MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

The New York University Continuing Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, September 24, 2015 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, Cunningham, Elcott, Gurrin, Halpin, Killilea, Mooney, Morton, Mowry, Rainey, Renzi, Sacks, Slater, Stehlik, Stewart, Testa, Williams, Ying; Alternate Senators Bianco, Celik (for Burt, by audio-conference), Nordlund, and White.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD MAY 14, 2015

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the May 14, 2015 meeting were approved unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: FRED CARL

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

Welcome

Chairperson Carl welcomed new members, including new Alternate Senators Carrie Nordlund from Wagner and Joe Foudy from Stern. He also reported Ralph Cunningham is now serving as the Senator from Nursing, replacing Ann Marie Mauro. Vince Renzi is serving as an FAS Senator. Ethan Youngerman is serving as an Alternate Senator. Carl encouraged committee members to respond to the polls regarding availability for first committee meetings. He noted the committees will be choosing their own Committee Chairs.

Chair’s Report

The report was accepted into the minutes.

Provost Search Committee

Carl reported the Committee will be setting up Listening Sessions for faculty members, similar to those organized by the Presidential Search Committee. He also encouraged Senators to contact him with any input regarding the Provost Search process.
SUMMER COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ad hoc Committee on National Security Technology Accelerator (NSTA): Joe Borowiec

See attached Document B: NSTA June 18, 2015 Meeting.

Senator Borowiec presented his general summary of the Committee’s work.

NSTA will facilitate the commercialization of United States Department of Defense (DOD) funded technologies in the commercial marketplace for both civilian and military utilization.

There is nothing related to weapons or weapons systems, all the work is open, it is non-classified and it has to be publishable. This was confirmed by the external committee.

He noted that Silicon Valley has benefited from Department of Defense funding since the 1950-60s, as well as the Boston area, but there was a growing interest to develop a new center. New York City was chosen over Silicon Valley and Boston. New York has a growing reputation for entrepreneurship and specifically NYU with its business majors.

The external committee developed a plan stating the DOD funding will start with roughly $6 million ramping up to $20 to $40 million. $40 million is roughly 10 times the amount of DOD research funding at NYU currently.

There was discussion on how to optimize this, for example, ways to integrate with NYU graduate programs or possible internships.

A Standing Committee will be appointed with a role to be determined.

A Senator asked if the Council should be concerned about any items regarding this project.

Borowiec stated he does not have concerns and thinks this is a great opportunity. He noted it will be open research. It also means possibly getting more money to the university and may help students in terms of job prospects, or at least internships. It is also another way to improve research, particularly in a scientific community.

Superblock Stewardship Advisory Committee: Ezra Sacks

Senator Sacks reported the Committee met once over the summer with Lynne Brown and the architects. He noted they do not have a timeline yet. He commented the process of designing Coles and the rest of the block is complicated. Currently a variety of different groups are examining issues from what kind of vegetation they can have inside the buildings to what kind of spaces can be public spaces, etc. He estimates this process will go on for at least six months to a year before a design for Coles and the rest of the block is presented.

He noted Washington Square Village and Silver Towers received new windows, which very effectively block noise. In addition, the air conditioner units in Silver Towers were replaced and the air conditioning unit sleeves were replaced in Washington Square Village. The University is also replacing the roofing system over Washington Square Village.

Coles Redevelopment Project—Plans for relocation/redistribution of services: Vince Renzi

See attached Document C: Interim Fitness and Athletic Plans.

Renzi reported the PowerPoint created by the University provides details on the plans for relocation and redistribution of services for the NYU community.

A Senator asked if the Council should be concerned about any items regarding this plan.
Renzi responded he does not think there are many concerns regarding this issue. He commented the University did a good job of listening to the Committee, and a good job of putting a plan in place. He also noted added benefits; for instance, the Committee voiced the need for family changing rooms, which will be put into the new plans.

The Committee also asked senior leadership regarding the rights of Community Board members. They announced that Community Board Members 2 (CB2) residents will be able to use the new floor of 404 Lafayette.

A Senator asked about pool options and if Palladium could accommodate all swimmers.

Renzi noted the pool is used heavily and NYU is also in the process of building a first grade swim team, so this is an important concern. Palladium will now open at 5:30 am for open swim before team practices and it will also stay open later. They have also made plans with the local YMCAs. He noted NYU will be renting court spaces from several local colleges. He commented people may find it better to get health club memberships with the corporate rate.

A Senator asked if Coles will stay open beyond November 15th through the end of the semester.

Renzi responded that is the plan and people will not be charged for the last few weeks of the semester. He also noted the facilities at 404 Lafayette will offer a free trial period.

OLD BUSINESS

Tisch Teacher Policy Update: John Gurrin

Senator Gurrin reported the C-FSC approved and sent their recommendations regarding the policy. The T-FSC tabled the review and then over the summer approved and sent the recommendations.

He reported the Tisch Teach Policy is now in effect as of September 1. The Senators in Tisch met with the Dean and currently each department is working on putting the policy in effect. Departments need to make decisions on items such as choosing to be on one-year contracts or three-year contracts, the review schedule, and develop supplemental policies that are department specific.

A Senator asked if it is still the case that the one-year contracts are limited to one particular department and were in place only for specific reasons.

Gurrin responded each department must choose the length of the contract. The expectation is that every department except the Interactive Telecommunications Program (ITP) will choose a three-year contract. He stated the faculty of any department could vote for a one-year, but that is not expected to happen.

A Senator asked why departments would vote for one-year versus three-year contracts.

Gurrin responded, for the teachers in the Interactive Telecommunications Program (ITP), his understanding of the reason for a one-year contract is to fill an open slot when a faculty member is going to Shanghai or Abu Dhabi to teach for one year.

It was noted the argument presented for the one-year contract by the program is because the curriculum in ITP changes from year to year and the program wanted the flexibility of hiring specialized teachers to match the changing curriculum. The department and the requirement are specific, so this is not going to be considered more generalized to the other schools and departments.

A Senator asked if the Council wants to explore under what circumstances a one-year, probationary contract would make sense.
Gurrin stated it is his understanding that it is typical for there to be a one-year probationary period in most schools. He commented he believes this issue will come up in other school’s policies, and it is appropriate for the Council to be thinking about the length of contracts and any related issues.

A Senator asked if the Provost accepted all the recommendations. It was stated the Provost accepted about 90% of the recommendations. She asked in the 10% not accepted, if any were meaningful recommendations and if the Committee is pleased with the result. A Senator followed up asking if there is anything the Council should be concerned about, i.e. teaching loads, reappointment procedures, etc.

It was stated the Committee was pleased with the final document and many of the recommendations were included. It was noted he would report back on what was specifically left out.

A Senator expressed this will be a real concern at the School of Professional Studies. He noted two years ago all SPS contracts were reduced from three years to one year, with no reason given.

A Senator stated one-year contracts are discouraged by the guidelines, and even if a faculty votes for one-year contracts, the Provost still has final approval, and they have to provide justification to the Provost for why there should be one-year contracts.

A Senator stated regarding the first initial contract, even if its three-year, the first year is probationary with a review at the end of the first year.

A Senator asked who will be doing the review at the end of the first-year; if this will be the original search committee, a faculty committee, or the Chair. He also wanted the Council to examine the wording which allows the department to not re-appoint based on a curricular change.

A Senator stated her opposition to short-term contracts. She stated if you need people for a short-term fill-in, you can do so with an adjunct or a temporary hire. To confuse the employment of faculty with curricular changes she believes sends the wrong message of a university making commitments to hire faculty. She stated she would fight strongly against any of these one-year contracts and believes the excuse of flexibility, leave of absence, is a charade. She stated she believes the one-year contract is used as punitive means for changing people from three-year to one-year. Another Senator stated the Council should continue to push for the elimination of one-year contracts. Another Senator endorsed the opposition to one-year contracts. He said if it relates to leaves of absence, perhaps the details of leave of absence, i.e. how much advanced notice, should be written into contracts.

It was suggested the Personnel Policies Committee add this to their agenda and possibly develop a general policy. A Senator also suggested a resolution from the Council regarding the need for faculty involvement in the creation of these policies. A Senator supported this and suggested the Committee develop best practices regarding the implementation of these policies, including the structure of review committees, how student and teaching evaluations are used, etc.

A Senator asked if the Provost’s response to the recommendations would be posted on the website.

It was noted the final document will be posted on the School’s site.

A Senator stated, regarding the reappointment committees, at the Silver School of Social Work, the continuing faculty cannot serve on the Review and Promotion Committee. Instead, the continuing faculty form a committee that consults with the Promotion and Reappointment Committee. This committee writes a report and communicates it to the larger committee, who then communicates it to the dean. It was noted the guidelines state that the administration is “encouraged” to include continuing faculty on these committees.

A Senator stated the C-FSC members are developing a body of knowledge that belongs on these committees and would like to push for C-FSC senators having more visibility on all of these committees. She suggested if Senators feel they are not being listened to at their schools, they should bring this up to the Council.
A Senator stated it is incumbent on Senators to bring back the notion of shared governance to the schools and to change the culture at the local levels.

