MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 11, 2016

The New York University Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, February 11, 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, Caprio, Carl, Cittadino, Elcott, Gurrin, Halpin, Mooney, Morton, Mowry, Rainey, Renzi, Sacks, Slater, Stehlik, Stewart, Williams; Alternate Senators Bianco, Casey (for Killilea), Celik (by audio conference, for Burt), Lee, Ritter, and 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 DECEMBER 8, 2015

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the December 8, 2015 meeting were approved unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: FRED CARL

See attached Document A: C-FSC Chair's Report.

Provost Search Committee

A Senator inquired on the status of the Provost Search Committee. Chairperson Carl responded the search is continuing and on schedule.

Committee Updates

Carl stated there is a vacancy of one seat on the C-FSC Benefits Committee and a vacancy on the Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (SCOG). He asked Senators to contact Karyn Ridder if interested in serving on either committee.

SCOG representatives noted the meetings take place on Tuesdays at 4:00 p.m. Representatives on the Benefits Committee stated they plan to schedule three meetings this semester, including a meeting with Marty Dorph and Director of Benefits Trish Halley. It was noted there will be restructuring with the departure of Allison Leary, and on March 1 Sabrina Ellis will be joining NYU as Vice President for Human Resources. The Committee plans to also have a joint meeting with the T-FSC Benefits Committee once Sabrina Ellis begins her new role.

Carl reported on the creation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Tuition Remission and Portable Tuition. The C-FSC has been asked to send the names of three representatives to serve. Senators Borowiec and Renzi have agreed to serve. Carl asked if Senators are interested in serving to contact Karyn Ridder.
Carl also reported on the C-FSC Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, which includes the following members: Susan Stehlik, Jamie Skye Blanco, David Elcott, Marco Williams, and Ethan Youngerman. The Committee will meet and decide on their Chair and agenda.

**Continuing Contract Faculty School-level Voting Rights**

Carl asked the Council if any other school, other than the Tandon School of Engineering, does not allow continuing contract faculty to vote at the school level.

Senators noted some discrepancies at the department level, but not at the school level. School of Professional Studies Senators noted the school does not have any tenured/tenure track faculty so there are no votes at faculty meetings.

Carl requested that Senators remind School Deans that continuing contract faculty must be engaged in all issues relating to continuing contract faculty.

The report was accepted into the minutes.

**QUESTIONS ON COMMITTEE REPORTS DISTRIBUTED**

See attached Document B: Committee Reports.

No questions were submitted on the following reports:

**Personnel Policies and Contract Issues: John Halpin**

**University Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Work-Life Issues: Vincent Renzi**

**Faculty Committee on NYU’s Global Network University: Vincent Renzi**

**University Senate Academic Affairs: Ben Stewart**

Senator Stewart added the Committee had a meeting yesterday, at which a list of honorary degrees were approved and there was a discussion of the Founder’s Day Award. Students who earn a grade point average (GPA) of 3.500 or higher receive a University Honors Scholar/Founders Day Award. There is concern that the award is becoming meaningless since so many students—over 50 percent—receive it. The Committee will continue discussion on this issue. The Committee is also discussing the issue of the summer session calendar, slated to end mid-week, which incurs financial and logistical problems.

**University Senate SCOG: Larry Slater**

Senator Slater added that at the last meeting of the Committee, there was a discussion of formalizing in the Bylaws a rule stating the faculty (T-FSC and C-FSC combined) could not be over fifty percent of the University Senate membership. Slater stated his position that this need not be formalized.

A Senator inquired on the distribution of students versus faculty on SCOG. A Senator reported the distribution on SCOG is as follows: six students, four T-FSC members, four C-FSC members, three AMC members, three deans, and three members of the administration.

Slater noted more students than faculty are often able to attend the meetings. He mentioned his concern that the last meeting, which included the discussion on the SCOG proposal regarding the Faculty of Health Representation, was called without much notice and many faculty members were unable to attend.

It was noted there was a miscommunication of the C-FSC response to the SCOG proposal. It was reported all Senate Councils were in support of the proposal, despite the C-FSC’s stated disagreement with the proposal. Carl sent a follow-up message re-stating the C-FSC’s position.
Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee: Ron Rainey

Senator Rainey discussed, as he mentioned in his report, his concerns regarding threats to academic freedom if faculty are pushed to be sensitive to students’ comfort zones in the classroom.

Senator Stehlik noted the topic of faculty/student relationships will be coming to the University Senate Academic Affairs Committee.

A Senator stated FAS faculty received an email from the Dean stating diversity is going to be a priority for FAS and it will be mandated to include language on the Moses Center on syllabi. He expressed his concern regarding the Dean making a decision on the contents of syllabi and the fundamental question of academic freedom.

Another Senator noted change is taking place and that which was once acceptable is not necessarily acceptable today. He does not see this as a threat to academic freedom, but as a part of academic learning.

A Senator noted that microaggressions or microstressors are often done without the person being aware, which speaks to a lack of sensitivity. He supported trainings as a way to educate faculty and teach faculty how to properly handle microstressors when they occur.

A Senator noted the issue of students being afraid to discuss certain subjects in the classroom.

A Senator noted faculty have to be able to push students as far as necessary on the academic ground while being trained to avoid unnecessary and unfair biases.

A Senator commented the concerns she is hearing from the Task Force and students is that students are being challenged by positions that themselves are critical. She commented regardless of whether it is communities of color, the transgender community, different kinds of queer communities, or communities of differently-abled people, faculty members must really listen to their concerns.

A Senator agreed with the need to push students and be uncomfortable in the process of learning, and added as a professor he also needs to be uncomfortable as norms change.

A Senator added the focus seems to be on students versus the administration or students versus the faculty, but he also had seen an increase in student to student conflicts, regarding age differences, language barriers, etc.

A Senator added at the Law School there is a focus on teaching students the concept of microaggressions because of interactions with clients.

A Senator added the structure of the Taskforce allows for these conversations and noted there are three different committees that are assessing issues faced in the individual communities of the administration, faculty, and students. There is then a separate committee, the Assessment Committee, which will bring this all together.

Liaison to the Department of Athletics: Vincent Renzi

Senator Renzi noted the locker lottery at Palladium has been delayed for a month and there is also a delay in the opening of the 404 Lafayette Street facility.

The reports were accepted into the minutes.
COMMITTEE REPORTS

Administration & Technology: Jamie Skye Bianco

Alternate Senator Bianco reported the meeting scheduled for this month was cancelled and rescheduled for March 10.

Educational Policies & Student/Faculty Relations: Ben Stewart

Senator Stewart stated there is no news to report.

Faculty Benefits and Housing: Joe Borowiec & Vincent Renzi

Senators Borowiec and Renzi stated there is no news to report.

Finance Policy and Planning: Susan Stehlik

Senator Stehlik added the Committee is pleased to have met the deadline for the budget recommendations. She noted according to the survey, faculty members are unclear about the factors related to the Annual Merit Increase and on how merit is defined. She added half of the faculty members are unaware of professional development funds.

Marty Dorph suggested the Committee present the survey results to the Dean’s Committee, but Stehlik stated her disagreement until the Committee has properly finalized the results. She noted the survey results are currently in draft format and need to be broken down by school.

The Committee has also been asked to provide a specific suggested number for the annual merit increase.

A Senator commented it seems the AMI will always be at 3% with 5% withheld to apply towards those with exceptional merit, so the Council’s recommendation is irrelevant.

Senators noted the issues related to salary compression. A Senator noted those at the lower income level should receive a higher percentage.

A Senator thanked the Committee for their work on the survey, and noted the breadth of information the survey obtained and the high response rate.

Governance Committee: Ezra Sacks

Senator Sacks reported the questionnaire developed by the Governance Committee was sent to the Steering Committee for response and input. Once they receive that response, the Committee will revise and send to the Council for discussion. The target is to distribute to schools and receive responses by the end of the spring semester.

Superblock Stewardship Advisory Committee: Ezra Sacks

Senator Sacks reported construction has begun on the gardens along Bleecker between LaGuardia and Mercer Street and LaGuardia between 3rd and Bleecker Street. This is a six-month landscaping project, which will renew and revamp the university gardens, walkways, lighting, etc.

Global Network University: Amy Becker

Senator Becker stated the Committee plans to meet jointly with the University Committee and T-FSC GNU Committee this semester.
Undergraduate Program Committee: John Halpin

Senator Halpin stated there is no news to report.

Ad Hoc Working Group on Developing Grievance Procedures for Grievances not related to Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion: Andy Williams & Fred Carl

Senator Carl reported the Committee held a meeting yesterday and expects to have two more meetings. He commented the meetings are going well and there is a general acceptance of the notion that disciplinary processes need to be developed for continuing contract faculty. There is a recognition that continuing contract faculty are not like every other non-faculty University employee, and he expects the disciplinary processes developed will be fairly close to those for the tenured faculty.

Faculty Advisory Committee on Academic Priorities: Susan Stehlik

Senator Stehlik reported the last dinner meeting focused on the listening sessions.

Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Misconduct: Susan Stehlik

Senator Stehlik noted the Committee is moving ahead to develop a policy and an education process. They plan to host a Town Hall for faculty and asked for a representative from the C-FSC. She noted the sense of the Committee is that faculty will not want to be forced to do a training session, but she feels faculty will welcome education sessions for clarity.

A Senator commented these education sessions need to be improved from those sessions on campus violence, in which the trainer read from a script. Another Senator added his school’s faculty found those trainings to be a poor presentation and unprofessional.

Stehlik mentioned the Committee was looking into an online training, which she is against and believes they should be in person.

A Senator commented there needs to be clarification regarding the process for contacting the Office of Equal Opportunity with complaints. She stated she makes these calls for her department and sometimes they take a lot of information other times they state they do need student information. She requested more clarity on the procedure.

A Senator noted the importance of adjunct faculty being included in these trainings. He also noted, in his experience, faculty members are open to any type of training and thinks a majority of our faculty would welcome these kinds of educational sessions.

OLD BUSINESS

Vote on Approving Recommendations to the Stern Guidelines on Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion


A Senator noted the name in the Guidelines needs to be changed from Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Contract Faculty to Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty. A Senator also noted the policy cites the old guidelines. These discrepancies will be updated.

A Senator commented these guidelines seemed to benefit from the twenty principles, drafted by the Alternate Senator for Liberal Studies (LSP), Heidi White. He commented those principles were well articulated.
It was noted the Personnel Policies & Contract Issues Committee and the Steering Committee are continuing to revise the principles to make them more adaptable to every school.

Senator Mooney confirmed the Committee is using the principles as a template during the review process of all policies.

A Senator inquired on the term appointment letter and its status as a contract.

Senator Sacks confirmed the appointment letter is considered a contract, and is required to contain information such as beginning and end of contract, a signature line, and a second copy must be filed in the Dean or Chair’s office.

