MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 10, 2011

The New York University Faculty Senators Council (FSC) met at noon on Thursday, March 10, 2011 in Room 914 in the Kimmel Center for University Life.

In attendance were Senators Bogart, Capan, Cappell, Fernandez, Gale, Goldman, Hammack, Harrington, Hutchins, John, Jones, Karl, Kovner, Lebowitz, Magder, Monaco, Moran, Nolan, Phillips, Raiken, Schacht, Simon, Sternhell, Thompson, and Tranchina and Alternate Senators Hendin, Hurvich, Jelinek, Newman, Reiss, and Tannenbaum. NYU Poly Professors Iacono and Ulman, and NYU Abu Dhabi Professor Zamir attended as special guests.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 17, 2011

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the February 17, 2011 meeting were approved unanimously.

INTRODUCTION BY GUESTS FROM NYU ABU DHABI AND NYU POLY

Professor Shamoon Zamir of NYU Abu Dhabi (AD) provided a brief introduction. He currently chairs the Faculty and Provost Executive Committee for NYU AD, which is beginning the process of setting up governance at NYU AD. The Committee was appointed by the Deans and Provost and then approved by the faculty. Zamir expressed the faculty’s interest in establishing an ongoing dialogue with the FSC and receiving representation on the Council. He noted the faculty believes it is important to carefully deliberate on governance structures that work best for NYU AD and to avoid hasty decisions, particularly with the expected increase in faculty. He added the current faculty council at AD is comprised of the entire faculty, including affiliate faculty. They do however restrict voting privileges to tenured, tenure-track faculty, or faculty with contracts longer than 3 years.

Senator Jones inquired about the current grading policy and the movement to a pass/fail scale for first year students. Zamir explained the policy was presented at a special meeting of the faculty. Concerns were expressed by the faculty there, including unease about the lack of consultation. They were informed the decision was made by the leadership, received consideration, and it was not based on issues of plagiarism or a reflection on the quality of students. The rationale focused on institutions in the U.S. that have adopted this policy, i.e. MIT and Swarthmore, and its suitability to this unique cultural environment. The faculty were informed the impact of policy will be closely monitored over the next three years. Zamir also explained while students grades are not declared, they have the option of having grades declared in their final transcript.

Zamir described NYU AD as a small, close-knit community of diverse faculty and students. The 150 students are from 39 countries. The general spirit is very positive. He stated there have been no issues with freedom of teaching. Senator Cappell commented that he believes the current issues in the Middle East will cause an increase in students from the region. Zamir responded the administration has mentioned the possibility of starting summer programs for regional students in order to better prepare them for the academic standards.
Senator Bogart questioned how NYU AD is governed and if they use the same governance documents as faculty on Washington Square. Zamir responded that currently many procedures and processes are ad hoc and, being a new and unique school, they do not want to automatically adopt documents from the Square. He added it is important to find what works best for AD. At the moment, there is a focus on establishing an agreement from the administration that draft policies are reviewed by the faculty.

Professors John Iacono and Avi Ulman from NYU Poly provided a brief introduction. Iacono explained that The Polytechnic Institute of NYU is currently owned by NYU but is not yet a school of NYU. It is comprised of 80 tenured or tenure-track faculty in 11 departments. Its governance operates under their charter and by-laws, and it has a board of trustees separate from NYU. The faculty do not have an elected senate structure, but instead meet as a whole. They do however have committees, including the Executive Committee and Tenure and Promotion Committee, which are advisory in nature. The Provost of NYU makes final decisions on tenure. Secretary Hutchins asked about the timeline for NYU Poly becoming a school. Ulman replied this timeline is decided by President Sexton. The faculty of NYU Poly have the goal to complete the merger as soon as possible and believe it is especially important for the recruitment of new faculty.

Senator Goldman suggested that the announcement from the Mayor’s office about an NYC media lab should help facilitate the collaboration. Ulman added he hopes Bloomberg’s call for an engineering school will also motivate the merger and accelerate the process.

Goldman proposed a motion to create an FSC ad hoc sub-committee to examine issues and build a stronger relationship with NYU Poly. She suggested the committee be comprised of both FSC and NYU Poly members with the purpose of gathering information to develop an informed resolution. It was decided this would be discussed again at the April meeting. Senator Cappell responded he has been actively advocating this merger, but believes--due to the complicated transitional nature and complex financial issues-- forming a joint committee is not the best step at this time. Instead, he stated the FSC should inform the administration of the FSC’s cooperation with Poly faculty. Chairperson Schacht stated the Executive Committee can communicate this with the President and Provost.