It was noted a new Provost will be coming in, and the outgoing Provost stated he believes the next administration will want to revisit the faculty handbook and the integration of the faculty handbook into the portal campuses.

A Senator asked for a line by line response from the Provost regarding the approval/rejection of recommendations to be posted online.

**Working Group on Personnel Policies**

**Questions and Discussion re: Joint C-FSC/T-FSC Recommendations to the Policy for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies Full-time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty**


Senator Rainey from Liberal Studies thanked the C-FSC and T-FSC Committees for their thorough review of the document. He reported the T-FSC approved these recommendations last Thursday.

He expressed his approval of the recommendations. He pointed out one recommendation: number 26, which he believes is one of the most important. He stated this recommendation supports transparency and shared governance. He stated the current practice at Liberal Studies had been to appoint a reappointment and promotion committee, elected by the faculty, and charged with making recommendations regarding reappointment and promotion. He mentioned he has served on the committee three times. He stated the last time he served there were twenty-six faculty members up for promotion. For the past ten years, the Dean of LSP has chaired the committee. The committee is charged with making recommendations to the Dean. Therefore the Dean would receive recommendations, while playing an active role in formulating those recommendations. Number 26 recommends the committee elect its own chair among the elected faculty members.

A Senator stated a challenge at FAS is there are many small programs, and in her small program there is only one person that makes appointments. He is the only tenured faculty member and also serves as chair.

A Senator pointed out a typographical error on page 5, number 13. The phrase “A. Titles” was corrected to “B. Titles.”

At the conclusion of the discussion, the recommendations were approved unanimously by vote of the Council.

A Senator moved a motion to request a line by line response from the Provost on these recommendations, similar to the response regarding the University Guidelines for Full-time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments. She also asked for the Provost’s response to be posted on the C-FSC website. Several Senators expressed support. A Senator commented it supports transparency and shared governance. It assists the Council in identifying what recommendations were accepted or rejected.

A Senator stated the final document would be posted on the Provost or School’s website.

A Senator suggested posting as an attachment in the C-FSC minutes.

A motion to post the Provost’s response was moved, seconded, and approved by vote of the Council with two abstentions.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Report on C-FSC Retreat: Mary Killilea and David Elcott**
See attached Document E: C-FSC Retreat Report.

Senator Killilea reported at the retreat, the responses to the “gallery walk” questions were posted around the room and people were asked to respond to them. Discussion groups were formed from highlights in the responses.

Two action items included the Council forming a Diversity Committee and the Council developing a comprehensive survey of the state of continuing faculty throughout the university.

Senator Elcott stated the challenges of creating diversity at an expensive, private university. This includes diversity of the student body and the university faculty and what impact this has on the culture of the university. He noted this relates to students of color and first generation college students.

He stated another topic centered on pedagogy. He noted there is a sense that non-tenured faculty may be more sensitive to the issues of teaching.

A Senator commented on the need for teaching resources for tenure-track faculty. Another Senator recommended offering teaching support and mentoring to all faculty, both tenure-track and continuing.

A Senator commented on the importance of three-year contracts, because of the evaluation metrics and stated it better supports a diverse faculty.

A Senator commented three new committees may come out of these action items: shared governance, diversity, and pedagogy/teaching.

A Senator commented on the need for professional development opportunities. He noted the diverse roles played by continuing faculty, which includes both teaching and research. He noted it is important that there are systems in place that allow continuing faculty to continue professional development.

A Senator commented on the importance of a comprehensive survey, in terms of finding out what is happening among the continuing faculty, structures and governance of departments, quality of life, etc., and that also serves as way of communicating these items to continuing faculty.

It was noted this would be a follow-up to the 2008 Report on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, put together by former T-FSC member Virginia Black. This included a survey and also reported on other universities and on national trends. It was noted the 2008 document was used by the Planning Committee.

A Senator commented on the challenges of expectation of scholarship even for non-tenure track faculty, and its effect on promotion. She stated there is now a category of applied scholarship at her school, which translates other assignments and activities into scholarship. She commented that applied scholarship still does not seem to count towards promotion. She commented this document will raise these issues and allow an opportunity to develop solutions.

NEXT MEETING

Chairperson Carl announced the next meeting of the Council will take place on October 29, 2015 at 12:00 noon.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.
Continuing Faculty Senators Council
Chairperson Fred Carl

Report as of September 18, 2015

1. Provost Office Update of Faculty Handbook
At the beginning of the summer the Provost's Office sent both the C-FSC and the T-FSC a draft of proposed amendments to the Faculty Handbook reflecting the bylaws changes approval by the Board of Trustees at their June 8, 2015 meeting related to the creation of the Faculty of Health and the College of Global Public Health. Both councils responses to the draft were concerned mainly with minor typographical issues, along with one substantive recommendation: to incorporate the University's Sexual Misconduct, Relationship Violence and Stalking Policy into the Faculty Handbook. This recommendation was accepted: as soon as the policy is amended to be in compliance with New York State legislation, it will be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook. Thank you to Senator Susan Stehlik for suggesting this.

2. C-FSC Retreat
Our Retreat was a very successful day of getting to know each other better and honing in on important agenda items for our Council for the year. It was a wonderful manifestation of the incredible pool of engaged, knowledgeable, committed and caring individuals working collaboratively that is our Council. A report on the Retreat will occur at our first C-FSC meeting for those of Senators and Alternates unable to attend. Thank you to Senator Susan Stehlik for suggesting that we have the Retreat, and thank you to Senators Stehlik, David Elcott, Mary Killilea and Joe Borowiec for planning the event.

3. Working Group on Personnel Policies
At the end of the Spring 2015 semester both the C-FSC and the T-FSC received from the Provost’s Office a request for review the Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies Full-time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty. Over the summer the Working Group developed a set of recommendations and met with the T-FSC Promotion and Tenure Modification Committee to create a joint set of recommendations. Please carefully review both the Policy and the Joint Recommendations for questions and discussion. Thank you to Senators John Halpin, Martha Caprio and Andy Williams and Alternate Senator Heidi White for all of their hard work developing these recommendations.
4. **Coles Project—Relocation and Redistribution of Services and Facilities**
On Thursday, September 10, 2015, Vice Chair Randy Mowry, Mary Killilea, Patrick Ying, Vince Renzi, T-FSC Chair Allen Mincer, T-FSC Vice Chair Awam Amkpa, past T-FSC Chair Raghu Sundaram and I met with Lynne Brown, Senior Vice President for University Relations and Public Affairs, Chris Bledsoe, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs/Director of Athletics, Ellen Schall, Senior Presidential Fellow, and Larry Maslon, Chair of the Superblock Stewardship Advisory Committee for a briefing on the plans for the relocation of services for NYU community members once the Coles facility closes. Vince Renzi will give a report on that meeting.

5. **Update on Developing Procedures and Guidelines for Grievances Not Related to Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion, and Disciplinary Processes for Continuing Faculty**
This fall the Provost’s Office will be requesting representatives from both the C-FSC and the T-FSC to serve on a working group to develop options for processes and procedures both for grievances not related to appointment, reappointment and promotion, and disciplinary processes for continuing faculty.

6. **Provost Search Committee**
As you may have seen from Andy Hamilton’s email on Friday, September 18, 2015, to the NYU community, I have been invited to serve on the Provost Search Committee, which will begin meeting on Tuesday, September 22nd.

7. **Our next C-FSC Meeting will be on Thursday, October 29th at 12:00 noon.**
Re: National Security Accelerator (NSTA) Summer Program

Attendees: John Aber, Kurt Becker, Joe Borowiec, Paul Glimcher, Leslie Greengard, Paul Horn, Daniel Malamud, Allen Mincer, Mark Righter, Alexander Tuzhilin, Rae Zimmerman, (i.e., Faculty Committee)

Meeting Date: June 18, 2015

Discussion Points:

- NSTA will facilitate the commercialization of DOD funded technologies in the commercial marketplace for both civilian and military utilization

- Annual US DOD budget for R&D = $70B
- Military funding is driving startups in Israel
- New York choses over Silicon Valley and Boston
- NYU will be the Center (designed by an External Committee)

- Optimize impact on NYU
- Funding possibilities (e.g., internships, sabbaticals?)
- Influence Master’s level entrepreneurship programs
- Role of Faculty Committee: TBD

- Export Control Regulations
- Restrictions: no weapons or weapons systems, all work open, non-classified, and publishable

Results shared from External “Summer Study” Committee (held July 6-7, 2015)

- Complete white paper for Secretary of Defense by end of summer
- Program announcement ≈ October 1, 2015
- Annual funding starts at $6M and ramps up to somewhere between $20M to $40M
- Goal is to accelerate commercialization of dual use technologies
- Agreed with restrictions stated above
- Supported integration between NSTA and academic programs
- Any work on technology with Export Control Regulations will be reviewed by a standing committee with NYU faculty participation
Coles
Redevelopment
Interim Fitness & Athletics Plan

September 8, 2015
Agenda

1. Coles Redevelopment Update
2. General Fitness
3. Specialty Fitness
4. Intercollegiate Athletics
5. Intramural Sports
6. Office Space & Continued Employment
7. Next Steps
Moving Forward