A Senator commented the appointment letter is considered a contract, and is required to contain information such as beginning and end of contract, a signature line, and a second copy must be filed in the Dean or Chair’s office.

It was noted the specifics for what is required in the written contract are now part of the University Bylaws.

A Senator commented the remaining controversial issue is whether those letters need to be countersigned by the addressee. It was noted these issues will be addressed as the policies are developed by each school.

A Senator stated his only objection to the Guidelines is that the responsibilities are defined as teaching only and research is not a part of the responsibilities of the individual. He believes research should be included and noted he will abstain from the vote for that reason.

A Senator noted at Schools such as Gallatin, Tisch, and Wagner, continuing contract faculty do need to pursue research, creative work, and professional work.

A Senator noted the Steinhardt guidelines will include research as part of the recognition in terms of evaluation, and reappointment.

It was noted the twenty principles also addresses this to take into account that 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.

Senators confirmed this is a school to school issue and their schools are addressing this in different ways, depending on the responsibilities of teaching versus engaged scholarship, research, professional work, etc. A Senator noted in FAS it is different by department.

A Senator commented the wording is important, and stated he finds the word “research” to be worrisome since it has for so long been identified in the tenured context in terms of research toward publication. However, in a teaching context, there is a lot of research that contributes to classroom activities that needs to be recognized and encouraged.

A Senator added at Tisch there is a push to rethink the definition of research.

A Senator noted the importance of the University recognizing and being supportive of continuing contract faculty as serious researchers who can bring in funding for the University, but at the same time avoid placing an undue burden on faculty members for whom research is not a part of their role.

A Senator mentioned Boyer’s model of scholarship, which proposed that scholarship includes four different categories: scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of application, and scholarship of teaching and learning.

A Senator noted the challenge in some schools for continuing contract faculty to be seen as scholars because research often means grant money and publications, and in some schools continuing contract faculty do not have that kind of context. He noted the need to better articulate scholarship, and noted Boyer’s model sounds like a good way of categorizing.
Stehlik stated the survey showed over fifty percent of faculty want to be considered for research or considered for research if they were supported by the University.

It was noted the Steinhardt Guidelines are addressing the issue of Principal Investigator status which requires special approval from the Provost's office. A Steering Committee member noted this was discussed in a meeting with the Provost and will continue to be addressed.

A Senator noted he served on the Middle States Report Committee last year, and the issue of broadening the definition of research and scholarly activity was discussed, not just for continuing contract faculty members but also for tenured tenure track faculty members.

Chairperson Carl suggested this as a topic for the next C-FSC retreat.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the recommendations were approved by vote of the Council, with one abstention.

A Senator asked if the University Guidelines apply to Nursing, Dentistry, and the Medical School as well as Shanghai and Abu Dhabi.

This was confirmed. Senators noted the status of these guidelines is unclear and it was agreed to discuss at the next meeting with Provost.

The Senator from Shanghai reported Shanghai is currently working very closely with the Provost to develop Shanghai's guidelines and is using the University Guidelines as they develop their own. She noted she has reviewed a draft and it heavily quotes from the guidelines and most of her suggestions have been incorporated in the second draft.

Report on request to Senate Executive Committee for continuation of Coles Advisory Group: Randy Mowry

Vice Chairperson Mowry reported he represented Chairperson Carl at the Senate Executive Committee meeting and he brought up the Council's suggestion to continue the Coles Advisory Group or form a committee that was concerned with the recreation and health benefit opportunities for faculty and staff at NYU. He stated there was no real discussion about the suggestion and the Committee will review.

A Senator suggested placing those members of the former Coles Advisory Group on the Superblock Committee.

It was noted the term “Coles” is being phased out and it is now being called the “181 Mercer Street Project.”

A Senator noted there are other areas that fall under student affairs that impact faculty, such as the Moses Center, residential education, etc. and it would be beneficial if faculty had more oversight. The Executive Committee will take this issue into consideration.

Report on request to Senate Executive Committee regarding developing an app to alert students of University sponsored events where significant amounts of food are left over, and frequently discarded: Randy Mowry

Mowry stated he also brought up to the Senate Executive Committee the issue of food waste and suggested developing an app to alert students to the availability of unused food. There was a discussion on the legal issues concerning health and safety. Columbia University has developed such an app.
NEW BUSINESS

C-FSC Spring Retreat

Chairperson Carl asked the Council for their thoughts on hosting a retreat at the end of the semester, at which the Council could discuss and start to develop strategies around specific issues.

A Senator commented the benefit of a retreat is the opportunity, through small group work, to gain a better understanding of what is going on around the University.

A Senator stated it is critical for those who regularly attend Council meetings to reach out to those members who do not to encourage their attendance.

Chairperson Carl restated the issue of research and the definition of professional development as a potential topic for the retreat.

He noted date options will be circulated and final topics discussed.

Student Evaluations

Carl asked the Council if there is an interest in continuing the conversation on the question of student evaluations, specifically on their function in evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Senators confirmed their interest in the topic. A Senator commented it is important for the Council to have a presence in this conversation and noted there is research that suggests there are other more efficient ways of assessing and evaluating teaching effectiveness.

The issue will be placed on the agenda of the Faculty/Student Relations Committee.

Public Affairs

Senator Halpin stated at the Senate Public Affairs meeting, the Committee discussed the community’s feelings towards NYU. There was a discussion of promoting how NYU has improved the neighborhood, surrounding businesses, Washington Square Park, etc. The improved Governance structures and collaboration between C-Faculty and T-Faculty was also noted. He suggested perhaps the Council could have a role in this positive promotion.

A Senator noted she recently brought a group of students studying social impact in the community to a community board meeting. She strongly recommended attending these meetings.

NEXT MEETING

Chairperson Carl announced the next meeting of the Council will take place on Thursday, March 10, 2016 from 12:00 to 2:00 P.M. and President Andrew Hamilton will be in attendance

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 A.M.
1. Committee Updates

Our Personnel Policies and Contract Issues committee is continuing to develop recommendations to school policies for Gallatin, the Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP), the Law School and, most recently, the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (ISAW). The committee, along with the Steering Committee, has developed a list of guidelines and benchmarks for continuing contract faculty in the development of their school policies.

The Provost’s Advisory Working Group, charged to develop recommendations for disciplinary policies and grievance procedures for continuing contract faculty not related to appointment, reappoint and promotion, held its second meeting on Thursday, January 21, 2016.

The Senate Executive Committee held one meeting on Monday, January 25, 2016. Randy Mowry will report on that at our February 11 meeting.

The Senate Task Force on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion held its first meeting on Friday, February 5, 2016.

There is a vacancy of one seat on the C-FSC Benefits Committee. Please contact Karyn and Fred if you are interested in serving on this committee.

There is a vacancy on the Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (SCOG). Please contact Karyn and Fred if you are interested in serving on this committee.

2. SCOG

On December 15, 2015, Michael Hengerer, the Chair of SCOG, sent our Council a proposal relating to the addition of seats on the Senate for the new School of Global Public Health (see attached). In an effort to limit the increase in the size of the senate, while also accommodating the addition of seats for representatives from the new College of Nursing and the College of Global Public Health, SCOG is proposing to keep the size of the C-FSC at 27 seats, while reapportioning the distribution of seats across schools. Thus, they add a seat from the two new colleges and take away one seat each from FAS and Tisch. After consultation with our SCOG representatives and the Steering Committee, we have responded: “After speaking with the C-FSC reps on SCOG and our Steering Committee, for a number of reasons we do not support the proposed
changes. The continued concern with the size of the University Senate seems unrelated to either the size of the Colloquium Room or to the effectiveness of the Senate Meetings. Since most business is actually conducted in smaller committees, questions of size at the relatively few Senate meetings seem misplaced. From the C-FSC standpoint, all of our Senators and many of our Alternate Senators have at least one committee assignment, with many having 3 and sometimes 4. As calls for the C-FSC to provide members for new committees continue to come in, an increase in size would, in fact, be welcomed.

We would recommend that the Senate increase in size to accommodate the new Deans and that each Council increase as needed to maintain their proportions relative to each other. Questions regarding the size of the Senate should be raised after SCOG makes its recommendations about the role and function of the University Senate.

Thank you.”

3. **Provost Search Process**

The committee continued to hold meetings during the week of January 24—January 28. It is expected that the committee will hold two more meetings before sending a list of candidates to Andy Hamilton.

4. **End of Semester Newsletter**

As requested at our December 8, 2015, meeting, we have sent out to all continuing contract faculty our first end-of-semester newsletter. Please be sure to send to Karyn any honors and achievements for inclusion in the end-of-Spring-semester newsletter.

5. **Next Meeting**

Our next meeting will be on Thursday, March 10, 2016, 12noon-2:00pm. Andy Hamilton has accepted our invitation to attend.
Memorandum

From: Senate Committee on Governance
To: Councils of the Senate
Re: Proposed Composition of the Senate 2016-17 Related to Addition of Faculty of Health, College of Nursing and College of Global Public Health
Date: December 14, 2015

Note: Council Input Needed Prior to February 18, 2016 Senate Meeting

As you know, SCOG was charged by the Senate Executive Committee with making a recommendation to the Senate on how the new Faculty of Health, College of Nursing (“Nursing”), and College of Global Public Health (“GPH”) should be represented on the Senate. Each of the Faculty of Health, Nursing, and GPH has a Dean and each Dean is represented on the Dean’s Council.

SCOG has studied the question and reviewed different scenarios that would accommodate the addition of three Deans while otherwise maintaining the structure of the Senate as closely as possible to what it is today. This approach honors the principles already endorsed by the Senate during the creation of the C-FSC, namely, that no constituency should have more than 50% representation on the Senate (including both faculty Councils as one for the purpose of that calculation) and that the existing proportions of representation should be maintained to the extent possible. After review, and as further illustrated below, SCOG believes that increasing the Senate from 128 members to 130 members would best fulfill these goals.

Below are tables showing the current composition of the Senate followed by the composition under SCOG’s proposal. It is important to note that the T-FSC’s loss of a Senator in 2016-17 is not related to the modification of Senate composition as recommended by SCOG; the planned reduction of T-FSC’s seats from 37 to 36 was put in place when the C-FSC was formed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
<th>% Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-FSC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-FSC</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Council</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Officers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Council Representation (2016-17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
<th>% Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-FSC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-FSC</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Council</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Officers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under SCOG’s recommendation, the percentage representation of each Council does not change significantly; the percentage representation of the Dean’s Council increases slightly while the percentage representation of the other Councils decreases slightly. Overall, however, the balance remains the same. We believed this scenario to be preferable to the other two options we considered: increasing the size of the Senate to 148 in order to maintain the exact current proportion of each Council or maintaining the exact size of the Senate (127) by decreasing the number of Senators in Councils other than the Dean’s Council. SCOG is mindful of the desire not to dramatically increase the size of the Senate; we also took into consideration the comments we received from the Councils last year that they require their current numbers of Senators in order to function effectively.

