MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 25, 2017

The New York University Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at noon on Tuesday, April 25, 2017 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Carl, Celik, Ferguson, Gershman, Halpin, Howard-Spink, Jahangiri, Joachim, Killilea, Kim, Mooney, Paiz, Sacks, Slater, Stehlik, Stewart, Watkins, Williams, and Youngerman; Alternate Senators Bianco, Casey, Depaola-Cefola (for Herman), Elcott, Fitterman (for White), Funk, Lee, Mandracchia, Mirabito (for Morton), Renzi, Sahin (for Borowiec), Smith.

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 MARCH 28, 2017

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the March 28, 2017 meeting were approved unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: FRED CARL

See attached Document A: C-FSC Chair Update

T-FSC Resolution in Support of Student Senators Council Resolution re: Board of Trustees

Chairperson Carl clarified the student resolution will be delayed until the fall and the T-FSC will also wait to present their resolution regarding faculty involvement on the Board of Trustees.

Senator Slater noted the students presented at the meeting of the Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (SCOG) and SCOG made recommendations regarding the resolution, including gaining a better understanding of the board functions and condensing the number of requests.

Retreat

Chairperson Carl asked for volunteers to assist the Communications Committee in planning and organizing the retreat.

C-FSC End of Year Celebration

Chairperson Carl reminded Council members of the End of Year Celebration on Wednesday, April 26. He noted special guests who will be in attendance.
Final Council Meeting of Academic Year 2016-2017

Chairperson Carl noted the final meeting of the academic year is on Thursday, May 11. At the meeting, the Personnel Policies and Contract Issues Committee will present their review of the Faculty of Arts & Science (FAS) Continuing Contract Faculty Policy. The Steering Committee elections for 2017-2018 will also take place. He noted that some school’s elections may not be completed by this date. If any newly elected Steering Committee members do not get re-elected by their school, the seat will become vacant and in the fall the C-FSC will choose the replacements for any vacant seats. He noted all Senators are eligible to run for Steering Committee positions.

Publications, Performances, Awards and Distinctions

John Gershman, John Halpin, and Heidi White received Distinguished Teaching Awards.

Jamie Skye Bianco was awarded the Steinhardt Continuing Contract Fellowship for next year.

The Chair’s Report was accepted into the minutes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

See attached Document B: Committee Reports

Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:

Communications: Susan Stehlik

Senator Stehlik noted the newsletter was sent to all Continuing Contract Faculty (C-Faculty), but with some errors. She proposed re-sending a corrected version. The Committee also received a recommendation to develop a policy regarding receiving permission of faculty members before any photos are posted in the newsletter, even if the photo is on a school website and already public.

She clarified the errors included typos and issues of clarity in the list of terms limits.

A Senator suggested making a distinction between individual people versus group photos. For individual photos, he suggested asking the individual first before publishing. A Senator noted the Photo Bureau offers professional headshots.

Senators noted the election information was correct and suggested to not re-send the newsletter.

Senate Public Affairs

A Senator reported at the Committee meeting it was noted that uniformed officers at NYU only have the rights of private citizens.

No Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:

Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations: Ben Stewart
GNU: Sam Howard-Spink
Personnel Policies and Contract Issues: Brian Mooney
Senate Academic Affairs: Ben Stewart
Senate SCOG: Larry Slater
Undergraduate Academic Affairs: Ethan Youngerman
Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Work-Life Issues: Diane Mirabito
Faculty Committee on the Future of Technology-Enhanced Education: Mary Killilea
Faculty Working Group on Global Learning Outcomes: Mary Killilea
Reports at Meeting:

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion: David Elcott

Senator Elcott reported the Committee is gathering information on C-Faculty and T-Faculty regarding diversity including race, ethnicity, gender, rank, and contract terms and also pay scale within the bands. In addition, the Committee is interested in gathering qualitative data by meeting with the diversity chairs of every school.

A Senator mentioned the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) equity report. It was noted the intention is to gather similar data for each school.

A Senator noted the recommended proposal to the Financial Affairs Committee requested a third party consultant do a complete compensation benefits study throughout the University.

It was noted the Committee is drafting the request and will bring to the Council for vote prior to sending the request to the University Administration.

A Senator noted the University Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion received demographic information regarding diversity and she recommended asking for data by school.

Finance and Policy Planning: Susan Stehlik

Senator Stehlik noted the memo from the Provost confirming the base compensation for full-time continuing contract faculty will be raised to a minimum of $60,000/year by September 1, 2017. In addition, the Provost has asked all the deans to promptly make clear how and for what purposes full-time continuing contract faculty can avail themselves of professional development funds.

Affordability Steering Committee: Susan Stehlik

Stehlik reported the Committee will meet this summer. She noted the Committee is examining the cost of transportation and transportation options and encouraged Council members to send any comments and suggestions.

The reports were accepted into the minutes.

PRESENTATIONS

Presentation, discussion and vote on recommendations regarding Tandon Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion.

See attached Document C: Tandon Recommendations.

Senator Mooney noted the T-FSC submitted their recommendations and attached the C-FSC recommendations they supported. The eight recommendations the T-FSC omitted concerned whether reappointment committee members should be elected or appointed and if a person is denied reappointment whether they have access to the full file.

A Senator suggested recommending an edit to section E. (2) (b), which currently states:

Where such an appeal is made, the Dean shall transmit to the Provost a report of the proceedings in the case at earlier stages. The Provost shall in each case obtain the advice of an ad hoc advisory committee—the Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C- FSC) Grievance Committee—drawn from a standing committee that shall consist of the members of the C-FSC Grievance Committee and the T-FSC Grievance committee.
He recommended instead stating one member from each of those committees plus one senior administrator selected by the C-FSC Steering Committee.

Mooney confirmed the Committee will make the correction.

The Senator also recommended the Committee review section F. (7) and ensure it follows new guidelines for grievances not having to do with appointment, reappointment, and promotion. This section states:

- **Appeal from a Dean’s Decision on Matters such as Duties, Salaries, Perquisites, and Working Conditions**

  Where such an appeal is desired by a faculty member and the Provost is so informed within 15 days after the faculty member is notified of the Dean’s decision, the Provost shall make informal s available. Appeal from a Dean’s decision can only be made on the same grounds as in (B) above.

A Senator noted typos in Recommendations 26, 49, and 50.

Senators discussed the recommendations regarding contracts being at least three years. A Senator noted some faculty members may prefer a one year or two year contract.

A Senator noted if a faculty member on a three year contract decides to leave after a year, they can break the contract.

It was suggested to add language allowing a faculty member to request a shorter contract. A Senator noted the downside of offering this option and the possibility of junior faculty being persuaded to ask for a one year contract.

A Senator asked if there is a standard time table for the reappointment process regarding notification. It was clarified for a one year appointment the faculty member will be notified by March 1 and for a three year appointment the faculty member will be notified by August 31 in the penultimate year.

The recommendations, with suggested corrections, were approved by vote of the Council.

**Presentation, discussion and vote on two recommendations regarding faculty evaluations from the C-FSC Educational Policies and Student/Faculty Relations Committee**

See attached Document D: Educational Policies recommendation.

Senator Stewart reported on the recommendations of the Committee. He noted on page 2 of the report under Recommendations for the Assessment of NYU’s SET system, the implication is that if general global measures do not correlate to more specific questions, this would be an indication that those general questions are measuring professor likeability or personality rather than teaching ability. The Committee proposes adding a third recommendation that states if those measures do not correlate, the Provost office will charge a body with revising the first two questions to be more specific.