- NYU has made provisions to ensure continued, high-quality experiences for current fitness users and student athletes
- Coles will remain in operation through at least November 15, 2015
- Coles will not close until the interim replacement facilities are available
- Memberships purchased for the fall semester will be charged through November 15
- Users will not be subject to additional fees if Coles remains open beyond November 15
Strategy

- All current Coles users will have access to:
  - 404 Lafayette Fitness Facility (under renovation)
  - Palladium Athletic Facility (with extended hours)
  - Newly-renovated Brooklyn Athletic Facility

- Matriculating students will have access to all three facilities at no additional cost

- Memberships to the three NYU-facilities will become available for purchase when 404 Lafayette becomes operational and Coles closes

- Membership to all three facilities will cost 20% less than the current membership price

Fitness Offerings at NYU Facilities

- **404 Lafayette Street**
  - Strength Training
  - Cardio Exercise
  - Recreation classes
  - Locker Rooms

- **Palladium Athletic Facility**
  - Strength Training
  - Cardio Exercise
  - Recreation Classes
  - Free Play on Court
  - Swimming and Diving Pool
  - Locker Rooms

- **Brooklyn Athletic Facility**
  - Strength Training
  - Cardio Exercise
  - Recreation Classes
  - Free Play on Court
  - Locker Rooms
404 Lafayette Fitness Center

- Located five blocks from Bobst and seven blocks from Union Square
- Previously a “Crunch” gym, occupies three floors, approximately 29,786 sq. ft.
- Cardio Equipment (20 pieces more than Coles): Treadmills, exercise bikes, ellipticals, and rowing ergs
- Strength Training: Free weights, plates, bars, dumbbells, and selectorized machines
- Dance and spinning studio; yoga room
- Locker rooms and showers
- Offices for department administration and membership
Basement Floor

Floor plans are illustrative only and may not reflect the final layout of equipment.
Ground (1st) Floor

Floor plans are illustrative only and may not reflect the final layout of equipment.
Second Floor

Floor plans are illustrative only and may not reflect the final layout of equipment.
**Court Space**

- Basketball courts in Palladium and Brooklyn will have set schedules of availability
- Racquetball, squash, and tennis courts, in addition to a running track will not be available during the interim period

**External Membership Options**

- NYU negotiated corporate memberships to local external fitness centers available to all employees
  
  - New York Sports Clubs: $708 (regional network)
  - New York Health and Racquet Club: $924 (city-wide network)
  - YMCA Citywide Network: $936 (for individuals; additional discounts for families)
  - David Barton Gym: $990
  - Chelsea Piers: $1,380
    - Please note that initiation fees may apply
### NYU Network Annual Membership Rates for Non-Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Current Rate</th>
<th>Discounted Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Regular</td>
<td>$608*</td>
<td>$516*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Family Member</td>
<td>$231</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Family Full Use</td>
<td>$729*</td>
<td>$613*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>$458</td>
<td>$366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$458</td>
<td>$366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Employee Family</td>
<td>$458</td>
<td>$366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Employee Family</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiree Family</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students &amp; Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (matriculation fee)</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Student Family Member</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Student Family Member</td>
<td>$458</td>
<td>$366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $150 donation to NYU. The 20% discount applies to the annual membership fee, not the $150 contribution (which will remain the same).
Accommodations for Swimmers

- Palladium pool will have set schedule of availability
- NYU will help defray the cost of access to the local YMCA network (McBurney and Chinatown facilities) for employees and their families:
  - Swimming Lessons for Children
  - Full YMCA Membership
Swimming Lessons for Children - YMCA

• NYU will provide partial reimbursement (up to $85 per child per year)

• NYU faculty, staff, and administrators are eligible to purchase aquatics classes at the member price at the McBurney and Chinatown facilities, regardless of Coles membership

• Only those children of faculty, administrators, and staff who belong to the NYU fitness facilities will be eligible to receive reimbursement

• When the $85 subsidy is considered in combination with the $55 cost that would have been spent on swimming lessons at Coles, the effective additional cost of swimming lessons at the YMCA would be $0 per child per class ($140 - ($85+$55) = $0)

• NYU hopes to offer as many non-beginner level aquatic classes at the Palladium pool—subject to safety, enrollment/demand, and availability—as possible for $55 per session (the current price of lessons at Coles)
Full YMCA Membership

- NYU will provide a partial reimbursement to help defray the additional cost of YMCA full membership to the McBurney and/or Chinatown facilities as follows:
  
  - Individual membership = $200 reimbursement
  - Family I (1 adult with children) = $350 reimbursement
  - Family II (2 adults with children) = $450 reimbursement

- Eligibility is limited to faculty, administrators, staff, and their families, who belong to the current NYU facilities as of November 15, 2015 and who purchase memberships to the local YMCA branches

- New hires to the University will also be eligible to receive reimbursement

- Reimbursement will be provided only after the submission of a valid receipt to Athletics Membership Office
Palladium will become the new “hub” for student athletes

- Enhancements including the expansion of space available to the Athletics Departments on the C2 level to accommodate:
  - Varsity Performance Center
  - Laundry and equipment distribution
  - Sports medicine
  - Team meeting rooms
  - Golf training room

- Auxiliary Gyms “A” & “B” on the C1 will be reconfigured to accommodate wrestling and fencing, as well as some recreation classes

- The court on the C2 level will be made available for free play as much as possible

- The Palladium will also serve as the point of departure for all athletic teams that travel for off-campus practices and/or competitions
Intercollegiate Athletics

- Men’s and women’s basketball and volleyball practices and competitions will be held at Baruch College (CUNY), Hunter College (CUNY), and Pace University-Downtown
  - NYU has purchased discrete blocks of time from each school and teams will practice and compete at these facilities
  - NYU will temporarily brand the gyms (much as is done for soccer and other games held at non-NYU facilities) to create an NYU home game experience for athletes and fans
- Wrestling and fencing will be accommodated at the Palladium and Brooklyn athletic facilities
  - Practice and training spaces will be created as part of the enhancements at the Palladium

Intramural Athletics

- Intramural sports that are currently hosted in Coles—primarily basketball and volleyball—will be accommodated through an extension of NYU’s existing agreement with Chelsea Piers
- The Palladium will serve as the point of distribution for equipment and departure of NYU transportation
Offices

- The Athletic Department administrative suite will be accommodated at 404 Lafayette Street
- The 404 Lafayette Street facility management offices will be located in the building
- Palladium and Brooklyn management facilities will continue to be primarily located in those facilities
- Coaches’ offices will relocate to University Hall during the interim period
- The Academic Affairs office will move to Palladium Hall

Continued Employment

- The University expects to maintain the current levels of staffing for students, staff, and administrators to manage the temporary and existing facilities
Next Steps

• A communication about the interim Fitness and Athletics plan is scheduled for distribution

• The Athletics website has been enhanced to illustrate the details of the plan
Recommendations of the C-FSC and T-FSC in regard to:

Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty

Background

“Dean Tom Carew [FAS] has completed a process within Liberal Studies to establish a Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies, working iteratively with [the Provost’s Office] and the Office of the General Counsel…. [The Policy] was submitted by Dean Carew…[and] was drafted by Dean Fred Schwarzbach in consultation with the FAS Dean’s office and the LS Steering Committee….” (Letter of April 23, 2015 from David McLaughlin to C-FSC and T-FSC Chairs)

The following document will enumerate various questions, comments and recommendations to the submitted Policy. Some questions and recommendations, however, are related to the process of inclusion of Liberal Studies faculty in discussions on, ability to suggest amendments to, and to vote on the Policy. These questions will appear in some of the responses to specific items in the Policy. A fuller discussion of these questions appears in Appendix A at the end of the recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Introduction, Page 1, paragraph 1, sentence 3:

“The primary responsibility of the LS faculty is a commitment to undergraduate education in LS and Global Liberal Studies (henceforth GLS).”

Recommendation
Delete. Sentences 1 and 2 in paragraph 1 adequately explain the role of LS faculty.

2. Introduction, Page 1, paragraph 2:

“The FAS Dean may make changes to these guidelines, in consultation with the Liberal Studies faculty.

Recommendation
Clarify specifically and explicitly the process of consultation with the LS faculty. Will any proposed changes be presented, discussed and voted on at the LS
Faculty Assembly, the LS shared governance body that “formulates recommendations concerning Liberal Studies’s management, development, and welfare”? ¹ Is another process envisioned? Mechanisms for timely distribution to the faculty, faculty discussion, as well as the ability for faculty to present amendments, make recommendations to and vote on the Policy in a regularly scheduled LS Faculty Assembly meeting following procedures outlined in the LS Faculty Charter, should be included and stated explicitly, such as:

“Any amendment to this Policy must be in writing, submitted at least two weeks in advance to the Liberal Studies faculty for discussion, for the possibility for amendments, and for a vote at a regularly scheduled LS Faculty Assembly meeting following the LS Faculty Charter.”

3. Page 1, Section I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, paragraph 1.

Recommendation

This paragraph begins an explanation of the responsibilities, but not the rights, of LS faculty. Add language detailing the rights of LS faculty, including the right to academic freedom, the ability to apply for FAS funds and, where eligible, University-administered funds, health care benefits, retirement benefits, and portable tuition benefits.