For your reference we are attaching the current apportionment of seats within T-FSC and C-FSC as well as the estimated apportionment of seats for those Councils under SCOG’s recommendation for 2016-17. The estimated apportionment is based on the current numbers of faculty members in each school and is subject to change based on the actual number of faculty members in each school at the time of the elections in the Spring. The areas showing change based on current faculty numbers are shown with yellow highlighting.

Any change to the composition of the Senate requires an amendment to the University Bylaws, which must be done by the University’s Board of Trustees. In order to put these changes into effect in time for the Spring Senate meeting, we will need to seek the Board’s approval of Bylaw amendments at its next meeting on February 23, 2016. To accomplish that, we will need to have the Senate vote on the proposed modifications to the Senate composition at its February 18, 2016 meeting.

---

1 Note that the current apportionment of seats for the C-FSC is based on the numbers assigned to the C-FSC two years ago when they were formed. At that time, C-FSC Senators were elected to two-year terms. Accordingly, the C-FSC did not have an election in the Spring of 2015. The C-FSC plans to stagger the election of its Senators and will have an election in Spring 2016 when some portion of its Senate seats will be vacated.
Before SCOG asks the Senate to consider this issue at its February meeting, SCOG would very much like to receive feedback from your Council. Accordingly, we would appreciate it if you could present this proposal to your Council and provide us with feedback as soon as you are able. SCOG is happy to answer any questions or provide additional information.

Thank you.
The T-FSC consists of not more than 36 members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 Elected members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6 From the School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 From the Division of Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 At-Large Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Apportioned among the schools by the method of equal proportions with the proviso that each school will be entitled to at least one elected faculty Senator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Apportionment Among the Schools

**A.** Total Voting Faculty in the Schools (1665) excluding the School of Medicine and the Division of Libraries, divided by the 28 seats remaining.

**B.** Schools with fewer than 59 Voting Faculty are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>#Voting</th>
<th>Presidential/Provostial Additions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th># Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPH</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C.** Total Number of Voting Faculty in the remaining schools (1502) is then divided by the 21 seats remaining. Each school gets 1 Senator for each 68 Total Voting Faculty.

**D.** Apportionment Among the Remaining Schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Voting</th>
<th>Presidential/Provostial Additions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th># Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisch</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The yellow highlights indicate areas showing change from the current seats.
# C-FSC Seats to University Senate Under Proposed 2016-17 Senate

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27</th>
<th>Elected members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>From the Division of Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Apportioned among the schools by the method of equal proportions with the proviso that each school will be entitled to at least one and not more than six elected faculty Senators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Apportionment Among the Schools

### A. Total Number of Voting Faculty in the Schools excluding the Division of Libraries, divided by the 26 seats remaining

86.65

### B. Colleges, schools, and portals subject to six seat limitation

(86.65\*6 = 519.92)

(more than 520 eligible voting faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Voting</th>
<th># Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Total number of voters in the remaining schools 1319 divided by the 20 seats remaining. Each school with fewer than 66 eligible voters gets one (1) Senator.

65.95

Schools with fewer than 61 voters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Voting</th>
<th># Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Marron Institute

### D. Total number of eligible voting faculty in the remaining schools (1111) divided by the 12 remaining seats. Each school gets one (1) Senator for each 93 eligible voting faculty.

92.58

### E. Apportionment Among the Remaining Schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Voting</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
<th># Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisch</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The yellow highlights indicate areas showing change from the current seats.
The T/TT FSC consists of not more than 37 members:
- 37 Elected members
- 6 From the School of Medicine
- 1 From the Division of Libraries
- 1 At-Large Senator

Apportioned among the schools by the method of equal proportions with the proviso that each school will be entitled to at least one elected faculty Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Voting</th>
<th>Presidential/Provo stial Additions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th># Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Voting Faculty in the remaining schools (1544) is then divided by the 24 seats remaining. Each school gets 1 Senator for each 64 Total Voting Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># Voting</th>
<th>Presidential/Provo stial Additions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th># Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisch</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C-FSC Seats Assigned to University Senate in 2014-15

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apportionment Among the Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Total Number of Voters in the colleges, schools and portals excluding the LIB (2063) divided by the 26 seats remaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Colleges, schools, and portals subject to six seat limitation (more than 476 eligible voters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School/Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Total number of voters in the remaining colleges, schools, and portals (1177) divided by the 20 seats remaining. Each college, school, and portal with less than 59 eligible voters gets 1 Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges, schools, and portals with fewer than 59 Voters are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYUAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYUSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Total Number of voters in the remaining colleges, schools, and portals (945) divided by the 13 seats remaining. Each college, school, and portal gets 1 Senator for each 72.61 Voters (subject to rounding to allocate exactly 13 seats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Apportionment Among the Remaining Colleges, Schools, Portals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSOA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Dear Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Member:

Welcome to the first end of the semester report of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC).

**What is the C-FSC and why should you be interested in it?**

The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) consists of twenty-seven elected Senators and twenty-six elected Alternate Senators of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty and is part of the University Senate's membership, which also includes the Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council, the Deans Council, the Student Senators Council, and the Administrative Management Council, as well as the President and a number of additional senior members of the administration. Minutes of the Council meetings, resolutions, and committee reports are available on the C-FSC website at www.nyu.edu/cfsc.

The University Senate is the deliberative body for the discussion of University-wide policies and proposed changes in University practices and structure. The Senate sets its agenda with particular concern for academic programs and structure, personnel and budgetary policies, development of facilities and community, professional, and educational relations of the University. The Senate makes any recommendations regarding policies and practices of the University to the President and Chancellor and, through the President and Chancellor, to the Board of Trustees.

The C-FSC was formed in the Fall semester of 2014 to provide the continuing contract faculty, an important constituent of the NYU full-time faculty, a Council seat in the Senate and a role in university governance.

The Senate has the power to act upon educational matters and regulations of the academic community that affect more than one school, fixes the length of terms and vacations and defines the University calendar, and makes recommendations regarding educational programs, policies and University publications. It also determines the time, place and manner of Commencement Exercises, and of other public occasions affecting more than one school of the University.

**What issues have your C-FSC representatives been engaged with during the Fall 2015 semester?**

Our Personnel Polices and Contract Issues Committee has been very busy reviewing school policies for full-time continuing contract faculty appointment, review, and promotion procedures.

We have begun meetings with representatives from the Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC), the Provost's Office and the Office of General Counsel to develop proposals for full-time continuing contract faculty regarding grievance procedures not related to appointment, review and promotion, as well as disciplinary procedures for full-time continuing contract faculty.

We have begun developing mechanisms for determining the state of shared governance, particularly with respect to full-time continuing contract faculty.

We have, through our membership on various University Senate, Provostial, and C-FSC Committees, provided a voice for continuing contract faculty perspectives on every current issue and initiative at NYU, including NYU's developing initiatives on diversity, inclusion and equity, as well as the Provost search.
We have established a very strong collaborative working relationship with the Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council.

We hosted, with the T-FSC, a welcoming reception for new faculty on September 28, 2015.

We will host, again with the T-FSC, a spring reception for faculty on February 4, 2016.

**How can you get involved?**

*Check out the C-FSC website*
This is the easiest way to stay informed. The website for the C-FSC [www.nyu.edu/cfsc](http://www.nyu.edu/cfsc) provides a wealth of information on the actual procedures of joint shared governance at NYU.

*Attend a University Senate Meeting*
Each member of the C-FSC is allotted one guest pass to University Senate meetings; if you are interested in attending, contact a member of the C-FSC.

*Vote during elections*
Each school has at least one representative to the C-FSC. Schools elect representatives for 3-year terms, usually in the late Spring.

*Meet your senators and faculty colleagues*
Attend the C-FSC/T-FSC faculty reception on Thursday, February 4, 2016, 5:00pm—7:00pm, at the Torch Club.

*Contact us with your concerns*
Please contact us with any questions or concerns at c-fsc@nyu.edu.

*Consider running for the C-FSC*
Full-time continuing contract faculty participation in any of the many mechanisms for joint shared governance at NYU is important work and can be immensely satisfying for many reasons: we are an important and integral part of the university and the presence of our perspective and voice at the site of university joint shared governance—the University Senate—is deeply necessary; and participating provides a wonderful opportunity to meet and engage with colleagues from different departments, schools and disciplines, which helps work against a sense of a faculty existing in departmental or disciplinary silos.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Fred Carl (C-FSC Chair), on behalf of the C-FSC Steering Committee
Report of the  
C-FSC Personnel Policies and Contract Issues Committee  
Feb. 7, 2016  

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

The met jointly with the T-FSC PPCI committee on Dec. 7, 2015 and constructed joint reviews of the Stern and Wagner Appointment/Reappointment/Grievance documents. Our committee will meet on Feb. 8 to review the Gallatin and CUSP documents. We are in the early stages of reviewing documents from the School of Law and ISAW.  

Respectfully submitted by John Halpin
Senate Academic Affairs Committee (SAAC) Report
February 8th, 2016

Committee members: Peggy Morton, Larry Slater, Ben Stewart

On 28 January, a subcommittee of SAAC met to discuss an issue with the summer calendar (the summer sessions are currently slated to end mid-week, which creates problems for Residential Life and Housing Services). At the subcommittee we agreed to send a recommended calendar change to our full committee meeting on February 10th.

At the February 10th meeting, we will also be discussing honorary degrees and Founder’s Day awards.

Respectfully submitted by Ben Stewart
Committee: Senate Committee on Organization and Government

Committee Members: Gene Cittadino, Ezra Sacks, Larry Slater, Francesca Tarocco

Reporting Member: Larry Slater

SCOG held its last meeting on Wednesday, December 9. At that meeting, the following topics were addressed:

1. Formal rule change regarding time of Senate meetings – The resolution was forwarded to the Senate and was adopted at the December 10th meeting of the University Senate. Changes meeting time to “dates and times adopted by the Senate upon recommendation of the Executive Committee.”
2. Senate Representation for the Faculty of Health and related Senate Rules – This is discussed in detail below.

With the addition of the College of Nursing and College of Global Public Health, a new representation structure was discussed. The committee was presented with three possible alternate scenarios.

Scenario 1: Increase the Senate by 3 seats to accommodate 3 Dean positions, while adding seats for Nursing and Global Public Health within the current allotment for the T/FSC, C/FSC, and SSC. Thus the three councils would have to reapportion the current allotment, causing some schools/colleges to lose seats to add the two new Colleges. This was not an issue with SSC as they would just give them some of the at-large seats.

Scenario 2: Keep the Senate at 128 even with the addition of the 3 Dean positions, resulting in the loss of 1 seat from each of the T/FSC, C/FSC, and SSC. Thus the three councils would have to reapportion to include the loss of one seat, again causing schools/colleges to lose seats. T/FSC already mentioned that they will be losing a seat after this year as the at-large seat will no longer exist, as previously determined by SCOG and the Senate.