A Senator suggested it be made clear this is a course evaluation rather than an instructor evaluation. A Senator noted in undergraduate programs, certain courses may have more drop-outs and in order to improve the quality of education, the task is to identify the relation to content or to the faculty member. A Senator noted schools use these evaluations to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Senators expressed concerns with the evaluations ability to accurately convey teaching effectiveness.

A Senator noted, as seen in the revision done at CAS, by focusing questions and asking students to respond to a single item more focused feedback is received. He also noted the importance of focusing on actionable items, i.e. feedback stating course goals are not clear.
He suggested in recommendation IV.2. regarding statistical validity of the sample, adding distribution scores in addition to the size of the class and the response rate.

He noted that extracurricular events outside the classroom can strongly affect evaluations. He suggested specific examples could be used.

He suggested tempering the language regarding grade inflation to recognize the potential reasons for the difference in grading. He noted continuing contract faculty frequently teach courses, such as introductory courses, in which there is a wide distribution in student abilities.

A Senator noted in cases where slanderous or threatening comments are sent, it may be important to note where information is secured for security purposes.

A Senator suggested the Committee also look at increasing response rates, which went down with online evaluations. He noted the College of Arts and Science requested faculty members devote the last ten minutes of the last class to the evaluations. A Senator noted at College of Dentistry students are required to submit evaluations in order to receive a grade.

A Senator stated at the Stern School 60% of the contract appointment is based on faculty evaluations.

Senators discussed the option to add additional questions to the evaluations in order to customize. Several schools do this.

A Senator asked about confidentiality and a Senator agreed that confidentiality should be emphasized. It was noted this refers to comments. The average numbers will be publicly available.

Senator Stewart thanked the Council for their comments.

**Presentation, discussion and vote on recommendations from Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (SCOG)**

*See attached Document E: SCOG Proposed Resolution.*

Senator Slater presented the proposed resolution from SCOG.

SCOG considered bylaws revisions related to Sections 65-69 of the University Bylaws. SCOG has recommended a change to Section 66. The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council, Section (a) Functions. The suggested change is as follows for the final sentence:

Original: It will perform such other educational functions as requested of it by the President and Chancellor, or by the Board.

Suggested: It may perform such other functions as are requested of it by the President and Chancellor, by the Board, or by the Senate.

The resolution was approved by vote of the Council.

**Presentation, discussion and vote on recommendation regarding tuition benefits from C-FSC Benefits and Housing Committee**

*See attached Document F: Faculty Degree Study.*

Alternate Senator Renzi reported the Committee examined the issue of tuition benefits for faculty. The Committee is also asking the T-FSC Benefits Committee to examine.
Renzi noted an amendment to the recommendation requesting the Provost ask the Board of Trustees for authorization to grant waivers to faculty who were eligible for this benefit as of September 1, 2014.

A Senator noted when dependent tuition benefits were changed from 100% to 90% tuition remission current students were not grandfathered in.

The recommendation, with suggested changes, was approved by vote of the Council.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Retreat Planning: Leila Jahangiri**

The Communications Committee asked for suggestions regarding the May C-FSC retreat.

Senator Jahangiri recommended the Mindful Leadership conference, and noted it is offered by a NYU alum. She offered this type of leadership session as a suggestion and asked for other suggestions.

A Senator recommended programs through the Vice Provost of Diversity Initiatives.

A Senator recommended using the retreat to set agenda items for the next academic year, and commented he found this to be a valuable exercise last year.

A Senator recommended structuring around general categories, such as global, financial, diversity, etc., to gather priorities and help format committee membership based on interests.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
C-FSC—Chair’s Report
Chairperson Fred Carl

Report as of April 21, 2017

1. President Hamilton and Provost Fleming Letter of Tuesday, April 18, 2017

All continuing contract faculty members should have received the letter from Andy and Katy announcing the decision to raise “base compensation for full-time continuing contract faculty to a minimum of $60,000/year by September 1, 2017,” and to ask “all the deans to promptly make clear how and for what purposes full-time continuing contract faculty can avail themselves of professional development funds.” (See full letter at https://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president/communications/increasing-base-compensation-for-full-time-contract-faculty-and-setting-clearer-policies-for-professional-development-funds.html)

These actions on the part of the University is significant in a few respects: it is a real step in correcting some compensation issues that have forced many excellent teachers to wonder whether they can afford to continue to teach at NYU; it is a public statement of commitment to continuing contract faculty as individuals who, like all other faculty, desire to continue to grow as teachers and thinkers and artists so that we can bring new skills into our classrooms; and it demonstrates the value of the C-FSC’s continually developing regular conversations and work with various members of the University community, work that happens in committee meetings, regular meetings with the University leadership, and in our Schools.

I would like to congratulate our C-FSC Finance and Policy Planning Committee—Susan, Jamie, Leila, Tommy and Jon—for the excellence of their work in preparing the detailed case for our proposals.

2. Action Items

We will have a number of items up for discussion and voting at the meeting on Tuesday, April 25, 2017:

1) Tandon policy;

2) Two recommendations from the Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee;
3) Recommendations from SCOG;

4) A recommendation on Tuition Benefits from our Committee on Benefits and Housing;

3. T-FSC Resolution in Support of Student Senators Council
Resolution re: Board of Trustees

The SSC gave a presentation to the T-FSC on their resolution calling for student members on the Board of Trustees similar to the one they presented to us at our March 28, 2017 meeting. After that meeting the T-FSC approved the following resolution:

Resolution from the T-FSC Governance Committee
Regarding Faculty Representation on the NYU Board of Trustees

WHEREAS faculty members have a distinctive perspective on the research and educational mission, and on the culture and administration of our university; and

WHEREAS, commendably, the NYU Board has been seeking more engagement with NYU faculty members;

RESOLVED that the T-FSC (Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Senators Council) proposes to the NYU Board of Trustees that the Board add NYU Faculty members to the Board to take part in the Board’s deliberations and decisions, and furthermore that the NYU Faculty will select the faculty representatives on the Board.

The SSC will not be presenting their resolution to the Senate until the Fall 2017. The T-FSC will not present theirs to the Senate until after the SSC has presented.

4. Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Misconduct

The Senate Executive Committee has approved Aysan Celik (NYUAD) to replace Susan Stehlik (Stern) as one of the C-FSC representatives on this committee.

5. Senate Task Force on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

The Task Force will be presenting its final report at the Thursday, April 27, 2017 University Senate Meeting.

6. C-FSC End of the Year Celebration
Our End of the Year Celebration will be on Wednesday, April 26, 2017, with cocktails and a DJ from 6:00-7:00 and dinner and a jazz flute trio from 7:00-9:00 in Kimmel 912/914.

7. C-FSC Retreat

Our 2017 C-FSC Retreat will be on Wednesday, May 24, 2017, from 10:00am-4:00pm in Kimmel 405/406.

8. Final C-FSC Meeting of AY 2016-2017

Our final C-FSC meeting will be on Thursday, May 11, 2017, 12:00-2:00. The election of Steering Committee members for AY 2017-2018 will take place at the meeting. Nominations can be sent to Karyn prior to the meeting. We realize that some School elections will not be finalized before May 11. However, if a nominated member intends to run, we should act as though they will be eligible; in the event that they are elected to the Steering Committee, but are not reelected by their School, that seat will be filled at the first C-FSC meeting of Fall 2017.

