



MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 26, 2016

The New York University Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, April 26, 2016, in in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Becker (by audio-conference), Borowiec, Burt, Carl, Carter, Cittadino, Elcott, Gurrin, Halpin, Killilea, Mooney, Mowry, Rainey, Slater; Alternate Senators Bianco, Casey, Mirabito (for Morton), Ritter, Sahin, Smith, and White.

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 10, 2016

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the March 10, 2016 meeting were approved unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: FRED CARL

See attached Document A: C-FSC Chair Update

School Senator Elections

In response to a Senator's inquiry on the status of school senator elections, Chairperson Carl reported that all schools will be contacted to encourage them to complete their elections as soon as possible. The Bylaws specify the elections should be held prior to the University Commencement.

Carl stated all newly elected Senators will be invited the retreat on May 25, 2016.

Leftover Food at Meetings

Carl stated there are containers available for Council members to take extra food back to their departments. He mentioned the Senate Executive Committee discussed developing an app that would alert University community members to the availability of leftover food from events. A similar process exists at Columbia University.

Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (SCOG)

Carl reported on the status of the SCOG resolution. He stated seats must be added to the University Senate to represent the following new schools: the College of Global Public Health, the College of Nursing, and the College of Dentistry.

Questions were raised during the Senate Executive Committee discussions concerning the need to keep the Senate at a certain size and after discussion SCOG is recommending to the Board of Trustees that the size of

the Senate increase by ten members, which includes the addition of three deans, two C-FSC seats, two Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) seats, one Administrative Management Council (AMC) seats, and two Student Senators Council (SSC) seats.

In the interim before the vote from the Board of Trustees, two schools, Tisch and the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS), will lose one seat each to accommodate the Colleges of Nursing, Dentistry and Global Public Health. If the Board of Trustees approves SCOG's resolution in June, the C-FSC will gain back those two seats. However, given the number of current faculty in each school, and following the formula that the Office of General Counsel uses to allocate seats, FAS will gain back one seat and Dentistry will gain a seat.

Carl stated Ron Rainey from Liberal Studies is retiring at the end of this academic year. Therefore, this seat will not be up for election until the SCOG resolution is approved by the Board of Trustees. FAS senators agreed that whatever the allocation of FAS, Liberal Studies will have a dedicated seat. It was noted if the Board of Trustees votes against the seat, an Expository Writing Senator will step down to allow the Liberal Studies to have a representative.

An Alternate Senator from Liberal Studies reported at the faculty assembly on Friday, the Steering Committee proposed that Liberal Studies not host the election now. A Senator made several arguments as to why it should be held now with the hope that seat would be approved by the Board of Trustees in the fall. If that Senator is elected now, he/she could then attend the retreat, the first meeting, and become involved early on. The assembly voted in favor of hosting the election now.

It was noted there was discussion of the T-FSC adding Senators-at-Large in their apportionment, however, the T-FSC passed a resolution deciding not to add Senators-at-Large.

Provost Advisory Working Group

Carl reported the Working Group has just about completed their work to establish disciplinary procedures. The general plan is to mirror, to the extent possible, Title IV in the Faculty Handbook for tenured/tenure track faculty.

Shared Governance Questionnaire

Carl reported the questionnaire from the C-FSC Governance Committee was sent to all C-faculty and is currently active. He asked Council members to encourage their colleagues to participate.

A Senator requested in the next reminder that the participation rate be included.

A Senator commented on a section that was difficult to interpret; he will pass his comments on to the Governance Committee.

End of Year Celebration

Carl reported the End of Year Celebration takes place on Thursday, April 28 at 6:00 pm. He noted in addition to C-FSC members, there will be members of the senior university administration attending, as well as two Board of Trustees members in attendance.

Retreat

Carl reported the Retreat takes place on Wednesday, May 25 and Alternate Senator White has offered to host a get-together at her home following the retreat. Senator Killilea, a member of the Retreat Planning Committee, stated the format will be similar to the fall retreat. The Committee will send out a questionnaire to facilitate discussion and collect ideas for next year's agenda. Time will also be set aside to reflect on the Council's accomplishments since the fall retreat and decide on agenda items that need to be revisited. She encouraged Council members to reach out to the Committee with suggestions.

The report was accepted into the minutes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

See attached Document B: Committee Reports

No questions were submitted on the following reports:

Global Network University: Amy Becker
Personnel Policies and Contract Issues: John Halpin
Ad Hoc Committee on Tuition Remission and Portable Tuition Benefits
Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Work-Life Issues: Vince Renzi
Faculty Committee on NYU's Global Network University: Vince Renzi

Administration & Technology: Jamie Skye Bianco

A Senator inquired on the timeline for the Social Media Policy. Bianco responded it is currently under legal review.

A Senator stated he was involved last year in the policy's review and noted one of the big concerns was addressing the grievance issue. Bianco noted this is addressed in the Personal Digital Content Policy.

Information Security and Risk Advisory Group

Carl reported the Senate Executive Committee was informed of the creation of this new group and asked for nominations of representatives to serve. Carl asked for nominations and noted the representative does not need to be a member of the Council.

Educational Policies & Student/Faculty Relations: Ben Stewart

A Senator noted a typographical error in the report. It should read: "female professors' numbers tend to be a little higher than *male* professors' numbers."

The error will be corrected in the report.

Senators discussed the use of student evaluation data.

Senators from Shanghai and Abu Dhabi mentioned the pilot program happening on their campuses this year, which is intended to become a template across the University.

It was noted there were technical issues in the Shanghai pilot program, but they have been resolved. Another issue relates to customization. The Senator noted some departments may want to do more customization than is possible.

A Senator from Steinhardt stated participation rates have dropped at Steinhardt with the online evaluation system. The School also noticed the shorter the survey, the higher the response rate, and it was noted customization may lengthen the survey and may thereby reduce participation.

He also discussed the issue of how evaluations measure teaching effectiveness.

It was noted in Shanghai and Abu Dhabi students are asked to complete online evaluations in class.

Stewart noted the Committee will be surveying schools over the summer to develop best practices.

A Senator expressed disagreement with making students complete evaluations in class online, noting this assumes all student have access to a device in class.

A Senator asked about publishing the results of the evaluations. It was noted in Shanghai, faculty had the discretion to not publish results with the rationale that some classes may only be offered by one faculty member. She noted this rationale would not apply to larger schools.

A Senator asked about increasing participation rates by only offering a grade if completed.

It was noted there have been objections to this, including issues with forcing a student to complete an evaluation and challenges with coordinating with the registrar's office.

A Senator asked about discussion with the tenured faculty. Stewart stated the T-FSC is included in the discussions, but noted the issue is specifically important to C-faculty.

A Senator stated at the College of Nursing course evaluations are part of the syllabus and students are required to submit their online evaluation prior to their grade being released. If a student misses the deadline, they must submit by paper. He noted this has resulted in a 98-100% response rate.

A Senator noted Steinhardt was informed they could not hold grades.