Scenario 3: Increase the size of the Senate to maintain current proportions. With the Dean’s council increasing by 3, to maintain its proportion at 14% the Senate would increase to 149 members, with the C/FSC increasing to 31-32 members. The Administration representatives and the SSC representatives did not feel this was a viable option.

The chair, Michael Hengerer, stated he would send the proposals to the Council Chairs for comment. C/FSC Chair, Fred Carl, has responded to the Committee with the recommendation that each council just add seats for the new Colleges.
Report of Representatives to the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Work-Life Issues

The committee held its first meeting on February 4, 2016. Present for the C-FSC were Vincent Renzi and Diane Mirabito.

President Hamilton joined the committee for its first half hour to express his support for the initiative and for discussion of issues.

The committee will begin work on a survey to the University community and will seek demographic data on faculty, staff, and students from the University administration. Detailed comparison will be made with programs at peer and target institutions, but at a minimum the committee already can see that re-establishment of a central office dedicated to work-life issues will be a primary recommendation.

The committee’s next meeting is scheduled for February 18th.

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
On December 3, 2015, the committee 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), Mary Killilea, Vincent Renzi, Larry Slater.

Martin Dorph, Executive Vice President for Finance and Technology, gave a presentation on the financial structure of the global network. He emphasized its sound financial performance, that each of the four units (New York, Shanghai, Abu Dhabi, and global programs) is self-sustaining, that there are intangible benefits beyond what is reported on financial statements, and that the University’s risk management strategy includes not only insurance but also emergency management responses for personnel, consideration of reputational risks, and hedges against currency fluctuation. While much about the operations especially at the other portals is confidential, his strong assurance is that the Trustees take seriously their fiduciary responsibilities and that the model is sound.

After the finance presentation, the committees heard from Awam Ampka, a co-chair of the T-FSC GNU committee, about on-going efforts to revise the Faculty Handbook to bring it up-to-date especially as regards the global academic network and the status of faculty across its various units.

The committees then turned to a discussion of the topic “Diversity and the Global Network,” although very quickly a consensus emerged that the term “diversity” was problematic—even more so, “diversity training”—but it was strongly agreed that the global network provides substantial and unrealized opportunities to build real competency in the understanding of the organization of cultural difference, among both faculty and students alike.

Finally, it was announced that the new president of the University will join the committee for its February meeting. It was asked that members prepare for the January meeting with topics and issues to raise with him.

Minutes of the meeting are available on the committee’s website—

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

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi, Representative to the Faculty Committee on the Global Network
Amy Becker, Chair, Committee on the Global Network University
Report of Representative to the Faculty Committee on the Global Network

At its meeting of January 26, 2016, the committee heard a report from the subcommittee charged to study certificates and M.A. programs offered at or making use of courses at Abu Dhabi, Shanghai, and the global academic centers.

The committee also heard a report from the committee’s co-chairs about their recent meeting with President Hamilton.

In December, the co-chairs (together with the chairs of the C-FSC and T-FSC Committees on the Global Network University) met with the FAS Faculty Assembly. Two major issues arose in that conversation: problems with curricular interoperability, and the unrecognized workload demands global issues make on faculty in New York. As a result, the committee has asked members to query their school constituencies about these issues. The results of this survey will be incorporated into a year-end report to the provost and president.

President Hamilton will attend the committee’s next meeting and is also hoping to meet with the committee again later in the term.

Minutes of the meetings 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

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi
UAAC Report

The University Academic Affairs Committee, chaired by Matthew Santirocco, met for the first time this semester on February 2. The meeting was devoted to reviewing and amending the ‘rolling agenda’ of topics that will be under discussion during the semester, some topics being moved off the agenda (as they are being addressed by other committees) and the remaining topics being prioritized.

A good deal of time was spent discussing last semester’s Listening Session on Diversity and Inclusion, appropriate responses by the University to student complaints and demands, and how our committee might participate in these responses. A proposal was made to focus on the topic of ‘micro-aggressions’ which has been given some attention in recent years; a suggestion was made to invite an ‘expert’ to make a presentation to the committee on this topic.

For my part, I spoke about my concerns about the current tendency to be overly sensitive to students taking offense at what is being taught in their classes. I expressed my opinion that pushing faculty to be more ‘careful’ in their pedagogy might impede learning, that making students more ‘comfortable’ in the classroom was not the best way to challenge them, and censoring topics for fear of offending students would stifle any kind of creative spontaneity (I noted that in my own career some of my finest teaching moments occurred when either I or my students spoke spontaneously rather than according to a script). I agreed it might be useful for faculty to hear more from the ‘experts’ (most of them self-appointed I suppose) what they are saying about ‘micro-aggressions’ and ‘trigger alerts’ but I made it clear that my first impression in hearing about these concerns is that I would worry more about institutional censorship and limits to academic freedom than about students taking offense at course content or feeling uncomfortable discussing controversial issues in class.

Ron Rainey, FAS Faculty Senator
Liberal Studies at New York University
February 8, 2016
The closure of the Coles gymnasium has been delayed until at least February 22, 2016, as construction on the interim athletics facility as 404 Lafayette Street has been delayed. The pool at Coles, however, has been closed in order to facilitate preparations for the redevelopment of the 181 Mercer Street site.

At present, an interim operating schedule is in place for the Palladium and Brooklyn gyms. The schedule will change again, with extended hours at Palladium, when 404 Lafayette opens. The current hours are available here—


A lottery for lockers at Palladium is scheduled for February 9, 2016.

As always, please continue to share with me questions, complaints, or concerns that you or your constituents may have, in order that I can address them with Department of Athletics.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi
DRAFT

TO: NYU Faculty Senate Finance Committee

From: NYU Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council

Prepared by: CFSC Committee Members

Susan Stehlik, Chair, Stern
Jamie Skye Bianco, Steinhardt
Joseph Carter, School of Medicine
Tommy Lee, Tandon School of Engineering
Jon Ritter, Faculty of Arts and Science

Date: February 7, 2016

Re: Report and Comments on Faculty Budget for 2016-17

As requested by the Committee, our Council submits the following comments on the 2016-17 budget.

Preface:

Last year we stated an overriding principle to guide our process of reviewing any budget matters. We would like to reiterate that it holds today;

As continuing contract faculty under various contract terms and status, we feel any AMI and productivity issues and measurements should be directly correlated to sound and competitive pedagogical guidelines that sustain and expand the reputation of this global University in all of its Schools.

In preparation for this year’s recommendations, we conducted a survey of all continuing full time faculty in all schools, including Abu Dhabi and Shanghai. The summary results of that survey are attached in the powerpoint file. Based on this survey which collected 832 responses or about 31% of all faculty and close to 40% or more from most of the schools, we have the following recommendations.

Recommendations:

1. Annual Merit Increase

Last year we recommended a formula for AMI directly related to inflation and cost of living, along with a review for compression issues. This year is no different. Our concerns, based on the survey is that the definition of a “merit” based salary increase seems to be unclear and ill-defined across the university, and that faculty are not satisfied with their current base compensation. 48% expressed dissatisfaction and only 31% expressed satisfaction with the remainder being neutral. 52% of faculty believe there is or may be a compression problem. A majority 53% felt the AMI did not adequately compensate them on an annual basis. The majority responded that the following factors should be considered in the annual merit review process:

- Administrative responsibilities
- Creative additions to course content and delivery
- Collaborative work
- Peer evaluations
- Student evaluations
2. Professional Development and Support

Last year we recommended a specific budget for professional development. This year, the survey results suggest we need a clearer commitment to professional development.

- While 45% indicated they had a professional development budget, 7% said they didn’t have one and 45% indicated they “didn’t know if they had a budget” for professional development.
- Over 60% of the faculty did not know if there was a budget to reimburse them for any necessary updating of professional credentials.
- 42% indicated sufficient resources to do their best in the classroom; 26% indicated they were not.
- 58% felt they were given full support to be intellectually challenged in their work.

If our faculty feel they work in an intellectually challenging and supportive environment, how can we not support their professional development in a way that is meaningful, tangible and public? If we claim to be in a competitive environment as a global university, how can we not support our faculty to continually update their thinking and teaching strategies?

We strongly reiterate last year’s request to specifically allocate a budget for professional development in all schools and to fully explain it to all faculty.

The faculty is clearly engaged, but not informed. By not specifically allocating a professional development fund in all schools, we in invite he perception that some faculty are valued over others. And, if that holds true, the followup question is necessarily, “why”.

3. Training and Development

Given the results of the November 18, 2015 Listening session and the concern for diversity and inclusion at all the campuses in the United States, we surveyed our faculty on their desire for additional training to adequately prepare for the ever changing issues in this area. The majority of the faculty fully supported more training for managing diversity issues in the classroom, more budget for hiring diverse faculty and more scholarships for diversity in our student population.

Rationale and Council Voice

As we approach our second year as a Council, we view the opportunity to share best practices with each other and offer our voice in the governance of the University to be a golden opportunity for managing this ever complex, global university. It is with this intent that we offer our recommendations for consideration for the 2016-17 budget.
Survey from the Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council on Budget 2016-17

Conducted from January 27 – February 5, 2016

Q1: I am a faculty member of the following school(s): (check all that apply)

Q2: I have been a full time faculty member for the following number of years:

Faculty Years of Service at NYU

Q4: I identify as:

Total Responses of 2,633 estimated contract faculty
Q5: I am satisfied with my overall compensation.

Answered: 827    Skipped: 5

Q6: I am compensated fairly relative to my local market, i.e., comparable schools in our geographical area. For an example of a recent faculty salary survey see: http://www.cupahr.org/surveys/fhe4.aspx

Answered: 794    Skipped: 38

Q7: Compensation: A base salary should consider prior University service, i.e., as an adjunct or related educational position.

Answered: 816    Skipped: 16
Q8: Compensation: I am concerned that we have a compression problem, i.e., recent hires are being compensated at a higher rate than experienced faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14% (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>26% (242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26% (232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26% (207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9: Annual Merit Increase: The "AMI" has adequately compensated me relative to my contributions at the University over my history with the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14% (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>26% (242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26% (232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26% (207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10: Annual Merit Increase: Which of the following factors should the AMI consider in allocating individual increases? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Excellence</td>
<td>32% (560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affirmative Actions</td>
<td>32% (560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>31% (512)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to the University, Department, or School</td>
<td>27% (457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Contributions to Student Learning</td>
<td>23% (397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>2% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>6% (104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11: Professional Development: Does your school have a professional development budget?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32% (560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12% (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>5% (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>1668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11: Professional Development: Does your school have a professional development budget?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>46.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12: Professional Development: If I am required to update any certifications, my school reimburses me for all costs associated with the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13: Professional Development (“PD”): These funds are typically allocated either to a dept. chair or individuals and intended to support faculty in keeping current within their academic discipline as well as their teaching methods. Our PD funds are allocated in the following manner: Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a full amount that must be used in the current year allocated</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a full amount that can be carried over from year to year</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a full amount based on a salary stipulation, i.e., percentage of salary</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a full amount without a stated criteria for allocation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a full amount in our department, for allocation by the department head</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a full amount in our department, equally distributed to each member of the dept., regardless of rank, responsibility or length of service</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a full amount in our department, distributed by department chair discretion</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not aware of any professional development budget in our department</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14: Professional Development: I am given adequate resources to perform at my best for my position.