4. Page 1, Section I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, paragraph 1, sentence 1:

“Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty in LS hold the title of Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical (Full) Professor; some faculty will retain the title, Master Teacher, as detailed in the Appendix.”

Recommendation

Since LS faculty are exclusively non-tenured, add language describing the differences between tenured faculty expectations and non-tenured faculty expectations. A model might be the following:

¹ “Charters of the Faculty Assembly AND Steering Committee,” page 1, paragraph 1, from LS website
“Clinical Faculty lines differ from tenure-track lines. Although clinical lines are without tenure, they are typically multiyear and research is not part of their formal responsibilities, and hence teaching loads are greater.”

5. Page 1, Section I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, sentence 2:

“As the responsibilities of Liberal Studies faculty are both diverse and flexible in order to meet the ongoing and changing needs of the program, the following categories of responsibilities of LS faculty are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive:”

Recommendation
Delete the first clause of the sentence preceding the comma. This section introduces the responsibilities of LS faculty members; the introductory clause states the obvious and is not needed.

6. Page 1, I. A. Teaching, paragraph 1:

“The standard teaching load for all full-time faculty is six courses per year. This may vary depending on other assigned duties or responsibilities. With the approval of the Dean, administrative and professional duties and other professional activities that serve the university or LS may substitute for one or more courses.”

Recommendation
Delete sentence two. The word “vary,” without further explanation might imply that the teaching load could be expanded. Sentence three explicitly states the mechanism for reduction of teaching load.

7. Page 1, I. A. Teaching, paragraph 2:

“Clinical faculty are also expected to:”

Recommendation
As the primary responsibilities of LS faculty is teaching, revise language to:

“Teaching responsibilities may also include:” and adjust verb tenses in bullet points accordingly.

---

2 FAS Website, Recruitment of New Faculty, Section 1.7, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professors, Overview, http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.ppassocdean.recruitment.html
8. Page 2, sentence 1:

“Serve, when asked, on senior thesis committees and, when appropriate, supervise independent studies.”

**Recommendation**
The language suggests that the additional duties are added to the course load. Add language specifying that supervising independent studies, which are typically very time intensive, is a choice of the faculty member, not required “when asked.” If it is, in fact, required, specify that this requirement becomes a part of the 6-course teaching load or that course load reduction is available.

9. Page 2, paragraph 2, bullet point 3 and 4:

**Recommendation**
Since service is one of the criteria on which faculty review is determined, give examples of service (“outreach to community at large”), e.g., providing community service by working with non-profit organizations assisting less fortunate members of the NYC community. Public identification of the faculty member doing such important work as an LS faculty member should not be required.

10. Page 2, Section C. Professional Activity, first sentence:

“LS faculty are generally practitioners and/or experts in their fields, and it is expected that they will demonstrate continuing intellectual and scholarly engagement in their fields or continuing practice at a higher level, as appropriate to the area of the appointment.”

**Recommendation**
The sentence is not clear: what are the criteria for evaluating the expected “continuing intellectual and scholarly engagement in their fields or continuing practice at a higher level”? And what exactly does “at a higher level” mean and who determines that? Clarify language as follows:

LS faculty are generally practitioners and/or experts in their fields. Continued creative, intellectual, and scholarly engagement in their fields is encouraged, though not required, as appropriate to the area of the appointment.

11. Page 2, Section C. Professional Activity, paragraph 1, last sentence:

“In support of professional, scholarly, and creative work, each faculty member draws upon an individual Professional Development Account (currently $2500 p.a.).”
Recommendation
Because professional, scholarly, and creative work is encouraged, as well as the expectation of a six course teaching load per year, research leave eligibility, or a sabbatical, of at least one semester should be provided to further support that professional, scholarly, and/or creative work. A description of that eligibility, and the process governing it, should be added.

12. Page 3, sentence 1:
“LS faculty will submit an Annual Activity Form, usually in March of each academic year, to report on their teaching, service, and professional development.”

Recommendation
“Development” is an ambiguous term in this context. Because the Annual Activity Form has a role in determining Annual Merit Increases, the language should be unambiguous. Change to “activity,” so sentence reads:

“LS faculty will submit an Annual Activity Form, usually in March of each academic year, to report on their teaching, service, and professional activity.”

13. Page 3, Section II. Appointment of Clinical Faculty, A. Titles, 1. Clinical Assistant Professor of Liberal Studies, line 2:

Recommendation
Delete “at a level of demonstrated excellence”; the phrase is ambiguous.

Change sentence to read:
“Faculty initially appointed at this rank have three years of superior teaching experience and performance (which may have been as a graduate student and need not have been full time), and demonstrated or potential expertise and accomplishment in their discipline or area of practice.”

14. Page 3, II. C. Terms of Appointments, One-year appointments:

Recommendation
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 LS Dean must supply a written justification, based on programmatic and academic considerations, to the LS Faculty Assembly.”
15. Page 3-4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, One-year Appointments:

“If a faculty member receives three continuous one-year appointments, a formal review, as defined below in Section III, shall take place in the third year as a condition for re-appointment.”

Recommendation
To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of LS faculty on one-year appointments (when the norm is three- and five-year appointments), add language allowing for a transition to a three-year appointment for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete the third-year review, such as:

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

16. Page 4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, Three-year appointments, sentence 2-3:

“Faculty are reviewed for reappointment during the penultimate year of a contract. Subsequent appointments may be for one year or three years.”

Recommendation
There is no explanation as to why a Clinical Assistant Professor on a three-year appointment would have his or her length of contract reduced to less than three years. Change sentences to read:

“Faculty are reviewed for reappointment during the penultimate year of a contract. Subsequent appointments shall be for three years.”

17. Page 4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, Three-year appointments, sentence 4:

“(With respect to promotion and apart from reappointment, Assistant and Associate clinical faculty have the option to request review for promotion in the last year of the second three-year contract, or at any time thereafter.)”

Recommendation
Delete “and Associate.” Following the next section, if five-year appointments are the norm for Clinical Associate Professors, they would not be on three-year contracts.

18. Page 4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, Five-year appointments:

“Five-year Appointments: Normally, five-year contracts are awarded only upon promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical (Full)
Recommendation
One may interpret the sentence to mean that there are cases when a Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical (Full) Professor might receive a contract of less than five years. For clarification, delete the above sentence. Replace with the following,

“Five-year Appointments: Five-year Contracts are awarded upon promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.”

19. Page 4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, Five-year Appointments:

Recommendation
Add language about subsequent appointments, for example:

“Subsequent appointments for Clinical Associate Professor are for five years.”

20. Page 4, Section II. C. Terms of Appointments:

Recommendation
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). Also include language about subsequent appointments for Clinical (Full) Professors.

21. Page 4, Section III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty, paragraph 1, sentence 2:

“A positive review establishes that a faculty member is eligible for reappointment:....”

Recommendation
Clarify “a positive review” from whom; change language to read:

“A positive review by the Review Committee establishes that a faculty member is eligible for reappointment:....”

22. Page 4, Section III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty, paragraph 1:

“This section sets out the process and criteria for performance reviews. A positive review establishes that a faculty member is eligible for reappointment: reappointment is subject to the academic and curricular needs of the program and the University. Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and
structural changes and improvements in academic programs. Appointments automatically terminate at the close of the period of time stipulated in the contract, unless there is an official notice of renewal.”

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

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

23. Page 4, Section III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty:

Recommendation
Add language specifying that the Committee for Reappointment and Promotion shall be the committee that conducts reviews for both reappointment and promotion. Separate language regarding Committee’s role and process by function, i.e. put process for review and reappointment in section on review and reappointment, and put process for review for promotion in section on promotion.

24. Page 4, Section III. A. The Review Committee, paragraph 1:

“The Committee for Reappointment and Promotion consists of three LS faculty elected by the LS FT faculty (at least two of whom will be [Full] Professors), two LS faculty appointed by the LS Dean (at least one of whom will be a [Full] Professor), and two non-LS outside members from FAS appointed by the FAS Dean, one of whom will be a Clinical [Full] Professor and one whom will be tenured.”

Recommendation
The committee of 7 includes a majority of members appointed by the LS and FAS Deans. This is a significant change from current Liberal Studies review policies (see “Guidelines for Review of Faculty for Contract Renewal,” available from Liberal Studies website) and represents an erosion of faculty responsibility to conduct faculty reviews for presentation to the LS Dean. The reasoning followed in the University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments for the formation of elected school grievance committees should be followed here. The following language should replace the above:
“The Committee for Reappointment and Promotion consists of five LS faculty elected by the LS FT faculty (at least three of whom will be [Full] Professors) and two non-LS outside members from FAS, one of whom will be a Clinical [Full] Professor elected by the FAS Continuing Faculty and one whom will be a tenured Professor elected by the FAS Tenured Faculty.”

25. Page 4
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
A. The Review Committee
First Paragraph
First sentence

“The Committee for reappointment and promotion will consist of three…”

Recommendation
Because terminology is not consistent throughout the Policy, the compositions of the review committees for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor and to Clinical (Full) Professor referred to in IV. A. are not clear.

Name the review committee, e.g., “Committee for Reappointment and Promotion”, and refer to it by name in:
III. A., second paragraph and IV. A. Review Committee, as the parent Committee from which members of the review committee for reappointment and members of the review committee for promotion will be drawn.

26. Page 4, Section III. A. The Review Committee, paragraph 1:
“The committee will be chaired by the LS Dean, who does not vote.”

Recommendation
This suggests that the Dean chairs a committee that submits a report to the Dean. It is not at all clear why the LS Dean is on this committee that reports to her/himself, and further suggests an erosion of the historical role of faculty in (and confidence in the ability of the faculty to) conduct faculty reviews. The Committee should choose its own chair, who then coordinates the creation of the committee’s report and recommendation for reappointment, which is then submitted to the LS Dean. The duties of the chair should be included in this paragraph, as well as the process of evaluating the review material. The process of the creation of the committee’s report should be explicitly stated with language similar to the following:

“The committee will prepare a written review for the LS 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).”
Further, the committee should hold a secret ballot to determine the majority opinion. In that case, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix. (This conforms roughly to procedures in place at FAS and also produces a fuller accounting of the committee’s findings, which can then be accurately submitted to the LS Dean. It also provides the necessary record of process in the event that the faculty member receives a negative review.)

27. Page 5
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
A. The Review Committee
First Paragraph on page 5

Recommendation
Specify that a majority vote of the Reappointment Review Committee shall be required for a successful review, that all votes of that Committee shall be by secret ballot and that re-voting by that Committee shall occur only if new material becomes available.

28. Page 5, paragraph 1:

Recommendation
Between sentence 2 and 3, add language detailing the process governing the creation of the review committee’s report, similar to that found on the FAS website, “Procedures for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty (http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html), adapted as follows:

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

29. Page 5, Section III, paragraph 2:

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

Recommendation
Because more detailed information and clarification is needed, and a review of promotion process needs to be included, add the
following (adapted from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty:

“The summary letter to the candidate must include the recommendation that the LS dean is making to the FAS dean, including promotion and the length of reappointment (if that is the decision), and a signature block for the candidate.”

30. Page 5, paragraph 2, last sentence:

“The LS Dean will send a written recommendation to the FAS Dean, who will make the final decisions regarding reappointment.”

Recommendation
To ensure that the FAS Dean receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendation of the LS Dean, add the following (again adapting from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty:
( http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html )

“The LS Dean must forward the review packet to the FAS Dean along with the committee's recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”

31. Page 5, Section B. Process and Timetable, timeline:

Recommendation
Add language similar to:

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

32. Page 5, Section B. Process and Timetable, timeline:

Recommendation
Specify the grounds for and process of stopping the contract clock by adding language satisfying the following from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, page 6:

“Each school process for review of full-time multi-year contracts of three years or more, including promotion reviews, must include:...the grounds for stopping the contract clock for reasonable cause, e.g., medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, same-sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation;”
33. Page 5, Section C. Materials, list of materials:

“Two peer observations of teaching”

Recommendation
Clarify the process of peer observation by referring to the explanation provided in the LS “Guidelines for Review of Faculty for Contract Renewal, Appendix A, Guidelines for Peer Classroom Observation,” pgs. 11-12.

34. Page 5
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
C. Materials
Seventh Bullet

“Summary of professional, service, scholarly, and artistic activities and accomplishments during the appointment period”

Recommendation
Add “, provided by the candidate” for accuracy and consistency

“Summary of professional, service, scholarly, and artistic activities and accomplishments during the appointment period, provided by the candidate.”

35. Page 6
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
C. Materials continued
Eighth Bullet

“If appropriate, copies of publications and creative productions during the appointment period.”

Recommendation
Add “, provided by the candidate” for accuracy and consistency

“If appropriate, copies of publications and creative productions during the appointment period, provided by the candidate.”

36. Page 6, Section C. Materials, after 2nd full paragraph ending with “LS Dean.”

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

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

37. Page 6, paragraph 3:

“NOTE: A school-level grievance/appeal process for faculty who are not reappointed is being developed and will be added to this document when it has been approved by the Provost.”

Recommendation:
The grievance/appeal process, of crucial importance to the faculty, should be developed by the faculty and added to the Policy document before it is approved by the Provost.

The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, notes numerous requirements and procedures for the school grievance process, including specifying who may grieve, the grounds for grievances based on non-reappointment, as well as grievances related to other issues, the process of requesting the convening by the dean of the grievance committee, and the accessibility of that grievance policy to the faculty. The policy does not address any of this, while still developing new mechanisms and policies for appointment, reappointment and promotion.

Additionally, the development of this grievance process should be undertaken by the LS faculty and submitted to the Faculty Assembly for discussion and a vote by the faculty. The process of consideration by the Faculty Assembly must include the right to offer amendments, according to the assembly’s published procedures (i.e., Robert’s Rules), and the vote may occur during a regular assembly meeting or by electronic ballot, as the assembly may determine.

38. Page 6, Section IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty, sentence 2:

“In addition to the consideration of teaching, service activities, and professional, scholarly, and creative work, recommendations also may be based on a prognosis of the clinical faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of Liberal Studies and Global Liberal Studies.”

Recommendation:
Delete the above sentence. Substitute the following:

“Recommendations will be based on teaching, service activities, and
professional, scholarly, and creative work.”

Stating that recommendations will be based on “a prognosis of the clinical faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of Liberal Studies and Global Liberal Studies” is overly ambiguous and does not satisfy the following (from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014):

“each school shall set exacting standards embodying the highest levels of achievement that ensure the distinct excellence of the school’s educational and training programs.”

Basing a promotion on “dependability,” “growth,” “potential,” or “versatility” is not exacting, as terms such as these do not name objective standards for academic advancement.

39. Page 6
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
A. Review Committee

“The Review Committee for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor shall consist of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee. For review for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor. The committee will be chaired by the LS Dean, who does not vote.”

Recommendation
The review committees for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and to Clinical (Full) Professor should be comprised of at least five members. Because of inconsistent terminology for review committees used throughout the Policy the composition of the various review committees is unclear – see Substantive Issue #1

“The Review Committee for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor shall consist of the members of the Committee for Reappointment and Promotion. For review for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Committee for Reappointment and Promotion who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

40. Page 6
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
A. Review Committee
Recommendation
Specify that all votes of the Review Committee for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor shall be by secret ballot and that re-voting by that Committee shall occur only if new material becomes available.

41. Page 7
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
D. Materials

“In conducting its review, the review committee shall consider evidence of accomplishments in the areas of teaching, service, and professional activity.”

Recommendation
Include for consistency that for faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in reviews for promotion, as indicated in I. B. on page 2.

42. Page 7, Section D. Materials, sentence 1:

Recommendation
Add “for promotion” before the comma, so the sentence should read:

“In conducting its review for promotion, the review committee….”

43. Page 7
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
D. Materials
Second paragraph, bullet list items

Recommendation
Include in each bullet item where appropriate “, provided by the candidate” for accuracy and consistency with the bullet list in III. C.

44. Page 7, Section D, paragraph 3, penultimate line:

“referees (not nominated by the faculty member), if necessary in consultation with faculty in the candidate’s area of expertise.”

Recommendation
Delete “if necessary”; there is no explanation of when such consultation would or would not be necessary.

45. Page 7, Section D, paragraph 5, final sentence:
“A majority vote will be required to constitute a recommendation for promotion.”

**Recommendation**
Clarify the sentence and the process of voting by changing the sentence to read:

“Specify that all votes of the Review Committee for Promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor shall be by secret ballot and that re-voting by that Committee shall occur only if new material becomes available.”

46. Page 8:

“NOTE: A school-level grievance/appeal process for faculty who are not reappointed is being developed and will be added to this document when it has been approved by the Provost.”

**Recommendation:**
The grievance/appeal process, of crucial importance to the faculty, should be developed by the faculty and added to the Policy document before it is approved by the Provost.

The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, notes numerous requirements and procedures for the school grievance process, including specifying who may grieve, the grounds for grievances based on non-reappointment, as well as grievances related to other issues, the process of requesting the convening by the dean of the grievance committee, and the accessibility of that grievance policy to the faculty. The policy does not address any of this, while still developing new mechanisms and policies for appointment, reappointment and promotion.

Additionally, the development of this grievance process should be undertaken by the LS faculty and submitted to the Faculty Assembly for discussion and a vote by the faculty. The process of consideration by the Faculty Assembly must include the right to offer amendments, according to the assembly’s published procedures (i.e., Robert’s Rules), and the vote may occur during a regular assembly meeting or by electronic ballot, as the assembly may determine.

47. Page 9
Appendix: Transition Plan
I. Process
b. final sentence

“The change from Master Teacher to a clinical title at this time will not be
regarded as a promotion and will not bring with it a promotional salary increment."

Recommendation
As the declination of a promotional salary increment for Master Teachers who achieve a positive review for a Clinical title after the transition period appears to be punitive for not opting in or achieving Clinical title status during the transition period, particularly for those who receive a positive review for the title of Clinical Associate Professor of Clinical (Full) Professor, reconsider the declination of a promotional salary increment stipulation in these instances

48. Page 9, Section I. Process, paragraph d:

“An appointed committee (one senior clinical FAS faculty, one additional NYU faculty member [who may be clinical], and one member external to NYU, all appointed by the FAS Dean) reviews CVs etc…..”

Recommendation
Specify that the two NYU faculty members both be full-time, continuing faculty members. All of the faculty in Liberal Studies are continuing faculty members; NYU continuing faculty should constitute the majority of the appointed committee.

49. Page 10, paragraph 2 (Section f), sentences 1 and 2:

“Faculty who believe determination of rank to be incorrect will have a limited window to appeal to the FAS Dean. The Dean’s decision is final and there will be no further right of appeal.”

Recommendation
Clarify the length of the “limited window” for appeal to the FAS Dean.

Also, explicitly state the process of appeal to the FAS Dean.

50. Page 10, paragraph 3 (Section g):

“Faculty who opt for the initial review for Clinical Assistant Professor and subsequently are not deemed qualified for the entry level rank will continue on appointment as Master Teachers, and will be eligible for reappointment as Master Teachers.”

Recommendation
LS faculty currently on three- or more year appointments have been through a rigorous evaluation process, similar to that envisioned in this new policy, in order to attain the multi-year appointment. Add language such as:
“Current service as a Liberal Studies Master Teacher on a contract of three years or more should be regarded as automatically sufficient to qualify for the title of Clinical Assistant Professor.”

51. Page 10, Section II. Salary Adjustments, paragraph a:

“New baseline salaries will be established for each clinical rank.”

**Recommendation**
Specify, for current faculty considering opting into the new faculty structure, what the new baseline salaries for each rank will be.

52. Page 10, Section II. Salary Adjustments, paragraph b:

“Future promotions, i.e. those that take place after the completion of the transition process, will earn a promotion increment (TBD).”

**Recommendation**
Specify, for current faculty considering future promotions, what the new baseline salaries for each rank will be.

53. Page 10, Section II. Salary Adjustments, paragraph c:

“Those who continue as Master Teachers in future will receive AMI awards as appropriate, but no other salary increments, and will not be eligible for base line salary adjustments.”

**Recommendation**
The denial of further salary increments to LS faculty who do not opt into the new faculty structure seems punitive. If opting in is not a requirement, why are those faculty members denied further salary increments and base line salary adjustments? Change sentence to read:

“Those who continue as Master Teachers in future will receive AMI awards as appropriate, and other salary increments as appropriate, and will be eligible for base line salary adjustments.”

**Appendix A**

As noted in the above Background (page 1 of these Recommendations, paragraph 2) significant questions have been raised by LS faculty regarding the process of development of this policy, specifically the denial of LS faculty to meaningfully participate in its development through the ability to make amendments to and vote on the policy in the LS Faculty Assembly, the LS shared governance structure with published, clear rules of procedure. Denying the faculty a meaningful role in the establishment of school policy seems to deviate
from the spirit embodied in 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:

“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.”

We strongly recommend that any development of this policy follow the letter and the spirit contained in the above quote from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, allowing the LS faculty, acting, according to its charter, through its Faculty Assembly, an active, essential and meaningful role in forming and approving any new policy, which policy must necessarily include the grievance/appeal process.

Minor editorial issues:

1. Page 1
   I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty:
   “Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty in LS hold the title of Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical (Full) Professor; some faculty will retain the title, Master Teacher, as detailed in the Appendix.”

   Recommendation
   Change “Assistant Clinical Professor” and “Associate Clinical Professor” to, respectively, “Clinical Assistant Professor” and “Clinical Associate Professor” for consistency with the titles indicated in II. B

2. Page 3
   II. Appointments of Clinical Faculty
   A. Criteria
   First paragraph
   Third sentence:
   “Based on the discipline, a doctoral degree is not necessarily required to be a clinical faculty member.”

   Recommendation
   A doctoral degree cannot be required to be a clinical faculty member. Rearrange as:
   “Depending on the discipline, a clinical faculty member may not be required to hold a doctoral degree.”
3. Page 4, footnote 1

“Faculty on appointment before September 2015 who continue at the rank of Master Teacher will be reviewed using the same process and the same criteria as Clinical Assistant Professors. ”

Recommendation
Add “for”:

“Faculty on appointment before September 2015 who continue at the rank of Master Teacher will be reviewed using the same process and the same criteria as for Clinical Assistant Professors. ”

4. Page 4
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
A. The Review Committee
First Paragraph
First sentence:

“The Committee for reappointment and promotion will consist of three LS faculty elected by the LS FT faculty (at least two of whom will be [Full] Professors), two LS faculty appointed by the LS Dean (at least one of whom will be a [Full] Professor), and two non-LS outside members from FAS appointed by the FAS Dean, one of whom will be a Clinical [Full] Professor and one of whom will be tenured.”

Recommendations
Change both references to “[Full] Professors” to “Clinical [Full] Professors”

5. Page 4
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
A. The Review Committee
Second Paragraph
First sentence:

“For review for reappointment of Clinical (Full) Professors, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

Recommendation
Rephrase as:

“The performance review committee for reappointment of Clinical (Full) Professors shall be comprised of the members of the Committee for
Reappointment and Promotion who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

6. Page 5  
Second paragraph  
First sentence  

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

Recommendation  
Rephrase as:

“The LS Dean will provide the candidate with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s evaluation, the Dean’s own assessment, and the continuing programmatic need for the appointment.”

“Candidate” and “faculty member” are used interchangeably to indicate the person being considered for reappointment or promotion, even in the same context, throughout the document. For example, see the top of page 6.

For consistency, use only either “faculty member” or “candidate” throughout as applicable in context.

7. Page 5  
C. Materials  
Second paragraph  

“The review committee will consider the following as well as such other materials that the candidate may supply or the committee request:”

Recommendation  
Add comma after “following” and “may” after the second “committee”

8. Page 6  
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty  
A. Review Committee:  
Second sentence
“For review for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

Recommendation
To make parallel with the previous sentence, rephrase as:
“The review committee for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment and Promotions Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

9. Page 7
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
C. Criteria for Promotion
2. Criteria for Promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor
First sentence

“A clinical faculty member ordinarily should have spent at least twelve years as a full-time faculty member (with up to six years counting from full-time employment at other colleges or universities) and at least six as an Associate Professor, before applying for the rank of (full) Professor. Promotion requires sustained excellence in teaching, service and administration, artistic and professional activity, and peer recognition in the applicable field.”

Recommendation
For consistency, insert the word “Clinical” and capitalize “full” as:

“A clinical faculty member ordinarily should have spent at least twelve years as a full-time faculty member (with up to six years counting from full-time employment at other colleges or universities) and at least six as a Clinical Associate Professor, before applying for the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor. Promotion requires sustained excellence in teaching, service and administration, artistic and professional activity, and peer recognition in the applicable field.”

10. Page 9
Appendix: Transition Plan
I. Process
d. first sentence

Recommendation
Replace “clinical” with “Clinical”
11. Page 9
Appendix: Transition Plan
I. Process
d.
iii. first sentence

Recommendation
Add “Clinical” before (Full) Professors
April 23, 2015

Memorandum to: Ann Marie Mauro, Chair, N/C Faculty Senators Council
Raghu Sundaram, Chair, T-Faculty Senators Council

From: David W. McLaughlin, Provost

Subject: Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies
Full-time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty

Dean Tom Carew has completed a process within Liberal Studies to establish a Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies, working iteratively with my office and the Office of General Counsel.

As part of the process of finalizing the LS document, I am asking the N/C Faculty Senators Council and the T-Faculty Senators Council for review and comments. I understand that each Council may wish to submit a separate response. It also would be useful and would accelerate the review process if the Councils were able to submit a coordinated response, to the extent possible. As is our practice I will consider the Councils’ comments in consultation with the Faculty of Arts and Science before finalizing the document.

The attached Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, which was submitted by Dean Carew, was drafted by Dean Fred Schwarzbach in consultation with the FAS Dean’s office and the LS Steering Committee (whose members are all elected). Dean Carew advises me that the LS faculty had the opportunity to review and comment on an earlier draft that subsequently incorporated some minor edits to clarify meaning and to ensure conformity to the University Guidelines, but no substantive changes. The document includes an Appendix, which outlines a transition process that will allow qualified LS faculty to opt to be considered for clinical titles, but that also permits those who wish to remain Master Teachers to do so without penalty (though the title itself henceforth will not be used for new appointments).

Thank you for your prompt attention to this proposal. Please let me know if you have questions or concerns that we can address to facilitate your review.

Copy to: Tom Carew
Fred Schwarzbach
Katy Fleming
Carol Morrow
Ulrich Baer
Karyn Ridder
Attachment
Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies Full-time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty

This Policy Document is being implemented by Liberal Studies to supplement NYU policies applicable to full-time non-tenure track faculty. If any part of this Policy Document is inconsistent with NYU policies, then the NYU policies then in effect will control. As with all NYU and LS policies, this Policy Document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

Note 1: This document goes into effect [date of approval]. The Appendix to this Policy details the process and procedures by which faculty currently on appointment in Liberal Studies will be assigned titles and rank.

Note 2: Where this document references “the Dean” or “the LS Dean”, it refers to the Dean of Liberal Studies. Where this document references “the FAS Dean”, it refers to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Introduction:

Liberal Studies (LS) is committed to providing its students with an education that prepares them to advance knowledge, creativity and innovation. LS full-time faculty play a central role in this process. The primary responsibility of the LS faculty is a commitment to undergraduate education in LS and Global Liberal Studies (henceforth GLS). Below are policies and procedures that pertain to the responsibilities, titles, contracts, review, and promotion for the full-time faculty in the program.

The FAS Dean may make changes to these guidelines, in consultation with the Liberal Studies faculty.

I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty:

Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty in LS hold the title of Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical (Full) Professor; some faculty will retain the title, Master Teacher, as detailed in the Appendix. As the responsibilities of Liberal Studies faculty are both diverse and flexible in order to meet the ongoing and changing needs of the program, the following categories of responsibilities of LS faculty are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive:

A. Teaching

The standard teaching load for all full-time faculty is six courses per year. This may vary depending on other assigned duties or responsibilities. With the approval of the Dean, administrative and professional duties and other professional activities that serve the university or LS may substitute for one or more courses.

Clinical faculty are also expected to:

- Develop, create, and teach new courses and develop new curricula, where appropriate
- Engage in program review and revision, accreditation compliance, and assessment of curricula
- Advise and mentor students
• Serve, when asked, on senior thesis committees and, when appropriate, supervise independent studies

B. Service and Administration

Service and administration also are key components of faculty performance, and all faculty are expected to contribute in these areas. To this end, LS faculty must be familiar and comply with all relevant NYU, School, and program policies.

For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in both reappointment and promotion reviews.

Faculty may:

• Provide administrative service to the program (e.g. by serving on program committees, advising student activities, attending recruitment events, etc.)
• Serve on University committees
• Provide outreach to the community at large as a representative of the program
• Render service to local, state, national, and international professional organizations

C. Professional Activity

LS faculty are generally practitioners and/or experts in their fields, and it is expected that they will demonstrate continuing intellectual and scholarly engagement in their fields or continuing practice at a high level, as appropriate to the area of the appointment. In support of professional, scholarly, and creative work, each faculty member draws upon an individual Professional Development Account (currently at $2500 p.a.).

LS faculty may demonstrate this engagement and practice as follows:

• Produce scholarship and research, or applied scholarship and research, related to a specific discipline or practice
• Produce scholarship and research, or applied scholarship and research, related to the pedagogy of their field or profession
• Engage in professional development in their field by attending conferences, joining professional associations, giving lectures or performances at other institutions, serving on the advisory boards of journals
• Apply for and be awarded grants (serving as P.I. per university sponsored research guidelines and subject to university approval)
• Engage actively in practice in the field

D. Annual Activity Reports
LS Faculty will submit an Annual Activity Form, usually in March of each academic year, to report on their teaching, service, and professional development. This report will be used in the annual merit review.

II. Appointment of Clinical Faculty

A. Criteria

Clinical faculty are experienced teachers, practitioners, scholars, and/or artists in their area of specialization. In all cases, possession of the appropriate terminal degree and excellence in teaching is required. Based on the discipline, a doctoral degree is not necessarily required to be a clinical faculty member. In certain fields (e.g. creative writing), demonstrated excellence and peer recognition may stand as sufficient professional credentials, as specified in the letter of appointment.

Initial appointment (and reappointment) shall be based on an evaluation of the candidate’s contribution to the excellence of the program, including its education and training programs, and his or her role in the university’s commitment to appoint and retain the best faculty in all disciplines.

B. Titles

The definitions below are intended as a framework for initial appointments of faculty.

1. Clinical Assistant Professor of Liberal Studies

Faculty initially appointed at this rank have three years of superior teaching experience (which may have been as a graduate student and need not have been full-time) at a level of demonstrated excellence, and demonstrated or potential expertise and accomplishment in their discipline or area of practice.

2. Clinical Associate Professor of Liberal Studies

Faculty initially appointed or promoted at this rank normally possess a minimum of six years of demonstrated sustained excellence in relevant teaching and curriculum innovation, service and administrative roles, and professional activity. In addition, they may have produced relevant professional scholarly, creative work, or performance of a nationally or internationally recognized level.

3. Clinical (Full) Professor of Liberal Studies

Faculty initially appointed or promoted to this rank possess a minimum of twelve years of demonstrated excellence in relevant teaching and teaching innovation, service and administrative roles, and professional activity. In addition, they will have attained and will document national or international peer recognition through publication, grant awards, professional organizational service, or media exposure.

C. Terms of Appointments

Clinical faculty may be appointed as follows:

Specific terms are:

- One-year appointments: These are appointments made by the Dean and used primarily to address temporary programmatic needs (e.g. a leave or resignation). There is no expectation of renewal, though they may be renewed on an annual basis at the discretion of the Dean. N.B. If a faculty
member receives three continuous one-year appointments, a formal review, as defined below in Section III, shall take place in the third year as a condition for re-appointment. Reappointment is conditional upon continued programmatic need and available funding.

- Three-year appointments: These are the norm for clinical assistant professors. Faculty are reviewed for reappointment during the penultimate year of a contract. Subsequent appointments may be for one year or three years. (With respect to promotion and apart from reappointment, Assistant and Associate clinical faculty have the option to request review for promotion in the last year of the second three-year contract, or at any time thereafter.)

- Five-year appointments: Normally, five-year contracts are awarded only upon promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical (Full) Professor. Reviews for reappointment are in the penultimate year of the contract.

Note: There is no limit to the number of consecutive reappointments that faculty may receive.

III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty

This section sets out the process and criteria for performance reviews. A positive review establishes that a faculty member is eligible for reappointment: reappointment is subject to the academic and curricular needs of the program and the University. Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvements in academic programs. Appointments automatically terminate at the close of the period of time stipulated in the contract, unless there is an official notice of renewal.

Faculty reviews are an essential component of professional development for all faculty members and the following guidelines and reappointment criteria are designed to enable faculty to gain valuable feedback, enhance their skills and experience, and contribute to the success of Liberal Studies.

A. The Review Committee

The Committee for reappointment and promotion will consist of three LS faculty elected by the LS FT faculty (at least two of whom will be [Full] Professors), two LS faculty appointed by the LS Dean (at least one of whom will be a [Full] Professor), and two non-LS outside members from FAS appointed by the FAS Dean, one of whom will be a Clinical [Full] Professor and one of whom will be tenured. The committee will be chaired by the LS Dean, who does not vote. No faculty member may serve on the committee in the year in which his or her contract expires. All LS committee members must be on a five-year contract and hold the rank of Associate or (Full) Clinical Professor.

For review for reappointment of Clinical (Full) Professors, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.

---

1 Faculty on appointment before September 2015 who continue at the rank of Master Teacher will be reviewed using the same process and the same criteria as Clinical Assistant Professors.

2 Faculty currently holding five-year contracts remain eligible for five-year contracts regardless of rank. See the Appendix that addresses transition issues.
The committee will review each candidate’s portfolio and other relevant documentation as is made available. The committee will prepare a written review for the LS Dean that summarizes and evaluates the evidence of accomplishment, notes areas that require improvement, and makes a recommendation regarding reappointment. In order for a successful review, the candidate must demonstrate excellence in the area of teaching, and, in addition, either service or professional activity.

The LS Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s evaluation, as well as his or her own assessment and continuing programmatic need for the appointment. The LS Dean will send a written recommendation to the FAS Dean, who will make the final decisions regarding reappointment.

B. Process and Timeline

The performance review will occur in the penultimate year of the contract. Each clinical faculty scheduled for review is required to submit a portfolio, whose contents are detailed in Section III.C. below. The timeline is as follows:

- Submission of portfolio – on or around February 1
- Review Committee recommendation to Dean – on or around March 1
- Dean’s preliminary notification to candidate – on or around April 1
- Dean’s recommendation and committee recommendation submitted to Dean of FAS – on or around April 10
- FAS Dean’s decision communicated to candidate in writing – on or around May 1

C. Materials

In conducting its review, the review committee shall consider evidence of accomplishments in the areas of teaching, service, and professional activity.

The review committee will consider the following as well as such other materials that the candidate may supply or the committee request:

- A statement of teaching philosophy, provided by the candidate
- Student evaluations of teaching during the most recent appointment, provided by the program
- Two peer observations of teaching
- Supplementary teaching materials (such as syllabi, assignments, etc.), provided by the candidate
- The current C.V., provided by the candidate
- All previous review and promotion committee recommendations and all previous dean’s recommendations
- Summary of professional, service, scholarly, and artistic activities and accomplishments during the appointment period
• If appropriate, copies of publications and creative productions during the appointment period

The committee may also request other materials and data from the candidate.

The committee’s written review should specifically indicate the strengths of the faculty member under consideration in relation to school and program criteria. Where there are weaknesses, the review committee may suggest courses of action to improve performance; these are conveyed to the faculty member in writing by the LS Dean.