A Senator noted the issue with the written comments is that they can sometimes be incorrect, and there is no way for a faculty member to correct them.

Senators noted that there are other online programs used outside of NYU to rate professors.

A Senator noted the focus should be on improving the curriculum and improving courses, which is sometimes independent of the professor, particularly in core courses.

It was noted the evaluations do effect Annual Merit Increase (AMI) in some schools, so even if it is not a contract issue, evaluations do have an impact in terms of salary.

Committee members noted the issue is a question of efficacy and improving the quality of the teaching. The Committee is also looking to develop best practices.

Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Committee: David Elcott

Senators asked if the Committee will be involved in drafting the job description for the new Executive Vice President of Diversity position. It was noted the University Committee will be discussing recommendations, and it was suggested the Council review these recommendations as part of the retreat in May.

University Senate Academic Affairs: Ben Stewart

Senator Slater reported the Committee is discussing the Founder's Day Award and finding ways to make the award more meaningful. Currently, 65-70% of students receive the award.

Graduate Program Committee: Iskender Sahin

Alternate Senator Sahin reported the Committee meets next week on the creation of several programs from Wagner, CUSP, and the Graduate College of Arts and Sciences.

Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee: Ron Rainey

Senator Rainey reported the topic of student evaluations was discussed, which included many of the same issues as today. He also noted the diversity and inclusion enterprise is on the agenda and will be a continuing part of the agenda for next year.

Faculty Committee on the Future of Technology-Enhanced Education at NYU: Mary Killilea

Senator Killilea reported the Committee is focusing on evaluating the outcomes of technology use in the classroom. She noted the focus is not to just use technology for the sake of technology and to ensure it is not getting in the way of pedagogy.

A Senator commented on the problem with the infrastructure for supporting technology. He stated he has had issues with getting adequate assistance from the ITS department.

Killilea noted one of the past recommendations from the Committee was to have more school-based resources. As a result, the schools now have technology resources. But, she commented, it is an issue of communicating those resources to faculty.

The reports were accepted into the minutes.

OLD BUSINESS

Amendments to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Global Network and the Global Network Professor title: Amy Becker

See attached Document C: Global Network and the Global Network Professor.

Senator Becker reported the Global Network professorship title came from the urging to identify the full-time faculty members who are participating in the research at a second campus, as a way to clarify their role and responsibilities. All tenured and tenure track faculty at Abu Dhabi and Shanghai are automatically granted this title. Select tenured and tenure track faculty from New York are granted this title, and select continuing contract faculty at Shanghai and Abu Dhabi may be granted the title.

The Committee started to look more carefully at some of the gaps and constraints for continuing contract faculty, particularly those in New York who show the commitment to the GNU. In addition, the way the procedure is written emphasizes tenured and tenure track faculty, but does not include many of the titles held by continuing contract faculty.

Becker presented the resolution, which is in response to a request by Carol Morrow to review amendments to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Global Network and the Global Network Professor title. The Committee approved the following two amendments, with editorial revisions to the original text highlighted in yellow. See *attached Document C*.

The resolution was approved unanimously by vote of the Council.

NEW BUSINESS

Joint Recommendations of C-FSC and T-FSC regarding Gallatin School of Individualized Study Clinical Faculty: Policy and Practice for Full-Time Continuing/Contract Faculty: John Halpin

See attached Document D: Gallatin Policy Joint Recommendations.

It was noted that for Senators in Schools that have not yet finalized their policies, continuing contract faculty members in those schools should be involved in the construction and review of the policy. Senators were encouraged to contact their school deans to ensure continuing contract faculty have input.

Senators brought up the use of describing a professor or clinical professor as “full-time” and regarding language on promotion versus appointment.

Committee members noted some edits made during the Committees' discussions were not included in this version.

A Senator sent his comments prior to the meeting. He stated from the perspective of the Benefits Committee, he suggested omitting the language in recommendation 3 regarding housing because, in fact, some continuing contract faculty are in faculty housing.

Senators discussed how these documents describe the differences between tenure track and continuing contract faculty members.

A Senator commented on the gender pronouns used in the document.

Senators discussed and agreed upon the following amendments to the recommendations:

Amendment 1:

In Recommendation 3, remove the following language: "for tenure and for NYU faculty housing."

Original:

3. Recommendation: Include this language:

"Clinical faculty are ineligible for tenure and for NYU faculty housing. Clinical appointments often include some administrative supervisory responsibilities. Clinical faculty lines are typically multiyear and differ from tenure lines at Gallatin in the following ways: [identify those differences]."

Amended:

3. Recommendation: Include this language:

"Clinical faculty are ineligible for tenure. Clinical appointments often include some administrative supervisory responsibilities. Clinical faculty lines are typically multiyear and differ from tenure lines at Gallatin in the following ways: [identify those differences]."

Amendment 2:

Prior to Recommendation 20, add the following language: "Recommendation: For purposes of consistency with part 4 ("Appointment and Promotion to Clinical Professor"), change the section title to 'Appointment and Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.'"

Amended:

IV. Policy and Practices for Reappointment and Promotion

2. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

Recommendation: For purposes of consistency with part 4 ("Appointment and Promotion to Clinical Professor"), change the section title to "Appointment and Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor."

Amendment 3:

In Recommendation 32, remove the following language: "at least six of which must have been."

Original:

32. Recommendation: Change language to "a minimum of twelve years, at least six of which must have been at NYU..."

Amended:

32. Recommendation: Change language to “a minimum of twelve years” at NYU or elsewhere”

Amendment 4:

Remove Recommendation 61.

Original:

Paragraph 2; Sentence 2:

“A decanal committee normally consisting of the Dean, the Associate Dean for Faculty, and one full professor appointed by the Dean will review the candidate’s teaching, advising and service as well as their scholarly, creative or practical work done since the last contract.”

61. Recommendation: Replace “their” with “his or her”

The recommendations, with amendments, were approved unanimously by vote of the Council.

A Senator, who is a named chair, suggested clarifying that a named chairship can be offered to a continuing contract faculty member.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.

**C-FSC—Chair's Report
Chairperson Fred Carl**

Report as of April 21, 2016

1. Committee Updates

Our Personnel Policies and Contract Issues committee has almost completed its recommendations to school policies for Gallatin, the Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP), the Law School, and the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (ISAW), and are meeting with the T-FSC Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications committee to reconcile each committee's recommendations into (hopefully) a joint recommendation for each school policy.

The Provost's Advisory Working Group, charged to develop recommendations for disciplinary policies and grievance procedures for continuing contract faculty not related to appointment, reappointment and promotion, is in the final stages of developing its recommendations to be submitted to the Provost. Following provostial approval, the policies and procedures will be incorporated into a revised University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Appointments, Including Grievance Procedures and Disciplinary Regulations.

The Governance Committee's Shared Governance Questionnaire has gone live and has been distributed to all continuing contract faculty members at the university, with a requested deadline for completion on May 1st. The Governance Committee will, hopefully, be able to report on the data at our final C-FSC meeting on Thursday, May 12th.