Answer Choices | Responses
--- | ---
Strongly Agree | 9% 59
Agree | 35% 262
Neither Agree/Disagree | 31% 248
Disagree | 19% 153
Strongly Disagree | 9% 70
Total | 852

Q16: Personal Development: I work in an environment where I am given full support for all I need to be intellectually challenged and supported in my work as a full time continuing contract faculty member.

Answer Choices | Responses
--- | ---
Strongly Agree | 17% 137
Agree | 48% 339
Neither Agree/Disagree | 21% 170
Disagree | 15% 124
Strongly Disagree | 6% 53
Total | 823

Q18: Personal Development: I am interested in more grant opportunities to do research.

Answer Choices | Responses
--- | ---
Yes | 52% 520
No | 15% 150
Maybe, if the supportive... | 33% 330
Total | 800

Q19: Diversity/Inclusion Issues: After the last University listening session a lot of discussion has been encouraged on how we can be better at supporting a more diverse and inclusive culture at NYU. Please check off all the items you think are important to achieving that goal.

Answer Choices | Responses
--- | ---
Training on biases... | 27% 270
More budget allocations... | 28% 280
More budget allocations... | 36% 360
Other (please specify) | 24% 240
Total | 750
Q19: Diversity/Inclusion Issues: After the last University listening session a lot of discussion has been encouraged on how we can be better at supporting a more diverse and inclusive culture at NYU. Please check off all the items you think are important to achieving that goal.

Answered: 726    Skipped: 106

**Note:** Q20 was added in the middle of the survey because Q19 only allowed one response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training on how to incorporate and manage a vigorous classroom discussion on controversial topics related to current diversity issues.</td>
<td>23% 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More budget allocation for sourcing and hiring diverse faculty candidates.</td>
<td>26% 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More budget allocation for scholarships targeted at diverse student candidates.</td>
<td>24% 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>24% 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20: Diversity Inclusion Issues: In question 19, you were not given an opportunity to check off more than one item. This question has been added to the survey to correct the error in Question #19. Please check off all items that you think are important.

Answered: 337    Skipped: 495

**Note:** Q20 was added in the middle of the survey because Q19 only allowed one response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training on how to incorporate and manage a vigorous classroom discussion on controversial topics related to current diversity issues.</td>
<td>63% 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More budget allocation for sourcing and hiring diverse faculty candidates.</td>
<td>66% 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More budget allocation for scholarships targeted at diverse student candidates.</td>
<td>63% 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents: 337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Continuing Contract Faculty Council
FROM: Susan Stehlik, Stern Senator
DATE: February 10, 2016

A number of recommendations were put forth and agreed to:

- Periodic training of all faculty for prevention and clarification of communication lines and accountability issues
- Consideration of including adjuncts in the training
- Type of prevention work needs to be reviewed
- A townhall will be held in the fall of 2016 with representatives from all councils to listen to faculty concerns about the extent and requirement of training
- The single adjudicator for appeals will be replaced by a diverse panel including a third party outside professional; the panel will rotate to make sure all available panel members are familiar with previous decisions and continuity of decision-making is maintained

The next meeting will discuss the more difficulty policy of Student Faculty relationships and the agenda for the Town Hall in the fall.

Note: Much of the information can be found at the following url: http://www.nyu.edu/life/safety-health-wellness/sexual-respect.html
TO: Continuing Contract Faculty Council  
FROM: Susan Stehlik, Stern Senator  
DATE: February 10, 2016  

The entire meeting was dedicated to a discussion of the Listening Session that was held in Coles on November 18, 2015.

Provost indicated genuine disappointment at the comments and overall information that was shared. He declared it a top priority for the University, especially with a new President and Provost coming on board. The entire meeting was spent discussing reactions and concerns for our school culture and climate.

The conversation will continue at the next meeting on February 11, 2016.

Personal Note: It is my opinion that every person attending showed deep concern for understanding the issues and wanted to pursue more discussion. This was the most spirited discussion of all the meetings I attended.
Recommendations Of  
The Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council and  
The Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council  
In Regard To:  

NYU STERN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS  
POLICY ON FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY (FTNTT/CF)  

Background  
From a letter dated July 30, 2015, sent by Provost David McLaughlin:  
"The Office of the Dean of the Stern School of Business has completed a process within the school  
to create its Policy on Full-time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty. My office together with the  
Office of 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 NYU Stern School of Business Policy On Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Contract  
Faculty (FTNTT/CF) and to ensure its compliance with the University Guidelines For Full-Time Non-  
Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments.

Substantive Major Recommendations

1. General recommendation:

   The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12,  
   2014, page 1, Section II. Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1 states: “In  
   response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate and/or  
   amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the  
   expectation that FTNTT/CF shall participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy  
   to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.” After the Provost has  
   read the recommendations made by the C-FSC and the T-FSC and determined which  
   recommendations for changes to the original school policy document are warranted, we strongly  
   recommend that all school policy documents (along with the recommendations of the two  
   senate faculty councils) be returned to the school in question for perusal, discussion and vote by  
   the full faculty of that school, which policy must necessarily include the grievance/appeal  
   process.

2. We recommend that the following be added:
   “Any amendment to this Policy must be in writing, submitted in advance to the faculty for  
   discussion, for the possibility for amendments, and for a vote.”
3. Page 1, Section 2, Titles and Qualifications, paragraph 1:

**Recommendation**
 Include a description of the difference between Continuing Faculty and Tenured Faculty, such as that found on the FAS website, "Clinical Faculty lines differ from tenure-track lines. Although clinical lines are without tenure, they are typically multiyear and research is not a part of their formal responsibilities."

4. Page 1, Section 2, Titles and Qualifications, paragraph 2:

"Clinical Assistant Professor: Initial appointment for clinical faculty members who have not previously taught at Stern or who have limited prior teaching experience."

The reference to "clinical faculty members who have not previously taught at Stern" implies that ALL new hires would be made at the Clinical Assistant Professor rank, in contradiction to the content of Page 2, Item 7, Initial Appointment, which states that "They may be appointed at the rank of assistant, associate, or professor."

**Recommendation**
Change "or" to "and".

"Clinical Assistant Professor: Initial appointment for clinical faculty members who have not previously taught at Stern and who have limited prior teaching experience."

5. 3. Responsibilities
Page 2

**Recommendation**
As teaching is the major responsibility of clinical faculty, and as nowhere in this document is there an indication of the number of courses per semester clinical faculty members are expected to teach, include a statement indicating such, or a statement indicating where it will be defined, e.g., that it will be defined in the contract.

6. Page 2, Section 4, Governance:

“In accordance with University Bylaw 82 (c), the clinical faculty at Stern may hold its own faculty meetings and may participate in joint meetings with Stern’s tenured/tenure track faculty. At the department level, clinical faculty participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion and tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure track faculty, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty at NYU.”
Recommendation
Add an explicit reference to voting as a form of participation in governance.

Suggested wording:
"In accordance with University Bylaw 82 (c), the clinical faculty at Stern may hold its own faculty meetings and may participate in joint meetings with Stern’s tenured/tenure track faculty. At the department level, clinical faculty participate as members of the department faculty, including voting on matters of department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion and tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure track faculty, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual's candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty at NYU."

7. 4. Governance
Second Sentence
Page 2

“At the department level, clinical faculty participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion and tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure track faculty, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty at NYU.”

The following clause in the above sentence is not clear:

“... and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty at NYU.”

What individual?
As an academic, should not a FTNTT/CF member participate in degree granting?

Recommendation
“At the department level, clinical faculty participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion of tenured and tenure track faculty, granting of tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure track faculty.”

If the meaning of: “... and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty at NYU.” is as indicated in the following sentence, include that sentence, otherwise rewrite this clause to clarify its meaning:

“A clinical faculty member does not participate in matters related to his or her candidacy for a degree or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty of NYU. “

8. Page 2, Section 5, Terms of Appointment, paragraph 1:

"The initial appointment term of clinical faculty of all ranks, including the Professor of Management Practice, is typically for one year, and will not normally exceed two
years. Following their initial term of appointment, clinical faculty may hold renewable contracts of varying lengths: "short contracts" of one or two years, or "long contracts" of three years or longer. Unless otherwise specified in the individual contract, clinical faculty appointments may be renewed indefinitely."

**Recommendation**

As per the NYU Guidelines, "...wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts." We recommend that initial appointments be for three years, with the first year probationary.

Should the category of "short contracts" be retained, we recommend that the circumstances under which they are necessary be described.

To satisfy the requirement, as stated in the “University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments,” that “school policies shall include a rationale for a FTNTT/CF title(s) that carries a one-year appointment,” add the following language

“If a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean must supply a written justification, based on programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty.”

9. To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of Stern faculty on one-year appointments, add language allowing for a transition to a three-year appointment for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal third-year review such as:

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

10. Page 3, Section 8, Annual Merit Reviews, sentence 1:

“Clinical faculty members are expected to adhere to the highest levels of performance and commitment to the university and the school and the highest standards of excellence in their fields. Specifically, they should demonstrate teaching excellence, as reflected by a combination of academically rigorous course content, teaching in courses of high strategic value to the school, pedagogical innovation, and high student ratings and enrollments. Clinical faculty members are also expected to make meaningful service contributions in their department and/or the school, by such activities as serving on committees, advising students, and attending school events. Service outside the school that supports Stern’s mission and brand is also encouraged. Conducting research is not required but is looked upon favorably.”

**Recommendation**

The requirement that courses taught be of "high strategic value" to the school is ambiguous. Further, because teaching assignments are established by the departmental
administration, the faculty member will have little control over the specific courses that they teach. The later requirement that there be "high enrollments" is, again, not under the direct control of the faculty member. We recommend that these criteria of excellence be rethought.

This paragraph also calls for "high student ratings." It is well known that student ratings are unreliable and often reflect inversely the rigor of the course. In fact, assessment should recognize that the value of the course is often better measured after graduation, when a student is applying learning in his/her professional life. In addition, assessment of teaching performance should include other measures.

Suggested wording:
“... and student ratings and student success consistent with high quality teaching. Evidence of teaching performance may include course materials (e.g., syllabi, lecture notes, assignments), course development and innovation, instructor development, peer classroom observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.”

11. 8. Annual Merit Reviews
First Paragraph
Final Sentence
Page 3

“Conducting research is not required but is looked upon favorably.”