9. C-FSC Meeting Participation

The Steering Committee strongly urges all C-FSC members, Senators and Alternate Senators, to attend and participate in C-FSC meetings and committees. Our Rules of Procedure stipulate that only Senators may vote on any action items (Alternate Senators vote when their corresponding Senator is unable to attend). It should be kept in mind that votes on Action Items comprise a relatively small part of our meetings. The bulk of our meetings consist of in-depth discussions of items of importance to continuing contract faculty by all members of the C-FSC, Senators and Alternate Senators included, and all committees and discussions rely on participation by the full Council.

10. Publications, Performances, Awards and Distinctions

Please mention any awards, publications, performances and distinctions at the meeting.

Thank You!
Report from C-CFSC Communications Committee
Vicky Steeves (chair), Leila Jahangiri, Susan Stehlik, and Sally Cohen

Date: April 4, 2017

We discussed the workflow for newsletter content generation, design, and dissemination in reference to the hiring of a student designer. The Committee interviewed two candidates for this position.

We then reviewed, in depth, the content and style of the first newsletter, which should be sent out within before the end of April.

Submitted respectfully,
Vicky Steeves, chair
Educational Policies Committee Report  
April 25th, 2017  

Members Present: Neal Herman, Brian Mooney, Deborah Smith, Ben Stewart (chair)  

The Educational Policies Committee last met on Thursday, April 20th. At that meeting, we continued to revise our draft report with recommendations on evaluations. That report includes four sets of recommendations: two that would go to the Provost’s office and two that we would place on our website. We would like to discuss this report at our April 25th meeting. Between April 25th and May 11th, we will work on revisions with the goal of putting the report, and its recommendations, to a vote at our May 11th meeting.  

Respectfully submitted by Ben Stewart
The committee held its most recent meeting of the semester on March 30, 2017. In attendance were Sam Howard-Spink, Aysan Celik, Josh Paiz, Mary Killilea, and Vince Renzi.

The group discussed the ongoing revisions to the joint hiring document being debated by the Faculty Council on the GNU, with regard to the role of C-faculty in evaluating T-faculty for hiring and promotion at the portals. There was strong agreement that “program heads” in AD and “area heads” in Shanghai be consulted on promotions (or at least be invited to contribute a letter to a tenure application packet), and that that involvement be codified in the document. (NB: It’s my understanding that the document will come to the CFSC for approval before finalization, which will allow us to make the case formally).

The other major topic for discussion was the proposed campus-wide conference to be held next year between the Square and the Portals, which had been raised at the Cross-Committee meeting of GNU faculty and site heads on March 28. It was agreed that C-faculty should be involved in programming the conference, perhaps convening a panel to discuss shared concerns across the portals.
Report of the Personnel Policies and Contract Issues Committee

April 21, 2017

Brian Mooney (chair), John Halpin, Heidi White, Lu Zhang

The Committee has completed its review of the policy for the Tandon School of Engineering and we are submitting recommendations on that policy to the C-FSC for its approval on April 25. Those recommendations are attached.

The T-FSC is submitting its own separate set of recommendations to the Provost to which they have attached a list of all of the C-FSC recommendations they support. Of our 53 recommendations they support all but 8. Those eight concern the composition of reappointment committees and a faculty member's access to written materials in the event of a denial of reappointment.

We are completing our review of the FAS policy this week and will submit that set of recommendations for approval at the May 11 C-FSC meeting.

Respectfully submitted
Brian Mooney
Senate Academic Affairs Committee (SAAC) Report
April 25th, 2017

Committee Members: Peggy Morton, Ezra Sacks, Ben Stewart (Chair)

On Thursday, April 13th, SAAC had a Calendar Working Group meeting to try to resolve issues with the Fall 2020 calendar. The Working Group included a representative from Tandon (from Applied Physics) and three representatives from three Washington Square departments (Biology, Chemistry, and Physics). After hearing about how each department manages their labs—as well as the logistical constraints that they face—we looked at the calendar options.

The Outcome of the Working Group: after a discussion of the pros and cons of the various options, there was a strong consensus that a Fall 2020 calendar without a Fall Break would be the best option for the lab sciences. For those departments, the other calendar options entail lab changes that are too frequent. Beyond infrastructure and personnel issues, the calendar’s logistical contingencies would also affect students in those sections: e.g., having to run labs out of sequence would disrupt the progressive scaffolding that the labs' development has been designed to produce. These problems affect several hundred students per department (in some cases 400-500 students per department).

The obvious disadvantage of the Working Group’s preferred calendar is that there is no Fall Break (other than Thanksgiving, the only day off that occurs within the semester is Labor Day). On the other hand, apart from the benefits to the lab sciences, one other advantage to the proposed calendar is that it would allow us to end the exam schedule a day earlier than any of the other options (December 21st rather than on the 22nd). Our hope is that this earlier end date would reduce the travel costs that students incur over winter break.

SAAC voted electronically to bring the proposed Fall 2020-Summer 2021 to the next Senate meeting on April 27th.

Respectfully submitted by Ben Stewart
The University Senate Public Affairs Committee met on Thursday, April 30, 2017. Marlon Lynch, Vice President for Global Campus Security, and members of his team presented detailed reports.

Public Safety covers a variety of critical campus functions such as investigations and victim assistance, emergency preparedness, environmental health, travel safety, and liaison with NYPD and other federal protection agencies. Changes are being made to meet new university needs, including accountability. These include the creation of two precincts, in Washington Square and Brooklyn, with standard 24/7 procedures for 350 uniformed officers and ongoing professional training; a new documentation and dispatch platform for the officers; the installation of upgraded equipment such as emergency call boxes, surveillance cameras, panic buttons, and card readers; refinements to NYU Alerts; and an advanced sexual misconduct compliance policy. Abu Dhabi has been folded into Public Safety operations and Washington Square now authorizes remote printing of ID badges at all the global sites.

Public Safety’s Strategic Technical Operations follows Information Technology guidelines and protocols, including NYU firewall protections to protect sensitive and personal data. As an anti-hacking prevention, NYU’s security system is maintained on a separate server that is not internet accessible nor tied into any other NYU systems. It maintains video footage from 2,700 cameras for a minimum of thirty days and is conscious of protecting student rights under FERPA.

Student safety in the residence halls was also discussed in the context of close cooperation with Public Safety, Counseling and Wellness Services, and the Student Health Center. The latter saw 30,000 unique students last year. Policies for sexual, alcohol and substance abuse, including prescription drugs, were outlined and it was reported that alcohol and marijuana use in the residence halls is down from this time last year. To insure awareness and compliance, students’ ability to register for the next semester can be blocked until they complete a NYU-specific online training module that is required of all freshmen, transfer and graduate students. Faculty training in the areas of sexual, alcohol and substance abuse policies can be requested (it is not mandated). Student hospitalizations for psychiatric treatment are up by 25% since this time last year (52 in 2015-2016, 65 so far in 2016-2017). Smoking remains an issue for community relations in the neighborhood and for NYU, especially outside Bobst Library, but enforcement has been challenging.

After a three year vacancy, the position of Director of Emergency Management has been filled by Jeff Stevens, who comes to NYU with high level military experience. In the absence of Coles, alternative sites have been identified on campus that can be used for emergency student accommodation as was necessary, for example, during Hurricane Sandy.

Respectfully submitted by Marion Casey
Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (SCOG)
C-FSC Meeting
April 25, 2017

John Gershman
Brian Mooney
Vincent Renzi
Larry Slater

SCOG met on March 30, 2017 and April 21, 2017.

March 30, 2017

As requested by the Senate Executive Committee, SCOG reviewed a resolution from the Student Senators Council regarding the creation of two voting student positions on the NYU Board of Trustees, which also included the development of a Board committee on “Student Life and Transparency” and the publication of minutes from Board of Trustees meetings. SCOG, as also submitted in a report to the Senate Executive Committee, recommended that the SSC not present the resolution at the University Senate at this time.