2. SCOG and Changes to C-FSC Seat Apportionment by School

As you all may remember, SCOG has been developing various proposals to accommodate the addition of Senate representation from the College of Global Health, the School of Nursing and the School of Dentistry. The addition of seats for those schools, without an increase in the size of the Senate (something that can only be approved by a vote of the Board of Trustees), will result in a reapportionment of seats for the C-FSC, resulting in the loss of 1 Senate seat each for FAS and Tisch. The FAS seat lost as of August 31, 2016, will be Ron Rainey's seat (which had been agreed to by the FAS Senators once the Council developed the first election rotation schedule). The Tisch seat lost will be John Gurrin's seat (again, based on an agreed upon-schedule developed by the Tisch Senators).

Our SCOG reps proposed an increase in the size of the Senate, which SCOG agreed to propose. My hope is that SCOG will present a Resolution to be voted on at the University Senate Meeting on Thursday,

April 28th calling for an increase in the size of the Senate by 10 members which will result in gaining back the two additional seats for the C-FSC, however, based on the current number of Voting Faculty in each School, one of the recovered seats will go back to FAS, and the other will go to Dentistry, which has a few more Voting Faculty than Tisch currently has. (As of my most recent communication with the SCOG chair, there was still an issue to be worked out with one Senate Council; this, hopefully, will be resolved by the April 28th Senate meeting.)

It is expected that Liberal Studies will thus remain represented by their own Senator on the C-FSC.

Please see the attached Worksheets; they will explain the number of Voting Faculty in each school, as well as the formula used to determine the actual apportionment of C-FSC seats:

- The first Worksheet lays out the apportionment of seats given the current size of the C-FSC.
- The second Worksheet lays out the apportionment formula and resulting actual apportionment of seats assuming the increase of two seats.
- The third Worksheet lays out the apportionment formula and resulting actual apportionment of C-FSC seats in 2014, the last time the Board approved to a change in the size of the Senate (this approval allowed for the formation of the C-FSC as a Senate Council).

3. Elections

Schools should have been notified by the Office of the General Counsel of upcoming elections for Senator and Alternate Senator seats. Election results should be known and certified by the final C-FSC meeting on May 12, 2016. At that final meeting nominations and elections will be held for the C-FSC Steering Committee for AY 2016-2017.

4. C-FSC End of the Year Celebration

Our End of the Year Celebration will be on Thursday, April 28, 2016, at the Torch Club, beginning at 6:00pm. A number of people from the University Leadership, as well as some members of the Board of Trustees will join us as we celebrate our work of the past year and our on-going work.

5. C-FSC Retreat

Our Retreat has been set for Wednesday, May 25, 2016, 10:00am-5:00pm. Our Retreat Planning Committee is Susan Stehlik, Mary Killilea, Deborah Smith, David Elcott and John Gurrin.

Heidi White has very generously offered to host a post-Retreat Get-Together at her place. Details will follow.

6. Next Meeting

Our next meeting, the final C-FSC meeting of the semester, will be held on Thursday, May 12, 2016, 9:00am-11:00am.

2016-17 C-FSC Seats to University Senate (Spring 2016 Elections)

The C-FSC consists of not more than 27 members:

27	Elected Members
<u>-1</u>	From the Division of Libraries
26	Apportioned among the colleges, schools, and portal campuses by method of equal proportions with the proviso that each college and school and each portal campus will be entitled to at least one and not more than six elected faculty Senators.

Apportionment Among the Colleges, Schools, and Portal Campuses

A. Total Voting Faculty excluding the Division of Libraries (2326) divided by the 26 seats remaining. **89.46**

B. Colleges, schools, and portal campuses with more than 537 Voting Faculty are subject to six seat limitation ($89.46 \times 6 = 536.8$).

School	# Voting	# Seats
Medicine	1012	6

C. Total Voting Faculty in the remaining colleges, schools, and portal campuses (1314) is divided by the 20 seats remaining. Each with fewer than 66 Voting Faculty gets one Senator. **65.7**

Colleges, schools, and portal campuses with fewer than 66 Voting Faculty are:

School	# Voting	# Seats
Gallatin	16	1
GPH	10	1
Law	7	1
Nursing	42	1
Shanghai	51	1
Silver	12	1
Stern	53	1
Wagner	10	1

D. Total number of Voting Faculty in the remaining colleges, schools, and portal campuses (1113) is then divided by the 12 seats remaining. Each gets 1 Senator for each 93 Voting Faculty. **92.75**

E. Apportionment among the remaining colleges, schools, and portal campuses:

School	# Voting	Calculation	# Seats
Abu Dhabi	85	0.92	1
Dentistry	180	1.94	2
Engineering	79	0.85	1
FAS	409	4.41	4
SPS	93	1.00	1
Steinhardt	90	0.97	1
Tisch	177	1.91	2

2016-17 C-FSC Seats to University Senate (adding two seats)

The C-FSC consists of not more than 29 members:

29	Elected Members
<u>-1</u>	From the Division of Libraries
28	Apportioned among the colleges, schools, and portal campuses by method of equal proportions with the proviso that each college and school and each portal campus will be entitled to at least one and not more than six elected faculty Senators.

Apportionment Among the Colleges, Schools, and Portal Campuses

- A. Total Voting Faculty excluding the Division of Libraries (2326) divided by the 28 seats remaining. **83.07**

- B. Colleges, schools, and portal campuses with more than 498 Voting Faculty are subject to six seat limitation ($83.07 \times 6 = 498.4$).

School	# Voting	# Seats
Medicine	1012	6

- C. Total Voting Faculty in the remaining colleges, schools, and portal campuses (1314) is divided by the 22 seats remaining. Each with fewer than 60 Voting Faculty gets one Senator. **59.73**

Colleges, schools, and portal campuses with fewer than 60 Voting Faculty are:

School	# Voting	# Seats
Gallatin	16	1
GPH	10	1
Law	7	1
Nursing	42	1
Shanghai	51	1
Silver	12	1
Stern	53	1
Wagner	10	1

- D. Total number of Voting Faculty in the remaining colleges, schools, and portal campuses (1113) is then divided by the 14 seats remaining. Each gets 1 Senator for each 80 Voting Faculty. **79.50**

- E. Apportionment among the remaining colleges, schools, and portal campuses:

School	# Voting	Calculation	# Seats
Abu Dhabi	85	1.07	1
Dentistry	180	2.26	3
Engineering	79	0.99	1
FAS	409	5.14	5
SPS	93	1.17	1
Steinhardt	90	1.13	1
Tisch	177	2.23	2

2014-15 C-FSC Seats Assigned to University Senate

The C-FSC consists of not more than 27 members:

27	Elected members
-1	From the Division of Libraries
26	Apportioned among the colleges, schools, and portals by the method of equal proportions with the proviso that each college, school, and portal will be entitled to at least one elected Senator and none will have more than six elected Senators