Given the final statement in
11. Promotion
b. Promotion procedure:

“Letters from external reviewers are not sought, since the job of a clinical faculty member is to teach and provide service, both of which are primarily internal activities.”

It is reasonable to expect from this statement that clinical faculty, who have been appointed to teach, will be given an advantage if they also conduct research. Conducting research may not have been a consideration at the time of hire, but the favorable consideration of conducting research during the promotion process may impel teaching faculty to attempt to conduct research for the sake of gaining promotion.

Recommendation
End the sentence after “required”

“Conducting research is not required.”

12. 8. Annual Merit Reviews
Second Paragraph
Second Sentence
Page 3

“During the rigorous Annual Merit Review process each spring, the department chair presents to the vice deans and deans the activity and achievements of each faculty member, using the completed FAR as one source of information, and discusses areas of improvement.”

Does "of improvement" mean areas requiring improvement or progress in areas previously identified as requiring improvement?

Recommendation
Consider replacing “of improvement” with either “requiring improvement” or “previously earmarked for improvement”, whichever applies.

“During the rigorous Annual Merit Review process each spring, the department chair presents to the vice deans and deans the activity and achievements of each faculty member, using the completed FAR as one source of information, and discusses areas of improvement, previously identified for improvement.”

13. 8. Annual Merit Reviews
Second Paragraph
Third Sentence
Page 3

“The department chair then provides feedback and recommendations to each faculty member.”

Recommendation
Add “written and “oral” before “feedback”.

The department chair then provides written and oral feedback and recommendations to each faculty member.”

14. Page 3, Section 9, Reappointment, paragraph 2, sentence 3:

“When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, reappointment does not occur. The faculty member may, however, request a performance review for career development.

Recommendation
We recommend adding, "In such event, the review would focus on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the new revised curriculum or academic structure and, if so, in what capacity.”
15. Page 3, Section 9, Reappointment, Reappointment Process, item 1:

“Faculty member submits course faculty evaluations for all courses since the last evaluation, sample syllabi, a brief teaching and service statement, Faculty Activity Report and CV.”

Recommendation
a. We recommend that "course materials" be included as an item submitted to the department for use in the reappointment review. In fact, we suggest simply copying here the list of items from the "Promotion procedure" section on page 5 of the document.

b. Other items for consideration might include lecture notes, assignments, course development and innovation, instructor development, peer classroom observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing, evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.

c. Further, since a faculty member might not be able to adequately describe their teaching and service in a "brief statement", we recommend that they be allowed "a thorough but concise teaching and service statement."

16.  9. Reappointment
Reappointment Process
Second First Level Bullet
Page 4

“The department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or in the case of departments without P&T committees, a 3-person ad-hoc advisory committee created by the department chair) reviews materials and makes recommendation.”

Recommendation
Specify the composition of the 3-person ad-hoc committee created by the department chair, e.g., rank and tenure/tenure track status of the committee members.

17. Page 4, Section 9, Reappointment, Reappointment Process, item 2:

“The department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or in the case of departments without P&T committees, a 3-person ad-hoc advisory committee created by the department chair) reviews materials and makes recommendation."

Recommendation
a. We recommend adding, "In conducting its review, the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consider evidence of accomplishments in the areas of teaching, service, and professional activity.

b. For reappointment reviews of continuing faculty members, we recommend that
some of the members of the review committee be continuing faculty. The wording that appears in bullet item 3 of the Promotion Procedure on page 5 of this document is appropriate: "Department’s full P&T committee meets to discuss and vote on the case. In departments without P&T committees, the Vice Dean of Faculty will appoint an ad hoc committee of at least 3 tenured faculty members from other departments in the school. In all cases, at least one clinical faculty member in a higher rank than the candidate must also serve on the committee reviewing clinical reappointment."

c. Further, we recommend that all committee members be elected by their peers and that there be no more than two from each department or program.

18. Page 4, Section 9, Reappointment, Reappointment Process, item 4:

"If the Committee of Department Chairs agrees, recommendation is forwarded to the dean for final approval. If the dean does not approve, the candidate is notified in writing according to the deadlines set forth under Contract Terms below."

Recommendation
Suggested wording:
"If the Committee of Department Chairs agrees, recommendation is forwarded to the dean for final approval. If the dean does not approve, the candidate is notified in writing, to include the rationale for the decision and a tally of the Promotion and Tenure Committee vote, according to the deadlines set forth under Contract Terms below."

19. Page 4, Section 9, Reappointment, Reappointment Process:

Recommendation
We suggest adding the following as bullet points (items a-f):

a. The process of the creation of the committee’s report should be explicitly stated with language similar to the following:

“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).”

b. Further, the committee should hold a secret ballot to determine the majority opinion.

c. A majority vote of the Committee shall be required for a successful review, all votes of that Committee shall be by secret ballot and re-voting by that Committee shall occur only if new material becomes available.
d. The review may be written by one or more members of the Committee, but all members of the committee should read the review before it is submitted to the dean.

e. 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 dissenting opinion should be appended to the majority review.

f. 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 Dean's decision is contrary on reappointment or length of contract to that of the faculty, the Dean will provide the full faculty with his/her 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.”

20. Page 4, Section 10, Contract Terms:

"a. Contracts of Three Years or Longer ("Long Contracts")"

Recommendation
Add language describing how the length of the contract should be determined. For example, it could be by rank - three years for assistant, five years for associate, and longer than five years for full clinical professors.

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

21. Page 4, Section 10, Contract Terms:

"b. One- or Two-Year Contracts ("Short Contracts")"

Recommendation
We recommend that the circumstances under which a contract of less than three years would be given be specified, or that some examples of such circumstances be listed. Further, if a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean must supply a written justification, based on programmatic and academic considerations, to the Stern faculty. To satisfy the requirement, as stated in the “University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments,” that “school policies shall include a rationale for a FTNTT/CF title(s) that carries a one-year appointment,” add the following language:

“If a one-year contract is adopted, the dean must supply a written justification, based on
programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty.”

22. Page 5, Section 11, Promotion, Item b, Promotion procedure, last sentence:

“Letters from external reviewers are not sought, since the job of a clinical faculty member is to teach and provide service, both of which are primarily internal activities.”

Recommendation
Because Item 8, Annual Merit Reviews, states that, "Conducting research is not required but is looked upon favorably," and because there might not be a member of the clinical faculty member's department qualified to assess that research, we recommend that external reviewers be an option.

23. 12. Transfer between FTNTT/CF and Tenured or Tenure Track Appointments
First Sentence
Page 5

It is understood from University Bylaw 86(b) that:
“A full-time Associate Professor or Assistant Associate Professor on the tenure track in the Leonard N. Stern School of Business, or any of its departments, who is not awarded tenure at the expiration of nine years will be ineligible for further full-time appointment in the University.”

The sentence:
“Clinical appointments will not be available to faculty members who have been employed in tenure-track appointments at New York University.”
also precludes faculty members on the tenure track from clinical faculty appointments before the deadline for being granted tenure (nine years).

Recommendation
Clarify whether a faculty member on the tenure track may hold a clinical appointment before the tenure-granting procedure has concluded.

For example, rewrite the sentence as:
“Under no conditions will clinical appointments be available to faculty members who have been employed in tenure-track appointments at New York University.”
or else specify for clarity the conditions under which faculty members on the tenure track may be eligible for clinical faculty appointments.

24. Page 6, Section 15, Grievance:

Recommendation
a. We recommend further elaboration here on the grievance procedure.

For example, the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty specify that, "Unless otherwise authorized in the school’s policy and approved by the Provost, each school shall either establish a new standing
faculty committee for FTNTT/CF grievances, which will include senior FTNTT/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 who shall participate in hearing and evaluating only those grievances that are filed by FTNTT/CF."

b. Additionally, The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/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.

We recommend the development of this grievance process should be undertaken by the Stern 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.

Other items from the NYU Guidelines have been discussed in detail earlier in this document, and it is likely that upon careful consideration, some nuances not discussed in the NYU Guidelines will be appropriate within Stern. These should be identified and explicitly described in this document in a timely manner (e.g., this year).

Substantive Minor Recommendations

1. Page 1, Section 1, Background, paragraph 1:

"In February 1980, the Stern School Faculty established the position of Clinical Professor for non-tenure track full-time members of the faculty. Guidelines for clinical faculty were codified and clarified in 1991. In September 2000, a faculty committee re-examined the role of clinical faculty at the Stern School and made a series of recommendations. In academic year 2011-12, the Vice Dean of Faculty and the Committee of Department Chair updated the guidelines and finalized the policy, incorporating some of the recommendations from the 2000 committee and adding the title “Professor of Management Practice,” after Provost approval. 1 Minor revisions were made to the 2012 policy in March 2014. In response to NYU’s changes to its bylaws, the policy was updated again in July 2015. The policy is consistent with, and incorporates by reference, the University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments, revised and posted in March 2015, found here."

Recommendation
Delete the first five sentences, which are simply a recounting of past Stern policies on Continuing Faculty and have no direct impact upon the current policy.
Replace the last two sentences with a reference to the University Guidelines for Full---
Time Non---Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments (effective March 1, 2015),
which state that "In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter,
schools shall formulate and/or amend their policies in accordance with existing school
governance processes and with the expectation that FTNTT/CF shall participate in
formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which
school governance policies permit."
Correct the link to those Guidelines to refer to the latest edition (March 1, 2015).
https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/provost/documents/facultyHandbook/GuidelinesFin
al020915.pdf

2. Page 1, Section 2, Titles and Qualifications, paragraph 1:

"All faculty members who hold these positions are expected to be actively engaged in
teaching, and to bring to the school and classroom important subject matter or
industry expertise and contacts."

Recommendation
Because some continuing faculty may be assigned substantial administrative duties,
either temporarily or permanently, the expectations should reflect that.

Suggested wording:
"All faculty members who hold these positions are expected to be actively engaged in
teaching or equivalent administrative responsibilities, and to bring to the school and
classroom important subject matter or industry expertise and contacts."

3. Page 3, Section 9, Reappointment, paragraph 1: "The review process and criteria for
reappointment are such that only individuals who are continuing to make a significant
contribution to the excellence of the school are reappointed. The specific criteria for
evaluating performance are those set forth under Annual Merit Review guidelines, as
explained above."

Recommendation
Include a link to the Annual Merit Review guidelines.

4. Page 4, Section 11, Promotion, Item a, Promotion Criteria:

"Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor: The candidate’s record must indicate a strong
record of achievement in the classroom. Service to the school is expected as well, which may be
in the form of directing key academic programs or centers, initiating new programs,
coordinating courses, serving on committees, advising students and engaging in other activities
that support Stern's mission.

Promotion to Clinical Professor: The candidate’s record must indicate extraordinary
achievement in the classroom. In addition, substantial service to the school is expected, through
activities such as directing key academic programs or centers, initiating new programs, contributing to curriculum and coordinating courses, serving on committees, advising students and engaging in other activities that support Stern's educational mission.”