NOTE: A school-level grievance/appeal process for faculty who are not reappointed is being developed and will be added to this document when it has been approved by the Provost.

IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty

The review processes and criteria for promotion are summarized below. In addition to the consideration of teaching, service activities, and professional, scholarly, and creative, work, recommendations also may be based on a prognosis of the clinical faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of Liberal Studies and Global Liberal Studies.

For promotion to Clinical Associate and Clinical (Full) Professor, external references will be solicited.

A. Review Committee: The Review Committee for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor shall consist of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee. For review for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor. The committee will be chaired by the LS Dean, who does not vote.

B. Timeline:

• Preliminary notification by the candidate of application for promotion – on or around November 1

• Submission of portfolio – on or around February 1

• Review Committee recommendation to Dean – on our around March 1

• Dean’s preliminary notification to candidate – on or around April 1

• Dean’s recommendation and committee recommendation submitted to Dean of FAS – on or around April 10

• FAS Dean’s decision communicated to candidate in writing – on our around May 1

C. Criteria for Promotion

1. Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

A clinical faculty member ordinarily should have spent at least six years at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor (with up to three years counting from full-time employment at other colleges or universities) to be eligible for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor in the clinical faculty of Liberal Studies. Promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor requires sustained excellence in teaching and also
recognizes the impact of service and administration, and artistic and professional activity. In rare instances, an initial appointment may be made at the rank of Associate Professor.

2. Criteria for Promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor

A clinical faculty member ordinarily should have spent at least twelve years as a full-time faculty member (with up to six years counting from full-time employment at other colleges or universities) and at least six as an Associate Professor, before applying for the rank of (full) Professor. Promotion requires sustained excellence in teaching, service and administration, artistic and professional activity, and peer recognition in the applicable field. Expectations for excellence in professional activities, however, must take into account the teaching load and administrative/service duties of the faculty member. In rare instances, an initial appointment may be made at the rank of (Full) Professor.

D. Materials

In conducting its review, the review committee shall consider evidence of accomplishments in the areas of teaching, service, and professional activity.

The review committee will consider the following as well as such other materials that the candidate may supply or the committee request:

- A statement of teaching philosophy
- Student evaluations of teaching during the most recent appointment
- Two peer observations of teaching
- Supplementary teaching materials (such as syllabi, assignments, etc.)
- The current C.V.
- All previous review and promotion committee recommendations and all previous dean’s recommendations
- Summary of professional, service, scholarly, and artistic activities and accomplishments during the appointment period
- Copies of publications and creative productions during the appointment period

External references will be solicited to assist in the evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship, creative work, or professional achievement, as appropriate to the appointment. Candidates will propose a list of three referees, one of whom will be selected by the LS Dean; the LS Dean will select two additional referees (not nominated by the faculty member), if necessary in consultation with faculty in the candidate’s area of expertise.

The committee may also request other materials and data from the candidate.

The committee’s written review should indicate specifically the strengths of the faculty member under consideration in relation to school and program criteria, and will recommend that the candidate be promoted or not promoted. A majority vote will be required to constitute a recommendation for promotion.
NOTE: A school-level grievance/appeal process for faculty who are denied promotion is being developed and will be added to this document when it has been approved by the Provost.
APPENDIX: TRANSITION PLAN

NOTE: These plans are provisional, pending review by the appropriate senate councils and approval by the Office of the Provost.

I. Process

a. Upon approval of the policy, all faculty may opt into a preliminary review of credentials according to the criteria for appointment as Clinical Assistant Professor. Upon review of this policy by the relevant senate councils and approval by the Provost, those who qualify, are appointed to the clinical rank either as of 1 September 2015 or the later date of approval. Those who do not qualify remain Master Teachers. [Those who do not opt in also remain Master Teachers.]

b. Those faculty who elect to remain as Master Teachers or are designated as such in their initial review remain eligible for further reappointments. After the completion of the transition process (provisionally 1 January 2017), any Master Teacher who wishes to be considered for a Clinical appointment will need to be reviewed according to the published procedures and judged against the criteria for that appointment. The change from Master Teacher to a clinical title at this time will not be regarded as a promotion and will not bring with it a promotional salary increment.

c. Further review for assignment to the senior ranks will be staged: review for promotion to Clinical Full Professor in Fall 2015, and review for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor in Summer or Fall 2016. [Thus by the end of AY2016-17 the transition process is complete.]

d. An appointed committee (one senior clinical FAS faculty, one additional NYU faculty member [who may be clinical], and one member external to NYU, all appointed by the FAS Dean) reviews CVs etc. for all current FT faculty who opt into review process for the senior ranks and determines those who qualify. Faculty will submit a docket in a predetermined format.

i. There will be a single committee convened for the Clinical Full Professor review.

ii. Those who are not deemed qualified for Clinical Full Professor appointment remain Clinical Assistant Professors and may request review for the rank of Clinical Associate Professor in the next phase of the review.

iii. The initial Clinical Associate Professor review will be conducted by a newly formed Promotion Committee, constituted as in Section IV.A. above, whose LS members will be (Full) Professors.

iv. Those who are not deemed qualified for Clinical Associate Professor appointment remain at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor.
e. Current faculty will be judged against new criteria for promotion to each rank (i.e. including length of service and additional qualifications, e.g. research/scholarship/publications).

f. Faculty who believe determination of rank to be incorrect will have a limited window to appeal to the FAS Dean. The Dean’s decision is final and there will be no further right of appeal. [N.B. Faculty can also request a promotional review at a future date via the new process and procedures after the transition process has been completed.]

g. Faculty who opt for the initial review for Clinical Assistant Professor and subsequently are not deemed qualified for the entry level rank will continue on appointment as Master Teachers, and will be eligible for reappointment as Master Teachers.

h. After the transition period ends on enter the date, any Master Teacher who wishes to be considered for a Clinical appointment will need to be reviewed according to the published procedures and judged against the criteria then in effect.

II. Salary adjustments

a. New baseline salaries will be established for each clinical rank. Those who already earn above the baseline salary will not have salaries adjusted; those below will be raised to the baseline. The salary adjustments for those at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor will be effective at the date that titles are awarded. Salary adjustments for those at the rank Clinical (Full) Professor will be effective on the date those titles are awarded (provisionally 1 January 2016). Salary adjustments for those at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor will be effective on the date those titles are awarded (TBD).

b. Future promotions, i.e. those that take place after the completion of the transition process, will earn a promotion increment (TBD).

c. Those who continue as Master Teachers in future will receive AMI awards as appropriate, but no other salary increments, and will not be eligible for base line salary adjustments.

III. Moving Forward:

a. All future hires, reviews, and reappointments will be governed by the new policy.

b. Those who remain as Master Teachers will be reviewed in the future by the new committee and held to the performance standards for Clinical Assistant Professor.

c. If a faculty member holding the title of Master Teacher applies for promotion after the transition period, full-time service as a Master Teacher will be counted toward the requisite years in rank.
C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL
Retreat
September 18, 2015
10am-4pm

The first retreat of the C-FSC was held on Friday September 18, 2015. The meeting was attended by 27 Senators and Alternates. Additionally, senators that could not attend were able to participate by sending responses to our discussion questions before the retreat.

Our first discussion focused on the question, “What most drives or concerns me as a human being who is a professor?” Some of the issues discussed during this session were student disengagement and distrust of the University. The importance of supporting our first generation students. The cost of education for our students. There is also concern about faculty evaluations and the importance of student evaluations which are now online.

The discussion of “What most drives or concerns me as a member of the NYU Global University community?” produced several issues which can be addressed by the C-FSC GNU committee. Questions about the treatment and hiring practices of faculty particularly at the non-portal sites were raised. It was expressed that this is important because these faculty are our colleagues but also because we are trusting them to provide quality education to our students. It is also important that there is monitoring of the quality of the courses being offered abroad. There is also interest in how to increase continuing faculty involvement in the abroad and portal campuses, and from the students perspective how can we make studying abroad affordable to all students. A third area of discussion was the challenge of protecting human rights across the GNU.

During the discussion of, “What most drives or concerns me in my school or division?”, we broke into three groups focused on: the role of technology, concerns about training our students in liberal arts and for life after NYU, and faculty equity. More specifically, technology in the classroom should be faculty driven and not forced. If a faculty member wants to add new technology into the classroom there needs to be support to make those enhancements. The group discussing student training is interested in how to rehabilitate arts, meaning reminding people of the value of liberal arts. The faculty equity group discussed some of the various issues that vary around the University, and how do we get a comprehensive view of how continuing faculty are treated. There was also a discussion about the importance of making sure continuing faculty know what their rights are, and that a “know you rights document would be helpful”.

The final wrap up session facilitated by Fred Carl was a summary of the issues discussed throughout the day and led to action items for the C-FSC to take on this year. The first is a comprehensive survey of the continuing faculty to provide us with data on the roles, treatment, best practices in relation to continuing faculty. This will allow us to assess the state of shared governance around the University, and hopefully highlight key issues that will need to be addressed in the future. It will also mentioned that the questions we ask will also serve as a way of communicating with a constituents. This will likely require the creation of an ad-hoc committee to develop the survey and analyze the data. Another action item was the potential formation of a diversity committee.