Apportionment Among the Schools

A. Total Number of Voters in the colleges, schools and portals excluding the LIB (2063) divided by the 26 seats remaining **79.34**

B. Colleges, schools, and portals subject to six seat limitation (more than 476 eligible voters)

College/ School/ Portal		# Voting	# Seats
MED		886	6

C. Total number of voters in the remaining colleges, schools, and portals (1177) divided by the 20 seats remaining. **58.8**
Each college, school, and portal with less than 59 eligible voters gets 1 Senators

Colleges, schools, and portals with fewer than 59 Voters are:

School		# Voting	# Seats
Gallatin		19	1
Law		8	1
NYUAD		54	1
NYUSH		7	1
SSW		14	1
Stern		53	1
Wagner		9	1

D. Total Number of voters in the remaining colleges, schools, and portals (945) divided by the 13 seats remaining. **72.69**
Each college, school, and portal gets 1 Senator for each 72.61 Voters (subject to rounding to allocate exactly 13 seats)

E. Apportionment Among the Remaining Colleges, Schools, Portals:

School		# Voting	Calculation	# Seats
ENG		69	0.95	1
FAS		382	5.26	5
Dentistry		183	2.52	2
SCPS		97	1.33	1
Stein		91	1.25	1
TSOA		189	2.60	3

Note that the current apportionment of seats for the C-FSC is based on the numbers assigned by the C-FSC two years ago as there was no new election in the Spring of 2015 in order to allow Senators elected in the Spring of 2014 to serve out their 2-year terms.

Admin and Tech

The combined meeting of the Admin & Tech committees (TFSC & CFSC) met on 4/7/16. In attendance from the CFSC were Ben Mendelssohn and Jamie Skye Bianco (Chair, CFSC, Admin & Tech).

Under discussion and final revision was the University Personal Digital Content Policy document. It is expected that this will have been the final committee-level review for this document and with minor editorial changes, it will be brought forth in the very near future for Council approvals and adoption.

Still on the agenda for the next meeting is the more beleaguered Social Media Policy document, which is still under going legal review. It is hoped that this review will be complete in time for the May meeting of the combined committees.

Respectfully submitted,
Jamie Skye Bianco, Chair, Admin & Tech

Report of the
C-FSC Personnel Policies and Contract Issues Committee
April 21, 2016

Committee members: Amy Becker, Nancy Fefferman, John Halpin (chair), Brian Mooney, Heidi White

The PPCI committee has met separately three times since our last report: March 28, April 4, and April 18. We completed our reviews of the Appointment/Reappointment/Grievance documents for Gallatin and CUSP, and made substantial progress on that for the School of Law. The committee met jointly with the T-FSC PPCI committee on April 20, 2016 and constructed joint reviews of the Gallatin and CUSP documents. We expect to provide the C-FSC with copies of those joint reviews within the next week.

Respectfully submitted by John Halpin

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

Committee members: Neal Herman, Brian Mooney, Peggy Morton, Jon Ritter, Ben Stewart (chair).

- 1) The committee met on Thursday, April 22nd.
- 2) We continue to work on a set of recommendations for the use of student evaluation data. Our goal is to come up with a set of principles for using evaluations in faculty reviews. The body to which these principles might be submitted as a resolution remains an open question (a side note: although we reached out to our parallel T-FSC committee, they have not shown interest in this issue. Once we have a draft of principles to work with, we will reach out to them again.
 - a) Issues and questions:
 - i) Should these principles be the same with regard to AMI considerations as opposed to review/reappointment considerations? What are the stakes of particular uses to particular ends?
 - ii) To what extent do departments and programs currently use student evaluations in evaluating teachers?
 - iii) What other measures can we suggest that are not overly labor intensive? This last issue is especially important to consider for those programs or departments in which continuing faculty are already, or may soon be asked to, perform the work of evaluating their peers.
 - b) Approaches to the above issues:
 - i) We're continuing to think about the research that has been done into the biases that tend to come along with student evaluations (one of the main ones being that "omnibus questions,"—those that rate things like overall teaching effectiveness—are particularly biased, mainly along the lines of factors like gender and ethnicity). In talking with David Vintinner, it appears that the FAS data may not follow some of these trends (he suggested, in fact, that, within FAS, female professors' numbers tend to be a little higher than male professors' numbers). Our goal for early-summer is to get a more detailed sense of those numbers, not just within FAS. We feel that getting a snapshot of current trends is especially important given that NYU is moving to a standardized evaluation.
 - ii) In the fall, we'd like to do a survey of continuing faculty to get their sense of how student evaluations are used in their own evaluations. As a side note, we were wondering if, for next semester, survey questions from multiple committees might be combined into a single survey.
 - iii) We are exploring alternative approaches to evaluation within each of our fields.

Respectfully submitted, Ben Stewart

Report of the
C-FSC Global Network University Committee
April 4, 2016

Committee Members: Amy Becker (chair); John Burt (via Skype); Mary Killilea; Vincent Renzi; Larry Slater (via phone)

The Committee met and discussed developing a proposal to clarify the criteria and processes for nominating a continuing contract faculty member to the Global Network Professor title. We hope to present a proposal before the end of the academic year.

In addition, we direct Senators to the Office of the Provost's report on Mobility Across the Global Network, which may be found at <https://www.nyu.edu/faculty/faculty-in-the-global-network/additional-information/mobility-across-the-global-network.html>

Submitted by Amy Becker.

Report of Representatives to the Ad Hoc Committee on Tuition Remission and Portable Tuition Benefits

The committee held its first meeting on March 25, 2016. Present for the C-FSC were Vincent Renzi and Iskender Sahin.

Martin Dorph attended the first part of the meeting to give the committee its charge, which is in the next twelve months to develop recommendations about how tuition benefits might be improved. The remainder of the meeting was taken up with a presentation by committee chair Sabrina Ellis (Vice President for Human Resources) and Trish Halley (Director of Global Benefits)

The committee will meet monthly over the summer of 2016.

Senators and alternates are encouraged to pass to the council's representatives on the committee any thoughts or recommendation they or their constituents may have on these issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi

Report of Representatives to the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Work-Life Issues

(1) The committee met on March 24, 2016. Present for the C-FSC were Vincent Renzi and Diane Mirabito.

The committee's guest was Joyce Rittenburg, who formerly managed work-life programming at the University.

(2) The committee met on March 31, 2016. Present for the C-FSC were Vincent Renzi and Diane Mirabito.

The committee's guest was Carol Hoffman, who directs work-life programming at Columbia University.

(3) The committee met on April 7, 2016. Present for the C-FSC were Vincent Renzi and Diane Mirabito.

The meeting was devoted to finalizing the survey to be sent to all full-time (non-union) employees.

(4) The committee's next meeting is scheduled for April 21st.

Senators and alternates are encouraged to pass to the council's representatives on the committee any thoughts or recommendation they or their constituents may have on these issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi

Report of Representative to the Faculty Committee on the Global Network

(1) On March 10, 2016, the Faculty Committee on the Global Network held a joint meeting with both the T-FSC and the C-FSC Committees on the Global Network University. Present for the C-FSC committee were Amy Becker (chair, via phone from Shanghai), John Burt (via phone from Abu Dhabi), Vincent Renzi, Larry Slater (via phone).

The three committees had previously asked the University administration to provide data on the movement of faculty, staff, and students around the global academic network, specifically addressing visa and immigration issues. Reporting this research to the committees were Carol Morrow, Senior Associate Provost; Josh Taylor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Global Programs; and Sherif Barsoum, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Director of the Office of Global Programs.

This was the first time the University had compiled such data; it will now be done annually. While there are some limitations (e.g., we don't always know whether individuals couldn't get a visa or simply didn't complete their applications), the general sense is that it is very much exceptional that members of the University community cannot circulate freely around the network because of visa or immigration issues.

The data is posted to the University website, at

<https://www.nyu.edu/faculty/faculty-in-the-global-network.html>.

(2) The Faculty Committee on the Global Network met on March 29, 2016. The agenda included consideration of a statement to the University administration urging programs to assist Syrian students and scholars displaced by the civil war in their country. The committee also began work on its year-end report.

(3) The committee met again on April 20th. The agenda included an update on the proposal (subsequently withdrawn) made by the FAS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee that would have limited the amount of course work CAS students could complete at Abu Dhabi and Shanghai. Also on the agenda was finalizing the statement of support for displaced Syrian students and scholars.

The majority of the meeting was devoted to teleconference with academic area heads at Shanghai, particularly concerning faculty hiring and circulation. A second teleconference with faculty and staff in Abu Dhabi was devoted to labor standards compliance.

(4) Minutes of the meeting are available on the committee's website—

<http://www.nyu.edu/about/university-initiatives/faculty-advisory-committee-on-nyus-global-network/meeting-schedules-and-summaries.html>

(5) The committee's final meeting of the year is scheduled for May 16th.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi

Resolution

In response to a request by Carol Morrow to review amendments to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Global Network and the Global Network Professor title, the C-FSC approves the following two amendments, with editorial revisions to the original text highlighted in yellow.

The Global Network, to be added as a final new paragraph section under the listing **THE UNIVERSITY, ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION** which you can see here: <http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-university/organization-and-administration.html>

The Global Network

New York University, which is primarily located in downtown Manhattan and Brooklyn in New York City, encompasses a [global network](#) that consists of degree-granting campuses at NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai, and **global** academic centers in Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and South America. These include Accra, Ghana; Berlin, Germany; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Florence, Italy; London, England; Madrid, Spain; Paris, France; Prague, the Czech Republic; Sydney, Australia; Tel Aviv, Israel; and Washington, D.C. **This academic** network offers NYU faculty a range of **global** and multi-disciplinary [opportunities for research, teaching, and scholarly collaboration](#).

Faculty Appointments in More than One Unit, to be added as a final new paragraph section under the listing **THE FACULTY, FACULTY POLICIES APPLICABLE TO ALL OR MOST MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY, INCLUDING TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, FULL-TIME CONTINUING CONTRACT FACULTY, AND OTHER FACULTY** which you can see here: <http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/other-faculty-policies.html>

Faculty Appointments in More than One Unit

Faculty appointments in more than one school (cross-appointments) may be made in one of three University approved categories, Joint, Associated, and Affiliated, which carry designated [rights, privileges, and responsibilities](#). Terms of appointment, including recruitment and review for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, are governed by University policies and school procedures. Cross-appointments between the University's global network of degree-granting campuses in New York, Abu Dhabi, and Shanghai use the [Global Network Professor title](#), which is conferred as an additional secondary title upon eligible faculty based in NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai, and may be conferred upon eligible faculty based in New York.

**Recommendations Of
The Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council and
The Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council
In Regard To:**

**Gallatin School of Individualized Study
DRAFT Clinical Faculty: Policy and Practice
for Full-Time Continuing/Contract Faculty**

Background

From a letter dated October 23, 2015, sent by Provost David McLaughlin: “The Office of the Dean of the Gallatin School of Individualized Study has completed a process within the school to create its policy document on *Gallatin School Clinical Faculty: Policy and Practice*. My office, together with the Office of the General Counsel, worked with the school to edit the document to ensure consistency with University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments.”

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 *Gallatin School Clinical Faculty: Policy and Practice* document and to ensure its compliance with the University Guidelines For Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments.

I. SUBSTANTIVE MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Preamble

Comment: The Preamble notes: “*As with all NYU and Gallatin policies, this Policy Document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.*” This sentence fails to specify the procedures to be followed in the event of any amendment to the policy.

1. Recommendation: Pursuant to University Guidelines Sec. II, para. 2, clarify specifically and explicitly the process of amendments to this policy. Any proposed changes should be presented, discussed and voted on by Gallatin’s faculty government. Mechanisms for timely distribution to the faculty, faculty discussion, as well as the ability for faculty to present amendments, make recommendations to and vote on the Policy in a regularly scheduled Gallatin faculty meeting following procedures of its faculty governance, should be included and stated explicitly in the policy, such as:

“Any amendment to this Policy must be in writing, submitted at least two weeks in advance to the Gallatin faculty for discussion, for the possibility for amendments, and for a vote at a regularly scheduled Gallatin faculty meeting, pursuant to its faculty charter.”

General Definitions

Comment: The definition states that the Committee be comprised of “six faculty at the rank of associate professor (including one clinical associate professor).” This ratio of tenure-track to contract faculty in the case of contract faculty reappointment is unbalanced.

2. Recommendation: The composition should be adjusted to a majority continuing faculty members in the case of continuing faculty appointment, reappointment and promotion. Include an additional sentence: “In cases of appointment, reappointment and promotion of clinical faculty, the Committee shall include at least three clinical faculty members at the ranks of Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor.”

I. Definition of the Clinical Faculty in the Gallatin School

Paragraph 1:

Comment: The paragraph can further clarify the distinctions between tenure-track and contract faculty, especially given the fact that there are research/creative production expectations of contract faculty at least for purposes of promotions.

3. Recommendation: Include this language:

“Clinical faculty are ineligible for tenure and for NYU faculty housing. Clinical appointments often include some administrative supervisory responsibilities. Clinical faculty lines are typically multiyear and differ from tenure lines at Gallatin in the following ways: **[identify those differences]**.”

Paragraph 6:

“When administrative appointments form a significant part of a clinical faculty member’s appointment, their contracts may incorporate different teaching and advising responsibilities.”

- a. It is reasonable to expect that “different” equates to “reduced”.
- b. Are there occasions when administrative appoints would form a significant part of a clinical faculty member’s appointment but their contracts would not incorporate different (reduced) teaching and advising responsibilities?

4. Recommendation:

- a. Rephrase to more clearly define “different”
- b. Change “may” to “shall” or “will”

“When administrative appointments form a significant part of a clinical faculty member’s appointment, their contracts {shall, will} incorporate reduced teaching and/or advising responsibilities.”

Paragraph 7:

“Clinical faculty, like all Gallatin full-time faculty, are expected to take on a full advising responsibility, normally 20-25 advisees per faculty member.”

Does this full advising responsibility of normally 20-25 advisees constitute the advising that can be performed in place of one course, as indicated in: I. Definition of the Clinical Faculty in the Gallatin School; Paragraph 6; Sentence 5:

“Clinical faculty may perform an administrative, advising, or co-curricular role for the School in the place of one course.”

If so, then it appears that all faculty qualify for release from teaching one course because they are expected to take on a full advising responsibility.

5. Recommendation: Clarify whether the full advising responsibility of 20-25 advisees qualifies for release from teaching one course. If a full advising responsibility of 20-25 advisees does not qualify for release from teaching one course, rephrase:

“Clinical faculty may perform an administrative, advising, or co-curricular role for the School in the place of one course.”

as

“Clinical faculty may perform an administrative role, an advising role in excess of the expected responsibility of advising 20-25 advisees, or a co-curricular role for the School in the place of one course per semester.”

II. Search and Hiring Procedures

Paragraph 1:

How does the faculty decide on the finalist candidates for presentation to the Dean?

6. Recommendation: For clarity, add or refer to a description of the procedure by which the faculty winnows the list of those candidates invited to campus for job talks and meetings with the faculty to those candidates that the faculty presents to the Dean.

Comment: The last sentence reads: "The faculty present finalist candidates to the Dean, and the Dean selects the candidate from among the finalists." This practice gives the Dean the power to select the candidate that should belong to the search committee.

7. Recommendation: The sentence should read: "The faculty presents the names of its preferred candidates in order of preference to the Dean for the Dean's approval. If the Dean prefers a

different candidate, the Dean must provide his or her justification for overriding the preferences of the search committee."

III. Terms of Appointment

Paragraph 1:

"It is important that the qualifications and performance of the clinical faculty member be evaluated regularly as part of the appointment and reappointment process. Clinical faculty members, like all Gallatin full-time faculty, are required to present an annual report of activities and accomplishments to the Dean."

8. Recommendation: Consider stipulating that faculty members shall receive written feedback regarding the conclusions of the annual evaluation, in particular, the identification of areas, if there are such, that require improvement for continued reappointment and/or promotion.

Paragraph 2:

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

9. Recommendation: Insert such language after paragraph 2.

Leaves and Resources

Paragraph 1:

Comment: The last sentence states "Faculty on sabbatical leave are released from teaching but are not released from all advising duties." This suggests that faculty would need to be present on campus, precluding research activities that would require either time away from campus or travel or residence elsewhere.

10. Recommendation: Add the word "usually" to the sentence: "...but are not usually released from all advising duties." Add the following "For faculty members whose sabbatical leave requires that they be absent from campus, advising duties may be fulfilled remotely or waived on an individual basis."

Comment: Clinical Assistant Professors are not eligible for sabbatical leave but are eligible to apply for course releases. Since research is required for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, some form of research leave should be provided to further support professional,

scholarly or creative work. A description of that eligibility, and the process governing it, should be added.

11. Recommendation: The policy should clarify that Clinical Assistant Professors may apply for one or more courses releases during a given semester. Add the following to paragraph 2:
"Although Clinical Assistant Professors are not eligible for sabbatical leave, they are eligible to apply to the Dean for one or more course releases during a given semester to constitute research leave. In addition, the faculty member may also fulfill advising duties remotely or apply for a waiver of advising duties to correspond with the course release/s."

IV. Policy and Practices for Reappointment and Promotion

Paragraph 1:

Comment: Statements of reappointment criteria appear in the Definitions section instead of under this section concerning reappointment and promotion policies.

12. Recommendation: Insert the following from the Definitions section on page 2 here (from paras. 2-5 on p. 2):

“To recognize the range of qualifications and experiences that lead to the appointment as a member of the clinical faculty, this document makes a distinction between the criteria used for appointment or reappointment at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor, and the criteria for promotion or initial appointment at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or above.”

“The requirements for reappointment of Clinical Assistant Professors as described below depend on evidence of excellence in teaching, advising, service and citizenship. While scholarship or practice in the arts or professional fields is highly valued, it is not required for reappointment. While it is important to recognize that such achievement is not required, many members of the clinical faculty achieve distinction and recognition for their work as scholars, artists or practitioners, and this achievement is highly valued by the School.”

“For promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, excellence in scholarship or research in an academic field and/or continuing accomplishment in a field of the arts or a profession, in addition to excellence in teaching, advising, and service, is required.”

13. Recommendation: Add the stipulation that if the reason not to reappoint is due to a curricular or structural change in the academic program that fundamentally alters the nature of an existing full-time teaching assignment, that reason will be clearly stated in the report not to reappoint, which will be available to the not-reappointed clinical faculty member, so as to eliminate any possibility that the decision not to reappoint could be interpreted as due to the failure of the faculty member’s teaching performance.

1. Reappointment without promotion, Clinical Assistant Professor

Paragraph 2:

Comment: The reappointment is contingent on the faculty member meeting a “standard of excellence” laid out in the School’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

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

Otherwise, a link to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines should be provided.

Paragraph 4:

Comment: The section does not provide enough detail on the Review Committee.

15. 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,” <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).”

16. Recommendation: Specify that a majority vote of the Reappointment 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. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

17. 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.”

Paragraph 5:

Of four possible outcomes, only two are indicated on the assumption that the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends promotion.

18. Recommendation: Rephrase to include all possible outcomes:

- a. “If the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends renewal of the contract and the Dean accepts the recommendation, he or she will then notify the clinical faculty member that the contract will be renewed.
- b. If the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends renewal of the contract and the Dean does not accept the recommendation, the Dean will notify the clinical faculty member that the contract will not be renewed and the faculty member will be given a written rationale for the non-renewal.
- c. If the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends against renewal of the contract and the Dean accepts the recommendation, he or she will then notify the clinical faculty member that the contract will not be renewed and the faculty member will be given a written rationale for the non-renewal..
- d. If the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends against renewal of the contract and the Dean decides to renew the contract, he or she will then notify the clinical faculty member that the contract will be renewed. ”

Comment: The paragraph does not specify a procedure to follow in the event that the Dean does not accept the Reappointment Committee’s recommendation.

19. 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.recuitment.html>):

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

2. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

Paragraph 1:

Comment: The paragraph provides that after 6 years, a Clinical Assistant Professor may request at the time for reappointment to be considered for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. It is not clear whether the 6 years must have been accrued at NYU or whether the 6 years can include prior service at another university.

20. Recommendation: Change language to “but normally after 6 years at NYU or elsewhere...”

Paragraph 5

Sentence 1:

“The report of the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee will be forwarded to the Dean who will then bring it before the entire Senior Faculty for a vote.”

21. Recommendation: Consider adding: “Voting by the entire Senior Faculty on its recommendation for promotion shall be by closed ballot. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.”

Sentence 2:

“The Promotion and Tenure Committee report and the faculty vote are advisory to the Dean, who will make the final decision about whether to approve a promotion or not.”

22. Recommendation:

To be consistent, specify the full name of the Committee: “Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee”

“The Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee report and the faculty vote are advisory to the Dean, who will make the final decision about whether to approve a promotion or not.”

Sentence 3:

“The Dean will then either accept the recommendation for promotion or will notify the clinical faculty member that the promotion has not been approved”

This sentence is not inclusive of all potential recommendations for promotion and the Dean’s acceptance of the recommendation. For example, the Dean may not accept the recommendation not to promote (the recommendation and the vote of the Senior Faculty are advisory to the Dean, not directive), in which case, it may be inappropriate for the Dean to “notify the clinical faculty member that the promotion has not been approved.”

23. Recommendation:

Re-write this sentence (or sentences) to comprise all potential recommendations and votes of the Senior Faculty and all the Dean’s potential acceptances or non-acceptances of the recommendation and vote of the Senior Faculty (see #18).

Comment: The paragraph does not specify a procedure to follow in the event that the Dean does not accept the Promotion Committee’s recommendation.

24. 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.recuitment.html>):

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

25. Recommendation: Consider adding at the end of this section that if the Dean notifies the clinical faculty member that the promotion has not been approved, the faculty members shall receive written feedback regarding the reasons that the promotion was not approved and indication of areas, if there are such, that require improvement for successful future promotion.

3. Reappointment to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor

Paragraph 2:

Comment: The paragraph refers to a decanal committee consisting of the Dean, the Associate Dean for Faculty and one full professor appointed by the Dean.

26. 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 section does not provide enough detail on the Reappointment Review Committee.

27. 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,” <http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html>):

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

28. Recommendation: Specify that a majority vote of the Reappointment 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. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

29. 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."

Paragraph 3:

Comment: The paragraph does not specify a procedure to follow in the event that the Dean does not accept the Promotion Committee's recommendation.

30. 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.recuitment.html>):

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

31. Recommendation: Consider stipulating that if the Dean notifies the clinical faculty member that he or she will be reappointed, the faculty member shall receive written feedback regarding recommendations, if there are such, for continued reappointment.

4. Appointment and Promotion to Clinical Professor

Paragraph 1:

Comment: The paragraph states "Appointments made at the rank of Clinical Professor normally require a minimum of twelve years of teaching and related professional experience at NYU or elsewhere."

32. Recommendation: Change language to "a minimum of twelve years, at least six of which must have been at NYU..."

Paragraph 4:

33. Recommendation: Consider adding: "Voting by the Senior Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Full Professors (including Tenured and Clinical) on their respective recommendations for promotion to Clinical Professor shall be by closed ballot. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to

avoid reporting a split vote.”

Comment: The paragraph does not specify a procedure to follow in the event that the Dean does not accept the Senior Promotion and Tenure Committee’s recommendation.

34. 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.recuitment.html>):

“If the school Dean's decision is contrary on appointment, title, or length of contract to that of the Senior Promotion and Tenure Committee, 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.”

5. Grievance and Appeals Related to Reappointment and Promotion

Comment: The University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments provides in sec. V. part d: “...[E]ach school shall either establish a new standing faculty committee for FTNTT/CF grievances, which shall include senior FTNNT/CF 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 FTNTT/CF...” The paragraph in the Gallatin policy is in part inconsistent with the University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments insofar as it omits reference to an election process for the selection of members of a grievance committee.

35. Recommendation: The paragraph must indicate that the grievance committee members are elected by the Gallatin continuing contract faculty:
“At Gallatin, the Grievance Committee shall be elected by the continuing contract faculty and shall be constituted of at least three elected, full-time senior continuing contract faculty members.”

Comment: The Guidelines also provide in sec. V numerous requirements and procedures for the school grievance process, including specifying who may grieve, the grounds of 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.

36. Recommendation: The development of the grievance process should be undertaken with full participation by the Clinical Faculty and submitted to the faculty for discussion and a vote by the faculty to ensure that the grievance policy conforms to the Guidelines. 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.

Comment: This paragraph does clarify the documentary basis upon which a faculty member may pursue a grievance because the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation and the record of the Dean's decision on the recommendation are not mentioned.

37. Recommendation: Include this language: "In all cases of an appeal of 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, and to the record of the Dean's reasons for overriding the recommendations of the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Comment: The composition of the grievance committee in the case of a grievance by a Clinical Assistant Professor is unclear.

38. Recommendation: Change the sentence to read:
"In the case of a grievance by a Clinical Assistant Professor, at least one of the members shall be an elected Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor."

Comment: The paragraph does not include a provision for grievances by Clinical Professors.

39. Recommendation: Include a sentence specifying the composition of a grievance committee for grievances of Clinical Professors. "In the case of a grievance by a Clinical Professor, the Grievance Committee shall consist of three elected senior faculty members at least one of which shall be a Clinical Professor."

II. SUBSTANTIVE MINOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Preamble

none

General Definitions

Comment: This paragraph refers to "Gallatin's Tenure and Promotion Guidelines" as a source for definitions and descriptions.

40. Recommendation: A hyperlink to the Guidelines should be provided.

I. Definition of the Clinical Faculty in the Gallatin School

Paragraph 3:

Comment: The paragraph refers to "the review preceding the review for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor should draw the candidate's attention to any areas that need to be addressed for a successful promotion". To so inform a Clinical Assistant Professor would require the reappointment committee to anticipate and predict when the faculty member would be applying for promotion in the future.

41. Recommendation: Add the following for clarification:

“In particular, a reappointment review should anticipate that a Clinical Assistant Professor may in the future apply for promotion and the reappointment review should draw attention to any areas that need to be addressed for a successful promotion.”

Paragraph 6:

Comment: The fifth sentence refers to course release of “one course” for those faculty with administrative, advising, or co-curricular roles.

42. Recommendation: Clarify whether the course release of one course is per year or per semester.

II. Search and Hiring Procedures

none

III. Terms of Appointment

Paragraph 2:

43. Recommendation:

- a. To comply with the stipulation that reappointment procedures begin in the penultimate year of the contract, rephrase to include “in the fourth year following the initial appointment and in the fifth year following each reappointment for Clinical Associate Professors,”
- b. For consistency, add “and in the fifth year for Clinical Full Professors” if Clinical Full Professors are reappointed after six years and require the reappointment procedures to begin in the penultimate year of the contract:

“Reappointment procedures begin in the penultimate year of the contract (thus in the second year for Clinical Assistant Professors, in the fourth year following the initial appointment for Clinical Associate Professors and in the fifth year following each reappointment for Clinical Associate Professors, and in the fifth year for Clinical Full Professors)”.

Leaves and Resources

Paragraph 2:

Comment: The policy indicates that clinical faculty share the same access resources to support research as all full-time tenure-track faculty. The policy is silent on whether Clinical Faculty can serve as Principal Investigators on research grants.

44. Recommendation: Clarify whether clinical faculty are eligible to serve as Principal Investigators. If they are not eligible, explain why not, or change eligibility.

IV. Policy and Practices for Reappointment and Promotion

Inserted Paragraph 3:

Comment: Refers to the requirements for reappointment as requiring “evidence of excellence in teaching, advising, service and citizenship.” It also refers separately to “scholarship or practice in the arts or professional fields.” In this context, “citizenship” is undefined and vague.

45. Recommendation: Delete “citizenship” unless it is defined specifically and in distinction to the other assessment criteria.

Inserted paragraph 4:

Comment: The paragraph includes this sentence: “We make an important distinction between what is a formal requirement for reappointment of contract as a Clinical Assistant Professor, and the quality of the artistic, professional or scholarly achievement of the clinical faculty member.”

46. Recommendation: Delete this sentence from the paragraph 4 transferred from page 2 because it does not make sense.

1. Reappointment without promotion, Clinical Assistant Professor

Paragraph 4:

Comment: The paragraph provides that the Reappointment Committee’s report “should be brief and succinct.”

47. Recommendation: As the report should be thorough and complete, delete the word “brief.”

2. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

Paragraph 3:

Comment: The paragraph needs to specify the criteria for promotion.

48. Recommendation: Provide a link to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Paragraph 5; Sentence 2:

“The Promotion and Tenure Committee report and the faculty vote are advisory to the Dean, who will make the final decision about whether to approve a promotion or not.”

49. Recommendation:

To be consistent, specify the full name of the Committee: “Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee”

“The Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee report and the faculty vote are advisory to the Dean, who will make the final decision about whether to approve a promotion or not.”

3. Reappointment to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor

none

4. Appointment and Promotion to Clinical Professor

Paragraph 3:

Comment: The paragraph duplicates the criteria of excellence that were specified in the prior paragraph.

50. Recommendation: Delete this paragraph.

5. Grievance and Appeals Related to Reappointment and Promotion

Comment: The last sentence concerning grievances by a Clinical Associate Professor is unclear.

51. Recommendation: Change the sentence to read: “In the case of a grievance by a Clinical Associate Professor, the Grievance Committee shall consist of three elected senior faculty members at least one of whom shall be a Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor.”

III. MINOR EDITORIAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

Preamble

none

General Definitions

Paragraph 1: The Gallatin Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee

Comment: The description of this Committee concludes with “Clinical Associate Professors on the committee vote on cases involving reappointment of Clinical Assistant Professors and on cases of promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.”

52. Recommendation: Delete this sentence because the voting conditions for Clinical faculty in the Committee are stated below.

Paragraph 2: The Senior Promotion and Tenure Committee

Comment: The definition refers to “all faculty at the rank of full professor.” This reference is unclear.

53. Recommendation: change the language to: “all faculty at the rank of Full Professor and/or Clinical Full Professor.”

Paragraph 7: Footnote 1

Comment: Refers twice to “that document.” The second usage is confusing.

54. Recommendation: Change the second reference to “that document” to “Promotion and Tenure Document” and include hyperlink.

I. Definition of the Clinical Faculty in the Gallatin School

Paragraphs 2-5:

Comment: These paragraphs refer to the criteria for reappointment and promotion rather than to the definition of clinical faculty in the Gallatin School.

55. Recommendation: These paragraphs should be moved to Part IV Policy and Practices for Reappointment and Promotion.

Paragraph 8:

Comment: The paragraph refers the reader to another section on promotion to Clinical Full Professor. The section makes no other similar references.

56. Recommendation: For the sake of consistency, delete this reference.

II. Search and Hiring Procedures

none

III. Terms of Appointment

Paragraph 1:

“Clinical faculty members are appointed for multiple-year contracts, and these contracts, following successful reviews, can be renewed without limit.”

This sentence reads as though the contracts require successful reviews, but what is actually meant is that faculty members must be successfully reviewed for their contracts to be renewed without limit.

57. Recommendation: Rephrase to clarify the meaning as:

“A clinical faculty member is appointed on a multiple-year contract, which, following a successful review of the faculty member at the time of contract renewal, can be renewed without limit.”

Leaves and Resources

Paragraph 1; Sentence 3:

“Clinical Associate Professors and full Professors are eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves according to the normal sabbatical schedule upon application and with evidence of continued artistic, professional or scholarly productivity.”

58. Recommendation: Capitalize “full” and add “Clinical” before “full Professors”

“Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Full Professors are eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves according to the normal sabbatical schedule upon application and with evidence of continued artistic, professional or scholarly productivity.”

IV. Policy and Practices for Reappointment and Promotion

none

1. Reappointment without promotion, Clinical Assistant Professor

none

2. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

Paragraph 3:

“The complete portfolio will be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and subjected to a similar but more extensive review and report as was undertaken for the Clinical Assistant Professor reappointments.”

59. Recommendation: To avoid confusion specify the full name of the Committee, “Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee” (the assumption for this recommendation is that the relevant committee is the “Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee”, as it is listed in the fifth paragraph, first sentence)

“The complete portfolio will be submitted to the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and subjected to a similar but more extensive review and report as was undertaken for the Clinical Assistant Professor reappointments.”

Paragraph 5; Sentence 2:

“The Promotion and Tenure Committee report and the faculty vote are advisory to the Dean, who will make

the final decision about whether to approve a promotion or not.”

60. Recommendation: Add “Reappointment,” before “Promotion”

3. Reappointment to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor

Paragraph 2; Sentence 2:

“A decanal committee normally consisting of the Dean, the Associate Dean for Faculty, and one full professor appointed by the Dean will review the candidate’s teaching, advising and service as well as their scholarly, creative or practical work done since the last contract.”

61. Recommendation: Replace “their” with “his or her”

Sentence 3:

“The candidate will not be renewed if the standards of excellence required at Gallatin in teaching, advising and service are not met, but in addition the faculty member’s performance in his or her field of scholarly, creative or practical work will need to meet the high standards required at the time of promotion or appointment.”

This sentence is awkward and does not describe correctly what is not to be renewed if standards of excellence are not met; it is the candidate’s contract, not the candidate him- or herself.

62.. Recommendation: Re-write the sentence as:

“The candidate’s contract will not be renewed if he or she has not met the standards of excellence required at Gallatin with respect to teaching, advising and service, nor will the candidate’s contract be renewed if his or her performance in his or her field of scholarly, creative or practical work has not been maintained at the high standards required at the time of promotion or appointment.”

4. Appointment and Promotion to Clinical Professor

none

5. Grievance and Appeals Related to Reappointment and Promotion

none