Recommendation
Both references to "achievement in the classroom" should be replaced with "evidence of excellent/extraordinary teaching performance and overall contributions to the school".

Minor editorial issue

1. Page 2, Section 5, paragraph 1, sentence 2, and Section 7 paragraph 1, sentence 2, both refer to the "appointment letter".
   
   Recommendation
   Replace "appointment letter" with "contract".

2. 7. Initial Appointment
   First paragraph
   Second sentence
   Page 2
   “The activities that a clinical faculty member is expected to engage in will be included in the appointment letter.”

   Recommendation
   Consider, to make slightly more readable:
   “The activities in which a clinical faculty member is expected to engage will be included in the appointment letter.”

3. 7. Initial Appointment
   Second paragraph
   Third sentence
   Page 3
   “They may be appointed at the rank of assistant, associate or professor.”

   Recommendation
   Add "clinical" before "assistant", "associate" and "professor" for precision.

   “They may be appointed at the rank of clinical assistant, clinical associate, or clinical professor.”

4. 7. Initial Appointment
   Third paragraph
   Third sentence
   Page 3
“Since this title is used to designate professionals who have distinguished themselves as widely recognized senior leaders in key line or staff positions in major firms, it can be used only for new appointments and is made only at the full professor level; gaining academic experience does not lead to promotion to PMP.”

Recommendation
Substitute “as” for “since”, as “since” is an indication of time past

“As this title is used to designate professionals who have distinguished themselves as widely recognized senior leaders in key line or staff positions in major firms, it can be used only for new appointments and is made only at the full professor level; gaining academic experience does not lead to promotion to PMP.”

5. 9. Reappointment
First paragraph
Second sentence
Page 3

“The specific criteria for evaluating performance are those set forth under Annual Merit Review guidelines, as explained above.”

Recommendation
Consider replacing, for ease of reading, “set forth under Annual Merit Review guidelines, as explained above” with “set forth above under Annual Merit Review”.

“The specific criteria for evaluating performance are set forth above under Annual Merit Review”.

6. 9. Reappointment
Second paragraph
Third sentence
Page 3

“When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, reappointment does not occur.”

Recommendation
Consider replacing, for ease of reading, “and there is no similar position open” with “and no similar position is vacant”.

“When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and no similar position is vacant, reappointment does not occur.”

7. 9. Reappointment
Reappointment Process
Third bullet item
“If reappointment is not recommended by the department committee, candidate is notified in writing according to the deadlines set forth under Contract Terms below.”

Recommendation
a) Replace “department committee” with “department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee”
b) Replace “set forth under Contract Terms below” with “set forth below under” Contract Terms

“If reappointment is not recommended by the department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee, candidate is notified in writing according to the deadlines set forth below under Contract Terms.”

8. 10. Contract Terms
a. Contracts of Three Years or Longer (Long Contracts”)

“Reappointment of a professor currently on a Long Contract requires a formal process that is conducted in the penultimate year of the contract and is completed by the end of that year.”

Recommendation
Replace “professor” with “clinical faculty member”

“Reappointment of a clinical faculty member currently on a Long Contract requires a formal process that is conducted in the penultimate year of the contract and is completed by the end of that year.”

9. 10. Contract Terms
a. Contracts of Three Years of Longer (“Long Contracts”)

“In the case of a decision to not reappoint, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than August 31 of the penultimate year, and shall continue to be under contract for the final year.”

Recommendation
Simplify and rearrange so as not to split the infinitive

“When the decision is not to reappoint, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than August 31 of the penultimate year, and shall remain under contract for the final year.”
10.  Page 4, Section 10, Contract Terms:

"One-or Two-Year Contracts ("Short Contracts")"
Clinical faculty holding Short Contracts will be reviewed for reappointment by the March 1 prior to the end of their contract term. In case of a decision to not reappoint, the clinical faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than March 1 of the final year, or at least 180 days prior to the termination date if the contract term ends on a date other than August 31.

Recommendation
It is not reasonable to assume that the clinical faculty member under review can be notified of a decision not to reappoint on the same day that the decision is reached by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Therefore, we recommend that the review be completed no later than February 1, with the notification to be made by March 1.

11. 10. Contract Terms
b. One- or Two-Year Contracts ("Short Contracts")
First paragraph
First sentence
Page 4

“Clinical faculty holding Short Contracts will be reviewed for reappointment by the March 1 prior to the end of their contract term.”

Recommendation
Consider a slight modification for slightly easier reading:

“Clinical faculty holding Short Contracts will be reviewed for reappointment by March 1 immediately preceding the end of their contract term.”

12. 10. Contract Terms
b. One- or Two-Year Contracts ("Short Contracts")
First paragraph
Second sentence
Page 4

“In case of a decision to not reappoint, the clinical faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than March 1 of the final year, or at least 180 days prior to the termination date if the contract term ends on a date other than August 31.”

Recommendation
Simplify and rearrange so as not to split the infinitive
“When the decision is not to reappoint, the clinical faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than March 1 of the final year, or at least 180 days prior to the termination date if the contract term ends on a date other than August 31.”

13. 10. Contract Terms
b. One- or Two-Year Contracts (“Short Contracts”)

Second Paragraph
Third Year Review
First sentence
Page 4

“Though reappointment cannot proceed without a performance assessment, numerous factors render the sort of formal review appropriate for multi-year appointments unnecessary in the case of faculty on Short Contracts.”

Recommendation
Simplify and add “clinical” before “faculty”

“Though reappointment cannot proceed without a performance assessment, numerous factors render the sort of formal review appropriate for multi-year appointments unnecessary for clinical faculty on Short Contracts.”

14. 10. Contract Terms
b. One or Two –Year Contracts (“Short Contracts”)

Third Year Review
Second Sentence
Page 4

“That said, in the first semester of the third year of continuous appointments, and in every subsequent third year, clinical faculty members with Short Contracts shall be subject to formal review comparable to the review of faculty on long contracts.”

Recommendation
Add “the first semester of” before “every”

“That said, in the first semester of the third year of continuous appointments, and in the first semester of every subsequent third year, clinical faculty members with Short Contracts shall be subject to formal review comparable to the review of faculty on long contracts.”

15. 11. Promotion
a. Promotion Criteria
First Paragraph
Second sentence
Page 4
“Service to the school is expected as well, which may be in the form of directing key academic programs or centers, initiating new programs, coordinating courses, serving on committees, advising students and engaging in other activities that support Stern’s mission.”

**Recommendation**
Consider slight modifications for slightly easier reading:

“Service to the school is also expected, and may consist of directing key academic programs or centers, initiating new programs, coordinating courses, serving on committees, advising students and engaging in other activities that support Stern’s mission.”

16. 11. Promotion Criteria
b. Promotion procedure
First First-Level Bullet
Page 5

“Candidate submits CV, teaching materials and service statement”

**Recommendation**
Add “to the Chair” after “statement”

“Candidate submits CV, teaching materials and service statement to the Chair”

17. 11. Promotion
b. Promotion procedure
Second Third-level bullet item
Page 5

“Student evaluations (both an aggregated summary across courses and complete CFE reports for all course sections taught)”

**Recommendation**
Use full word terminology, not abbreviation (CFE), as the naïve person is unaware of the meaning of “CFE”

“Student evaluations (both an aggregated summary across courses and complete Course Faculty Evaluation (CFE) reports for all course sections taught)”

18. 11. Promotion Criteria
b. Promotion procedure
Second First-Level Bullet
Page 5

“Department chair prepares a report, summarizing the candidate’s contributions and describing
how the candidate meets the qualifications for Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor.”

**Recommendation**
Add "and submits it to the Promotions and Tenure Committee" at the end of the sentence.

“Department chair prepares a report, summarizing the candidate’s contributions and describing how the candidate meets the qualifications for Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor and submits it to the Promotions and Tenure Committee.”

19. 11. Promotion  
b. Promotion procedure  
Third First-level bullet item  
First Sentence  
Page 5

“Department’s full P&T committee meets to discuss and vote on the case.”

**Recommendation**
Substitute “proposed promotion” for “case” for specificity

“Department’s full P&T committee meets to discuss and vote on the proposed promotion.”

20. 11. Promotion  
b. Promotion procedure  
Third First-level bullet item  
Third Sentence  
Page 5

“In all cases, at least one clinical faculty member in a higher rank than the candidate must also serve on the committee reviewing clinical promotions.”

**Recommendation**
Rearrange for clarity

“The committee reviewing promotions of clinical faculty must include at least one clinical faculty member of higher rank than the clinical faculty member being considered for promotion.”

21. 11. Promotion  
b. Promotion procedure  
Fifth First-level bullet item  
Page 5

“Committee of department chairs and vice deans meets to discuss and vote on the case, and then makes its recommendation to the dean.”

**Recommendation**
Substitute “proposed promotion” for “case” for specificity

“Committee of department chairs and vice deans meets to discuss and vote on the proposed promotion, and then makes its recommendation to the dean.”

22. 11. Promotion
   b. Promotion procedure
   Sixth First-level bullet item
   Page 5

   “Dean reviews the case and informs the department chair and candidate of his/her decision.”

Recommendation
Substitute “proposed promotion” for “case” for specificity

“Dean reviews the proposed promotion and informs the department chair and candidate of his/her decision.”

23. 11. Promotion
   b. Promotion procedure
   Final sentence

   “Letters from external reviewers are not sought, since the job of a clinical faculty member is to teach and provide service, both of which are primarily internal activities.”

Recommendation
Substitute “as” for “since”, as “since” is an indication of time past and substitute “responsibilities” for “job”, and substitute “are” for “is”

“Letters from external reviewers are not sought, as the responsibilities of a clinical faculty member are to teach and provide service, both of which are primarily internal activities.”
NYU STERN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
POLICY ON FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY (FTNTT/CF)

July 2015

1. Background

In February 1980, the Stern School Faculty established the position of Clinical Professor for non-tenure track full-time members of the faculty. Guidelines for clinical faculty were codified and clarified in 1991. In September 2000, a faculty committee re-examined the role of clinical faculty at the Stern School and made a series of recommendations. In academic year 2011-12, the Vice Dean of Faculty and the Committee of Department Chairs updated the guidelines and finalized the policy, incorporating some of the recommendations from the 2000 committee and adding the title “Professor of Management Practice,” after Provost approval. ¹ Minor revisions were made to the 2012 policy in March 2014. In response to NYU’s changes to its bylaws, the policy was updated again in July 2015. The policy is consistent with, and incorporates by reference, the University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments, revised and posted in March 2015, found here.

The University Guidelines require that each school establish its own policies governing the appointment, review and reappointment of full-time contract faculty, conduct a five-year review of the school’s policy, and establish a formal process for periodic reviews thereafter.