Schacht concluded by thanking the guests for their attendance.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: ROBERT SCHACHT

Chairperson Schacht reported that at the meeting with President Sexton on Mar. 1, the Executive Committee inquired about the effects of the current issues in the Middle East on Abu Dhabi. Sexton was confident about the current state in Abu Dhabi. They also discussed the comments from the Mayor’s office concerning academic needs in the field of engineering. Sexton responded that NYU will be submitting a strong and competitive proposal to the City’s initiative.

ELECTION FSC CHAIRPERSON 2011-2012

The candidates for the position of Chairperson 2011-2012: Senator Ted Magder of Steinhardt and current Chairperson Robert Schacht of the School of Medicine presented their brief vision statements.

Magder stated he arrived at NYU in 1996 joining the department of Culture and Communication. He later chaired this department, then renamed Media, Culture, and Communication. He has served on a number of university committees, including the Human Resources Policies Assessment Task Force (HRPAT), the Committee to review the future of Steinhardt, and the
Undergraduate Advisory Committee. He is also an affiliate of the AD faculty. He stated his vision is to focus the business of the FSC on a manageable level, establish priorities, tackle issues effectively, improve transparency, and continue collaboration with the Administrative Management Council (AMC) and Student Senators Council (SSC). He also stated the need to be respectful of university administration and guide meaningful dialogues.

Schacht stated, as chair of the FSC this academic year, he focused on more deliberation by the FSC, rather than frequently bringing members of the administration to speak at FSC meetings. He believes this worked well and felt it was an active and enthusiastic group this year. His vision is to complete what was started last year, particularly examining policies defined by the faculty. He also stated he would like to work more on governance and commented the time between ‘notice and comment’ is key. He stressed the importance of working hard with the administration and empowering faculty. He also stated he looks forward to working more with AD and Poly.

The election of FSC Chairperson for the 2011-12 academic year took place by secret ballot. After collecting the votes of the 31 senators present, Secretary Hutchins announced Ted Magder from the Steinhardt School will serve as FSC Chairperson next year.

**FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Executive Committee: Secretary Hutchins**

*See attached Document A.* Secretary Hutchins presented a draft regarding motions and voting procedure developed by the Committee for consideration by the Council. The focus is to allow ample time for consideration on actions by the Council. In order to have these items of business which require votes receive the fullest consideration by all members of FSC, Hutchins stated the Committee suggests allocating time to have such items distributed in writing to the Council in advance of debate.

Senator Bogart commented that he believes this should go into effect next academic year. Senator Monaco expressed her agreement with the proposal but stated concern over the delay in action because the Council only meets once a month. She suggested if an urgent matter arises, a two-thirds majority ruling would allow for immediate vote and action. Hutchins responded this possibility is already in place by parliamentary rules which state the rules may be suspended by a two-thirds vote. Jones suggested removing “and reports”, and Hutchins agreed. This document will be brought up again at the April meeting.

**Governance Committee: Senator Harrington**

*See attached Document B.* Senator Harrington stated the Committee has been discussing shared governance issues and developing best practices. First item to be addressed is the proposed reply to Nathaniel Landau, President of the School of Medicine’s Faculty Council (SOM FC), following his response to the FSC’s resolution regarding Letters of Agreement at the Medical Center. *See attached Document C.* Harrington stated the Committee attempted to present a balanced letter allowing open channels of communication but also referring to the by-laws concerning jurisdiction. If approved, this letter is to be sent from the FSC Executive Committee. Immediate Past Chair Hammack noted Landau’s letter made a substantive argument, and he questioned why the Committee is responding with a jurisdictional reply. He commented it does not seem collegial. He stated the Council did not have opportunity to discuss the substance of the issue at the Medical Center, the content of these letters, or the consequences of administrative versus academic assignments. Harrington answered that the Committee believed it was an issue of governance and jurisdiction.
After further discussion and the addition of several wording changes, a motion was duly made and seconded that the letter presented by the Governance committee be approved. It was approved by a vote of 19 in favor, 2 senators opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Harrington stated the Committee established an Accountability Ledger. The purpose of this is to track incidents in which established practices and procedures of shared governance have not been followed by the administration, as well as incidents where there has been compliance.