SCOG also considered bylaws revisions related to Sections 65-69 of the University Bylaws. SCOG has recommended a change to Section 66. The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council, Section (a) Functions. The suggested change is as follows for the final sentence:

Original: It will perform such other educational functions as requested of it by the President and Chancellor, or by the Board.

Suggested: It may perform such other functions as are requested of it by the President and Chancellor, by the Board, or by the Senate.

The suggested changes are to provide consistency among all five councils and also to have the bylaws more in alignment with current processes and practices.

April 21, 2017

At its final meeting of the year, SCOG reviewed a draft document on SCOG’s review of Senate Function, as requested for the 2016-2017 academic year by the Senate Executive Committee. SCOG will send the final report to the Senate Executive Committee prior to the final University Senate meeting on April 27, 2017 and it will be provided to the University Senate at the meeting. The report will include recommendations for improving Senate Function in four target areas:

1) Bylaws Recommendations (addressing Sections 65-69 as stated above)
2) General Senate Function Recommendations (relating to meetings, committees, and policies)
3) Board of Trustee Recommendations (improving relationships and visibility)
4) Communications Recommendations (visibility, transparency, and ease of use on the NYU Website for Administration and University Senate pages)
The Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee met on 3/30.

The UAAC, in collaboration with the FTEE, officially sent a Joint Advisory on Policies Regarding Online Courses to Provost Fleming, who accepted it. The advisory aims to make such policies consistent across NYU schools, while giving schools flexibility about what to accept and produce.

An advisory on the Residential Colleges (which will be at 181 Mercer) is nearing completion in a subcommittee. A macrolevel advisory (the building won’t be open for at least 4 years), it focuses on student body make-up, recruitment, faculty presence, and the possibility for residential-curricular links.

The committee also examined a draft of an advisory on Global Learning Outcomes, organized around “competencies” and “attitudes/values,” that are commonly used in college impact studies.

-Respectfully submitted by Ethan Youngerman
The Undergraduate Program Committee met on Tuesday, March 28, 2017. At that meeting it was announced that the Department of Mathematics at the Tandon School of Engineering would be joined with the Department of Mathematics at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences. A new version of the UPC proposal form and guidelines for departments/units that wish to build online programs were also discussed. A program proposal for a new major in Interactive Media at NYU Abu Dhabi was presented by representatives from NYUAD. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 27, 2017.

Respectfully submitted by John Halpin
TO: Karyn M. Ridder, Manager, Faculty Governance
FROM: Diane Mirabito, DSW, Clinical Associate Professor, Silver School of Social Work
RE: Work Life Balance Committee Meeting
DATE: April 21, 2017

The Work Life Balance Committee met twice in April. The Survey developed by the Committee, in collaboration with HR, was implemented to administrators, researchers, and faculty. Participation rate included: 58.6% for administrators, 26.3% for researchers and 33% for faculty.

This month the committee focused on discussion and analysis of the survey results. Results will be analyzed this summer and will be available at the beginning of the Fall semester.

In addition to compiling and analyzing the survey results, committee members will be exploring model Work/Life programs throughout the country at comparable Universities/Colleges.

A report of the committee’s work for the past 1 and ½ years and its recommendations will be given at the Senate meeting on April 27th.
Report on the Faculty Committee on Future of Technology-Enhanced Education

C-FSC Representative: Mary Killilea

Report as of April 25, 2017

During the March 6, 2017 the Faculty Committee on Future of Technology-Enhanced Education discussed the following:

1. Clay Shirky, who currently represents NYU Shanghai on the committee, would be taking up the position of Vice Provost for Educational Technologies beginning July 1.

2. The committee approved the final version of this advisory, which incorporates several edits suggested by the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee. [Subsequent to the meeting, the document was shared on March 8 with Provost Fleming, who approved it. Matthew will discuss it with the Undergraduate Deans at that group’s next meeting on March 22.]

3. Visit by Armanda Lewis and Francesca Socolick (co-chairs, instructional technologists subcommittee of the TTC) Armanda Lewis and Francesca Socolick gave a presentation on the instructional technologists subcommittee. Per the ad hoc FTEE committee’s recommendation (in its Final Report of July 2014), the hiring of instructional technologists began in each NYU school, using provostial bridge funding. Shortly thereafter, the group was formed as a subcommittee of the TTC, and it began meeting monthly. Among its many initiatives has been the development of a charter. This working document lays out the basic components of an instructional technologist’s role at NYU: (a) engagement with faculty in course and curriculum development [pedagogy]; (b) learner experience [design]; and (c) support for teaching and learning tools [technology]. It also establishes shared principles for maturity and growth, viz., service and support management, metrics and reporting, and professional development. Working in conjunction with educational technology stakeholders across the University, the subcommittee explores ways of improving communication (e.g., common onboarding for faculty and staff, a project database), evaluating third-party platforms and services, and examining different models of blended and online learning.

Following the presentation, Jan Plass asked if the IT subcommittee has seen evidence of a similar philosophical or pedagogical approach to educational technology across the units. Armanda noted that some degree of convergence was starting to become apparent, but that the various units create and track projects differently and that there are also contrasts in methodology among the various disciplines. Furthermore, it is only relatively recently that all units have been staffed with instructional technologists. There does seem, however, to be a growing interest in using educational technology not only to improve learner experience but also to prepare students to engage successfully with technology in a professional capacity. Several members recommended that the subcommittee could provide guidance to faculty and students on how to use NYU Classes more effectively. Other needs that were cited were proactive communication during service interruptions and support for projects that involve both teaching and research. With this in mind, Matthew proposed that the committee review the results of the fall 2016 IT satisfaction survey. Finally, at his request, Armanda and Francesca agreed to work with the instructional technologists group to develop some recommendations for coordinating
communication about available instructional technology tools, per Provost Fleming’s charge to the FTEE. They will report back in mid-April to the FTEE, and also to the TTC.

The FTEE also met on April 5, 2017 but I was unable to attend and the minutes have not been posted but from the agenda it seems the meeting focused on organizing the annual report.
Report on the Faculty Working Group on Global Learning Outcomes

C-FSC Representative: Mary Killilea

Report as of April 25, 2017

The Faculty Working Group on Global Learning Outcomes met on March 9, 2017 and April 10, 2017 to review internal and external documents on global learning and impact of study away programs. The focus of those meetings has been the production of a report that represents the working group’s best effort to identify a set of global learning objectives for NYU. These are perhaps best understood as aspirational goals for international education; they are framed around student learning, rather than institutional or operational concerns; and they align with, and serve as a statement of, NYU’s academic values, and is a first step in assessing more fully the quality and impact of NYU’s study-away programs.
Recommendations Of
The Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council
In Regard To:

Tandon School of Engineering
Proposed: Guidelines for Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Grievance Procedures, and Voting Rights

Background

From a letter dated January 5, 2017 sent by Provost Katherine Fleming: “The Dean of the Tandon School has submitted to me the school’s guidelines pertaining to C-Faculty. I am advised that this document was drafted with extensive iterative faculty input, including an authoring ad hoc working group of C-Faculty and T-Faculty that included faculty senators; discussion with the Tandon Faculty Executive Committee and at Tandon faculty meetings; and surveys of C-Faculty. The full process is detailed in the attached memo from Richard Thorsen, Tandon’s Interim Associate Dean for Academic Administration.”

The following document consists of recommendations made jointly by the C-FSC Personnel Policies & Contract Issues Committee and the T-FSC Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Committee in an effort to improve the Tandon School of Engineering Guidelines for Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Grievance Procedures, and Voting Rights and to ensure its compliance with the University Guidelines For Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments.

I. SUBSTANTIVE MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

I. Introduction

Comment: 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.”

I. Recommendation: 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.”

II. Scope

Comment: 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.

2. Recommendation:
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]

III. Appointment and Reappointment

Comment: The University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, page 4, states: “Continuing Contract Faculty appointments that provide for the possibility of extended period 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.”

3. Recommendation: “If a one- or two-year contracts are 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.).”

Comment: 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 or a combination of one-year and two-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as:
4. **Recommendation:** “Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments or a combination of successive one-year and two-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment.”

Comment: In the first paragraph, the policy provides only that reappointment to a three-year contract subsequent to an initial one-year or two-year contract “may be appropriate.” This presents the possibility of the creation of a permanent group faculty on continuing one-year or two-year appointments.

5. **Recommendation:** Delete “may be appropriate” and change sentence to “…reappointment shall be to terms of three years for Assistant and Associate Industry Professors and lecturers, and five years for Industry Professors and Senior Lecturers.”

Comment: The policy does not address the term length of appointments subsequent to an initial three-year or five-year contract.

6. **Recommendation:** When promoted to a three-year contract (Industry Assistant Professors and Lecturers) subsequent appointments shall be for at least three years.

7. **Recommendation:** When promoted to a five-year contract (Industry Associate Professors and Senior Lecturers) subsequent appointments shall be for at least five years.

Comment: The two bullet points in this section provide the faculty member with notification dates, but these provisions do not address the possibility that the faculty might not be reappointed for curricular needs or structural changes.

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.

8. **Recommendation:** Add the following language (paraphrased from the Tisch Arts Professor Policy, 2013, the Tisch Teach Policy, 2014, and the Gallatin Contract Faculty Policy, 2015),

“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.”

**IV. Reappointment Review**

A. Contracts Continuing Beyond the Third Year of Continuous Service from Initial Appointment

Comment: It is not clear if this section is intended to cover faculty on continuous 1-year contracts

9. **Recommendation:** Clarify whether this applies to faculty on continuous 1-year contracts.
Comment: The first bullet point concerns the composition of the reappointment committee and directs that the committee consist of at least two members. If there are only two or some other even number or members, they may deadlock on decision.

10. **Recommendation:** The committee should consist of three or five or some other uneven number of members.

Comment: The first bullet point does not indicate how committee members are selected.

11. **Recommendation:** The committee should be made up of elected, not appointed, members from the appropriate department.

Comment: The first bullet point specifies that the committee chair be appointed by the Department Chair. The spirit of elections should pertain to the selection of the chair as well as the other members of the committee.

12. **Recommendation:** The committee chair should be elected from among the committee members.

Comment: The third bullet point presents a list of items to be assessed as evidence of teaching quality. It does not include reports of classroom teaching observations.

13. **Recommendation:** Insert language from the list “Materials for the promotion review” on page 4 of the policy, “Written evaluations of classroom teaching observed by voting faculty.”

Comment: The materials for review include materials demonstrating evidence of “Research and Scholarship” and of “Creative and Performance Arts.” It appears that some faculty will be expected to produce research and creative output, but the policy is silent on the availability of leave time and research funds for such faculty.

14. **Recommendation:**
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.

**Materials for the reappointment review**
Comment: The list of materials is incomplete in comparison to the list of materials to be considered for promotion found on page 4.

15. **Recommendation:** Conform the list of items to the list provided for Promotions so that it includes statements of teaching and service, list of all courses taught since the previous appointment, and written evaluations of classroom teaching observed by voting faculty. Consider specifying other materials. 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.

**Process for department evaluation**
Comment: Voting faculty does not include Industry Assistant Professors or Lecturers. This creates a bifurcation that may exclude long-term Assistant Professors or Lecturers.
16. Recommendation: Include as voting members Industry Assistant Professors and Lecturers who have been reappointed to second 3-year contracts when the vote concerns reappointment of other Industry Assistant Professors or Lecturers.

Comment: The paragraph concerning voting members does not specify who votes on the reappointment of Industry Professors and Senior Lecturers.
17. Recommendation: Add this clarification.

Comment: The “Process for department evaluation” section does not actually explain details of the procedures to be followed.
18. Recommendation: The Committee Chair should coordinate 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.recuitment.htm HYPERLINK "http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.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).”

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify what constitutes a vote of the committee.
19. Recommendation: 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.

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify the procedure according to which the committee will prepare its report.
20. Recommendation: 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.recuitment.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.”

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify a procedure to follow when the Dean agrees with a committee’s decision to reappoint a faculty member.

21. Recommendation: 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.”

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify a procedure to follow in the event the Dean disagrees with a committee’s decision to reappoint a faculty member.

22. Recommendation: 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.recruitment.htm)

“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.”

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify the faculty member’s rights in the event of a decision not to reappoint.

23. Recommendation: 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. If the report names references who have provided evaluations for the review in confidence, their names and other identifying details will be redacted from the copy provided to the faculty member.”
V. Promotion

Statement of principles

Comment: The paragraph omits “service” as an indicator of performance and achievement.

24. Recommendation: Add “service” to the list: “…teaching, research, scholarship, service or in other duties.”

Review Process

Comment: The second paragraph under “Review Process” does not explain how the promotion review committee will be formed.

25. Recommendation: 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.

Comment: The second paragraph under “Review Process” does not specify how the procedures for the promotion review committee.

26. Recommendation: 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,”


“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).”

27. Recommendation: 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.

28. Recommendation: 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.”

Materials for the promotion review

Comment: Although the list of materials for promotion review includes many salient documents, other possible materials are not included.

29. Recommendation: Consider specifying other materials. 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.

Comment: The Materials for the promotion review section asks for copies of student course evaluations and course syllabi, but does not limit the request to any time period.

30. Recommendation: The time period under consideration could be limited to the current reappointment period or six years, whichever is longer.

Comment: The paragraph on voting procedures for promotions provides that it be a “closed” vote, but the voting for reappointments is not closed.

31. Recommendation: In the interests of transparency, the voting result should not be closed.

Comment: The “Process for department evaluation” section does not actually explain details of the procedures to be followed.

32. Recommendation: The Committee Chair should coordinate the creation of the committee’s report and recommendation for promotion, 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](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.htm)

“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 promotion (when applicable).”

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify what constitutes a vote of the committee.

33. Recommendation: Specify that a majority vote of the Promotion Committee shall be required for a successful review for a recommendation for 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.
Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify the procedure according to which the committee will prepare its report.

34. Recommendation: 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 Promotion 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.”

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify a procedure to follow when the Dean agrees with a committee’s decision to promote a faculty member.

35. Recommendation: Add detailed information: “The Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding promotion, 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 promote, the summary letter to the faculty member with notification of intent to promote should include the length of reappointment/appointment, and a signature block for the faculty member.”

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify a procedure to follow in the event the Dean disagrees with a committee’s decision to promote a faculty member.

36. Recommendation: 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.recruitment.html):

“If the school Dean's decision is contrary on promotion to that of 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.”

Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify the faculty member’s rights in the event of a decision not to reappoint.

37. Recommendation: Add language similar to the following:

“In all cases of an appeal to a negative decision related to promotion by the Dean, the candidate will have access to the Promotion Committee’s full report, including its recommendation and any comments from the faculty. If the report names references who have provided evaluations
for the review in confidence, their names and other identifying details will be redacted from the copy provided to the faculty member.”

**VI. Grievance**

C. Continuing Contract Faculty Who Are Eligible to Grieve

Comment: The second paragraph entirely deprives faculty on initial appointments of one or two years of any grievance rights based on reappointment. This is contrary to the University Guidelines which provide under “Grievance Procedures” in the section “Who Can Grieve”:

“Faculty on continuous one-year or two-year appointments are similarly entitled to grieve the process in the event the third-year review process leads to a negative decision; and they are entitled to grieve the process in the event they are not reappointed after a third year review when a review had been explicitly promised in connection with the possibility of reappointment subject to it, but was not undertaken for reasons other than elimination of the position.”

38. Recommendation: Delete this paragraph.

D. Procedure to Be Followed when a Continuing Contract Faculty Member Wishes to Seek Settlement of a Grievance

Comment: Section (2) The last sentence provides that a faculty member “may appeal to the Dean to convene the School of Engineering Faculty Grievance Committee.” The sentence seems to suggest that the Dean has some discretion whether to convene the grievance committee.

39. Recommendation: Change the sentence to read: “shall have the right to appeal to the Dean who shall convene the School of Engineering Faculty Grievance Committee.”

E. Appeal from a Dean’s Decision on Reappointment or Promotion

Comment: In section (2), parts (b), (c) and (e) the name of the Grievance Committee is incorrect.

40. Recommendation: Change to “Continuing Contract Faculty Senator’s Council Faculty Grievance Committee”

Comment: Part (d) omits reference to violations of academic freedom as a ground for pursuing a grievance. The University Guidelines for CCF provide as a ground for grievance decisions that “violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question.”

41. Recommendation: Change the first sentence to read: “The Committee shall not judge professional merits, but only ascertain whether procedural safeguards have been observed or whether the grievant’s academic freedom has been violated.”

F. Appeal from a Dean’s Decision on Matters Such As Duties, Salaries, Perquisites, and Working Conditions

Comment: The paragraph refers to “informal procedures” but does not specify what those procedures are.
42. Recommendation: Specify the informal procedures as meetings, correspondence, etc.

VII. Voting Rights of Continuing Contract Faculty at Faculty Meetings

Comment: Paragraph 5 indicates that the Grievance Procedure is not included in this document but is under development. 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.

43. Recommendation: 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.”

44. Recommendation: 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.

45. Recommendation: 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.

II. SUBSTANTIVE MINOR RECOMMENDATIONS

II. Scope
Comment: Whereas the “Industry Professor” title is defined in terms of the expected background of the faculty member, the Lecturer titles are defined in terms of their duties.

46. Recommendation: Define the two categories of faculty in consistent ways, either by background, or by duties, or by the combination of both.
IV. Reappointment Review

A. Contracts Continuing Beyond the Third Year of Continuous Service from Initial Appointment

Comment: On the top of page 3, at the end of the third bullet point, there is a provision concerning “Creative and Performance Arts.”

47. Recommendation: Clarify “innovation and impact in conducting creative and performance arts.”

B. Contract Not Continuing Beyond the Third Year of Continuous Service from Initial Appointment

Comment: The wording is confusing.

48. Recommendation: Add the word “respectively” as follows: “…pursuant to a one- or two-year contract, respectively, shall not be required to undergo the review process…”

VII. Voting Rights of Continuing Contract Faculty at Faculty Meetings

Comment: Paragraph (2) provides that the Tandon School of Engineering Faculty “may separately poll and record the votes” of the various categories of faculty. The sentence is unclear.

49. Recommendation: Change to “may separately poll and record: 1) the opinions of the T-TT and emeritus faculty; and 2) the opinions of the voting and non-voting continuing contract faculty.”

Comment: The language concerning eligibility to run for the position of Speaker-Elect is confusing: “Only the T-TT faculty are eligible to run for the Speaker-Elect position (eventually serving as the Speaker and Past Speaker). However, those Continuing Contract Faculty how were previously granted individual voting rights are also eligible to run for the Speaker-Elect position.”

50. Recommendation: Change to “Two categories of faculty are eligible to run for the position of Speaker-Elect (eventually serving as the Speaker and Past Speaker): 1) T-TT faculty; and 2) those Continuing Contract Faculty how were previously granted individual voting rights.”

Comment: Paragraph 5 concerning the Nominations and Elections Committee is confusing as it states that membership on that committee will draw from three standing committees, including the very same Nominations and Elections Committee.

51. Recommendation: Clarify this sentence.

III. EDITORIAL RECOMMENDATIONS
I. Introduction
Comment: In the quotation, “university” in the last line is not capitalized.
52. Recommendation: Capitalize “University.”

Comment: The technically correct name for the faculty is “Full-time Continuing Contract Faculty.”
53. Recommendation: Insert “Full-time”
Continuing/Contract Faculty Senate Recommendations

On Student Evaluations:

Report Prepared by the C-FSC Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee

Committee Members:
- Ben Stewart, Chair, Faculty of Arts and Science
- Spiros Frangos, School of Medicine
- Neal Herman, College of Dentistry
- Brian Mooney, School of Professional Studies
- Deborah Smith, School of Professional Studies

Introduction

The evaluation of teaching poses a range of problems, not least of which is that assessing a teacher’s classroom performance with precision comes with high costs. Moreover, when assessing the performance of full-time, non-tenured faculty, this problem is especially acute. Whereas tenured faculty assessments tend to rely heavily on scholarship as a measure of performance, the performance of continuing/contract faculty has no equivalent avenue of assessment. For continuing/contract faculty, the obvious, easily-available measure for the assessment of teaching has been student evaluations.

Given this situation, we seek to ensure that student evaluations of teaching (SET) are used in the interests of identifying and cultivating good teaching. We are especially concerned with this issue given that a number of studies have raised concerns about various kinds of bias within teaching evaluations. Moreover, within the scholarship on SETs, there is an ongoing debate about the value, versus problems with, global measures of teaching. Due to these concerns, we propose four sets of recommendations, two of which will be set to the Provost’s office (one concerned with the evaluation of, and the other concerned with the design and revision of NYU SETs) and two of which will be published on the C-FSC’s website (one that addresses teachers who are up for reappointment, and one that addresses reappointment and promotion committees).

Recommendations to the Provost’s office:

I. The assessment of NYU’s SET system
II. The development, at the School level, of the customizable portion of the evaluation (i.e., how to ensure continuing faculty involvement in those questions’ development).

Recommendations to be posted on the C-FSC’s website

III. Evaluation-related recommendations for teachers who are up for reappointment and/or promotion.
IV. Recommendations for the use of evaluations in reappointment and promotion (R&P) processes.
Recommendations to the Provost’s office:

I. Recommendations for the Assessment of NYU’s SET system

1. We recommend that NYU’s Office of Institutional Research examine the extent to which the gender, age, and race of teachers and students has effects on student evaluations.
2. We recommend that NYU’s Office of Institutional Research examine the extent to which the NYU evaluation’s global measures (questions 1 and 2: “Overall evaluation of the instructor(s),” and “Overall evaluation of the course.”) correlate with students’ answers to its more specific questions.

II. Recommendations for the Customization of Evaluation Questions at the School Level:

1. Continuing/contract faculty should be represented on the School-level committees that develop and revise evaluation questions for the customizable portion of the NYU evaluation. These faculty should be elected faculty representatives (either from School- or University-level bodies).
2. Quantitative questions should err on the side of asking about specific rather than general aspects of the class and the teaching (see footnote 1).
3. Qualitative (short answer) questions should be framed so as to encourage specificity in students’ answers. Consider the qualitative question on the customizable portion of CAS evaluation: “Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.” On the one hand, that question encourages student to focus on a concrete skill that they took from the class. On the other hand, asking for “the best thing” might limit students’ ability to remember what they learned. Why not ask for the two or three things about the course/instructor that were effective in helping you learn?

Recommendations to be posted on the C-FSC’s website

III. Recommendations for Teachers Who Are Up for Reappointment and/or Promotion.

1. Faculty members should carefully review the evaluations and consider whether the responses suggest worthy changes in pedagogy.
2. We recommend that faculty consider evaluations in the context of longer-term patterns of response. While we know that the responses in any one class or for any
one semester are not necessarily indicative of much, patterns that persist over time and across different courses are stronger indicators of areas for improvement.

3. Departments and programs should establish peer mentoring or other forms of peer support to cultivate faculty reflection on their evaluations, particularly in relation to reappointment. We recommend that these peer interactions include discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of including reflections on evaluations in reappointment and promotion documents (how much or how little to include, how best to frame those reflections, etc.).

IV. Recommendations for the Assessment of Teachers

1. Evaluations of faculty should avoid the use of quantitative data from student evaluations. School-based R&P recommendations should be re-examined to address this avoidance. At most, such numbers should be used to sensitize the reading of qualitative data.

2. For a given class, R&P recommendations should attend carefully to the statistical validity of the sample (both in terms of the size of the class and the response rate).

3. To the extent the quantitative data is examined, it should only be examined longitudinally. A given class or semester may be an outlier. At best, quantitative may suggest a trend in teaching quality over a period of time.

4. Student evaluations are best examined holistically. The faculty member familiar with the course and with the students enrolled in it can often put student responses in context. Deans and administrators should be discouraged from looking at the student responses without discussing them with the faculty member; faculty should have an opportunity to explain the context for students’ responses. The faculty member is likely to have valuable insight into which of the student narrative responses are worthy of consideration and which ones are either incorrect or false claims, or are possibly motivated by some other personal reason.

Background for C-FSC Recommendations on Evaluations

We are concerned that SETs may not always work in the interests of the evaluated faculty members or to the institutions to which they belong. A number of recent studies (Anderson and Miller 1997; Basow 1995; Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016; Cramer and Alexitch 2000; Stark and Freishtat 2014) have questioned the validity of student evaluation of teachers (SET). These studies suggest that SET exhibit a range of student biases with respect to gender, ethnicity, and age. Some of these distortions are complexly layered. For instance, Basow (1995) finds evidence that the gender of the student is significant, as is the academic division in which evaluations take place:
male faculty are perceived and evaluated similarly by their male and female students, whereas female faculty tend to be evaluated differently, depending on the divisional affiliation of the course. Female faculty tend to be rated highly by their female students, especially in the humanities, but less positively by their male students, especially in the social sciences (664).

Such evidence led us to our first recommendation, that NYU’s Office of Institutional Research should examine the extent to which the gender, age, and race of teachers and students has effects on student evaluations.

Additionally, we are also concerned with the general character of the first two questions on NYU’s evaluation, which led us to our second recommendation for the Institutional Research Office, namely, the assessment of whether the NYU evaluation’s global measures (questions 1 and 2: “Overall evaluation of the instructor(s),” and “Overall evaluation of the course.”) correlate with students’ answers to its more specific questions. On the issue of “global measures,” Gravestock and Gregor-Greenleaf (2008) argue that “Most attempts to identify particular characteristics of effective teaching stem from a belief that teaching should be measured according to multiple aspects or categories of teaching activity” (31). However, they also note disagreements about how to present overall measures of teaching—should measures of multiple dimensions be averaged, or is there value to questions that call for overall, global evaluations of teaching?

While there is no consensus on the value or dangers of global questions, Gravestock and Gregor-Greenleaf end their discussion of that issue with a caution about questions such as those “that ask students if they would recommend the course to others” (32) and they also describe a change that the University of Minnesota made to their student evaluation: in 2007 (109), “the University of Minnesota decided to eliminate its global question, ‘How would you rate the instructor’s overall teaching ability?’ The committee charged with revising the instrument argued that this item was too often the only score evaluated in summative teaching assessment, that students have difficulty responding to the question, that the item is not diagnostic and that global questions such as these do not correlate with ratings on questions that review specific teaching characteristics” (32).

Issues with the evaluation instrument may be further complicated as a result of biases that emerge out of the relations between teachers and students. For example, Wolfgang Stroebe (2016) outlines a possible cause of such bias. Stroebe theorizes that, because student evaluations are such important “determinants of academic personnel decisions” (801), teachers may exchange leniency (in the form of inflated grades) for higher student evaluations. In support of his claim, he primarily cites a number of psychological studies that suggest students’ inclination to give teachers lower evaluation scores when they receive lower-than-expected grades. To the extent that teachers make their classes more lenient as a result of their concerns about evaluation scores, high evaluation scores “reflect[] a bias rather than teaching effectiveness” (800).
Although it’s clear that the linkage between teaching evaluations and reappointment creates an incentive to professors to give higher grades, we are not so certain that grade inflation is a problem among continuing faculty. In fact, we are concerned that NYU’s continuing faculty may be giving grades that are lower than NYU students’ average grades. To the extent that this is so, those faculty’s teaching practices may be in tension with their reappointment interests (even as those teachers’ interests are likely aligned with the goal of establishing a rigorous classroom).

As noted above, higher evaluations may not be an accurate signal for the kinds of teaching that are conducive to the acquisition of knowledge that will benefit students over the long term. For instance, the results of Carrell and West’s (2010) seven-year-long study, which looked at multiple years of evaluations from 10,534 students, suggested “that evaluations reward professors who increase achievement in the contemporaneous course being taught, not those who increase deep learning” (430). As continuing faculty, we want to encourage the kinds of teaching that have larger payoffs down the road, not only for our students, but also for the teachers who will interact and engage with those students in the future. We are concerned that an over-valuing of SETs—and, separately, a perception among faculty that the SETs are overvalued—could disincentivize precisely the kind of teaching and learning that rigorous evaluation of faculty is meant to ensure.

Given that NYU is currently in the process of transitioning to a University-wide evaluation system, it’s an especially important time to establish procedures around that system’s revision, assessment, and use for purposes other than providing feedback to individual teachers. This situation motivates those of our recommendations that extend beyond the evaluation instrument itself: those that call for continuing/contract faculty involvement in the development and revision of questions; those that suggest strategies for teachers to engage with their evaluations; and finally, those that offer protocols for R & P committees’ use of evaluations in reappointment and promotion decisions.
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Appendix A: Evaluations from Shanghai, CAS, and SPS

CAS Evaluation Questions

**General Questions (University: all on a 5-point, Likert scale)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overall evaluation of the instructor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overall evaluation of the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The instructor(s) provided an environment that was conducive to learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructor(s) provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The course objectives were clearly stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The course was well organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The course was intellectually stimulating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAS Custom Questions (8-17 on a 5-point, Likert scale; 18 is a qualitative question)**

**Questions about the Course**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The course was effective at helping me learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The classes were informative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The course was challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The course increased my knowledge of the subject.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions about the Instructor**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The instructor was effective at helping me learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The instructor encouraged student participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The instructor was open to students’ questions and multiple points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The instructor was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The instructor created an environment that promoted the success of students with diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Question:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CAS Evaluation Questions**

**Standard University Questions (all on a 5-point, Likert scale)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overall evaluation of the instructor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overall evaluation of the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The instructor(s) provided an environment that was conducive to learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructor(s) provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The course objectives were clearly stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The course was well organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The course was intellectually stimulating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAS Custom Questions (8-17 on a 5-point, Likert scale; 18 is a qualitative question)**

*Questions about the Course*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The course was effective at helping me learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The classes were informative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The course was challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The course increased my knowledge of the subject.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Questions about the Instructor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The instructor was effective at helping me learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The instructor encouraged student participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The instructor was open to students’ questions and multiple points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The instructor was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The instructor created an environment that promoted the success of students with diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Question:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School of Professional Studies

Standard University Questions

For the following questions (1) means “poor” and (5) means “excellent.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall evaluation of the instructor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overall evaluation of the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following questions, (1) means “strongly disagree” and (5) means “strongly agree.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The course objectives were clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The course was well organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The course was intellectually stimulating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional SPS Questions

1. On average how many hours a week (other than scheduled class time) did you devote to this course?

2. What did the faculty member do to encourage your engagement in the course?

3. Comment on positive aspects that should be continued.

4. Suggest specific changes that the faculty member could make to improve the course.
Proposed C-FSC Resolution Regarding Section 66 of the University Bylaws

Presented by the Senate Committee on Organization and Governance for consideration at the C-Faculty Senators Council Meeting, 4/25/17

SCOQ considered bylaws revisions related to Sections 65-69 of the University Bylaws. SCOG has recommended a change to Section 66. The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council, Section (a) Functions. The suggested change is as follows for the final sentence:

Original: It will perform such other educational functions as requested of it by the President and Chancellor, or by the Board.

Suggested: It may perform such other functions as are requested of it by the President and Chancellor, by the Board, or by the Senate.

The suggested changes are to provide consistency among all five councils and also to have the bylaws more in alignment with current processes and practices.
The committee moves that the Contract Faculty Senators Council request that the Office of the Provost develop on behalf of the Board of Trustees procedures for the implementation of University Bylaw 81 (c) of December 14, 2016, that give reasoned justification for the policy of prohibiting faculty study toward degrees-in-course and the grounds for seeking the Board’s exceptional permission for such study.

Background

This matter was brought to the attention of the Committee on Benefits and Housing in December, 2016, by constituent contract-line faculty appointed as language lecturers and senior language lecturers who sought to use their employee tuition benefits to pursue graduate degrees at the University. These faculty had been told that University policy on employee tuition benefits prohibited them from doing so, despite the fact that a number of faculty are known previously to have earned such degrees or to be currently pursuing them.

In researching this matter, the committee received confirmation from University Human Resources that there had been no change in policy regarding employee tuition benefits, and that a faculty member admitted to degree candidacy at the University would receive employee tuition remission benefits.

From the Office of the Provost, the committee determined that the difficulty was not due to a change in employee tuition benefits policy but rather to a change in the University Bylaw concerning faculty degree candidacy.

Bylaw 78 (c) previously read as follows.

No officer of instruction holding professorial rank in the University, that is, rank above the grade of instructor, shall be permitted to enroll as a candidate for a degree or be recommended for a degree in course. A degree candidate who accepts appointment to professorial rank must thereupon relinquish such candidacy.

So far as the committee has been able to determine in consultation with the Office of the Provost, the previous practice was to interpret the term “professorial rank” to mean
those faculty with the word “professor” in the title of their appointment. For this reason, language lecturers and senior language lecturers, not being so termed, were able routinely in the past to use their employee tuition benefits to pursue study as candidates for graduate degrees.

The revised University Bylaws of September 1, 2014, contained a number of changes related to the establishment of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty. Among the changes was the inclusion of contract-line faculty in the prohibition on faculty degree candidacy, now at Bylaw 81 (c), as follows.

Degree Programs by Faculty. No Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty member or Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty member, other than librarians, will be permitted to enroll as a candidate for a degree or be recommended for a degree in course, unless specifically excepted by the Board. A degree candidate, other than a librarian, who accepts appointment as a Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty member or a Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty member must thereupon relinquish such candidacy, unless specifically excepted by the Board.

An immediate result of this change was to exclude language lecturers and senior language lecturers from pursuing study as candidates for graduate degrees. The matter became confused because this was mistakenly represented to some faculty as a change in employee tuition benefits policy. Moreover, the effect on the language lecturers and senior language lecturers appears to have been inadvertent. That is, the committee has found no evidence that the Board set out deliberately to prohibit these faculty from pursuing graduate degrees: Though it had been routine, the total number of faculty previously doing so was small, and the practice was uncontroversial. The impact on these faculty rather seems to have been an unanticipated consequence of Board’s desire to include contract-line faculty in the Bylaws on the same terms as tenure-line faculty.

Recommendations

A brief survey of peer institutions reveals that such a general prohibition on faculty degree candidacy is not common. Indeed, other institutions often encourage further study, citing values such as lifelong learning and general excellence. The committee notes that faculty pursuing graduate degrees could also lead to a more interdisciplinary faculty; a better-retained and more diverse faculty (these appear to be goals and results of offering such study to administrators); and a faculty better prepared to respond to the increasingly complex demands of the modern university and our diverse and ever-changing student body. Nonetheless, it does not seem unreasonable to imagine that some limitations on faculty degree candidacy can be justified. At the same time, even prior to the establishment of the contract faculty, the Bylaws had recognized the possibility that the Board would consider exceptions to the prohibition on faculty degree
candidacy, and the committee has found cases in which faculty termed “professor” have previously been granted permission to study toward degrees at the University.

The committee therefore recommends that the Office of the Provost consider whether the prohibitions of Bylaw 81 (c) are necessary, and, if not, what constraints would be necessary to have in their place (e.g., stipulations that would prevent faculty enrolled in degree programs from entering into conflicts of interest). On the other hand, if the broad outlines of Bylaw 81 (c) are necessary, the committee recommends that the Office of the Provost should articulate the reasons for the prohibition and the grounds for requesting exceptions to it; establish guidelines for faculty seeking such exceptions, and for their program heads, their deans, and for the Provost’s Office in determining whether to support such requests; and publish these procedures where they will be readily and publically available to members of the University community. As a part of articulating these policies and procedures, the committee recommends also that academic justifications be given for the continued exception from the policy for Library faculty, and for the continued exclusion of graduate study in Law and Medicine, and in certain programs in the Stern School of Business, the School of Dentistry, and the School of Professional Studies. Justification should also be included for the continued extension of the prohibition to “administrators of policy-making rank,” whom these Bylaws have consistently been interpreted to prohibit from degree candidacy as well.1

1. See, e.g., the University Faculty Handbook dated April, 2014, p. 51.

While the rule does not prohibit a teacher of professorial rank, whether on temporary or permanent appointment, from taking courses at this institution for credit to be applied elsewhere toward a degree, it does prohibit such an appointee from pursuing a course to be credited toward a degree at New York University. In applying the rule, the prohibition has been extended to all holders of professorial titles, including visiting, research, adjunct, and clinical professors of each grade, and to administrators of policy-making rank. The holder of any professional librarian’s rank may pursue graduate work and be a degree candidate at the University.

Cf. the Faculty Handbook dated July 1, 2016, p. 24.

While the rule does not prohibit a Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty member, Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty member, or Other Faculty member from taking courses at this institution for credit to be applied elsewhere toward a degree, it does prohibit such an appointee from pursuing a course to be credited toward a degree at New York University. In applying the rule, the prohibition has been extended to administrators of policy-making rank.