2. Titles and Qualifications

The Stern School has a limited number of full-time positions outside the tenure track for highly qualified individuals whose professional competence and experience is deemed beneficial to the mission of the School. All faculty members who hold these positions are expected to be actively engaged in teaching, and to bring to the school and classroom important subject matter or industry expertise and contacts. In the Stern School, Full-time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty (FTNTT/CF) hold “clinical” titles, including Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor.

Clinical Assistant Professor: Initial appointment for clinical faculty members who have not previously taught at Stern or who have limited prior teaching experience.

Clinical Associate Professor: Experienced teacher with strong record of sustained achievement in the classroom. Substantial service contribution to the school is expected.

Clinical Professor: Experienced teacher with a record of extraordinary achievement in the classroom, noteworthy contributions to the School's curriculum and reputation and/or significant exercise of administrative responsibilities.

The clinical title at Stern also includes Clinical Professors with the honorific designation of “Professor of Management Practice.” This title is reserved for faculty who join Stern after retiring from distinguished careers in fields related to business practice. These individuals contribute to the teaching and research mission of the school by bringing "managerial practice" into the classroom and serving as an important resource for their colleagues.

¹ Approved by the Provost of New York University on March 30, 2011.
3. Responsibilities

Clinical faculty members play a key role at Stern. Their primary responsibility is teaching courses that are critical and often required components of the School’s curriculum, including both undergraduate and graduate core courses. By contributing to the academic process at Stern through their full-time commitment to teaching and through such service activities as directing key academic programs and centers, initiating new programs, course coordination, committee work, and student advising, clinical faculty complement the tenured and tenure track faculty in attaining Stern’s mission.

4. Governance

In accordance with University Bylaw 82 (c), the clinical faculty at Stern may hold its own faculty meetings and may participate in joint meetings with Stern’s tenured/tenure track faculty. At the department level, clinical faculty participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion and tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure track faculty, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty at NYU.

5. Terms of Appointment

Appointments and reappointments of clinical faculty are made for fixed renewable terms. The appointment letter will stipulate start and end dates of the appointment, an indication of whether the appointee is eligible to be considered for reappointment, responsibilities, compensation and agreement to be bound by applicable University policies. In accordance with University Bylaw 87 (b), the appointment of clinical faculty automatically terminates at the close of the period of time stipulated in the contract, unless there is an official notice of renewal.

The initial appointment term of clinical faculty of all ranks, including the Professor of Management Practice, is typically for one year, and will not normally exceed two years. Following their initial term of appointment, clinical faculty may hold renewable contracts of varying lengths: “short contracts” of one or two years, or “long contracts” of three years or longer. Unless otherwise specified in the individual contract, clinical faculty appointments may be renewed indefinitely.

6. Establishing a Position

The decision to establish a clinical faculty position as opposed to a tenure-track position requires consultation with members of the department concerned and approval of the dean, and is reviewed by the Provost as part of the annual staffing plan. All clinical faculty members occupy full-time faculty budget lines.

7. Initial Appointment

Nominations for appointments of candidates to clinical faculty positions are put forward by the respective departments via the same channels as nominations for tenure-track appointments, and are subject to the same departmental review processes before they are forwarded to the dean. The activities that a clinical faculty member is expected to engage in will be included in the appointment letter.

A candidate for a full-time clinical appointment must present evidence of a distinguished career as a practitioner and/or appropriate education or teaching experience in a field relevant to the appointment. Candidates are expected to show outstanding pedagogical skills or talent, as evidenced by past teaching
performance, curriculum development and teaching innovation, or expertise in an area of strategic importance that is not otherwise available on the faculty. They may be appointed at the rank of assistant, associate or professor.

The honorific designation “Professor of Management Practice” (“PMP”) is reserved for candidates who have had distinguished careers in business or related fields. Candidates should hold certifications and educational credentials appropriate for the work done as a practitioner, and should be able to relate non-academic experiences effectively to teaching assignments within the Stern School. Since this title is used to designate professionals who have distinguished themselves as widely recognized senior leaders in key line or staff positions in major firms, it can be used only for new appointments and is made only at the full professor level; gaining academic experience does not lead to promotion to PMP.

8. Annual Merit Reviews

Clinical faculty members are expected to adhere to the highest levels of performance and commitment to the university and the school and the highest standards of excellence in their fields. Specifically, they should demonstrate teaching excellence, as reflected by a combination of academically rigorous course content, teaching in courses of high strategic value to the school, pedagogical innovation, and high student ratings and enrollments. Clinical faculty members are also expected to make meaningful service contributions in their department and/or the school, by such activities as serving on committees, advising students, and attending school events. Service outside the school that supports Stern’s mission and brand is also encouraged. Conducting research is not required but is looked upon favorably.

All continuing clinical faculty members complete a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) each year for review by the department chair and vice deans. During the rigorous Annual Merit Review process each spring, the department chair presents to the vice deans and deans the activity and achievements of each faculty member, using the completed FAR as one source of information, and discusses areas of improvement. The department chair then provides feedback and recommendations to each faculty member. The feedback reflects the input gathered at the meeting with the vice deans and deans.

9. Reappointment

The review process and criteria for reappointment are such that only individuals who are continuing to make a significant contribution to the excellence of the school are reappointed. The specific criteria for evaluating performance are those set forth under Annual Merit Review guidelines, as explained above.

Reappointment is also based on departmental criteria of performance and consideration of curricular and programmatic initiatives. Thus, the decision to reappoint may be influenced by curricular and structural changes and needs in academic programs (even in those cases in which a candidate may satisfy the appropriate standards of achievement). When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, reappointment does not occur. The faculty member may, however, request a performance review for career development.

Reappointment Process:

- Faculty member submits course faculty evaluations for all courses since the last evaluation, sample syllabi, a brief teaching and service statement, Faculty Activity Report and CV.
• The department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or in the case of departments without P&T committees, a 3-person ad-hoc advisory committee created by the department chair) reviews materials and makes recommendation.

• Department chair forwards recommendation for reappointment to the Committee of Department Chairs. If reappointment is not recommended by the department committee, candidate is notified in writing according to the deadlines set forth under Contract Terms below.

• If the Committee of Department Chairs agrees, recommendation is forwarded to the dean for final approval. If the dean does not approve, the candidate is notified in writing according to the deadlines set forth under Contract Terms below.

10. Contract Terms

Contract terms fall into two categories, each with different review and notification schedules:

  a. **Contracts of Three Years or Longer (“Long Contracts”)**

    Reappointment of a professor currently on a Long Contract requires a formal process that is conducted in the penultimate year of the contract and is completed by the end of that year. In the case of a decision to not reappoint, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than August 31 of the penultimate year, and shall continue to be under contract for the final year.

  b. **One- or Two-Year Contracts (“Short Contracts”)**

    Clinical faculty holding Short Contracts will be reviewed for reappointment by the March 1 prior to the end of their contract term. In case of a decision to not reappoint, the clinical faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than March 1 of the final year, or at least 180 days prior to the termination date if the contract term ends on a date other than August 31.

    **Third Year Review:** Though reappointment cannot proceed without a performance assessment, numerous factors render the sort of formal review appropriate for multi-year appointments unnecessary in the case of faculty on Short Contracts. That said, in the first semester of the third year of continuous appointments, and in every subsequent third year, clinical faculty members with Short Contracts shall be subject to formal review comparable to the review of faculty on long contracts.

11. Promotion

Clinical faculty can be promoted from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor or from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor, according to these criteria:

  a. **Promotion Criteria**

    Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor: The candidate’s record must indicate a strong record of achievement in the classroom. Service to the school is expected as well, which may be in the form of directing key academic programs or centers, initiating new programs, coordinating courses, serving on committees, advising students and engaging in other activities that support Stern’s mission.

    Promotion to Clinical Professor: The candidate’s record must indicate extraordinary achievement in the classroom. In addition, substantial service to the school is expected, through activities such as directing key academic programs or centers, initiating new programs, contributing to curriculum and
coordinating courses, serving on committees, advising students and engaging in other activities that support Stern's educational mission.

b. Promotion procedure

- Candidate submits CV, teaching materials and service statement
  - Teaching materials provide evidence of teaching performance and teaching potential within the context of a research university, and should include:
    - A teaching statement from the candidate explaining his/her teaching philosophy, learning goals for students, and strategies and methods employed to help students attain those goals
    - Student evaluations (both an aggregated summary across courses and complete CFE reports for all course sections taught)
    - Sample syllabi (or access to online teaching sites)
    - List of advisees (graduate and undergraduate)
    - Where appropriate, reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness
  - Service statement briefly describes service to the department, school, university, and/or profession, particularly information that might not be evident from the CV.

- Department chair prepares a report, summarizing the candidate’s contributions and describing how the candidate meets the qualifications for Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor.

- Department’s full P&T committee meets to discuss and vote on the case. In departments without P&T committees, the Vice Dean of Faculty will appoint an ad hoc committee of at least 3 tenured faculty members from other departments in the school. In all cases, at least one clinical faculty member in a higher rank than the candidate must also serve on the committee reviewing clinical promotions.

- If the departmental committee supports proceeding with promotion, department chair submits the completed NYU Promotion application form, candidate’s materials, his/her report and the committee vote to the Vice Dean of Faculty. If the committee chooses to retain the candidate at the same level instead of promotion, the candidate is notified in writing.

- Committee of department chairs and vice deans meets to discuss and vote on the case, and then makes its recommendation to the dean.

- Dean reviews the case and informs the department chair and candidate of his/her decision.

Letters from external reviewers are not sought, since the job of a clinical faculty member is to teach and provide service, both of which are primarily internal activities.

12. Transfer between FTNTT/CF and Tenured or Tenure Track Appointments

Clinical appointments will not be available to faculty members who have been employed in tenure-track appointments at New York University. Clinical faculty positions cannot be used as a mechanism to retain individuals who are not granted tenure.
In rare cases, and then only with the provost’s approval, a clinical position may be converted into a tenure track position for which the incumbent may apply within the search process.

13. **Relative Size of the Clinical Faculty**

While clinical faculty members make valuable contributions to the Stern School, excessive reliance on non-tenure track faculty may gradually dilute the research mission of the School. Consequently, the size of the clinical faculty and their aggregate teaching responsibility will be subject to annual review by the Committee of Department Chairs and vice deans.

14. **Contract Clock**

The contract for a clinical faculty member may be stopped for stipulated reasons, as per the University Guidelines for Full Time Contract Faculty Appointments. These reasons include medical, personal, as primary caregiver for a child, spouse, parent, same-sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation.

15. **Grievance**

Stern follows the grievance and appeal process as set forth in the NYU Guidelines. The Guidelines require that the grievance committee include at least “one senior full-time contract faculty member who shall participate in hearing and evaluating only those grievances that are filed by” clinical faculty members. Beginning with the 2015-16 committee elections, at least one position on the existing Stern Grievance Committee will be required to be filled by a Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor.