift or contract and, if applicable, the date on which the foreign source assumed ownership or control of the institution and changes in program or structure resulting from the change in ownership or control.

WHEREAS, New York State’s Freedom of Information Law (FOIL) (Public Officers Law §87 et. seq.) allows members of the public to access records of government agencies.²

WHEREAS, every New York State or municipal department, board, bureau, division, commission, committee, public authority, public corporation, council, office or other governmental entity performing a governmental or proprietary function is subject to FOIL³. Each of those governmental entities is an "agency."

WHEREAS, each of the 64 State University of New York’s campuses have Record Access Officers that accept and process FOIL requests.

WHEREAS, information from the City University of New York (CUNY) can be accessed through FOIL.

WHEREAS, CUNY also operates an internal office through which university records can be obtained.

¹ “What are FOIA exemptions?”
² New York State Freedom of Information Law
³ Section 86, Freedom of Information Law.
WHEREAS, from the most recently published reporting period of September 1st, 2016, to August 31st, 2017, $618,979,375 of NYU’s revenue was received in the form of government grants as listed in the IRS Form 990. (See Appendix A)

WHEREAS, federal government grants constituted 9.37% of NYU’s revenue in the aforementioned reporting period.

WHEREAS, the Student Government Assembly of NYU has identified transparency as a top priority for the 2018-2019 academic year.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that New York University uphold its commitment to openness, accountability, and accessibility.

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that New York University establishes a Committee comprised of two representatives from each council of the University Senate, a representative from NYU’s Office Accounting and Reporting, Office of Institutional Research and Data Integrity, and other relevant university actors as determined by the aforementioned Committee members. The Committee will be charged with investigating and developing a mechanism for university actors, meaning students, alumni, faculty, staff, and administrators, to access information.

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that every NYU school, campus, global site, governing body, and any other university entity adhere to the standards of transparency and access as determined by the Committee.

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the Committee will determine what entity will oversee the process of information requests.

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that, upon request, university actors can access NYU’s annual operating budget, including a full list of university expenditures, including salaries, contracting, construction, and allocation fees amongst schools, global sites, and portal campuses.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that, upon request, university actors can access information regarding the sources of NYU’s funding.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that, upon request, university actors can access meeting minutes of all university governing bodies.
FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that, upon request, university bodies, departments, and any other university entity relevant to the request make accessible how much money came from contracts or gifts attributable to a particular country, and a description of any conditions or restrictions placed on the gifts or contract, and when applicable, the date on which the foreign source assumed ownership or control of the institution and changes in programs or structure resulting from the change in ownership or control.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the Committee will consult with experts to determine what specific information is to be redacted.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that university entities can redact certain information within records from being disclosed that is specifically exempted from disclosure by state or federal statute; (b) if disclosed would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, excluding salary information, with reference to standards set by state and federal law; (c) if disclosed would impair present or imminent contract awards or collective bargaining negotiations; (d) are compiled for law enforcement purposes and which, if disclosed, would: i. interfere with law enforcement investigations or judicial proceedings; ii. deprive a person of a right to a fair trial or impartial adjudication; iii. identify a confidential source or disclose confidential information relating to a criminal investigation; or iv. reveal criminal investigative techniques or procedures, except routine techniques and procedures; (e) if disclosed could endanger the life or safety of any person; (f) if disclosed, would jeopardize the university’s capacity to guarantee the security of its information technology assets, such assets encompassing both electronic information systems and infrastructures.  

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that redactions for reasons other than those specified are permissible.

4 Freedom of Information Law, New York State Senate
Appendix A: NYU Government Grant Revenue as listed in the 2016-2017 reporting period on the IRS Form 990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Expenses $</th>
<th>Revenue $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>830,559,560</td>
<td>618,979,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Proposed by Senator at-Large for Marginalized Jewish Students, Student Activists, and Students With Mental Health Struggles, Rose Asaf; Senator at-Large for Muslim Students, Bayan Abubakr; Alternate Senator at-Large for Middle Eastern & North African Students and Documented Noncitizen Students Leen Dweik; and Alternate Senator at-Large Student Workers and Low Income Students, Ben Zinevich.
Recommendations of the T-FSC and the C-FSC in regard to:

NYU RORY MEYERS COLLEGE OF NURSING
Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion
of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty

BACKGROUND

Following the separation of the NYU Rory Meyers College of Nursing (hereafter referred to as Meyers) from the NYU College of Dentistry, the school’s policies pertaining to the appointment, reappointment and promotion of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty (hereafter referred to as Clinical Faculty) were revised with input from an Appointments and Promotion/Continuing Contract Faculty Committee (hereafter referred to as AP/CCF Committee) as well as the leadership of the Meyers Faculty Council and the Meyers College Dean, Eileen Sullivan-Marx. The completed document was presented to the Meyers Faculty Council for electronic voting on February 12, 2018 and was passed by a quorum of full-time faculty with no votes opposed or abstained, per the Meyers By-Laws dated May 1, 2017. On March 2, 2018 Dean Sullivan-Marx submitted the document to NYU Vice Provost, Carol Morrow.

At NYU, our strong tradition is for schools to develop policies that are “consistent with school culture and history.” Within that tradition, the NYU Faculty Handbook (hereafter Handbook) provides that school policies will be reviewed by the Provost to determine “whether the substance of the policy: (i) is consistent with general University policy; (ii) is compatible with the University’s commitment to excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, or artistic achievement and service within a community of respectful and respected academic professionals; and (iii) has no adverse implications for the University.” As part of the process of finalizing the Meyers policy for its Clinical Faculty, NYU Provost Katherine E. Fleming invited the C-FSC to comment on the document called “AP_Draft.3.14.2018 _Revision 3 AGS”, adopting the same perspective (per letter of March 23, 2018 from Katherine E. Fleming to the C-FSC and T-FSC Chairs).

The following document will enumerate various questions, comments and recommendations to the submitted policy.

MAJOR SUBSTANTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Add a description of the faculty voting process for the approval of this document. This is in keeping with the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, revised December 15, 2015, page 1, Section II., Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1, which states:

“In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate or amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the expectation that Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty shall..."
participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.”

Clarify specifically and explicitly the process of consultation with Clinical Faculty.

We strongly recommend that any development of this policy follow the letter and the spirit contained in the University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, allowing the Clinical Faculty, acting according to the school’s governance structure (e.g. the Meyers Faculty Council or similar body, faculty meeting, etc.) an active, essential and meaningful role in forming and approving any new policy, which policy must necessarily include the grievance/appeal process.

2. Page 2. Appointment as a Member of the Faculty
   We recommend including research (which is not required but could be considered) in the evaluation of CCF.

3. Page 2. Appointment as a Member of the Faculty
   We recommend the inclusion of a section that describes faculty participation in shared governance.

4. Page 3. Appointment as a Member of the Faculty.
   Clarify the Meyers policy for supporting “publications or presentations at scholarly meetings.”

   In schools where professional, scholarly and/or creative activity is either required or encouraged for reappointment and promotion, we recommend that professional development funds and research leave or sabbatical should be provided to further support professional, scholarly, or creative work. A description of that eligibility, and the process governing it, should be added following paragraph 2.

5. Page 3. Section II. Appointment as a Member of the Faculty
   We recommend that a statement of hiring practices be included. Transparency is needed.

6. Page. 3. General Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion
   We recommend adding here or in Appendix a time line for reappointment processes, including reappointment evaluation and notification of contract renewal or termination.

Clarify the distinction between titles as reflected in the duration of contracts. An appointment of at least five years is the norm for Clinical Associate Professor, with an increase in term of appointment for Clinical Professor.

We recommend rewording paragraph 3, sentence 2 as follows:

“After the initial year, reappointment for Clinical Assistant is for three years, Clinical Associate is for five years, and Clinical Professor is for six years. When promoted to a three-year contract as Clinical Assistant Professor, subsequent re-appointments shall be for at least three years. When promoted to a five year contract as Clinical Associate Professor, subsequent re-appointments shall be for at least five years. When promoted to a six year contract as Clinical Professor, subsequent re-appointments shall be of at least the same length.”

We also recommend moving these sentences to the end of paragraph 2.


We recommend that paragraph three address reappointment only and be reworded as follows:

“Reappointment will be contingent upon the faculty candidate demonstrating excellence in teaching, scholarship, and/or service at NYU Meyers or clinical care at affiliated or other practices and hospitals (see Section V.B below), upon curricular and programmatic need and available multi-year funds.”

The policy should also indicate that curricular or programmatic need does not automatically warrant a denial of reappointment. Instead, the denial should have a rational basis, and it should include a process for determining whether the professor can or cannot teach under the new curriculum or structure. We recommend adding the following language to the end of paragraph 3:

“In such event, the review would focus on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and/or new academic structure and, if so, in what capacity.”


We recommend that termination of a contract include the specific timeframe in which notification must be given, as specified in the Handbook on pages 55-56. We suggest the following language:

Notice of intention not to reappoint a Clinical Faculty member of any rank shall be sent to the individual affected according to the following schedule:
(a) Not later than March 1 of the first year of academic service, if the appointment is to be terminated on August 31.

(b) Not later than August 31 of the penultimate year, if the appointment is to be terminated on the following August 31, or not later than one year before the termination of the appointment.


We recommend deleting because the substance of this paragraph has already been addressed in II. Appointment as a Member of the Faculty, paragraph 2.


Since Continuing Contract faculty are exclusively non-tenured, add language describing non-tenured faculty expectations. We recommend the following edit and addition:

“Continuing Contract faculty lines differ from tenure-track lines. Although continuing contract lines are without tenure, they are typically multiyear. Clinical faculty will have no limit on the number of reappointments at each rank.”

12. Page 4. Specific Criteria for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Titles

We recommend adding a description of the circumstances in which CCF faculty may apply for a vacant TT position, detailed in NYU CCF guidelines 2014.

13. Page 5. Other faculty titles

Recommendation: Consider the development of a “clinical ladder for advancement.”


Change duration of contracts. An appointment of at least five years is the norm for Clinical Associate Professor. We recommend the following edit:

“Initial new hire appointment as Clinical Associate Professor is for one year; thereafter, reappointment will be for five years. Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor is for five-year renewable appointments.”


Change duration of contracts. An appointment of at least six years is the norm for Clinical Professor. We recommend the following edit:
“Initial new hire appointment as Clinical Professor is for one year; thereafter, reappointment will be for six years. Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor is for six-year renewable appointments.”


To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year appointments, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review. We recommend the following edit:

“Appointment as a Clinical Instructor carries with it the possibility of annual/multi-year reappointment. Clinical Instructors on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment. Clinical Instructors will have no limit on the number of reappointments and are not eligible for tenure.”


Add language regarding the process and timetable. We recommend language similar to:

“The faculty member shall receive notification that they are up for review no later than the first week of the academic year in the penultimate year of their appointment.”


We recommend incorporating part of paragraph 3 into paragraph 2 after sentence 3 using this language to reflect the communication process:

“The Executive Vice Dean of Meyers will provide a written review of the faculty candidate to the AP/CCF Committee. The letter from the Executive Vice Dean will include a summary description of the academic responsibilities and contributions of the faculty member in Meyers. The AP/CCF Committee will review and make recommendations to the Dean about all reappointments.


“Automatically terminate” in the final sentence of this paragraph is also problematic. The policy should indicate that curricular or programmatic need does not automatically warrant a denial of reappointment. Instead, the denial should have a rational basis, and it should include a process for determining whether the professor can or cannot teach under the new curriculum or structure. We recommend deleting sentence 6 and replacing it with the following language at the end of paragraph 2:
“Even in those cases, the review would focus on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and/or new academic structure and, if so, in what capacity.”


Delete the remainder of paragraph 3 (see number 12 above) as reappointment review for contracts will be every 3 years or so depending on contract length, therefore 3rd and 6th year reviews are no longer necessary.


Specify “teaching portfolio” to include a range of factors that can be considered for promotion. We recommend deleting “that includes student and peer evaluation” from item (c) and inserting the following language at the end of sentence 1:

“The teaching portfolio may include course materials (e.g. syllabi, lecture notes, assignments), course development and innovation, instructor development, collegial observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing, evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc. For faculty whose responsibilities also include administration, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in reviews for reappointment or promotion.”

22. Page 8. Standards for Promotion to Clinical Professor, paragraph 2, between sentences 4 and 5.

Add language detailing the process governing the creation of the AP/CCF Committee’s recommendation. We recommend inserting the following language after sentence 4:

“The recommendation may be written by one or more members of Meyer’s five member AP/CCF Committee, but all members of the committee should read the recommendation before it is submitted to the Dean. The recommendation should represent a collective judgement of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division of opinion, the minority opinion should be appended to the majority recommendation.”

23. Page 8. Standards for Promotion to Clinical Professor, add paragraph 3.

Add language about communicating the results of the reappointment or promotion recommendation to the faculty member as well as procedures to be followed. We recommend adding a third paragraph to this section of the policy, such as:

“The Executive Vice Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation
regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s evaluation, as well as his or her own assessment and continuing programmatic need for the appointment. In the event that the Executive Vice Dean follows the recommendation of the committee to reappoint and/or for promotion, the summary letter to the faculty member with notification of intent to reappoint or for promotion should include the length of reappointment/appointment, and a signature block for the faculty member. If the Executive Vice Dean’s decision is contrary to that of Meyer’s AP/CCF Committee concerning appointment, title, or length of contract, the Executive Vice Dean will provide the committee with the reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Executive Vice Dean’s decision is finalized. In all cases of an appeal to a negative decision related to reappointment or promotion by the Executive Vice Dean, the candidate will have access to the AP/CCF Committee’s full report, including its recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”


Add language allowing for a transition from one-year to three-year appointments to the end of this paragraph, such as:

“A Clinical Instructor on continuous one-year appointment shall move to a three-year appointment if promoted to Clinical Assistant Professor.”.


Add language similar to the following at the end of this paragraph:

“In all cases of an appeal of a negative decision related to reappointment or promotion by the Executive Vice Dean, the candidate will have access to the Meyer’s AP/CCF Committee’s full report, including its recommendations and any comments from the faculty.”


Add “in writing” to the end of sentence 5, then add language to further clarify procedures before sentence 6, such as:

“If the committee’s report is accepted by both the grievant and the Executive Vice Dean, the matter shall be considered settled. However, if the Executive Vice Dean shall deny any findings of fact, or refuse to implement suggestions by the committee made as a part of the committee’s recommendations on the disposition of a case, the Dean is required to reply in writing giving in detail his reasons. This memorandum must be sent both to the grievant and to the committee along with the procedure for appeal.”

MINOR SUBSTANTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation**

Edit for consistency (see Editorial Recommendations below). We recommend “Definition of Scholarship”

28. Page 5. Clinical Professor, last paragraph

For purposes of clarity, we recommend deleting the last phrase “and its affiliated clinical facilities and hospitals.” The sentence should read, “The rank of Clinical Professor may be granted to those members of the faculty who have served in a position that includes in its title Associate Professor or its equivalent at NYU or other institutions and who fulfill leadership service roles in NYU Meyers.”

29. Page 4. Ranked Titles, paragraph 1, sentence 2: “and are not eligible for tenure”

**Recommendation**

Redundant. We recommend deleting the end of this sentence.

**EDITORIAL RECOMMENDATIONS**


**Recommendation**

Verb tense is incorrect. We recommend “and who maintain”

31. Page 3. Appointment as a Member of the Faculty, paragraph 2, sentence 1: “expended in scholarly activities”

**Recommendation**

Edit for consistency. We recommend “expended in scholarship”

32. Page 3. Appointment as a Member of the Faculty, paragraph 2, sentence 2: “maintain a degree of scholarly productivity”

**Recommendation**

Edit for consistency. We recommend “maintain a degree of scholarship”
33. Page 3. General Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion, paragraph 3, sentence 3: “excellence in teaching, scholarly productivity, and or service”

**Recommendation**

Edit for consistency. We recommend “excellence in teaching, scholarship, and or service”

34. Page 4. Ranked Titles, Clinical Assistant Professor, paragraph 1, sentence 1: “effective teaching and scholarly activity”

**Recommendation**

Edit for consistency. We recommend “effective teaching and scholarship”

35. Page 5. Ranked Titles, Clinical Professor, paragraph 1, sentence 2: “through scholarly activities”

**Recommendation**

Edit for consistency. We recommend “through scholarship”

36. Page 7. Standards for Promotion to Clinical Professor, sentence 2: “which may or may not be use”

**Recommendation**

Verb tense is incorrect. We recommend “which may or may not be used”
TWENTY-FIVE PRINCIPLES REGARDING SCHOOL POLICIES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION FOR FULL-TIME CONTINUING CONTRACT FACULTY—Recommendations/Requirements for Continuing Contract Faculty contracts & policies (NYU)

Endorsed by the C-FSC Personnel Policies and Contract Issues Committee and the C-FSC Steering Committee on 3.17.2016; Amended 10.18.2018

1. FACULTY GOVERNANCE

The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, revised December 15, 2015, page 1, Section II., Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1, states:

“In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate or amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the expectation that FTCCF shall participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.”

Clarify specifically and explicitly the process of consultation with the Continuing Contract faculty.

We strongly recommend that any development of this policy follow the letter and the spirit contained in the above quote from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, allowing the Continuing Contract faculty, acting according to the school’s governance structure (e.g., its Faculty Assembly or similar body, faculty meeting, etc.), an active, essential and meaningful role in forming and approving any new policy, which policy must necessarily include the grievance/appeal process.

Mechanisms for timely distribution to the faculty, faculty discussion, as well as the ability for faculty to present amendments, make recommendations to and vote on the Policy in a regularly scheduled faculty meeting following procedures outlined in the school’s governance structure, should be included and stated explicitly.

2. CHANGES TO POLICY

The policy should follow the letter and the spirit contained in the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, revised December 15, 2015, page 1, Section II., Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1, which states:

“In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate or amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the expectation that Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty shall participate in formulating
and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.” Add the following:

“Mechanisms for timely distribution of any amendments to the Policy to the faculty, faculty discussion, as well as the ability for faculty to present amendments, make recommendations to and vote on the Policy in a regularly scheduled faculty meeting following procedures outlined in the school’s governance structure, should be included and stated explicitly.”

3. CONTINUING CONTRACT FACULTY AND TENURED FACULTY DISTINCTION

Since Continuing Contract faculty are exclusively non-tenured, add language describing the differences between tenured faculty expectations and non-tenured faculty expectations. This is important because in some schools Continuing Contract faculty primarily have teaching responsibilities, while in other schools Continuing Contract faculty are expected to maintain an active scholarly, research, creative and/or professional life.

For faculty in schools without continuing research/creative expectations for Continuing Contract faculty, continued creative, intellectual, and scholarly engagement in their fields can be encouraged, though not required, as appropriate to the area of the appointment. For those schools, a model might be the following (adapted from the FAS Website, “Recruitment of New Faculty, Section 1.7, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professors, Overview,” http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html):

“Continuing Contract Faculty lines differ from tenure-track lines. Although continuing contract lines are without tenure, they are typically multiyear and research is not part of their formal responsibilities, and hence teaching loads are greater.”

For faculty in schools with continuing research/creative expectations for Continuing Contract faculty, a model might be the following:

“Continuing Contract Faculty lines are typically multiyear and differ from tenure lines at the School in the following ways: [enumerate those differences].”

4. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES ------ REAPPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION

Include for consistency that for faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in reviews for reappointment or promotion.

5. ONE-YEAR APPOINTMENTS

The University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, page 4, states:
“Continuing Contract Faculty appointments that provide for the possibility of extended periods of employment support continuing involvement with students and colleagues and provide an appropriate and desirable element of job security. Thus, wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts. However, in addition to providing schools with an essential degree of flexibility, one-year contracts may be programmatically and academically desirable in a number of schools and academic programs within schools; school policies shall include a rationale for a Continuing Contract Faculty title(s) that carries a one-year appointment.

“Full-time contract faculty members are to be hired within the context of the school’s long-term strategic planning for faculty academic programming, which is approved by the Provost. This is true for one-year as well as multi-year contracts.”

Add language similar to the following:

“If a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification, similar to the hiring plan submitted annually to the Provost, based on programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty through the formal governance structure established at the school (the Faculty Assembly, Faculty Senate, etc.).”

6. ONE-YEAR APPOINTMENTS

To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year appointments, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as:

“Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment.”

7. PROMOTION & SUBSEQUENT APPOINTMENTS

When promoted to a three-year contract (Assistant Clinical/Arts/Music Professors—the titles should be consistent titles in place for Continuing Contract faculty at the school), subsequent appointments shall be for at least three years.