Secondly, the Committee recommended that FSC senators circulate, through their Schools and departments, the agreement the FSC worked out with the administration which allows senators access to NYU Email Direct for the purpose of communicating with the faculty. Secretary Hutchins recommended removing “NYU-Direct’ because this communication tool was not specifically mentioned, and Harrington agreed.

Harrington presented the Committee’s four basic features of shared governance: representation, information, consultation, and reasoned justifications. Senator Kovner encouraged the FSC to closely review this document and send suggestions to Harrington.

Senator Jones inquired about the sources of the four features. Harrington responded the basic pillars of shared governance originated from the Committee members’ understanding and knowledge of what is appropriate for an advisory body. Senator Goldman suggested making this clearer by adding the line “According to deliberations by the Committee, these are the four basic features of shared governance.”

Hutchins moved that the Council table this document and review at the April meeting.

**Tenure Modifications Committee: Senator Monaco**

Senator Monaco asked the Council to review the Committee’s revisions to the “Institute for the Study of the Ancient World Promotion and Tenure Guidelines” and to send any questions, additions, etc. to her by email. *See attached Document D.* This document and the “Institute for Fine Arts Promotion and Tenure Guidelines” document will be reviewed at the April meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 PM.
Proposed Resolution Regarding Motions and Voting Procedure

Presented by the Executive Committee for consideration
at the Faculty Senators Council Meeting, 3/10/11

Amendment to The Rules of Procedure
Faculty Senators Council

Background & Rationale

In order to have items of business which require votes receive the fullest consideration by all members of FSC we should build in enough time to have such items distributed in writing to the Council in advance of debate. Most motions will have originated from and been deliberated and edited by FSC committees.

Rule of Procedure (add to section “IV Regular and Special Meetings”)

The text of all substantive motions and reports to be considered at a regular meeting of the Faculty Senators Council must be submitted to the FSC Coordinator by Monday 10:00 am of the week of the regular FSC meeting. The agenda, text of motions, and supporting materials shall be distributed to the members by Tuesday, mid-day before regular FSC meetings. A motion from the floor is possible but, without this prior notice and documentation, the vote will normally take place at the next FSC meeting following the debate and in exceptional cases by e-mail no less than one week after the debate.
March 10, 2011

TO: Faculty Senate Council

FROM: FSC- Governance Committee (FSC-GC)

Christine Harrington christine.harrington@nyu.edu, Chair
Bruce Bogart bogarb01@nyumc.org
Anthony Kovner anthony.kovner@nyu.edu
Carl Lebowitz carl.lebowitz@nyu.edu
Marie Monaco mem6@nyumc.org
Eric Simon eric.simon@nyu.edu
Daniel Zwanziger daniel.zwanziger@nyu.edu

RE: Report and Proposed Resolutions

A. Proposed Reply to SOM’s Feb. 17, 2011 Letter (aka Dr. Landau’s Letter)

Dear Dr. Landau:

Thank you for your letter of February 17, 2011.

In response, we would like to let you know that NYU’s Faculty Senators Council (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 FSC recognizes senators, elected to the FSC by the voting faculty of Schools, 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.

That being said, we would like to keep channels of communication open with all the Schools.

Sincerely,
B. Governance Committee Report

1. Administrative Accountability on Shared Governance

As part of the FSC-GC’s on going role, we have established an **Accountability Ledger**. The purpose of the Accountability Ledger is to track incidents we know of where established practices and procedures of shared governance have not been followed by the Administration, as well as incidents where there is compliance.

Some examples of a lack of shared governance FSC-GC has discussed include:

- The BD of Trustees did not follow University procedures to “consult with faculty” in the appointment of the current President, nor were they followed when the BD of Trustee unilaterally reappointed him to this office.
- Appointing faculty who are not elected, appointed, or even vetted by the duly elected representatives of the faculty (FSC) to serve on University committee, and alleging that “faculty have been consulted” when FSC expresses concern over a policy making process.
- Requiring FSC members, as well as the random faculty the Administration appoints to University committees to pledge “deliberative privilege”, thus preventing consultation with and representation for faculty interests.
- Supporting School of Medicine threats to take away the economic guarantees of tenure established by the Faculty Handbook.
- Side-stepping the processes of “consultation with faculty” at the School level and the University level while planning and implementing academic reforms, such as the Faculty of Arts and Science Graduate Financial Aid Reform (aka FAR 4).
- Bypassing the duty to “consult faculty” with “Trustee-driven proposals”, such as the recent case of a “Trustee-driven decision” to reduce faculty-retirees’ medical benefits.
- The sudden statement from the Administration that “there is no faculty housing shortage,” after years of admitting there is such a shortage and trying to plan accordingly.
- Many faculty have expressed to their FSC representatives that they view the planning and implementation of the “Global University” and “Project 2031” as lacking adequate “consultation with the faculty” (i.e., notification, of administrative decisions, is not “consultation”).

Before an incident can be registered on the Accountability Ledger it must be carefully documented and researched. Incident reports are to be submitted to the Governance Committee with complete documentation, references and contact information so the Committee is able to verify incidents.

2. Communications (access to information) as a Governance Issues

**We Recommend:**

FSC Senators circulate, through their Schools and departments, the agreement FSC
worked out with the Administration (see Memo from Provost McLaughlin, 3/32011 ), which allows Senators access to NYU-Direct email for the purpose of communicating with the faculty (their constituents).

**B. RESOLUTIONS on Shared Governance**

There are 4 basic features of shared governance:

1. **Representation** (not “notice and comment”)

WHEREAS: Shared governance means that input from the faculty’s duly elected representatives (FSC) is central to the process of “consulting with faculty”,

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Faculty’s Senate Council will have representatives, selected by the FSC, on University Committees dealing with all matters that affect faculty.

2. **Information**

BACKGROUND: The Faculty Senators’ Council functions as the personnel committee for the faculty. As such, it is obligated to represent the faculty’s interest in dealing with the administration, and to insure that the faculty is informed on issues that pertain to them and impact their well-being. It has been common practice by the administration to impose a rule requiring confidentiality with respect to deliberations on certain topics, such as, but not limited to, benefits. This practice is referred to as “deliberative privilege”.

WHEREAS: This practice prevents the faculty from obtaining timely knowledge concerning issues that affect them, and

WHEREAS: This practice prevents the administration from obtaining valuable feedback from the faculty as a whole,

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senators’ Council does not support the practice of a code of confidentiality, also known as “deliberative privilege”, except in cases concerning information specific to individuals, whose privacy rights transcend the need for transparency.

3. **Consultation**

WHEREAS: Shared governance means seeking faculty input before decisions are made that affect the faculty and adequately responding to faculty input,
IT IS RESOLVED: That when a decision is not pressing, a reasonable length of time for consultation must be provided (i.e., during semesters this means a few weeks in order to have a regular FSC meeting). During the summer when FSC is not in session, decisions should be postponed. If a decision is absolutely necessary during the period when the FSC is not in session, then all efforts must be made to communicate with the FSC Executive Committee, who will take appropriate actions to inform all Senators.

4. **Reasoned Justifications**

WHEREAS: Deliberation is an important element of the consultation process,

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Administration will provide, in writing, its reasons for not accepting the FSC’s advice developed though the process of consultation.
MEMORANDUM

TO: President John Sexton
    Provost David McLaughlin

FROM: Nathaniel Landau, President NYULMC FC

RE: Letters of Agreement at the Medical Center

On November 18, 2010, the NYU Faculty Senators Council (FSC) passed a resolution that termed the Letters of Agreement distributed by the Dean’s office to the Medical Center Faculty to be a breach of the NYU Faculty Handbook.

At two recent meetings, the NYU Langone Medical Center Faculty Council (NYULMC FC) took up the matter of the FSC resolution. The result was the passage of three resolutions. These assert that when the FSC ruled on the Letters, it prevented the NYULMC FC from playing its rightful role in guiding policies that directly affect the Medical Center faculty.

The NYULMC FC resolutions and the outcome of the vote are attached. In brief, the resolutions state:

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.

Cc
Robert Schacht, President FSC
Steven Abramson, Senior VP
Robert Grossman, Dean and CEO
Carol Morrow, Associate Provost
Diane Yu, Chief of Staff to the President
Robert Berne, Executive VP
Three Resolutions regarding the Faculty Senators Council Resolution Concerning Letters of Agreement at the School of Medicine

Jan. 31, 2011

Whereas:
The recent resolution termed the “Faculty Senators Council Resolution Concerning Letters of Agreement at the School of Medicine” that was passed by the faculty senate was not discussed, considered or approved by the NYULMC Faculty Council.

The NYULMC Faculty Council believes that the NYU Faculty Senate should inform the NYULMC Faculty Council of its deliberations on matters that directly pertain to the Medical Center. The NYULMC FC should be informed before any such resolutions are approved and passed onto the leadership of the University. Furthermore, the opinion and guidance of the NYULMC FC should be solicited and be taken into consideration in the deliberations of the FSC on such matters.

Regarding the Letters of Agreement at the School of Medicine, this issue will be considered through the standard procedures of the NUULMC Faculty Council. The matter has been referred to the Benefits and Tenure Committee who will report on their findings. The Council will recommend whatever action we feel is appropriate after a careful, fair and thorough discussion.

Resolved:

1. We, the members of the NYULMC Faculty Council (NYULMC FC), urge the leadership of the university to disregard the resolution that was passed regarding the Letters of Agreement at the School of Medicine as it was passed without our knowledge and without our guidance.

2. We urge the NYU Faculty Senate to rescind the resolution regarding the Letters of Agreement at the School of Medicine and to reconsider it after having heard the disposition of the NYULMC on the matter.

3. We urge the NYU Faculty Senators Council not to approve any future resolutions that are directed at the medical center without prior consultation with the NYULMC Faculty Council.
1. We, the members of the NYULMC Faculty Council (NYULMC FC), urge the leadership of the university to disregard the resolution that was passed regarding the Letters of Agreement at the School of Medicine as it was passed without our knowledge and without our guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 36
skipped question 0

2. We urge the NYU Faculty Senate to rescind the resolution regarding the Letters of Agreement at the School of Medicine and to reconsider it after having heard the disposition of the NYULMC on the matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 36
skipped question 0
3. We urge the NYU Faculty Senators Council not to approve any future resolutions that are directed at the medical center without prior consultation with the NYULMC Faculty Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 36
Skipped question: 0

Document C, Page 4
Incorporates Review by Provost Office and Office of General Counsel, January 10, 2011 and ISAW Faculty Input of January 11, 2011

Institute for the Study of the Ancient World
New York University
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The guidelines given in this document are to be read in the context of the statement “New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines” (available at http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html) and of the policy statements on academic tenure in the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.).

These guidelines recognize the special circumstances of the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (“ISAW”), including its small faculty size and the absence of a departmental structure. Should ISAW substantially grow or change its structure, these guidelines will be modified accordingly through the same process by which they were adopted.

1. Standards.

1.1. A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in tutorial instruction, research seminars, and the direction of research in the context of a research university, together with the promise of effective contributions toward the work and intellectual life of ISAW and NYU, are prerequisite for tenure and promotion at ISAW. Once these prerequisites are met, a candidate must have a record of outstanding scholarly research and publication. In the absence of such a record, tenure or promotion will not be granted.

1.2. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure and promotion is an inquiry. Is the candidate for tenure or promotion among the strongest in his/her field, in comparison with other scholars in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of ISAW? It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses that may be improved.

2. Promotion and Tenure Committees.

2.1. Because of its relatively small size and lack of a departmental structure, the Director of the ISAW will appoint an ad hoc Faculty Review Committee for each case of tenure or promotion, with members typically chosen from ISAW as well as other NYU faculties. A recommendation is made that one member of the ad hoc committee be appointed by someone other than the director, such as the Dean of FAS. This will prevent the appearance that the process is under the total control of the Director.

2.2. In the case of initial appointment to tenure rank, the Faculty Review Committee will be composed of the tenured members at or above the proposed rank of the candidate who served on the search committee. If there are fewer than three such members on the search committee, the Director of ISAW will appoint additional members from among the eligible faculty of ISAW or...
from other closely related faculties in the University to create a quorum of three. The Director will appoint a Chair of the Faculty Review Committee from among the members of the Committee, who will administer the business of the Committee.

2.3 In the case of reviews of faculty members already serving at ISAW, the Faculty Review Committee will be composed of three members at appropriate rank who will be appointed by the Director. It is suggested that one member of this committee be appointed by someone other than the Director, such as the Dean of FAS. If there are too few ISAW faculty members suitable for service on a particular Committee, the Director of ISAW will appoint appropriate members from other closely related faculties in the University to create a quorum of three. The Director will appoint a Chair of the Faculty Review Committee, who will administer the business of the Committee. The Director will not attend the meetings of the Faculty Review Committee. The vote of the Committee members will be by closed ballot and reported by numbers.

2.4 It is the responsibility of the Faculty Review Committee to gather the relevant materials for the case, both from the candidate and from a minimum of five external referees. All letters to outside referees are sent by the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee on behalf of the committee. The materials gathered by the Faculty Review Committee, together with its assessment of the candidate, form the docket that goes to the full tenured faculty of the Institute for its consideration.

3. Materials included in the docket.


3.2. Assessment of teaching performance and potential. This assessment is to be specific to the character of ISAW’s doctoral program, focusing on the leading of research seminars, the supervision of research, and the conducting of tutorial instruction. The docket may include the following information:

- Candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy and practices
- Syllabi or descriptions of seminars
- List of doctoral students directed and committees served on
- Record of observation of teaching
- Student evaluations, including letters solicited from students or former students

3.3. Assessment of the candidate’s record of contributions to the work of the Institute, of the University, and of the larger academic community, or of potential for such contributions.

3.4. Assessment of the candidate’s scholarly work. This assessment should consider not only the quality of the candidate’s published and forthcoming work but its specific suitability to ISAW’s distinctive mission. The docket should include, as appropriate, the following information and documents:

- Candidate’s statement of research aims and plans
- Copies of major and representative scholarly publications
External assessments of the candidate’s publications, including reviews
Copies of any earlier reviews (in the case of internal candidates for tenure)
List of the external referees, with brief indication of their scholarly interests and
reason for their selection
The external referees’ letters

3.5 The five referees should not be scholars with whom the candidate has had a close
association, such as a dissertation adviser. (Co-authors should not be included unless the
association is relatively minor or unless the candidate’s work is in a narrow field where it would
be difficult to find enough equally qualified referees.) The referees should be suggested by
members of the Faculty Review Committee or in consultation with external experts, not by or in
consultation with the candidate. In the event that five independent scholars cannot be identified,
additional letters may come from scholars who have an association with the candidate, but any
such connection shall be disclosed.

4. Review by the ISAW Faculty.

4.1 The docket prepared by the Faculty Review Committee will be made available to the entire
tenured faculty of ISAW, except that in the case of promotion to the rank of Professor only those
members at that rank may participate in the process. The faculty will vote whether to accept the
recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee and will submit its recommendation to the
Director. The vote must be by closed ballot and tallied following departmental custom or
departmental decision.

5. Review by the Director.

5.1 The Director of ISAW is responsible for evaluating the docket and making a
recommendation to the Provost. The Director will consider the recommendation of the Faculty
Review Committee and the vote of the full ISAW faculty in preparing this recommendation. The
director must forward the report of the committee as well as the results of the closed vote
(including the number of positives, negatives and abstentions) to the Provost. The Director will
inform the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee and the candidate of the recommendation. In
the case of a recommendation contrary to the vote of the faculty, the Director will provide the
Chair of the Faculty Review Committee with reasons for the recommendation, and the Chair of
the Faculty Review Committee will have an opportunity for further information or counter-
argument before the Director makes a final recommendation to the Provost.

5.2 In the case of internal candidacies, the Director of ISAW ordinarily will submit the docket to
the Provost with a recommendation no later than March 1.


6.1 In the case of a Joint Appointment between ISAW and another school of the University, the
Faculty Review Committee must include members selected from ISAW and the relevant
academic department in the other school. The eligible faculty of ISAW and the eligible faculty
of the other school shall vote whether to accept the recommendation of the Faculty Review
Committee, and the votes shall be forwarded to the Director of ISAW and the Dean of the other school, respectively. The ISAW Director and the Dean will forward a joint decision to the Provost. If the ISAW Director and the Dean find themselves in disagreement, they will discuss the case jointly and individually with the Provost.

7. **Review by the Provost.**

7.1 The Provost will evaluate each docket, including the ISAW Director’s recommendation. The Provost may convene an ad hoc committee to advise him or her on ISAW promotion and tenure cases.

7.2 The Provost will support or oppose the ISAW Director’s recommendation in his/her final decision and will inform the Director of his/her pending decision. In those cases in which the Provost’s decision is contrary to the recommendation of the Director, the Provost will provide the Director with the reasons and give the Director an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost issues a final decision. The Provost will notify the Director of the final decision, along with reasons for the decision if the Director’s recommendation is disapproved.

8. **Guidelines for Appeal.**

8.1 In the event of a negative decision on tenure or promotion, the candidate shall have the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of NYU’s Faculty Grievance Procedures appearing at pp. 56-58 of the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.), available at http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/FacHbk2008.pdf.