MINUTES OF THE T-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF DECEMBER 11, 2014

The New York University Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, December 11, 2014 in in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Grand Hall.

In attendance were Senators Allgood, Alter, Amkpa, Antoon, Appiah, Backus, Becker, Chan, Diner, Disotell, Goodwin, Jacobs, Jelinek, Kamer, Kane, Ling, Miller, Mincer, Pearce, Porfiri, Rajagopal, Smith, Stanhope, Sundaram, Zwanziger; Active Alternates Archer, Drysdale, Hill, Hurbis-Cherrier, and Pearce; Alternate Senators Samuels (for Adelman), Swislocki (for Klimke, by phone), Reiss, and Tannenbaum; and Past Chair Magder. FSC Former Chairs Al-Askari, Lebowitz; and Former Members Moskowitz and Raiken attended as guests.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD NOVEMBER 6, 2014

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the November 6, 2014 meeting were approved as corrected.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS: CANDIDATES FOR FSC CHAIRPERSON, 2015-2016

Chairperson Sundaram announced the members of the Nominating Committee: David Backus, Maurizio Porfiri, and Dan Zwanziger. The Committee called for nominations, including self-nominations, for the position of Chairperson, 2015-2016.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: RAGHU SUNDARAM

Communication with Faculty

Chairperson Sundaram reported the Executive Committee discussed how to improve the communication process with all faculty. The EC requested half-year reports, no more than a page, from all Committee Chairs detailing the Committee’s work and future plans. These reports will be posted on the T-FSC website and also sent via email to all faculty.

Meeting with University Admissions Group

See attached Document E: Admission Group documents.

Sundaram reported the Educational Policies & Faculty/Student Relations Committee Co-Chairs and he met with members of the Admission Office to gather information on the admissions process. The group received three documents: an Executive Summary of the NYU Undergraduate Admission Process, University Financial Aid and Debt Trends, and Freshman Transfer Information.
Sundaram stated the Committee will organize a follow-up meeting to discuss the information in more detail. He encouraged Senators to review the documents and send any questions on the data to the Committee.

Sundaram noted the Committee asked for specific data on school level applications and admissions. They were informed this information requires the Dean’s consent to be disseminated. He encouraged Senators discuss with their school’s Dean.

Sundaram noted Bob Berne will be attending the January Council meeting to discuss the proposal to establish a "Faculty of Health" comprised of the College of Dentistry, the College of Nursing and a new college to be established: the "College of Global Public Health". He asked the Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Committee to review and comment on the proposal and develop questions to submit to Bob Berne prior to the meeting. He also asked for representatives from Nursing and Dental to be included on the Committee.

**FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Governance: Committee Co-Chair Mitchell Kane**

**T-FSC Officer Rules**

*See attached Document A: FSC Rule Changes.*

Secretary Kane presented the Committee’s three proposals to modify the T-FSC rules relating to officers. The proposals were discussed at the November meeting, but no formal vote took place.

The first proposal is that officer elections be moved forward by two months. The second proposal is that the immediate Past Officers: Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary, serve on the Executive Committee for one year without voting privileges. Both proposals are in an attempt to achieve greater continuity and better transition.

The third proposal addresses the issue if an Officer-elect is in the third year of his or her term. Under the current rules, a Chair-elect who fails to win re-election to the T-FSC would then be nominated to serve as a Senator-at-Large, however the Senator-at-Large positions were eliminated last year. The proposal is a Senator in any year of his/her term may run for election as an Officer, and if in the final year of his or her term, then such term will automatically be extended for a year. In no event, however, may a Senator’s term be extended by more than two years under this provision.

A Senator proposed an amendment to insert "school" before election and change “covering” to “normally scheduled”, to clarify the language. The following amendment to the motion was moved and seconded.

**Primary Amendment to Main Motion:**

If the Chair-elect or Vice Chair-elect or Secretary-elect is in final year of his/her Senatorial term, then his/her term will automatically be extended by one year and the school election normally scheduled for that Senator’s seat will be postponed for one year.

A Senator asked how Alternate seats would be handled in this case. It was noted that the rules suggest a particular Alternate is tied to a particular Senator, but in some schools this is not considered to be the case. It was questioned whether the Alternate would stand for re-election as well. No amendment on this matter was proposed.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the following resolution was approved unanimously by vote of the Council:
Resolution:

IT IS RESOLVED: That the T-Faculty Senators Council approved changes to the Rules of Procedure, which advance the elections of officers by two months, and have immediate past officers serve for a year without vote on the succeeding Executive Committee (EC). Furthermore, if a Senator is elected to the EC in his/her third year, his/her term on the FSC would be automatically extended by one year and the school election normally scheduled for that Senator’s seat will be postponed for one year. In no event, however, may a Senator’s term be extended by more than two years under this provision.

Administration & Technology: Committee Co-Chairs Arthur Miller & Carol Reiss

University Access to Personal Digital Content

See attached Document B: Access to Personal Digital Content documents.

The Committee report was postponed to a later meeting.

A Senator commented on the T-FSC recommendation that the Senate take the necessary steps to establish the Oversight Committee as described in the new policy on University Access to Personal Data Content (PDC), as soon as the policy is put into effect and not after the end of the 2014/2015 academic year.

The Senator suggested modifying the deadline of establishing the committee to “before the policy becomes effective”.

The discussion and report were postponed to a later meeting.

Global Network University (GNU): Committee Co-Chairs Awam Amkpa & Arvind Rajagopal

Senator Amkpa reported the GNU Committee, which now has representatives from the Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Senators Council (N/C-FSC), met and affirmed the report by the University’s Faculty Advisory Committee on the Global Network. The Committee also supports the recent proposal to establish a new Global Network Faculty. See attached Document F: Global Network Faculty Proposal. The Committee advised that provisions be made to spell out the rights and responsibilities of such faculty, including grievance procedures, and have agreed to write the recommendation as an addendum to the proposal on GNU faculty. The university, in consultation with both the T-FSC and the Advisory Committee on the Global Network, has set up a website: Faculty in the Global Network that highlights information on the GNU infrastructure, teaching and research facilities, as well as coordinated hiring processes within NYU.

The Committee also met with Vice Chancellor Linda Mills, Senior Vice Provost Matthew Santirocco and Vice President Nancy Morrison to discuss the operations of the Global Network University. Though satisfied with the partnerships and affiliations fostered between departments and the Global sites in curriculum committees, the Committee remains concerned that the processes for faculty engagement are uneven and so far unsatisfactory.

The Committee’s focus is on oversight of academic freedoms that ensures the production and circulation of knowledge through research, teaching, intra-mural and extra-mural activities are supported at the Portals and academic sites. The connectivity promised by the GNU also warrants ensuring the basic
rights and responsibilities of faculty at the Portal and academic sites further enhances this important goal. The Committee has sought clarification and possible revisions of the GNU organizational plan, particularly with regard to the ways in which its operations interface with the Office of the Provost, which safeguards such academic freedoms. Operating the GNU without robust provostial supervision and oversight threatens faculty governance issues, processes for hiring, and grievances as articulated within the provisions of the faculty handbook and university by-laws. The Committee has requested information on labor laws pertinent to conditions of hiring faculty at the academic sites in order to develop a common understanding of the basic rights of such faculty and make appropriate recommendations to the T-FSC’s Governance committee. Such understanding will also complement iterations of the faculty handbook at the Portals. Furthermore, the Committee is requesting clarity on the extent of integration of the provostial units in New York, Abu Dhabi and Shanghai. This is especially important to verifying oversights of the broad mosaic of the university’s curriculum.

The Committee will continue to seek information and clarifications on faculty benefits and will advocate for a comprehensive policy on benefits.

The labor issues at Abu Dhabi and Shanghai continue to be of grave concern to the Committee. The University and its partner at Abu Dhabi appointed Nardello and Co. to investigate labor issues that arose during the construction of the Saadiyat campus. That investigation is still in progress. The Committee has also been relaying faculty concerns over the Shanghai campus and are aware that a report that addresses monitoring and compliance mechanisms at the site is forthcoming. While these investigations and interventions indicate the University’s commitment to ensuring a well-structured system for the GNU, the Committee does not think they sufficiently address the T-FSC’s previous request for a more thorough monitoring mechanism that can pre-empt as well as adequately address anomalies. The Committee continues to be concerned about erosions of confidence caused by reports and allegations of irregularities concerning various monitoring agencies, and hope that the university will adopt a more collaborative approach to address these concerns.

The Committee commends recent faculty and student projects and activities focused on labor issues at Abu Dhabi. The collaborations between students and faculty in Abu Dhabi and New York are exemplary and the Committee hopes the university will provide facilities and resources that will make such enterprises part of the important frameworks for global education.

The Committee will be presenting a more detailed report which includes activities and actions of the committee within the GNU. In addition, the Committee plans to solicit the input of students and faculty across NYU’s home and portal campuses on the subject of GNU.

The Committee is following up regularly with the President’s Office on the status of the NYU investigations and hopes to have Nardello and Co. make a report at a Council or Senate meeting. Senator Klimke will report at a future meeting on the Abu Dhabi faculty’s view of the situation. It was also suggested to invite a presenter from Abu Dhabi at the teach-in to make a report.

Regarding the Proposal for a New Faculty Title: Global Network Faculty, a Senator inquired if mentoring graduate students included dissertation supervision, and if so, how it aligns with associated faculty appointments. Amkpa clarified he believes it does include dissertation supervision, but does not replace that of associated faculty appointments. It expands the pool of faculty who are engaged in dissertation supervision.

The Committee will also seek clarification whether Shanghai and Abu Dhabi report to the Provost as the chief academic officer of the University.
NEW BUSINESS

NYU Health Realignment Working Group Conclusions: Carol Reiss

Alternate Senator Reiss reported she served on this committee not as a T-FSC representative, but as a representative from the Faculty of Arts and Science. The committee is comprised of representatives involved in teaching or clinical aspects of global public health from Wagner, Steinhardt, Dentistry, School of Medicine, Nursing, Arts and Science, Social Work, etc. Reiss reported the most successful public health groups within major universities are independent schools of health and not a department, division, or an institute. The University needs to expand the curriculum, expertise, and the numbers of faculty involved in this area. All faculty to be hired will be tenured/tenure track faculty and three new areas of the curriculum will be developed.

The new College of Global Public Health will be closely associated with the College of Dentistry and College of Nursing and there is a plan for a Dean of all of three schools to be appointed and involved in curriculum, tenure decisions, and finances.

As Sundaram mentioned in the Report from the Chairperson, the Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Committee will review the full proposal to establish a “Faculty of Health” comprised of the College of Dentistry, the College of Nursing and a new college to be established: the "College of Global Public Health”.

Tenure and Economic Security

Chairperson Sundaram provided background on this topic. He stated the School of Medicine (SOM) modified their compensation policy to allow for a reduction in salaries of faculty who were not being research productive, subject to a base level below which the salaries could not be cut.

At various points in time, the FSC has passed resolutions regarding the SOM faculty salary policy. See attached Document D: Resolutions regarding Tenure at SOM. The resolutions present the past history of this policy.

The Faculty Handbook states (Title I.II):

“Academic tenure is a means to certain ends, specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research; and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession of teaching attractive to men and women of ability.”

A Committee was appointed to examine the meaning of economic security. The first Committee in 2013 failed to submit a report. In May 2014 a Committee was again appointed to study the question. The members included Senators McIlwain, Backus, Uleman and Jelinek.

The Committee’s charge was to clarify the meaning of economic security and identify what features of a compensation process are inconsistent with providing economic security. The School of Medicine framed the discussion but the charge was to focus on this as a broader issue.

Chairperson Sundaram stated the important connection between tenure and research, commenting tenure is the bedrock of the research model. He noted the privilege of job security. He also noted the difference in salaries between tenured faculty and contract faculty. He mentioned it can be viewed that half of a tenured faculty salary is for research. He noted the issue of tenured faculty who are no longer engaged in the University.
He framed the discussion around (1) what do faculty owe their colleagues? and (2) what do faculty owe the university in exchange for the privilege of tenure? He stated the challenge of reduced teaching loads of tenured/tenure-track faculty with the focus being more on research, and with more students and classes the push to hire more non-tenure track faculty to teach.

A Senator commented that every school is different.

A Senator stated that faculty wish to be treated well by the university and also wish to produce enough value that the university has in its interest to retain tenure. He posed the question of how do tenured and tenure track faculty members convince the university they are generating value.

A Senator stated the origin of the statement on academic freedom and economic security comes from a 1940 statement from the AAUP.

He commented on the differences between medical schools and new policies on tenure, productivity metrics, and salary. For instance, Columbia Medical School does not have tenure. Some medical schools have grandfathered existing faculty at the time they introduced a change in policy, including Yale and Dartmouth.

He read a sentence from the 1999 AAUP report on tenure in the medical school, concerning salary reduction policies in medical schools: “unilateral administrative aggregation of a portion of that salary, absent to prior understanding as to the extent of the guarantee may reasonably be interpreted not as an exercise of fiduciary responsibility but as an attack on the principles of tenure.”

Regarding the faculty's responsibility for bringing in a portion of his or her salary, he read from Document D:

11. At the 1996 conference of the AAMC [Association of American Medical Colleges] in Washington, Mr. Andrew Schaffer, a distinguished lawyer, a Vice President on legal affairs at NYU and head of its legal department stated that except for cause, financial exigency, program termination or it can be convincingly demonstrated that it is clearly understood by faculty members and the institution that salary is composed of parts, Courts in most States ruled that tenure includes Full Salary.

He stated when the SOM instituted letters of agreement between new hires, the letters stated that new research faculty would require to bring in 50% of their research salary. In this case there was a definition of salary as composed of parts. Before 1998, there was no mention of bringing in a portion of your salary.

The Senator referenced a taskforce convened to examine the policy and make recommendations about salaries in the medical school. The Committee made a report in 2004 and recommended that salaries could be reduced and that research faculty be responsible for bringing a portion of their salaries. However it was recommended, those faculty members hired before the institution of this policy be excluded from this policy.

The Senator mentioned there was a base salary recommended by the Academic Excellence Commission of $65,000, going up in rank from assistant professor to $75,000 and then $85,000. There was a reconsideration of a base salary by the faculty council at the SOM, and the council voted on a base salary of the 25th percentile of all research faculty at medical schools in the northeastern section of the United States, which when instituted in 2012 was $144,000 dollars for full professors. The SOM Council stated the approval of the base salary was not an implicit recommendation on salary reduction.

A Senator clarified the maximum reduction of a faculty member’s salary was 20%, per year. And if a faculty member’s salary is reduced, when he/she applies for a grant, the salary amount recorded on the grant is current salary, not previous salary.
A Senator commented this is a complicated issue and it is difficult to separate from the medical school context. He commented the SOM has a completely different model regarding research than, for instance, FAS or the Silver School. He remarked on the challenge of discussing this as a university wide policy, and also the challenge of the Council discussing a medical school policy without more information about medical schools in general.

A Senator commented on the challenge of framing the question of economic security between different disciplines that might have a better ability to bring in income outside of academia.

A Senator stated he was a tenured faculty member at the Medical School for 45 years, was on the founding committee for the Faculty Council at the Medical School, chaired the Benefits and Tenure committee at the Medical School for 30 years, and chaired the FSC Tenure Modifications Committee for 18 years. He submitted the 12 exhibits in Document D. He stated tenure equals full salary as decided by the court in the 1979 resolution. He stated tenure is a university issue, not a local issue.

A Senator stated that while schools are different, he believes the universal principle should be that before a person's salary is reduced, that some negotiation take effect. In terms of negotiation, he stated there needs to be a vigorous examination of other avenues of productivity of the tenured faculty member.

The Senator stated as NYU has become more predominantly a research university, the tenured/tenure track faculty have become less involved in areas such as student advising. Contract faulty have been taking over the administrative responsibilities. He used this as an example of different avenues of productivity.

A Senator stated in the policy established at the SOM, faculty may be given other responsibilities to make up for the requisite amount of salary from external sources. He commented it is unfortunately administered capriciously in that some people are given jobs but are then required to sign a change of responsibility letter, which contains a statement that they agree to have their salary reduced. If this job is taken away the next year, then their salary is reduced.

A Senator commented that when a person in an organization is not performing to the job description, it is the supervisor's responsibility, not the colleague's responsibility, to police that individual. If a faculty member is not performing up to his/her job description, the department chair and/or administrative dean should have some mechanism in place to handle the issue.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
Report of the Governance Committee

Clarifying the Wording of Changes in FSC Rules of Procedure Already Agreed Upon

At the last FSC meeting, we discussed a set of changes to our election Rules of Procedure. They advanced the elections of officers by two months, and have immediate past officers serve for a year without vote on the succeeding Executive Committee (EC). Furthermore, if a Senator is elected to the EC in his/her third year, his/her term on the FSC would be automatically extended by one year. This would reduce new representation from his/her school on the FSC by one seat for that fourth year, so that FSC membership remains constant.

However, one paragraph (III.2.e.) was unclear in implementing this intention, and was sent back to the Governance Committee. It read as follows:

“FSC members in any year of their term are eligible for election to the position of Chair, Vice Chair, or Secretary. In the rare instance that the Chair-elect or Vice Chair-elect or Secretary-elect is in his/her third year of the three year Senatorial term and is re-elected for one of these offices (with its one-year term), then his/her Senatorial term will be automatically extended to a fourth year, and the election for his/her replacement on the FSC will be postponed for a year.”

The Governance Committee unanimously recommends that the following paragraph replace III.2.e. in our Rules of Procedure.

“FSC members in any year of their term are eligible for election to the position of Chair, Vice Chair, or Secretary. If the Chair-elect or Vice Chair-elect or Secretary-elect is in the final year of his/her Senatorial term, then his/her term will automatically be extended by one year and the election covering that Senator’s seat will be postponed for one year. In no event, however, may a Senator’s term be extended by more than two years under this provision.”

In addition, we recommend a tiny change in paragraph III.2.a, for clarity. The change is in brackets and takes the place of the struck out word.

“Nominating Committee: The Executive Committee shall appoint a Nominating Committee at the start of the fall semester to consist of 3 members of the Council in the second year of their current [first] terms or the first or second year of any successive terms.”
Here are the relevant sections of our Rules of Procedure with changes incorporated.

III. Officers

2. Nominations

(a) Nominating Committee: The Executive Committee shall appoint a Nominating Committee at the start of the fall semester to consist of 3 members of the Council in the second year of their first terms or the first or second year of any successive terms.

(c) The Nominating Committee should make every effort to prepare a list of at least two candidates for the position of Chair-elect. The list of candidates will be announced in the notice prior to the November meeting.

(d) The Nominating Committee should make every effort to prepare a list of at least two candidates for the position of Vice Chair and Secretary. The list of candidates will be announced in the notice prior to the February meeting.

(e) FSC members in any year of their term are eligible for election to the position of Chair, Vice Chair, or Secretary. If the Chair-elect or Vice Chair-elect or Secretary-elect is in the final year of his/her Senatorial term, then his/her term will automatically be extended by one year and the election covering that Senator’s seat will be postponed for one year. In no event, however, may a Senator’s term be extended by more than two years under this provision.

(f) No person may serve as Chair for more than two academic years without interruption. There is no lifetime limit.

3. Elections

(a) The Chair-elect shall be elected by secret ballot at the November meeting and will sit with the Executive Committee thereafter.

(b) The Vice Chair and the Secretary shall be elected by secret ballot at the March meeting.

4. Terms of Service.

(a) The Chair-elect, Vice Chair-elect, and Secretary-elect will assume their offices following the May meeting of the Council and serve until the following May.

(b) To ensure continuity, the Past Chair, Past Vice Chair, and Past Secretary will continue to serve on the Executive Committee without voting privileges for one year, even if they have completed their elected terms of office as Faculty Senators.
FSC Advisory on Electronic Access Policy
To: David McLaughlin, Provost
From: Raghu, Allen, Mitchel and the T-FSC
Date: TBD

Re: Creation of a Senate Access to Personal Data Content Oversight Committee

The FSC recommends that Senate take the necessary steps to establish the Oversight Committee as described in the new policy on University Access to Personal Data Content (PDC), as soon as the policy is put into effect and not after the end of the 2014/2015 academic year.

Without limiting the committee’s discretion to pursue its charge, FSC also recommends that the committee address the following issues that have been raised during the drafting of the PDC policy.

1. Make available to the University community a detailed description of the distinction between data and metadata, with clear examples of each

2. Make available to the University community a detailed description of how standard encryption procedures may or may not shield either data or metadata from monitoring.

3. Make available to the University community a detailed description of when and how non-NYU email accounts, devices or networks used by University members could be monitored.

4. Make available to the University community a detailed description of how NYU is obligated to respond to lawful requests for information from external authorities, including how these obligations may differ across the GNU.
New York University
UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Title: University Access to Personal Digital Content
Effective Date: [date], 2014
Supersedes: New Policy
Issuing Authority: Executive Vice President, Finance and Information Technology
Responsible Officer: Chief Information Technology Officer

Policy

It is the policy of New York University, including its Schools and other units, Global Network University sites, and all University Affiliates (together “NYU”), that NYU limits the circumstances under which NYU will access, disseminate, and use Personal Digital Content (“PDC”, as defined in this policy) of NYU faculty, students, and staff, and that NYU be transparent about those circumstances and its related procedures.

NYU recognizes that as faculty, students, and staff increasingly create, receive, use, transmit, and store information in digital form — as opposed to traditional media (e.g., print materials, file cabinets, etc.) — there is growing concern that such information may be more vulnerable to unintended or inappropriate use. At the same time, NYU appreciates and affirms that NYU faculty, students, and staff have an expectation of privacy that is important to fulfilling NYU’s commitment to academic freedom (as set forth in the Faculty Handbook), and its commitment to respect in its relationships with faculty, students, and staff (as set forth in the New York University Code of Ethical Conduct).

Purpose of this Policy

The purpose of this policy is to establish internal standards and procedures governing NYU’s access to, and dissemination and use of, PDC to achieve the above-stated policy objectives. This policy is grounded on six important principles:

- Access to, and dissemination and use of, PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff will be authorized only by an appropriate and accountable person, pursuant to NYU’s Policy on Requests to Information Technology (NYU IT) to Support Investigations, and through a specific and formal process.
- Access to, and dissemination and use of, PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff will occur only for a legitimate NYU purpose, as set forth in this policy.
• Except as provided in this policy, there is a presumption that notice pursuant to the Notice section of this policy will be given to affected NYU faculty, students, and/or staff when their PDC will be, or has been, accessed.
• Access to, and dissemination and use of, PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff will be limited in scope to the information needed to accomplish the purpose.
• NYU will maintain sufficient records to enable appropriate review of compliance with this policy.
• Access to, and dissemination and use of, PDC will be subject to ongoing, independent oversight by an NYU committee that will issue regular reports to the University Senate.

This policy does not create rights in any individual or entity to seek legal redress for action inconsistent with the policy.

Scope of this Policy

This policy affords protections to faculty, students, and staff of NYU with respect to their Personal Digital Content and sets forth NYU’s commitment and processes to effectuate those protections.

Procedures for Implementation

Background

NYU faculty, students, and staff rely on technology in multiple aspects of their work, teaching, research, study, and other activities. In doing so, they often use electronic systems, networks, and devices that NYU owns, provides, and/or administers. These NYU Systems assist NYU in carrying out certain activities. As used in this policy, “NYU Systems” means all information technology services, networks, and devices owned, provided, and/or administered by any unit of NYU, such as email services, internet access, file servers, voice message servers, hardware and cloud-based storage devices and/or services, laptop, tablet, desktop, and other computers, phones or other mobile devices, and other outsourced information technology services (e.g., Google NYU Mail or Google Apps for Education).

This policy provides protections to NYU faculty, students, and staff with respect to their “Personal Digital Content” or “PDC,” which means the following content to the extent stored in files and/or accounts on, or transmitted through, NYU Systems and that are associated with a specific NYU faculty member, student, or staff member:

(a) digital documents and communications of NYU faculty, students, and staff, such as emails, voice mails, text messages, and their associated audio and/or visual content and metadata;
(b) internet usage and/or search records for specific NYU faculty, students, or staff;
(c) manuscripts and other similar works of authorship by NYU faculty, students, or staff that are not publicly available; and
(d) other scholarly content of NYU faculty, students, and staff that comprises “Traditional Works of Scholarship” under NYU’s Statement of Policy on Intellectual Property, except to the extent such works also qualify as “Instructional Media” under that policy.
Examples of content that are not included within the definition of PDC include: (a) information generated by automatic processes at NYU, such as logs or records of access to NYU facilities or equipment; (b) “Research Data” as defined in NYU’s Policy on Retention of and Access to Research Data; (c) personal information needed for management of NYU records, such as financial, human resource, and student information system records; and (d) routine uses of NYU instructional management systems, such as NYU Classes.

Reasons for Access

NYU does not routinely monitor the PDC of any specific NYU faculty member, student, or staff member. NYU may obtain access to such PDC in some circumstances, but only for a legitimate institutional purpose, as set forth in this policy. The paragraphs below describe certain purposes for which NYU may access such information. While this list is expected to cover most instances of access, the list is not intended to be exhaustive. NYU may access the PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff for other comparable reasons that advance a legitimate institutional purpose, as determined by a person designated to authorize access pursuant to this policy, and subject to review by the oversight committee as described below. In evaluating the institutional purpose, the person designated to authorize access should in each case weigh not only the stated reasons for access but also the possible effect of access on NYU values such as academic freedom and internal trust and confidence.

A. System Protection, Maintenance, and Management

NYU Systems require ongoing management, maintenance and inspection to ensure that they are operating properly; to implement new systems; to protect against threats such as attacks, malware, and viruses; and to protect the integrity and security of information. For example, system logs, also known as log files, are created automatically during system operation and contain information about system events that are needed for specific business reasons or to satisfy legal requirements. Business reasons include, but are not limited to, deploying new software, troubleshooting, system testing, collecting metrics on system performance and usage, billing, documentation, electronic discovery, and forensic investigation. No routine network scans of faculty, students, or staff are done that examine content.

B. Business Continuity

NYU may access PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff for the purpose of ensuring continuity in its business operations where the information in question is material to conducting business operations, and where it is reasonably determined that there is no better practicable alternative under the circumstances. This need can arise, for example, if an employee who typically has access to the files or business information in question is unavailable for the time period when the files or information are needed.

C. Safety Matters

NYU may access PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff to deal with exigent situations presenting a threat to campus safety or the life, health, or safety of any person.
D. Legal and Regulatory Process and Litigation

NYU may access PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff in connection with threatened or pending litigation, and to respond to subpoenas and similar lawful requests for information in law enforcement investigations, other government investigations and regulatory processes, and legal and regulatory processes, and as otherwise required by law.

E. Internal Investigations and Audits

NYU may access PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff in connection with investigations under any applicable NYU policies (such as, for example, claims of discrimination, harassment, sexual misconduct, research misconduct, or financial misconduct); for purposes of internal audits and audits by NYU’s public accounting firm; and in connection with claims relating to public safety, including allegations of criminal conduct and circumstances as outlined in policies such as Electronic Communications and Social Media Policy, Missing Student Notification Policy, Use of Email, and Terms of Use. Access may be authorized only when the authorizing person has determined that the investigation advances a legitimate institutional purpose and that there is a sufficient basis for it.

Authorization of Access

Access to PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff must be authorized by an appropriate person, pursuant to NYU’s Policy on Requests to Information Technology (NYU IT) to Support Investigations.

Any authorization of access will apply only to the particular situation and specific NYU faculty, students, and/or staff. Any other situation must be separately authorized.

No independent authorization is required for information technology personnel to conduct routine system protection, maintenance, or management in accord with internal protocols and processes. Likewise, requests for access in connection with litigation, legal and regulatory processes, or requirements, or law enforcement investigations, or to preserve PDC for possible subsequent access in accordance with this policy, need no independent authorization if made by the Office of General Counsel.

In exigent situations involving a threat to campus safety or the life, health, or safety of any person, access may be authorized by the Office of General Counsel. If emergency conditions do not allow for prior authorization, the matter will be reported to the Office of General Counsel as promptly as possible.

Presumption Notice Will be Provided

When NYU intends to access PDC of current NYU faculty, staff, and students, and except as otherwise provided in this policy, there is a presumption that notice will be given to the affected party or parties. All reasonable efforts should be made to give notice at the time of access or as soon thereafter as reasonably possible. The following are examples of situations where notice is not required:

A. System protection, maintenance, and management — Individual notice is not required for ordinary system protection, maintenance, or management as described in this policy. Notice
should be given if the access relates specifically to the activity of an individual faculty member, student, or staff member, unless troubleshooting the individual user’s problem with a system based on a report from the user.

B. Business continuity — Individual notice normally is not required for access to PDC for purposes of business continuity, in accordance with this policy and established NYU practice, and the common understanding that individual notice in such cases typically is not practicable.

C. Legal restrictions — Individual notice is not required where NYU is subject to legal constraints, or with requests by law enforcement or regulators, or similar constraints on NYU’s ability to give notice.

D. Emergencies and other extraordinary cases — Contemporaneous individual notice is not required in cases where there is insufficient time, where giving notice could otherwise interfere with an effective response to an emergency or other compelling need (e.g., at a stage of an internal investigation where giving notice could compromise the investigation, or in exigent situations presenting a threat to campus safety or the life, health, or safety of any person), or where it is impracticable. The decision not to give contemporaneous notice to an NYU faculty member, student, or staff member must be made by the person designated by this policy to authorize the access. In such cases, notice will ordinarily be given as soon as practical.

The person designated by this policy and under NYU’s Policy on Requests to Information Technology (NYU IT) to Support Investigations to authorize access may decide not to give notice. Any such decision, and the grounds for overcoming the presumption set forth in this policy, will be documented, and available for review by the oversight committee, as set forth in this policy.

Scope of Access

NYU will adopt reasonable steps, whenever practicable, to limit access, dissemination, and use of PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff obtained under this policy to the content that is related to NYU’s documented purpose in obtaining access. These steps will vary depending on the circumstances of the search. Participation in the search, and access to, and dissemination and use of, the PDC in question should be limited to those personnel with a reasonable need to be involved.

Records of Process

Any person who authorizes access to PDC of NYU faculty, students or staff will provide that reasonable records of the process are preserved, including who requested the access, who undertook any investigation, the process undertaken, and any decision reached.

In all instances of access under this policy, records should be maintained that are adequate to permit effective review as described in the Oversight section of this policy. Records will be maintained for a period of time that is consistent with all legal obligations and with custom and practice.

Compliance with Laws
There are numerous international, federal and state laws related to data privacy, data security, and data transfer. This policy should be understood in light of those laws, including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, the Electronic Communications Decency Act of 1986, the Healthcare Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.

**Oversight Committee**

This policy, its implementation, and instances of access under this policy will be subject to review by an oversight committee to be constituted by the Provost annually, which will include representatives (or their designees) from each council of the University Senate and appropriate senior administrators. The oversight committee will be provided at least annually with a report by NYU IT that categorizes the number of incidents where PDC of NYU faculty, students, and staff was accessed, and for each incident, the date, position of the individual(s) whose data was accessed (i.e., faculty, student, staff), the academic or administrative unit that requested access purpose for the access, whether there was notice provided, and whether such access, dissemination and use was in compliance with this policy and with NYU’s *Policy on Requests to Information Technology (NYU IT) to Support Investigations*. The report will not contain any actual PDC, and will not directly or indirectly identify individuals whose PDC was accessed. The oversight committee will meet at least annually to discuss the report and may make recommendations to the Provost as to the processes set forth in this policy and possible amendments to the policy. The oversight committee will also make periodic reports to the University Senate on the implementation of this policy.

**Policy Definitions**

“Personal Digital Content” or “PDC” means the following content to the extent stored in files and/or accounts on, or transmitted through, NYU Systems and that are associated with a specific NYU faculty member, student, or staff member:

(a) digital documents and communications of NYU faculty, students, and staff, such as emails, voice mails, text messages, and their associated audio and/or visual content and metadata;,

(b) internet usage and/or search records for specific NYU faculty, students, or staff;

(c) manuscripts and other similar works of authorship by NYU faculty, students, or staff that are not publicly available; and

(d) other scholarly content of NYU faculty, students, and staff that comprises “Traditional Works of Scholarship” under NYU’s *Statement of Policy on Intellectual Property*, except to the extent such works also qualify as “Instructional Media” under that policy.

“NYU” means Schools and other units of NYU, NYU’s Global Network University sites, and all University Affiliates.

“NYU Systems” means all information technology services, networks, and devices owned, provided, or administered by any unit of NYU, such as email services, internet access, file servers, voice message servers, hardware and cloud-based storage devices and/or services, laptop, tablet, desktop, and other computers, phones or other mobile devices, and other outsourced information technology services (e.g., Google NYU Mail or Google Apps for Education).
“School” means each NYU school, college, and institute that functions similarly to a school or college (e.g., IFA, ISAW, Courant, and CUSP), NYU’s three degree-granting campuses -- New York, Abu Dhabi and Shanghai, and may include for purposes of this policy other global sites as designated by the Provost.

“University Affiliates” consist of those entities controlled, directly or indirectly, by the University through (a) ownership of more than 50% of the ownership interests in the entity or (b) the power to appoint or elect a majority of the organization’s governing body e.g., directors or trustees.

Related Policies

- Code of Conduct:IT@NYU
- Code of Ethical Conduct
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- HIPAA Policies
- Policy on Personal Identification Numbers
- Policy on Requests to Information Technology (NYU IT) to Support Investigations
- Data Classification at NYU
- Statement of Policy and Guidelines on Educational and Research Uses of Copyrighted Materials
- Policy on Responsible Use of NYU Computers and Data
- World Wide Web Policies and Procedures
- Electronic Communications and Social Media Policy
- Missing Student Notification Policy
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Policy

New York University (the “University”), including the schools, colleges, institutes, and other administrative units of NYU, NYU’s Global Network University sites, and all University affiliates, as each term is defined in NYU’s Policy on Policies (together, “NYU”), supports and encourages open discourse by members of the University Community through the use of Electronic Communications, which encompasses Social Media, while at the same time seeking to address the concerns associated with such use.

Purpose of this Policy

This policy:

- Promotes awareness within the University Community regarding the benefits and risks (including privacy-related risks) of Electronic Communications;
- Helps create a safe learning and working environment at NYU;
- Helps to ensure the confidentiality of personally identifiable information in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and NYU policies;
- Strives to protect NYU Marks (i.e., NYU’s name, logos, trademarks, service marks, or graphics) and NYU’s reputation;
- Sets certain rules for the use of Electronic Communications for NYU purposes; and
- Reinforces that NYU policies apply to Electronic Communications, as they do to any other types of communications and media, and that such other policies must be consistent with this policy.
Scope of this Policy

This policy applies to all members of the University Community with respect to their utilization of Electronic Communications. Other pertinent NYU policies also apply to Electronic Communications, some of which are referenced in the Related Policies section below. NYU schools, colleges, institutes, other units, Global Network University sites, and University Affiliates may supplement this policy, provided that such supplementary policies are consistent with this policy in accordance with the NYU Policy on Policies.

I. General Principles of Electronic Communications

   a. Freedom of Expression and the Academic Community

   NYU is committed to the principle of academic freedom, as described more fully in the Statement in Regard to Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Faculty Handbook. Nothing in this policy is intended to abridge or interfere with those rights and responsibilities. This policy is intended to support and encourage NYU’s academic mission and specifically NYU’s commitment to a research and teaching environment that is open, robust, and diverse. In addition, nothing in this policy is intended to abridge or interfere with the right of NYU employees to speak about the terms and conditions of their employment pursuant to Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

   b. Criminal and Civil Liability with Respect to Electronic Communications

   Members of the University Community are always subject to the jurisdiction of applicable local and national governments when they are using Electronic Communications. In addition to the consequences addressed in the Enforcement section below, violations of applicable laws through the use of Electronic Communications can lead to criminal and/or civil sanctions, as well as to private law suits by persons claiming injury. Members of the University Community also may want to be mindful of local customs, norms, and practices with respect to Electronic Communications.

   c. Limited Expectations of Anonymity and Privacy

   Members of the University Community should not assume that Electronic Communications, including Social Media, are anonymous or private. When composing an Electronic Communication, the author may want to assess the risk and the consequences of communications becoming public. Electronic Communications often are forwarded, posted, or otherwise distributed without the approval or knowledge of the author. Members of the University Community may want to monitor privacy settings on Social Media accounts to maximize their privacy to the extent desired and feasible. Electronic Communications, including e-mails, also can be subject to disclosure, for
example in litigation, to regulatory bodies or other persons in connection with NYU business operations, and in response to subpoena.

Pressing the “delete” key does not mean that an Electronic Communication is unrecoverable even where all recipients have “deleted” it. In addition, Internet Protocol addresses (known as IP addresses) normally can be traced to their source (e.g., to NYU) and often to a specific computing device.

NYU reserves the right to monitor and record activity on NYU devices, networks, and systems related to Electronic Communications in accordance with the protections for privacy of such communications as set forth in relevant NYU policies and procedures (including Responsible Use of NYU Computers and Data Policy, http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/responsible-use-of-nyu-computers-and-data-policy-on.html), and in accordance with applicable laws.

II. Social Media Overview

a. Appropriate Uses of Electronic Communications

Electronic Communications must be used in accordance with applicable laws and NYU policies, including the Code of Ethical Conduct. NYU encourages members of the University Community to use Electronic Communications in a manner that: (a) is consistent with NYU’s academic mission; (b) employs common sense; and (c) is knowledgeable, accurate, truthful, and professional. NYU also encourages members of the University Community to correct errors on a timely basis where appropriate. Users of Electronic Communications also should be aware of the terms of use that may be imposed on users by the vendors or others involved in specific Electronic Communications, including Social Media accounts.

b. Misuses of Electronic Communications

Misuses of Electronic Communications may subject members of the University Community to disciplinary action pursuant to the Enforcement section below. The list below, while not exhaustive, provides examples of misuses of Electronic Communications. Misuses of Electronic Communications include:

- Threatening, tormenting, defaming, bullying, intimidating, stalking, or performing similar acts that a reasonable person would consider objectionable by its severity, pervasiveness, and/or persistence;
- Unreasonably and substantially interfering with a person’s academic or work performance, opportunities or benefits, or a person’s mental, emotional, or physical well-being;
- Exploiting a person’s known psychological or physical vulnerabilities or impairments;
• Publishing content that reasonably causes or could be expected to reasonably cause a person to fear for his or her physical safety;
• Unreasonably disrupting NYU operations or creating a foreseeable risk of doing so (including, for example, organizing a demonstration that seeks to materially impair ingress to or egress from a University premises or event; or attempting to disable or interfere with, through malware or otherwise, University electronic resources or operations);
• Publishing content, including digital images or video files, that includes non-consensual use of another individual’s nudity or sexuality;
• Publishing offensive content, including slurs, epithets, jokes, or images, that insults, mocks, degrades, threatens, or ridicules an individual or class of individuals based on membership or perceived membership in a Legally Protected Class that a reasonable person would consider creates a hostile learning, working, or living environment;
• Illegally discriminating on the basis of a Legally Protected Class, or perceived membership in such classification;
• Inciting or attempting to incite violence;
• Jeopardizing or potentially jeopardizing the health or safety of a child (including viewing, downloading, or transmitting child pornography);
• Violating the intellectual property or related rights of NYU or others (which may include, for example, plagiarism, failure to attribute properly, or failure to obtain necessary consent);
• Disclosing without authorization or unlawfully the confidential or proprietary information of NYU or members of the University Community (including, but not limited to, patient and student information protected under the HIPAA Privacy Rule or the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA));
• Impersonating, including but not limited to misrepresenting the University Community member’s capacity or authority;
• Sending unauthorized bulk e-mail (spam) or otherwise transmitting mass messages in violation of applicable NYU policies (including Appropriate Use of E-mail at New York University Policy, http://www.nyu.edu/its/policies/email.html), unless authorized by NYU;
• Engaging in electioneering prohibited by applicable law or that could jeopardize NYU’s tax exemptions; and
• Engaging in any other conduct prohibited by local, state, federal, or other applicable law or NYU policy.

Actions described in the above list also may violate NYU’s Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy and Complaint Procedures for Students, Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy and Complaint Procedures for Employees, Sexual Misconduct, Relationship Violence, and Stalking Policy, or other NYU policies.

c. **NYU Name, Marks, and Logos**
Use of NYU Marks must (1) be for official NYU business or otherwise have been approved in writing by NYU’s Office of Digital Communications (“DigiComm”), digital.communications@nyu.edu, and (2) follow all NYU rules and policies; provided, however, that members of the University Community may reference their NYU affiliation for identification purposes (e.g., an NYU faculty member or an NYU student), but where it is not clear, they must make it clear that they are acting in a personal capacity and not for or under the auspices of NYU. Members of the University Community do not have the authority to alter or create their own versions of NYU Marks for use in Electronic Communications.

III. Institutional Social Media Accounts

a. Establishment

Members of the University Community must notify DigiComm, digital.communications@nyu.edu, prior to activating an Institutional Social Media Account. Administrators of existing Institutional Social Media Accounts activated prior to the Effective Date of this policy must promptly notify DigiComm if they have not previously done so.

b. Access, Maintenance, and Ownership

For each Institutional Social Media Account, there must at all times be at least two NYU employees to serve as the Administrators of that Account who have appropriate account access credentials (including usernames, passwords, and answers to security questions) and who have been provided or expressly delegated the authority to administer the account (including editing account settings and content). The personal information of a member of the University Community should not be incorporated into the account access credentials of an Institutional Social Media Account. To ensure the continuity of Institutional Social Media Accounts, anyone who administers such accounts should maintain passwords and all other relevant information necessary to access such accounts in a safe and secure location.

NYU may have an ownership or other interest in the information, files, or data contained in an Institutional Social Media Account; if so, NYU may have the right to control the distribution or publication of that information, separate from any right NYU may have to access the account as described above.

NYU reserves the right to take steps to “freeze” any Institutional Social Media Account that violates this policy or other NYU policies.

c. Guidelines for Administrators
Administrators of Institutional Social Media Accounts should monitor/moderate postings on a frequent basis in accordance with applicable response approaches/strategies to ensure compliance with this policy and other applicable NYU policies.

d. Public Affairs

As with any form of communication that may appear to represent NYU, members of the University Community should exercise good judgment in determining whether an Electronic Communication should be approved in writing by NYU’s Office of Public Affairs prior to transmission through an Institutional Social Media Account.

NYU employees must notify NYU’s Office of Public Affairs if contacted by a media representative about an Institutional Social Media Account, and employees must not respond to a request for information by such a representative without first consulting with NYU’s Office of Public Affairs.

IV. Use of Social Media in an Employment Context

a. Screening Candidates for Employment

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has cautioned that personal information, such as that gleaned from social media postings, may not be used to make employment decisions on prohibited bases, such as race, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, color, religion, age, disability, or genetic information. Members of the University Community intending to use Social Media to screen employee candidates should consult with their Human Resources representatives for guidance.

b. Reviewing Employee Performance

Members of the University Community in their capacity as supervisors should not use Social Media to comment on or display information concerning the work performance of their subordinates. Faculty who are asked to evaluate other colleagues or subordinates should not use Social Media to comment or display information concerning their performance. Formal performance reviews and/or recommendations related to the work performance of subordinates should not be made using Social Media without the express consent of such employee. Before supervisors make any informal communications about the job performance of their subordinates using Social Media, supervisors must exercise judgment and discretion and consider whether there is a need to obtain the approval of any colleagues or supervisors.

c. Authority Relationships and Social Media

Maintaining a Social Media account requires careful assessment of the implications of inviting a person to be a “friend” or “connection” or the equivalent or accepting such an invitation from another person. This is particularly true where there is an authority
relationship (such as faculty-student, doctor-patient, or supervisor-subordinate) between inviter and invitee; the presence of such an authority relationship necessitates close consideration of the implications of sending and accepting an invitation.

Supervisors should exercise good judgment and caution when inviting subordinates to be a “friend” or “connection” or the equivalent using Social Media; if a supervisor believes there is a possibility a reasonable person similarly situated to the subordinate in question would find an invitation to be inappropriate, the supervisor should not send that invitation. Supervisors should consider whether it is appropriate to decline invitations they receive from subordinates. These cautions also are applicable in other cases involving authority relationships.

d. Protecting Confidential Information

In using Social Media and other Electronic Communications, members of the University Community must ensure the confidentiality of personally identifiable information and other NYU sensitive information in accordance with applicable laws and NYU policies, including, but not limited to, those related to HIPAA, FERPA, and personal identification numbers (see, e.g., the Related Policies section below). Before uploading or sending student, patient, or other NYU information through Social Media, members of the University Community must ensure that such actions are in compliance with applicable laws and NYU policies.

e. Outside Service Providers

Members of the University Community should exercise caution and act within their authority when entering into contractual agreements (including click-through agreements) on behalf of NYU for services related to Institutional Social Media Accounts or distribution of University-generated content over Electronic Communications (e.g., through AddThis or ShareThis). Members of the University Community should pay particularly close attention to the privacy policies of potential service providers.

f. Endorsements and Testimonials

When making an endorsement or a testimonial in one’s NYU capacity, members of the University Community must comply with the Federal Trade Commission’s Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising.

g. Social Media and Teaching

It is recommended that institutional Social Media accounts created by faculty to support courses of instruction include a clear statement on expectations for use of such social media by instructors and students. For example, if desired by a faculty member, the statement might provide that students are prohibited from using the account for any purpose other than their activities for the course, and that no content from the account
may be copied or distributed by any student for any other purpose. It also is recommended that the statement note that all Social Media should be used in an appropriate manner and include a link to this policy and to the New York University Code of Ethical Conduct.

h. Disclaimers

If others could reasonably be confused as to whether a publicly-available Electronic Communication by an employee or member of the University Community represents the position of NYU when in actuality the Electronic Communication does not do so, members of the University Community should accompany the Electronic Communication (either directly or if necessary via a link) with a disclaimer such as the following: “The views expressed herein are mine alone and do not represent the views or opinions of New York University.”

Enforcement

As noted in Section II(b) Misuses of Electronic Communications above: (a) employees, including faculty, who violate this policy may be subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination in accordance with applicable NYU policies and, where applicable, the Faculty Handbook; (b) students who violate this policy may be subject to disciplinary action up to and including expulsion, in accordance with the disciplinary rules and procedures of NYU and the relevant school, college, and/or other unit; and (c) other members of the University Community who violate this policy, including but not limited to consultants, vendors and contractors, may be subject to termination of their relationship with NYU.

V. Review

In accordance with NYU’s Policy on Policy, every NYU policy is to be reviewed periodically, as necessary to assure that the policy reflects obligations imposed by current laws and best practices. Given the rapidly changing nature of electronic communications and social media, it is particularly important to review this policy periodically.

Policy Definitions

“Electronic Communications” means any electronic transfer of information between one or more electronic devices and/or electronic networks/systems relating to such devices. Electronic Communications encompass Social Media.

“Institutional Social Media Account” means a Social Media site or account appearing to represent or be associated with NYU regardless of whether the site or account is hosted by NYU (e.g., NYU Wikis or NYU Blogs) or a third party, including any site or account using an NYU Mark; provided, however, that where the only association with NYU is that members of the University Community have referenced their NYU affiliation for
identification purposes, the site or account is not an Institutional Social Media Account so long as it is clear that the members of the NYU Community are acting in a personal (and not official NYU) capacity.

“Legally Protected Class” means race, gender, gender identity or expression, color, religion, age, national origin, ethnicity, disability, veteran or military status, sexual orientation, marital status, citizenship status, and any other class or status that is protected under applicable laws.

“NYU” means the schools, colleges, institutes, and other administrative units of NYU, NYU’s Global Network University sites, and all University affiliates, as each term is defined in NYU’s Policy on Policies.

“Social Media” means Electronic Communications that provide the user the ability to distribute content quickly to a broad audience, including but not limited to social networking sites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Instagram, MySpace, YouTube, Ask.fm, Google+, Quick Chat, Meetup, tumblr, Flickr, SlideShare, Pinterest), blogging and microblogging, wikis, website creation, website postings and comments, mass text and multimedia messaging, and mass e-mailing, and includes future forms of such communication.

“University Community” means the following persons associated with the University and its domestic and international subsidiaries and affiliated entities: (a) the Board of Trustees, (b) all full-time and part-time employees, including but not limited to faculty members, instructors and researchers, (c) volunteers, (d) fellows, trainees and post-doctoral appointees, (e) students, and (f) others who are performing activities or providing services, including but not limited to consultants, vendors and contractors.

“NYU Marks” means NYU’s name, logos, trademarks, service marks, or graphics.

Related Policies

General Conduct

- [Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Policy](#)
- Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy and Complaint Procedures for Students
- Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy and Complaint Procedures for Employees
- [Code of Ethical Conduct](#)
- [Compliance Complaint Policy](#)
- [Faculty Handbook](#)
- [Interaction with Government Officials](#)
- [University Policy on Student Conduct](#)
- Sexual Misconduct, Relationship Violence, and Stalking Policy
Information Privacy
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- HIPAA Policies
- Policy on Personal Identification Numbers

Information Technology
- Data Classification at NYU
- Statement of Policy and Guidelines on Educational and Research Uses of Copyrighted Materials
- Policy on Responsible Use of NYU Computers and Data
- World Wide Web Policies and Procedures
Conclusion of the Working Group, 11/20/14:

The NYU Health Realignment Working Group, composed of 26 faculty members and deans and chaired by the Executive Vice President for Health, Bob Berne, met on October 8th, November 11th and November 22nd. Attached are a list of members of the Working Group and minutes from the three meetings.

The meetings included active discussions of a proposal to realign several of the health units at NYU. The intent is to enhance academic achievement, to enrich our reputation and stature in nursing, dentistry and global public health, and to formalize a structure to promote cooperation, creativity and positive outcomes extending throughout the health field more generally.

There is no “perfect” organizational structure, and any change such as the one recommended below has advantages, disadvantages, and risks. Taking these and other factors into account, the Working Group is endorsing the following proposal:

A new college of global public health will be created at NYU as a natural evolution in the development of the Global Institute of Public Health (GIPH). At this time it is anticipated that the six tenure/tenure track faculty in public health in Steinhardt will choose to move to the new College of Global Public Health, with the requisite consideration of the individual faculty member transitions and the fiscal effects on the Steinhardt School. Further, the College of Nursing will no longer be a component of the College of Dentistry. Finally the three colleges – the new College of Global Public Health, the College of Dentistry, and the College of Nursing – will be linked together in a structure to be named the “the Faculty of Health” (FoH). While each of the three colleges will be at the “school-college” level in the NYU lexicon with appropriate autonomy, their joining to form the Faculty of Health will create academic and administrative synergies to take advantage of emerging inter-professional and inter-disciplinary opportunities and to establish a distinctive edge in an ever increasing competitiveness in health-related disciplines. The formation of the Faculty of Health will also facilitate interactions with other health schools and programs at NYU and beyond. The current expectation is that the Faculty of Health will have a dean and modest staffing to provide oversight and support in areas that include strategic planning, budget/finance, faculty recruitment, retention and promotion, human resources, research and grant management, and IT. (It is also expected that there will be a national search for the Dean of the Faculty of Health with a faculty-majority search committee.) In these areas, significant economies of scale might be achieved that will place the Faculty of Health at an advantage in securing faculty, students, and research funding.

We understand that the next steps are reviews by the appropriate elected bodies at NYU, review and approval by the University leadership, and approval by the NYU Board of Trustees, followed by submission to the State of New York.
FSC Resolutions regarding Tenure and Benefits at the School of Medicine

The FSC has at least a 22-year history of interest in tenure matters at the NYU School of Medicine (SoM), according to the FSC website. Beginning in 2008, FSC became officially critical of proposed changes in SoM tenure. This was followed by resolutions in 2009 and 2010. Below these resolutions and supporting documents are quoted. More details can be found at http://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/university-senate/membership/councils/tenured-tenure-track-faculty-senators-council/council-records/resolutions.html. Resolution dates are underlined and bolded below.

-- Jim Uleman, 12/6/14

11/18/10 Resolution Concerning Letters of Agreement at the School of Medicine

Background: The NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines state that the guidelines for individual schools, "and any subsequent changes to them, must be presented to the Provost of New York University for approval, and the Provost should consult with the Faculty Senators' Council (FSC) prior to making the final decision about such changes."

On February 16, 2006, the FSC approved the following resolution in support of this guideline: "The Faculty Senators Council affirms that any proposed changes to a School's procedures for promotion and tenure must be submitted to the Provost, who in consultation with the Faculty Senators Council, will review and approve them."

In a resolution approved in 2008 the FSC stated: "The Council believes strongly that unilateral imposition of modifications of existing practices and obligations involving tenure or retroactively altering agreements regarding tenure and institutional salary undermine the mutual trust that has been the bedrock of this University's remarkable growth and success, and that will be essential as the faculty and the administration together face the challenges of achieving greater excellence."

In 2009 the FSC reiterated this position stating: "In particular, as we have stated before, it is our understanding of the provisions of the Faculty Handbook that tenure protect faculty members' economic security."

It has recently come to the attention of the Tenure Modifications Committee of the FSC that a subset of tenured faculty members at the School of Medicine have been asked to sign contracts, termed "Change of Responsibility" agreements that would appear to limit their tenure rights.

Whereas: The privileges and obligations of tenure as described in the Handbook include academic freedom and economic security; and

Whereas: New York University does not have a policy of post-tenure review that allows for the renegotiation of or reduction of salary. Therefore be it
Resolved: The current practice of the NYU School of Medicine to request that certain faculty members sign agreements limiting their tenure rights is in violation of the Handbook. We urge that the School of Medicine cease this practice, and that any alterations in the tenure guidelines outlined in the Handbook be subject to the appropriate procedures for instituting such changes. Let it be further noted that any changes to the tenure guarantees outlined in the Handbook will apply prospectively, and will not retroactively affect already tenured faculty.


A) Provost McLaughlin responded (Dec. 13, 2010) that

I, of course, agree with the statement in the resolution that any changes in University faculty tenure regulations can occur only after following required University procedures. The "Change of Responsibility" letters referred to in the resolution do not affect University tenure regulations. After receipt of your memorandum, I requested and received for review several of the letters to which you refer and they contain no modifications of the rules regarding tenure.

I note that I have previously approved the recommendations of the School of Medicine faculty's Academic Excellence Commission.

I should also note that any disputes concerning faculty salary or perquisites are subject to the established faculty grievance procedures.

B) The NYU Langone Medical Center Faculty Council (NYULMC FC) also responded to the FSC resolution by passing three resolutions on Jan. 31, 2011. The President or NYULMC FC (Nathaniel Landau) summarized their action in a letter to President Sexton and Provost McLaughlin on Feb. 17, 2011, as follows:

1. The NYULMC FC urges the leadership of NYU to disregard the resolution passed by the NYU FSC regarding letters of Agreement at the Medical Center.

2. The NYULMC FC urges the FSC to rescind their resolution and reconsider it once the NYULMC FC has made a determination the matter.

3. The NYULMC FC urges the NYU FSC to consult with the NYULMC FC in deliberations on future matters that specifically affect the Medical Center faculty.

C) The FSC Executive Committee (Robert Schact, Daniel Zwanziger, and Carol Hutchins) replied to Dr. Laudau on March 17, 2011, as follows:
In response, we would like to let you know that NYU’s FSC is a University-wide body whose jurisdiction is defined by University Bylaw 41(c) as follows:

The Faculty Senators Council may consider any matters of educational and administrative policy and shall function as the Faculty Personnel Committee of the Senate.

The University recognizes senators, elected to the FSC by the eligible voting faculty of Schools in accordance with FSC voting procedures, as the official representatives of Schools. Committees within Schools, such as the Benefits and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Council at the School of Medicine, do not have standing to override FSC Resolutions.

9/17/09
Resolution in support of our School of Medicine Colleagues
“The Faculty Senators Council reiterates its earlier [May 1, 2008] resolution regarding procedures affecting the Faculty of the NYU School of Medicine. In particular, as we have stated before, it is our understanding of the provisions of the Faculty Handbook that tenure protect faculty members’ economic security. Second, we encourage Administrators and Faculty to use established procedures and that consultation and good faith collegial governance be followed going forward. Finally, take the position that new policies should not be retroactively applied.
“We continue to hope that a collegial resolution of any differences between the SOM faculty and its administration will soon be achieved.”

5/1/08
“In concert with our faculty colleagues at the NYU School of Medicine [SoM] and those who serve on the SoM Faculty Council, the members of the NYU Faculty Senators Council reaffirm the central importance of academic excellence in all responsibilities associated with the faculty of every unit and School at New York University and the critical importance of the institution of tenure to its achievement. As our University Faculty Handbook asserts under Title I, Item III.: The Case for Academic Tenure: ‘Academic tenure is a means to certain ends, specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research; and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession of teaching attractive to men and women of ability (p. 21).’ Accordingly, the FSC believes it is clear that tenure without economic security is meaningless.
“In addition, the Faculty Senators Council reasserts that, as Schools and faculties address the issues and problems with which they may be confronted, established due process and negotiation are the means for resolving whatever disagreements may arise. The Council believes strongly that unilateral imposition of modifications of existing practices and obligations involving tenure or retroactively altering agreements regarding tenure and institutional salary undermine the mutual trust that has been the bedrock of this University’s remarkable growth and success, and that will be essential as the faculty and the administration together face the challenges of achieving greater excellence.”
2/16/06 Resolution approving changes in tenure process at School of Medicine
Status: Received by Provost’s office and communicated to relevant parties

2/21/02 Endorsement of expansion of academic tracks at NYU School of Medicine (SoM)
with two additional full-time, non-tenure tracks
Recommends five-year review to be conducted by SoM; copies of review to be
provided to FSC
Status: Approved by the Board of Trustees, May 7, 2002; to be implemented in
June 2002

5/3/01 Reaffirms that, regardless of school affiliation, equitable policies (including
benefits policies) should be applied to all NYU faculty, including those at
the NYU School of Medicine
Status: Portable tuition remission issue addressed and tabled by School of
Medicine Faculty Council

10/12/00 Recommends that School of Medicine retirees health plan be transferred from
Oxford to United Healthcare and that questions from School of Medicine
faculty retirees be directed to the Washington Square Benefits Office
Status: Taken under advisement

11/12/92 Resolution in support of the extension of the probationary period for tenure track
faculty from 7 to 10 years at the School of Medicine
Status: Approved by the Board of Trustees, March 15, 1992

Documents from Professor Salah Al-Askari, M.D.

Dr. Al-Askari has deposited documents with Karyn Ridder in the FSC office that support the
following points, made in a 5/27/14 memo.

"I believe that the members of the Faculty Senators Council should be familiar with the
rights of the tenured faculty at NYU to full salary as stated in the printed handbooks and
documented in the resolutions of the FSC and in the medical school’s Faculty Council
documents. As you know I have served as Senator from the medical school for more than 24
years, chaired the FSC in 1989, chaired the Tenure Modification Committee of the FSC for 18
years and chaired the Benefit and Tenure committee of the FC of the medical school for more
than 30 years.

"I would like to bring the following facts to the attention of the Faculty Senators:

1. The rights and obligations of the tenured and tenure-track faculty at NYU are clearly spelled
   out in the printed faculty handbooks (bylaws). Tenure is granted by the University but not by
the schools (page 25, 1999 handbook). Likewise changes in tenure rights are made by the trustees.

2. The 1979 resolution of the NYU Senate which was accepted by the Trustees as part of the bylaws, document that at NYU tenured faculty are entitled to their full salary. This resolution was ruled valid by the court in NEW YORK CITY during the law suit by the FC of the Medical School against NYU to stop the disastrous merger with Mount Sinai. The lawyer for the FC was former Congresswoman E. Holtzman.

3. Although the Board of Trustees has the right to change the Bylaws, such changes are prospective but not retroactive (page 25, 1999 handbook). I was a member of the committees that updated the handbook.

4. Tenure, tenure rights and changes including “buy-outs” are made by the University but not by the schools (Dean Scotch). Minutes, Med. School FC minutes (5/6/96, PARA III).

5. Tenure at NYU includes salary (1979 resolution page 25, 1999 handbook).

6. The FSC passed a resolution affirming that tenure include full salary (1/22/1998)

7. The benefit and tenure committee of the medical school’s FC voted that tenure includes full salary (4/4/2008).

8. On 11/16/1989, president Oliva appointed the University Committee on Uncapping of Mandatory Retirement, which was composed of Deans, Tenured Faculty and Administrators (I was a member of the committee). Its subcommittee on Academic Enterprise (I was a member of this subcommittee) emphasized that tenured faculty are entitled to full employment etc (Page 4 of the subcommittee report). The Full Report was distributed to the senate and was unanimously approved by the senate.

9. On 9/17/2009, the FSC supported the vote by the FC of the School of Medicine that tenure includes economic security.

10. On 11/19/2010, the FSC voted that the School of medicine practice of requesting some tenured faculty to sign an agreement limiting their tenure rights is in violation of the handbook and requested the school to cease this practice.

11. At the 1996 conference of the AAMC [Association of American Medical Colleges] in Washington, Mr. Andrew Schaffer, a distinguished lawyer, a Vice President on legal affairs at NYU and the head of its legal department stated that except for cause, financial exigency, program termination or it can be convincingly demonstrated that it is clearly understood by faculty members and the institution that salary is composed of parts, Courts in most States ruled that tenure includes Full Salary.

12. A survey of tenured/tenure track faculty at the SOM in 2009 showed that 287 members participated. 83.3% of the faculty voted in favor of retaining the current salary rules.”
Executive Summary of the NYU Undergraduate Admission Process

NYU enjoys a highly competitive applicant pool for admission due to the superb faculty within the schools and its position as a global leader in higher education. Each year we have seen applications for admission increase, even as the number of US high school graduates is shrinking. In this very competitive market for students, engaging our entire community in attracting the best and brightest candidates for admission is imperative. We welcome the interest of faculty and are pleased to offer this executive summary of the admission process.

Enrollment goals and priorities for each school are set during enrollment planning meetings that include the deans and other representatives from the schools, members of the enrollment management team and representatives from finance. Through this process, the deans confirm for the enrollment staff the desired: size of the incoming class; academic profile; financial aid available to award; and specific personal attributes and qualities that are important to the school.

Applying for admission to NYU is fairly straightforward. Prospective students fill out the Common Application for admission to apply to NYU. Students may apply:

Early Decision I (November 1)
Early Decision II (January 1)
Regular Admission (January 1)

They are asked to select their primary school of interest and may also check a box that indicates interest in another program or campus within the NYU Global Network.

Primarily the Assistant Vice President and Dean of Admissions oversees the undergraduate admission process. Senior admissions staff are assigned a liaison role with a school or college within NYU and staff are trained to read and understand the relevant criteria for admission. Liaisons are experts on the schools they are assigned and are in constant contact with the dean/faculty when relevant, such as when there is an artistic review (in Tisch/Steinhardt). In addition, special scholars programs always involve a discussion with the appropriate school deans and faculty.

Students who indicate an interest in Abu Dhabi or Shanghai (if Chinese) must participate in Candidate Weekends. International students who apply to Shanghai must participate in Skype interviews. This expanded and very personalized admission process places a strong emphasis on academic excellence and fit. Faculty are highly involved in this process, meeting candidates (either in person or virtually) to help inform admission decisions.

Release dates for admission decisions are:

Early Decision I – December 15
Early Decision II – February 15
Regular Decision – April 1

During the application process, candidates for admission will often visit campus, seek personal interactions with faculty and look for information about the value of an education at NYU. The ability to articulate and show evidence of the distinctive and extraordinary educational experience that NYU students enjoy is what attracts the most talented, inquisitive, intellectual and engaging students to our community of scholars.

How Candidates Apply for Admission

Despite receiving more than 60,000 applications for freshman/transfer admission, NYU still employs a holistic review process in its evaluation and selection of candidates for admission – meaning that each candidate is evaluated on multiple variables and that the “whole person” is evaluated on more than simply grades, test scores, and quantifiable metrics. Our holistic process involves a thorough review and analysis of the following required credentials for admission:
After Admission Decisions and Selections include:

- **The Common Application and NYU Supplement** – two documents submitted by every candidate for admission that ask applicants to provide basic biographic information, a resume of extracurricular activities and work experience, a personal statement, and responses to three essay questions aimed at extracting contextual information about candidate experiences, interests, and personal characteristics.

- **School Report and Transcript** – two documents submitted by every candidate for admission via the student’s school. The School Report provides contextual information about the school community, level of rigor, and comparison data on other students in that school. The transcript typically provides information including grades, level of rigor in each class taken, and class rank.

- **Test scores** – examination results that meet NYU’s testing requirements. NYU has a flexible testing policy and allows students to submit SAT, ACT, SAT Subject Tests, AP, and IB examination results to meet our testing requirements. In addition, students are welcome to submit other national examinations administered in their home country to be eligible for admission.

- **Counselor and Instructor/Teacher Evaluation** – two letters of recommendation submitted on behalf of every candidate for admission. The counselor evaluation is submitted by a school official and one instructor/teacher evaluation is submitted by a faculty member who has taught the student in an academic subject. Both letters are solicited to illuminate information such as non-quantifiable personal characteristics, potential for impact at NYU, contextual information the student may not feel is important to share. Letters are often used to gauge the level of intellectual curiosity present in each candidate. Evaluations can be submitted online or by mail.

- **Audition and/or Portfolio Results** – creative and performing art evaluations are conducted by NYU faculty in the Tisch School of the Arts and the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development. Faculty are asked to provide an artistic rating on all auditions and portfolios, which are then considered in conjunction with the remainder of the student’s application materials. A student’s talent in the arts will comprise roughly half the evaluation at NYU for these two schools.

Admission Decisions and Selections

After each candidate is assigned a slate of ratings, a final decision is rendered on each applicant. Possible decisions include:

- **Admit** – a student is admitted to their primary school, college, or program of interest.

- **Refer (Admit)** – student is admitted to their alternate school, college, or program of interest.

- **Wait List** – student is offered a space on the wait list, postponing a final decision until May, June or July.

- **Deny** – student is not offered admission and cannot apply or be reconsidered for
any other school, college, or program for that term.

- **Defer** – student who has applied for Early Decision admission is not offered admission but notified that he/she will be reconsidered for admission during the Regular Decision round. Very few students are offered this option – as NYU’s philosophy with regard to Early Decision is to provide candidates with an ‘early decision’ whenever possible.
## Freshman Applicants, Admits and Registrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Five Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>37,464</td>
<td>41,243</td>
<td>42,807</td>
<td>45,779</td>
<td>50,608</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>14,275</td>
<td>13,487</td>
<td>14,998</td>
<td>14,829</td>
<td>17,815</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrants</td>
<td>5,012</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>5,140</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Acceptance Rate and Yield Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Average Critical Reading and Math SAT Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>1339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)

*Excludes NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai Campuses because they are excluded from IPEDS reporting.

**Fall 2014 includes data for the Polytechnic School of Engineering.
# New York University
## New York Campus*
### Transfer Admissions Information
#### Fall 2010 to Fall 2014**

## Transfer Applicants, Admits and Registrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>5 Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>5,597</td>
<td>6,067</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>6,545</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrants</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing trends in applicants, admits, and registrants from 2010 to 2014.](image)

## Acceptance Rate and Yield Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing trends in acceptance rate and yield rate from 2009 to 2014.](image)

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)

*Excludes NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai Campuses because they are excluded from IPEDS reporting.

**Fall 2014 includes data for the Polytechnic School of Engineering.
New York University
New York Campus*
Retention and Graduation Rates
Reporting Years Fall 2009 to Fall 2013**

Graduation Rate
Retention Rate

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)
*Excludes NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai Campuses because they are excluded from IPEDS reporting.
**Fall 2014 includes data for the Polytechnic School of Engineering.
New York University
New York Campus

First-time, Full-time Freshman Financial Aid
Cohorts 2006-2007 to 2013-2014
Source: IPEDS Student Financial Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cohort</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>5,124</td>
<td>5,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Receiving</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>2,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Grant Aid</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Amount of</td>
<td>$10,749</td>
<td>$12,792</td>
<td>$14,986</td>
<td>$16,598</td>
<td>$15,720</td>
<td>$17,672</td>
<td>$23,721</td>
<td>$24,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Grant Aid</td>
<td>$33,420</td>
<td>$35,290</td>
<td>$37,372</td>
<td>$38,765</td>
<td>$40,082</td>
<td>$41,606</td>
<td>$43,204</td>
<td>$44,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>$10,749</td>
<td>$12,792</td>
<td>$14,986</td>
<td>$16,598</td>
<td>$15,720</td>
<td>$17,672</td>
<td>$23,721</td>
<td>$24,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Discount</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Amount of Institutional Grant Aid Received

Average Institutional Grant Aid as a Percent of Tuition and Fees
New York University  
New York Campus  

Undergraduate Cumulative Debt at Graduation  
Graduating Class 2009-2010 to 2012-2013  
Source: Common Data Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Undergraduate Graduating Class with Student Loans</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Undergraduate Student Debt for Borrowers at the Time of Graduation</td>
<td>$41,375</td>
<td>$36,351</td>
<td>$35,104</td>
<td>$30,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Undergraduate Graduating Class with Student Loans  
Graduating Class 2009-2010 to 2012-2013

Average Undergraduate Student Debt for Borrowers at the Time of Graduation  
Graduating Class 2009-2010 to 2012-2013
Proposal for a New Faculty Title: Global Network Faculty

- We propose that a new title, “Global Network Faculty,” be created and used to designate members of the full-time faculties of NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai as participants in the research and teaching activities of appropriate units in NYUNY.

- The title would be awarded to an NYUAD/NYUSH colleague by an NYUNY unit, to signify that the granting unit regards that colleague as a professionally active and accomplished academic who would be an asset to the unit’s research, training, and teaching agendas, and, as such, is qualified to teach and mentor its students, including graduate students.

- Although Global Network Faculty status would entail eligibility to teach and mentor students in the program, it would not carry automatic guarantees with regard to specific teaching, advising or mentoring assignments, since teaching assignments (undergraduate and graduate) must be driven by the curricular needs of the program and assignments to thesis committees by the intellectual needs of students; thus programs must retain the right to make these assignments internally.

- Likewise, Global Network Faculty status would not confer any rights or obligations, either upon the faculty member or the awarding unit, with regard to departmental governance or salary. It will also have no implications for tenure in the awarding unit.

- By awarding this designation, the awarding units would signify their willingness to host these colleagues when they are visiting New York, welcoming them into the educational and scholarly activities of the unit. Global Network Faculty would be listed on the unit’s catalog and website. While it is hoped that this hosting would often entail offering Global Network Faculty office space, central administration will need to insure that departments and units on the square have the resources to make this possible without disrupting local operations.

- When NYUNY units confer Global Network Faculty status they would also be agreeing to participate in the individual’s third-year, tenure, and promotion review processes. A template for this process should be agreed upon by the Provosts of NYU, NYUAD, and NYUSH, working in consultation with School and Divisional Deans.

- The title of “Global Network Faculty” would refer exclusively to the person’s relationship to the relevant academic unit in New York; it would not affect or alter the person’s title at their primary Portal campus.

---

1 In cases when there is no single or obvious match between units at the Portals and units at NYUNY (for example, the Literature Program at NYUAD has counterparts in several departments in FAS and Gallatin, including the Departments of English, Comparative Literature, French, German, etc.) the decision about which NYUNY unit or units are the right ones for an individual to be affiliated with will need to be agreed upon by the units and deans involved, and facilitated by the Provost of NYU.
Global Network Faculty status as a condition for hiring and promotion is intended for tenure-stream faculty and for Arts Professors and Music Professors; it could also be granted to other full-time non-tenure-stream standing faculty at the portals, but there would be no expectation that the granting unit would be involved in the individual’s hiring, review, or promotion processes.

The title of “Global Network Faculty” would not preclude a faculty member from also having other titles and other modes of affiliation with the NYU academic units, which would be proposed and decided in whatever ways the unit normally decides upon affiliated, associated, or joint appointments.

Units would have the right to revoke Global Network Faculty status at any time, although it is expected that this would be an extremely rare occurrence.

The process leading to Global Network Faculty status would normally begin in the recruitment phase, when relevant NY units would be invited (by Portal deans) to participate in the formulation of search plans. Ideally, the unit that would eventually affiliate the new Portal colleague would have representatives of its faculty on the search committee, and participate in the search itself in a variety of ways (attending job talks and candidate meals, for instance, and providing feedback to the Committee through the departmental representative).

To propose Global Network Faculty status for one of its prospective or already hired standing faculty, the unit (through the appropriate chair and/or dean) would provide the granting unit with the individual’s full professional dossier. The granting unit would then conduct a discussion of this material and take a vote on conferring the status of “Global Network Faculty” to the individual. The results of this vote would be forwarded to the divisional dean of that unit for final approval.

We recommend that the status of “Global Network Faculty” first be introduced in for faculty at the two Portals and then later be extended to designate members of the faculty of NYU New York who have an especially significant and continuing relationship with the campus. As with the status in New York, the Portal would retain the right to revoke Global Network Faculty status at any time, although it is expected that this would be an extremely rare. There would be no expectation, however, that the status would confer upon the individual any rights or obligations with regard to departmental governance on the campus, and there would be no expectation that the campus would be involved in the individual’s third-year, tenure, and promotion review processes in New York.