When promoted to a five-year contract (Associate Clinical/Arts/Music Professors—the titles should be consistent titles in place for Continuing Contract faculty at the school), subsequent appointments shall be for at least five years.

When promoted to a XX-year contract (Full Clinical/Arts/Music Professors—the titles should be consistent titles in place for Continuing Contract faculty at the school), subsequent appointments shall be of the at least same length.
8. **FULL CLINICAL/ARTS/MUSIC PROFESSOR** (the titles should be consistent titles in place for Continuing Contract faculty at the school)

As an appointment of at least five years is the norm for Clinical Associate/Associate Arts/Associate Music Professor, provide an increase in term of appointment for Clinical/Arts/Music (Full) Professor; this is the case at certain schools (e.g., The Gallatin School).

9. **PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY—PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUNDS AND RESEARCH LEAVE OR SABBATICAL**

In schools where professional, scholarly and/or creative activity is either required or encouraged for reappointment and promotion, professional development funds and research leave or sabbatical should be provided to further support professional, scholarly, or creative work. A description of that eligibility, and the process governing it, should be added.

In schools where the Continuing Contract faculty’s responsibilities are exclusively teaching, professional development funds that support that faculty member’s continued growth in teaching their field should be provided.

10. **CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT**

Specify how “performance” will be assessed. For example, the following factors might be considered: course materials (e.g., syllabi, lecture notes, assignments), course development and innovation, instructor development, collegial observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing, evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.

11. **TERMINATION DUE TO CURRICULAR NEEDS**

The policy should indicate that curricular or structural changes do not automatically warrant a denial of reappointment. Instead, the denial should have a rational basis, and it should include a process for determining whether the professor can or cannot teach under the new curriculum or structure.

Add the following language (paraphrased from the Tisch Arts Professor Policy, 2013, the Tisch Teach Policy, 2014, the Gallatin Contract Faculty Policy, 2015, and Liberal Studies, 2018),

“In such event, the review would focus on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and/or new academic structure and, if so, in what capacity.”
12. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND COMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION

The majority of the committee should be made up of elected, not appointed, members; additionally, the majority of committee should be made up of Continuing Contract faculty members.

13. PROCESS FOR COMMITTEE FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND COMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION

The Committee should choose its own chair, who then coordinates the creation of the committee’s report and recommendation for reappointment, which is then submitted to the Dean. The duties of the chair should be included in this paragraph, as well as the process of evaluating the review material. The process of the creation of the committee’s report should be explicitly stated with language similar to the following (from the FAS Website, “Recruitment of New Faculty, Section 1.7, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professors, Overview,” http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html):

“The committee will prepare a written review for the Dean evaluating and summarizing the evidence of accomplishment, noting areas that require improvement, and making a recommendation regarding reappointment, and promotion and contract length (when applicable).”

14. VOTING: COMMITTEE FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND COMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION

Specify that a majority vote of the Reappointment Committee and the Promotion Committee shall be required for a successful review for a recommendation for reappointment or promotion, and that all votes of both Committees shall be by secret ballot. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

15. REPORTS: COMMITTEE FOR REAPPOINTMENT OR COMMITTEE FOR PROMOTION

Add language detailing the process governing the creation of the review committee’s report, similar to that found on the FAS website, “Procedures for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty (http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html), adapted as follows:

“The review may be written by one or more member of the Review and Reappointment Committee, but all members of the committee should read the review before it is submitted to the Dean. The review should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division of opinion, the minority opinion should be appended to the majority review.”
16. REAPPOINTMENT COMMITTEE OR PROMOTION COMMITTEE

Add detailed information: “The Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s evaluation, as well as his or her own assessment and continuing programmatic need for the appointment.

“In the event that the Dean follows the recommendation of the committee to reappoint and/or for promotion, the summary letter to the faculty member with notification of intent to reappoint or for promotion should include the length of reappointment/appointment, and a signature block for the faculty member.”

17. RECORD OF REAPPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION PROCESS

In the case of schools where a division dean receives the committee report and passes that with a recommendation to reappoint or to promote to a school Dean, add language to ensure that the school Dean receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendation of the divisional dean, similar to the following:

“The divisional dean must forward the review packet to the school Dean along with the committee’s recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”

18. PROCEDURES FOR DEANS – REAPPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION

Add the following as a new paragraph (adapted from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty: http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html):

“If the school Dean's decision is contrary on appointment, title, or length of contract to that of the Review and Reappointment Committee or the Promotion Committee or the divisional dean, the Dean will provide the committee with the reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's decision is finalized.”

19. APPEAL OF A NEGATIVE DECISION REGARDING REAPPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION BY THE DEAN

Add language similar to the following:

“In all cases of an appeal to a negative decision related to reappointment or promotion by the Dean, the candidate will have access to the Review/Promotion Committee’s full report, including its recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”
20. PROCESS AND TIMETABLE

Add language similar to:

“During the first week of the academic year in the penultimate year of an appointment, faculty member receives notification that she/he is up for review.

Specify the grounds for and process of stopping the contract clock by adding language satisfying the following from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, revised December 15, page 6:

“Each school process for review of full-time multi-year contracts of three years or more, including promotion reviews, must include: ... the grounds for stopping the contract clock for reasonable cause, e.g., medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, same-sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation....”

21. SCHOOL GRIEVANCE/APPEAL PROCESS – REAPPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION

The grievance/appeal process, of crucial importance to the faculty, should be developed by the faculty and added to the Policy document before the school sends the policy to the Provost. The process should be identified and explicitly described in this document.

We recommend that the grievance/appeal process closely follow the principles elaborated in the University Guidelines that specify that all members of the committee, including the senior continuing contract faculty member, be elected: “Unless otherwise authorized in the school’s policy and approved by the Provost, each school shall either establish a new standing faculty committee for Continuing Contract Faculty grievances, which will include senior Continuing Contract Faculty and T/TTF elected by the voting members of the faculty; or shall expand its existing standing grievance committee for T/TTF to include (elected) senior Continuing Contract Faculty who shall participate in hearing and evaluating only those grievances that are filed by Continuing Contract Faculty.”

Additionally, The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty note numerous requirements and procedures for the school grievance process, including specifying who may grieve, the grounds for grievances based on non-reappointment, as well as grievances related to other issues, the process of requesting the convening by the dean of the grievance committee, and the accessibility of that grievance policy to the faculty.

The development of this grievance process should be undertaken with full participation by the Continuing Contract Faculty and submitted to the faculty for discussion and a vote by the faculty. The process of consideration must include the right to offer amendments, and the vote may occur during a regular faculty meeting or by electronic ballot, as the faculty governance body may determine.
**PROCEDURES FOR GRIEVANCE**

**22.** Add the following language (paraphrased from the Liberal Studies Reappointment and Promotion Policy, 2018)

“Having decided to consider the case, the grievance committee will then hear evidence and report to the Dean in writing on its findings of fact and its opinion on a fair disposition of the case. After considering the advice of the committee, the Dean will inform the grievant in writing of his or her decision, and include a summary of the committee’s report provided by the committee.”

**23.** Add the following language (paraphrased from the Liberal Studies Reappointment and Promotion Policy, February, 2018)

“If the committee’s report is accepted by both the grievant and the Dean, the matter shall be considered settled. However, if the Dean shall deny any findings of fact, or refuse to implement suggestions by the committee made as a part of the committee's recommendations on the disposition of a case, the Dean is required to reply in writing giving in detail his or her reasons. This memorandum must be sent both to the grievant and to the committee.”

**24.** Add the following language (quoted from the Liberal Studies Reappointment and Promotion Policy, 2018)

“The majority of the members of the grievance committee must be contract faculty members.”

**25.** Add the following language (quoted from the Liberal Studies Reappointment and Promotion Policy, 2018)

“As a standing committee of the faculty, it must regularly report to the faculty on the number of cases heard or under study and the ultimate disposition of such cases, (for example, amicably settled, on appeal to the Provost or President, or committee report rejected by the Dean).”
C-FSC Administration and Technology Committee Minutes  
October 11, 2018

The entire committee met, by conference call, to discuss initiatives for the 2018-2019 academic year. We had an engaging and a productive meeting. The following initiatives have been identified as action items:

invite Len Peters, NYU Vice President, Information Technology & Chief Information Officer to deliver a presentation before the C-FSC regarding the impact of malware and phishing on the NYU community and to share initiatives that are underway to safeguard messaging and data

Invite Ben Maddox, Associate Vice President, Teaching and Learning with Technology to deliver a presentation before the C-FSC on the current trends in educational technology in the classroom (online and on premises) and the direction for New York University

Explore the newly deployed ‘NYU Connect,’ system, a new platform for advising alerts and other communication about student success. This may include inviting Bernie Savarese, Assistant VP for Student Success to present to the committee and/or the C-FSC.

Questions were raised regarding lesson content from NYU Classes that are appearing on the ‘Course Hero’ website. There are concerns arising, regarding the appropriateness of this; and questions as to possible safeguards. This is a discussion topic that the committee will take on, including reaching out to resources at the University to gather more data and information regarding the implications of this.

Lastly, the committee also spoke about the feasibility of engaging students in techno-related projects, that may be of interest to the Senate. This is a conversation that we will engage members of the C-FSC for input.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Kleinert
Chair
C-FSC
Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee

Date: October 12, 2018

Members: Scott Illingworth (Chair), Spiros Frangos, John Gershman, Fidelindo Lim, Noelle Mole Liston

The committee met on September 27th and October 11th. John Gershman, Scott Illingworth, and Noelle Molé Liston were present on both occasions.

REPORT
At the end of last academic year members of the committee met with MJ Knoll Finn and members of the parallel committee in the T-FSC to discuss her responses to our shared questions about the Spring Admit pilot program. The written responses she provided are included.

At our first two meetings this semester the committee discussed gathering data about any existing ramifications from that program and the relationship to larger questions about compensation and expectations for work outside a contracted period. We are requesting the help of C-FSC colleagues to assess both the rules and expectations from school to school, particularly regarding:

- Summer and J-term teaching
- How questions of compensation are handled (stipend, course reduction, buyout, etc.)
- Local conversations about the Spring Admit program

The committee prepared a set of items for the C-FSC Steering Committee as possible points of discussion with Provost Fleming regarding both Spring Admits and other potential changes in education policy she expects.

MJ Knoll Finn has requested semi-regular meetings with members of our committee to share upcoming plans and seek direct faculty input about ideas and plans under consideration by her department.

The committee is also reaching out to the Student Senators Council as we did last year to hear areas of focus or concern that we might collaborate with them on.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Illingworth
SPRING ADMISSION - GENERAL QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

What process was used to reach the decision to begin a Spring Admits program?

- After a review of the size of the incoming freshman classes and housing availability (due to more current students choosing to study away in spring) we decided to pilot a program that would move students from the fall to the spring to reduce the size of the fall first year class. The numbers are small because this is a pilot and we want to see how this will work. We also wanted to add flexibility to our academic calendar to mitigate the risk of only one point of entry (fall).

What faculty (Deans, Chairs, Tenure, Contract) were included in that process?

- All deans were informed of this when reviewing the data. Many were interested but three were willing to join the pilot – Liberal Studies, Steinhardt and Tandon. Liberal Studies had approximately 80 students in Year One. We are now in Year Two. The pilot is scheduled for five years. Targets for this year are below.

How will shared governance be engaged moving forward in decisions to expand/alter the Spring Admit program?

- Once we complete the pilot phase it would be good to discuss next steps. Schools are working closely with their own faculty since this is not a University-wide endeavor.

How many spring admits are expected to enroll for 2019, broken down by school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandon</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How is the University planning to incorporate Spring Admits into University residential life so as support their community-building without increasing their isolation?

- NYU will offer over 200 events during the spring semester to welcome first-year and transfer students. Spring Welcome takes place during the first three weeks of spring semester and includes a series of events, information sessions and meet ups for all students to kick start the new semester.

Will Spring Admits have an opportunity to join the Explorations Program from the outset of their NYU careers?

- "The Faculty Affiliates and Explorations program are part of an ongoing University effort to create intimate "learning communities" for our students through the integration of their academic experiences and their residential lives."

What is the University’s expectation, if any, of how these students will spend the Fall semester prior to their Spring matriculation at NYU?

1. All NYU admitted freshmen starting in the spring semester have the opportunity to take advantage of the NYU School of Professional Studies GAP Semester Program in Fall 2018, a program specifically designed to allow students to sharpen their skills and gain real-world exposure to different industries before beginning their undergraduate studies. All NYU students will receive a $1,500 scholarship that may be applied to GAP Semester tuition.

2. If you want to start gaining hands-on experience, or saving up some money to help fund your university expenses, you could choose to work or intern with a local organization.
3. You could choose to take a gap semester and spend a few months volunteering or traveling.

4. You could spend some time honing your craft - whether that's arts or athletics - by fully immersing yourself in your practice.

5. You could consider taking classes as a visiting student at a local college or university (just be sure to not enroll at another institution as a degree-seeking student).

6. If you choose to take classes, touch base with your academic advisor prior to enrolling to ensure that any course you take will qualify for credit once you arrive at NYU and the Office of Financial Aid to confirm that it will not impact your financial aid eligibility.

Steinhardt

With respect to the spring semester, in what courses within schools will Spring Admits be required to take that typically are not offered in the spring semester?

- We have adjusted the first semester experience so that spring admits are taking courses that are typically offered in the spring semester. The only exception is that we haven't typically offered freshman-only, program-specific 0-credit New Student Seminars (exclusive to Steinhardt) and we will be adding those seminars to each program for the spring admits.

Aside from courses that may require fall semester prerequisites, will Spring Admits be "mainstreamed" into regularly-scheduled spring semester courses, or are special classes planned for them as a cohort of brand-new freshmen to ensure they're getting the attention they need in learning environments shared with students who have been in college for the fall semester?

- Fall freshmen are mainstreamed into all courses in the fall, and spring freshmen will be, too. As noted above, we will have a New Student Seminar in each of our three majors that will be for freshmen so that they are oriented throughout the spring term, just as the fall freshmen would be throughout the fall term.

How have faculty who are currently responsible for teaching those courses been included in planning for these new enrollments?

- These are regularly scheduled spring courses appropriate for freshmen. There is nothing to discuss with them. The New Student Seminar is taught by advisers in the fall, and will be taught by them in the spring -- the same curriculum, so they are fully prepared.

With respect to the summer, what plans have been made to meet the anticipated increase in summer course demand for the Spring Admits?

- The programs are ready and know what to expect for any courses in the major that students will be taking over the summer. As for CAS courses, we've spoken with Richard Kalb and there are so many liberal arts Core and other electives
offered in the summer, that students will easily disperse themselves across a wide range of possible courses.

In what courses within schools will Spring Admits be required to take that typically are not offered in the Summer semester?

- The only course Steinhardt students will be required to take in the summer that is not typically offered in the summer is Advanced College Essay. We have had lengthy conversations with the CAS Writing team to offer this course in the 1st session of the summer for all three Steinhardt majors. All the remaining summer curricula have been worked out by the faculty themselves. The courses students will be taking in the summer are typically offered in the summer.

To what extent is the University planning to create new courses and/or increase enrollments in existing courses?

- I'm not sure what you mean. The University doesn't create courses; academic departments do. They all know what to expect and will be working with our School registrar, as needed to make sure there's enough room in summer 2019 courses.

How has the University included relevant faculty in such planning?

- Same answer as above re spring.

Does the University expect Spring Admits to catch up to the prior year's Fall Admits after completing their summer coursework?

- Yes

In addition to a potential increase in summer course offerings, does the University anticipate a potential increase in course offerings for the following Fall semester as well?

- Since nearly of these spring admits are not additive, then there should be no to minimal impact on fall course enrollments.

Has the University set forth a policy or set of principles with respect to balancing the number of adjunct versus full-time faculty who will be responsible for teaching these potentially additional course offerings/sections?

- Since Steinhardt students are taking regularly scheduled summer courses, faculty are expected to hold office hours and otherwise be available during the summer term in which they are teaching -- as usual. I will check with Vice Dean Ted Magder when he returns to the office in June to see if the directors for Steinhardt's three programs already receive summer compensation.

Has the University set forth a policy or set of principles with respect to an anticipated necessary extension for faculty planning and oversight during the summer?

- NA
How does the University expect the Spring Admits program to impact the University's budget and affordability due to the potential need to hire additional adjuncts and/or fulltime faculty who will have increased responsibilities for teaching, advising, and mentoring, particularly during the summer?

➤ Will incur some additional expense for adjuncts in Summer 2019 only for the Advanced College Essay.

To what extent does the University believe that AP credits or college credits earned by spring admits during the Fall semester prior to NYU Spring matriculation may ameliorate some of these issues?

➤ It's possible that not all spring admit freshmen will take a full load of summer courses if they bring in AP or other credits. Hard to know in advance how those credits will count toward degree requirements.

What is the planning to ensure that required core academic courses and prerequisites in pursuing a major are available to Spring Admits each semester as needed?

➤ In working out the spring and summer curricula for Spring admits, we've already ensured that these students will be able to make the progress they need to in order to register as Sophomores in the fall term.

To what extent have discussions focused on the differential needs of Spring Admits who are pursuing sequential majors (e.g., in the STEM areas) versus non-sequential majors?

➤ This is only an issue for our Nutrition major, and the schedule we've worked out for spring admits ensures that we're meeting their needs.

What support services have been planned to help Spring Admits acculturate as new NYU students or even as new college students? (Unlike transfer students, Spring Admits may not be bringing prior full-time collegiate experience with them.)

➤ See note about Steinhardt's New Student Seminar.

What is the planning to support Spring Admits academically to ensure that they do not face retention issues the way transfer students often do?

➤ Students work directly and immediately with major-specific advisers, just as Fall freshmen do, and will participate in New Student Seminar in the spring. We are not anticipating higher attrition than we would see among fall freshmen.
Liberal Studies

With respect to the spring semester, in what courses within schools will Spring Admits be required to take that typically are not offered in the spring semester?

➢ Cultural Foundations I, Social Foundations I, and Writing I

Aside from courses that may require fall semester prerequisites, will Spring Admits be "mainstreamed" into regularly-scheduled spring semester courses, or are special classes planned for them as a cohort of brand-new freshmen to ensure they’re getting the attention they need in learning environments shared with students who have been in college for the fall semester?

➢ In Liberal Studies, we now offer 3 courses in the spring (CF I, SF I, Writing I) that historically were only offered during the fall. In addition to these 3 core requirements, students register for an elective from the options normally offered across NYU for first-year students. In this regard, then, 75% of the spring curriculum entails special courses for this population, and 25% "mainstream" electives.

How have faculty who are currently responsible for teaching those courses been included in planning for these new enrollments?

➢ The faculty were contacted last summer and fall semester to recruit them for the spring/summer teaching sequence in Cultural Foundations, Social Foundations, and Writing.

With respect to the summer, what plans have been made to meet the anticipated increase in summer course demand for the Spring Admits?

➢ The second components of the core sequence are scheduled in the summer, specifically Cultural Foundations II, Social Foundations II and Writing II. Students are advised to register for 3 courses only, however, so there is no anticipated increase in summer course demand beyond the core requirements mentioned.

In what courses within schools will Spring Admits be required to take that typically are not offered in the Summer semester?

➢ Cultural Foundations II, Social Foundations II, Writing II

To what extent is the University planning to create new courses and/or increase enrollments in existing courses?

➢ If spring admits register in 3 core requirements during summer, there will not be a need for new courses, only additional sections of the same core courses as this population increases over time.

How has the University included relevant faculty in such planning?

➢ The necessary planning is recruitment of faculty to teach courses in the spring/summer core sequence, which is already happening in Liberal Studies.
Does the University expect Spring Admits to catch up to the prior year’s Fall Admits after completing their summer coursework?

- Yes

In addition to a potential increase in summer course offerings, does the University anticipate a potential increase in course offerings for the following Fall semester as well?

- No, there is no increase anticipated in Liberal Studies for fall semester courses. With the shift of enrollments from fall into spring, we instead anticipate some reduction in sections offered during the fall, and the standard number of sections during the spring.

Has the University set forth a policy or set of principles with respect to balancing the number of adjunct versus full-time faculty who will be responsible for teaching these potentially additional course offerings/sections?

- N/A, there must be a university-level discussion about the value of summer teaching with expansion of the spring admissions population, evaluating options for faculty incentives (higher compensation, including "on load," etc.).

Has the University set forth a policy or set of principles with respect to an anticipated necessary extension for faculty planning and oversight during the summer?

- N/A, the planning and oversight of the summer courses for spring admits is currently through administrative units within Liberal Studies, such as Academic Affairs and Academic Advising. These administrative units operate throughout the summer regardless. In Advising though, one additional academic advisor was hired to support the advisement and programming needs of this population.

How does the University expect the Spring Admits program to impact the University’s budget and affordability due to the potential need to hire additional adjuncts and/or full-time faculty who will have increased responsibilities for teaching, advising, and mentoring, particularly during the summer?

- Uncertain. The savings from needing fewer instructors during the fall semester help offset summer teaching expenses, but only a limited extent. Whether we secure more full-time faculty or more adjunct faculty to teach summer as the program expands, budget and compensation will require further conversation.

To what extent does the University believe that AP credits or college credits earned by Spring Admits during the Fall semester prior to NYU Spring matriculation may ameliorate some of these issues?

- Based on the current structure for spring admissions, advanced standing credits (whether test or transfer) ameliorate some of the credit concerns for students. For this reason, students are allowed to register in up to 8 credits non-degree at other institutions during the gap semester.
What is the planning to ensure that required core academic courses and prerequisites in pursuing a major are available to Spring Admits each semester as needed?

- This represents a challenge, since all students in this cohort pursue a major outside of Liberal Studies. For instance, all students declaring a major in Media, Culture & Communication (MCC) need to complete one of three core courses for the major by the fall semester of sophomore year. Since spring admits typically register later in the queue though, enrollment in a core course for the MCC major has been difficult. For the current cohort, approximately 11 students (out of 82) intend to declare the MCC major, but 9 of those students were closed out of the required classes, and advised instead to join a waitlist for now and check again in July. We anticipate ongoing issues with spring admits accessing some of these "gateway" courses for various majors and are working through a way to manage their ability to get important courses toward their major choice.

To what extent have discussions focused on the differential needs of Spring Admits who are pursuing sequential majors (e.g., in the STEM areas) versus non-sequential majors?

- Again this represents a challenge, especially for students pursuing pre-health that might need to incorporate a laboratory science in the summer, or a student pursuing business that might need to manage all the prerequisites for internal transfer application. Since students are customarily advised against taking pre-health requirements in the summer, so for heavily sequenced curricula, taking one term out of those available to progress in the sequence can complicate matters. This was the reason for initially requesting admission for spring semester minimize acceptances for pre-health students.

What support services have been planned to help Spring Admits acculturate as new NYU students or even as new college students? (Unlike transfer students, Spring Admits may not be bringing prior full-time collegiate experience with them.)

- Some services and programs intended to support this population included a dedicated academic advisor for spring admits, 6 dedicated peer advisors, monthly newsletters from peers throughout the spring, clustered housing assignments in a first-year residence hall, monthly advising newsletters during the fall semester, new student orientation (with a dean's convocation, museum visits, common reading discussion, group service activity, etc.), virtual faculty seminars during the fall, a student life webinar to promote early awareness, assessment and satisfaction surveys, and modified policies and criteria to allow participation in various programs (e.g., alternative breaks, study abroad petitions, internal transfer deadlines, student government committees, dean's list honors, LS Dean's Circle scholars group, LS Probst Merit Scholarships, etc.).

What is the planning to support Spring Admits academically to ensure that they do not face retention issues the way transfer students often do?

- In addition to regular check-ins and outreach from the academic advisor and peer advisors, all the standard support resources and services are available to
this population. While retention has not appeared to be a concern, there may
need to be some vigilance around summer leaves of absence. For various
reasons, a couple students who committed to the program last May have
experienced some changes in their availability for the upcoming summer, which
has generated some requests for a leave of absence. These couple students will
return in the fall semester, but essentially be behind nearly one full semester.
Tandon

With respect to the spring semester, in what courses within schools will Spring Admits be required to take that typically are not offered in the spring semester?

➢ All courses will be among those that are typically offered in the spring semester.

Aside from courses that may require fall semester prerequisites, will Spring Admits be "mainstreamed" into regularly-scheduled spring semester courses, or are special classes planned for them as a cohort of brand-new freshmen to ensure they're getting the attention they need in learning environments shared with students who have been in college for the fall semester?

➢ The answer to this will depend on the numbers of spring admit students. If the numbers are commensurate with a separate class, we will probably work to that. But, if not, I do not think there will be any problem "mainstreaming" them. They will be receiving special advising from the first year advising staff, including a new hire specifically for that purpose.

How have faculty who are currently responsible for teaching those courses been included in planning for these new enrollments?

➢ Department Chairs and advisors have been made aware of the spring admissions initiative, but the faculty who will teach the courses have not been involved as yet. This will be done as part of the detailed planning when we have a better idea of the actual numbers of students and their disciplines.

With respect to the summer, what plans have been made to meet the anticipated increase in summer course demand for the Spring Admits?

➢ I have begun working with department chairs and advisors to work out the detailed plans. So far, the CSE department has expressed some concerns. Mainly they are concerned that they have been inundated with students lately, and are very stressed. I have assured them that the spring admission program is not meant to increase overall enrollment, but rather to shift from Fall to Spring. They have also expressed a concern about the CS-UU 1134 course over the summer, as it is a very challenging course. On the other hand, it is often offered over the summer, so it is not a new situation. I am currently in discussion with them.

In what courses within schools will Spring Admits be required to take that typically are not offered in the Summer semester?

➢ All courses will be among those that are typically offered in summer.

To what extent is the University planning to create new courses and/or increase enrollments in existing courses?

➢ There is no plan to create new courses, but certainly there will be increased enrollments in existing courses to some degree in the spring and summer.
How has the University included relevant faculty in such planning?

- The teaching faculty has not yet been included in the planning. As with the Spring Semester, this will be done as part of the detailed planning when we have a better idea of the actual numbers of students and their disciplines.

Does the University expect Spring Admits to catch up to the prior year's Fall Admits after completing their summer coursework?

- Yes

In addition to a potential increase in summer course offerings, does the University anticipate a potential increase in course offerings for the following Fall semester as well?

- We do anticipate a slight increase, but as the spring admits are simply shifted from the fall to the spring, we do not anticipate a large increase due to this initiative.

Has the University set forth a policy or set of principles with respect to balancing the number of adjunct versus full-time faculty who will be responsible for teaching these potentially additional course offerings/sections?

- No, there is no specific policy. But, the CSE department is in discussions with the administration about additional hiring and such balance in general with the increase in students they have seen. As this initiative grows, more long term planning will have to be done.

Has the University set forth a policy or set of principles with respect to an anticipated necessary extension for faculty planning and oversight during the summer?

- There is no specific policy regarding this. These issues are being worked out with departments affected. Again, as the program grows, more planning will be done.

How does the University expect the Spring Admits program to impact the University's budget and affordability due to the potential need to hire additional adjuncts and/or fulltime faculty who will have increased responsibilities for teaching, advising, and mentoring, particularly during the summer?

- In this first pilot program for spring admission, the numbers are not too large, and we do not expect a very large impact. It will probably involve either paying a few full time faculty additional pay over the summer, or hiring a few Adjuncts. Going forward this will be a more significant issue.

To what extent does the University believe that AP credits or college credits earned by Spring Admits during the Fall semester prior to NYU Spring matriculation may ameliorate some of these issues?

- We believe that these credits will ameliorate the issues somewhat, but will know better when we have the student profiles.
What is the planning to ensure that required core academic courses and prerequisites in pursuing a major are available to Spring Admits each semester as needed?

- All required courses for the standard fall semester will be offered in the spring, and those are the prerequisite courses for the standard spring semester, which will now be offered in summer.

To what extent have discussions focused on the differential needs of Spring Admits who are pursuing sequential majors (e.g., in the STEM areas) versus non-sequential majors?

- All of our conversations have been informed by the rigorous nature and vertical structure of the STEM majors targeted for this initiative. More specifically, the advisement process and support services being secured directly reflect our interest in mitigating any challenges the students may encounter during the spring and summer terms.

What support services have been planned to help Spring Admits acculturate as new NYU students or even as new college students? (Unlike transfer students, Spring Admits may not be bringing prior full-time collegiate experience with them.)

- During the gap semester, students will have an opportunity to take an online study skills course, focused on equipping them with the academic skills they will need to make a smooth transition to Tandon. Like their fall counterparts, spring admits will be privy to orientation activities, during the week before their first day of classes, designed to introduce them to the campus community. Throughout the spring and summer terms, students will receive structured academic support in two high impact areas: math and computer science. Students will also be introduced to the centralized and department-specific tutoring services available in the broader Tandon and NYU community. Lastly, students will meet with their advisors, on a regular basis (i.e. weekly to biweekly contacts), throughout their spring semester, shifting to less frequent sessions during the summer.

What is the planning to support Spring Admits academically to ensure that they do not face retention issues the way transfer students often do?

- Any potential retention issues evident in this population will be a function of their progression through the curriculum in the spring and summer terms, their participation in student life, and their connection to their academic departments. With this in mind, the support services extended to the students will be designed to facilitate their full integration into the NYU community in general, and the Tandon student experience specifically. Allowing students to form a tangible connection to the academic resources and opportunities at Tandon, one that extends beyond the completion of their first year, should lead to a sense of connectedness that yields strong retention figures.
September 30, 2018

RE: September Report of the Finance & Policy Committee to the Contract Faculty Senate Council.

Present:
Leila Jahangiri
Maria Patterson
Larry Slater
Tommy Lee

Not Present
Jamie Bianco
Joseph Carter

Agenda:
1. Meeting was convened by the members present to elect Tommy Lee as chair of the Finance and Policy Committee.
2. Set agenda to speak at the next finance meeting
   a. Revisit the AMI
   b. Revisit salary bands

Respectfully submitted,

Chair, CFSC Finance and Policy Committee

CC:
October 10, 2018

RE: October Report to the Contract Faculty Senate Council.

Financial Affairs Committee convened on 10/4 Thursday at 11AM in Kimmel 912

CSFC Members Present:
Leila Jahangiri
Maria Patterson
Larry Slater
Tommy Lee

Not Present
Joseph Carter

1. Meeting Lead by Stephanie Pianka, CFO of NYU
   a. Discussed the response by Provost regarding AMI (2018-2019)
      i. Need to further discuss as both TTFC and AMC are as concerned as we are
   b. Budgeting – Board of Trustee; report are made in June
   c. Need more information on compression / Inversion

   a. 57% of budget derived from Tuition and Financial Aid
   b. 10% Housing and Dining
   c. 9% Sponsored Research
   d. 8% Sponsored Educational Programs
   e. 4% Endowment

3. Faculty Salaries
   a. Full Professor (TT + CF) $214,523
   b. Assoc Professor (TT + CF) $124,884
   c. Asst Professor (TT + CF) $115,190

4. New Purchase
   a. 27 Washington Sq North for $45M from Vornado Realty (bought @ 20Mil in 2015).
      ii. Steven Roth – formal board member of school of medicine
   b. Residential before, so may be faculty housing

5. Ex-Officio member – Prof. Susan Stehlik, Stern School of Business, past Chair of Finance and Policy Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Chair, CFSC Finance and Policy Committee

CC: Committee Members and Steering committee
C-FSC Governance Committee Report dated October 9, 2018

Present: Jonathan Cayer, Lauren Davis, Antonios Saravanos, and Geoff Shullenberger.

The C-FSC Governance Committee met at noon on Friday 5th of October. The first order of business was to elect a Chair and the second order of business was to set the C-FSC Governance Committee's Agenda for AY 2018/2019.

Antonios Saravanos was unanimously re-elected to Chair the C-FSC Governance Committee for AY 2018-2019.

The Committee is hereby proposing the following agenda items:

- Create Recommendations and Best Practices Guidelines for Nomination and election of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators for distribution to Schools across NYU
- Create and propose by-laws for adoption by the C-FSC.
- Work with the T-FSC to edit the data and report on the shared governance survey conducted in 2016.
- Create a mechanism that would require different Schools to ratify NYU's Principles of Joint Shared Governance [https://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/university-senate/membership/councils/tenured-tenure-track-faculty-senators-council/rules-bylaws/principles-of-joint-shared-governance.html](https://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/university-senate/membership/councils/tenured-tenure-track-faculty-senators-council/rules-bylaws/principles-of-joint-shared-governance.html) (currently the principles are limited to Board/Administration/both Faculty Senator Councils).
- Support as needed the Communications Committee’s initiative to create communication channels between Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty and Faculty Councils across different schools.

The committee's next meeting is scheduled for noon on Friday November 2nd.

The meeting adjourned at 3:31pm.
Report of the Personnel Policies & Contract Issues
October 11, 2018

Our committee met October 10 from 2:00-3:30pm with the T-FSC Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications Committee.

(C-FSC members in attendance: Husefa Talib and Heidi White, and by phone - Sally Cohen, John Gershman, Joyce Moon-Howard. T-TFSC members in attendance: Co-Chairs Phyllis Frankl and Robert Lapiner, Fabienne Doucet, Rochelle Dreyfuss, and Susan Waltzman)

Our two committees discussed the Meyers College of Nursing: Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty. We unanimously approved to combine our sets of recommendations. The merged document requires a vote of approval by our council. Please see our recommendations below.

We also discussed the recent submission of the School of Professional Studies: Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty. Because of the length, the number of appendices, and the number of draft documents included, we unanimously agreed to send a letter to the T-TFS and C-CFSC Council chairs, asking for a shorter document, one that only includes finalized documents, and one that includes a finalized grievance policy. The letter will also request clarification about process for appointment, reappointment, and promotion at SPS in the interim. Phyllis Frankl kindly volunteered to pen the letter.

We also added three principles to our “21 Principles” document. See document below. These additions (highlighted in the document) require a vote by our council.
Graduate Program Committee

The following programs were approved:

1. Master of Science (M.S.) in Executive Coaching and Organizational Consulting (online with a low residency component)

2. Master of Science (M.S.) in Economics at NYU Abu Dhabi

Submitted by Iskender Sahin