MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 14, 2013

The New York University Faculty Senators Council (FSC) met at noon on Thursday, March 14, 2013 in Room 905/907 in the Kimmel Center for University Life.

In attendance were Senators Adelman, Alter, Anton, Billman, Cappell, Cowin, Gale, Harrington, Hutchins, Jelinek, Jones, Karl, Ling, Ludomirsky, Magder, McIlwain, Mincer, Monaco, Nolan, Raiken, Sternhell, Stokes, Sundaram, Tannenbaum, Thurston, Uleman, Van Devanter, and Zwanziger, Active Alternates Azmitia, Chan, Rubin, and Tuzhilin, and Alternate Senators Dasanayake, Reiss, and Simon. FSC Advisors Al-Askari and Moskowitz attended as guests.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 14, 2013

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the February 14, 2013 meeting were approved unanimously.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS: VICE CHAIRPERSON AND SECRETARY, 2013-2014

The Nominating Committee is accepting nominations, including self-nominations, for the positions of Vice Chair and Secretary. The Committee will present the list of candidates in the notice of the April meeting and the vote will take place at the May meeting.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: TED MAGDER

Observer Status for NYU Poly

Chairperson Magder reported members of the Executive Committee (EC) met with John Iacono from NYU Poly to discuss the transition of Poly and its representation in university governance. Poly will likely become a school January 2014. The EC recommended Poly elect a representative to serve as an observer without voting privileges. At the time that Poly becomes a school, the FSC will recommend the observer become a voting member.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the following motion was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously by vote of the Council:

Resolution

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senators Council will advise Poly that it should elect a member of its voting faculty in accordance with our rules to serve as an observer on the FSC in the coming academic year (2013-2014) and at the time Poly is recognized officially as a school of NYU, that observer will assume full voting rights on the Faculty Senators Council.
Governance: Committee Chair Harrington

Best practices for selecting & appointing university presidents

Senator Harrington presented the report developed by the committee on best practices in selecting university presidents and a draft of the Committee’s resolution. See attached Documents A and B.

Senator McIlwain stated that faculty from across the University have expressed the need and desire to further institutionalize shared governance and greater faculty participation in choosing a university president. The Governance Committee set out to understand the principles at NYU and standard operating procedures in selecting presidents at NYU. The Committee reviewed a wide-range of documents that led to the following basic findings:

1) While it can be accomplished in many ways, faculty participation in presidential searches is regarded as the norm in both principle and in practice at research universities across the US.
2) Faculty participation is a central feature currently taking place at institutions regarded as our peers.
3) With the exception of our most recent president, significant faculty participation in presidential selection has been the norm at NYU.

The NYU Bylaws do not include guidelines regarding criteria for who is to be included as a member of the committee or any procedures governing the committee’s process for developing their recommendations for presidential selection. The Committee developed a resolution to address the issue. See attached Document B.

Senators expressed their concerns with the resolution. One Senator commented on the restrictions the resolution places on the Board of Trustees, the decision-makers in the process, particularly forcing a lengthy search when they have a top candidate. He also stated an objection with the line: “each faculty representative on the Committee shall be elected by the voting members of the Faculty Senator’s Council at the time the Committee is first constituted.” He expressed concern this would not represent a cross-section of the faculty or the Faculty Council.

It was questioned why this resolution was being discussed when the election for president will not take place for several years. A Senator stated that it timely to produce a resolution since Sexton’s term ends in 2016 and any change in the Bylaws should be worked on now.

Senators commented on the level of detail in the resolution, which may lead the administration to reject in full. For example, the resolution indicates items that shall be posted on an official website including “description and details of scheduled outreach efforts.” He commented that personal phone calls, for instance, may not be deemed appropriate for public posting.

Harrington stated this is intended to provide transparency and refers to federal law and fair hiring practices.

Senators discussed how faculty would be elected to serve on a committee and suggested sending an announcement to all faculty. Senators commented on the importance of faculty representation across schools. Senators suggested including administrators and students on the committee. A Senator stated we should not speak for SSC or AMC. Another Senator commented that administrators and students do not have same place in shared governance as faculty.
Senators commented on the balance between description and generality, and the importance of providing enough framework but not too much detail. Micro-management of the Board of Trustees may not be received well.

The general focus of the resolution is to establish an advisory search committee, ensure faculty have a prominent role in the process, and ensure the committee consults with all constituencies in university.

The Senator who served on the search committee for President John Sawhill outlined the format: the Chancellor wrote a memo to the FSC to appoint a faculty advisory committee. That committee consisted of 7 members across disciplines. He stated the format was very effective and should be given consideration. The resolution recommends that faculty should constitute no less than 1/3 of the Committee.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the following amendment to the motion was moved and seconded.

**Primary Amendment to Main Motion:**

Remove section A. and change the RESOLVED section as follows:

RESOLVED: The Faculty Senators Council recommends that the NYU Board of Trustees amend Chapter IV, Section 25(b) of the NYU Bylaws to include a new section outlining the composition and responsibilities of a Presidential Search Committee that has significant and meaningful elected-faculty representation.

In addition the following sentence would be added in the memo: We further request that we meet with the executive and representatives of the board of trustees to draft the details of this section.

During debate on this amendment to the main motion, a second amendment was moved and seconded.

**Secondary Amendment to Main Motion:**

Include (iv.):

The Presidential Search Committee and its procedures will be governed by NYU’s five principles of Shared Governance, which serve as a framework for ensuring Faculty representation, information, consultation, reasoned justification, and communication (see [The Faculty Handbook](#)).

The secondary amendment was approved by vote of the Council. The primary amendment was approved by vote of the Council. The final approved resolution reads:

**Resolution:**

Whereas: Faculty participation in, and consultation on searches to select NYU presidents has historically been the norm, and

Whereas: The most recent search departed significantly from that norm, and

Whereas: The current NYU Bylaws include no detailed provisions for how Presidential searches will be conducted, it is

RESOLVED: The Faculty Senators Council recommends that the NYU Board of Trustees amend Chapter IV, Section 25(b) of the NYU Bylaws to include a new section outlining the composition and responsibilities of a Presidential Search Committee that has significant and meaningful elected-faculty representation.
The Presidential Search Committee and its procedures will be governed by NYU’s five principles of Shared Governance, which serve as a framework for ensuring Faculty representation, information, consultation, reasoned justification, and communication (see The Faculty Handbook).

**PAAC/Tenure Modifications: Committee Chair Monaco**

*Division of Libraries revision to the Libraries Bylaws to create a new non-tenure track title: Assistant and Associate Librarian of Practice*

The joint committee presented their recommendations. See attached Document C.

Senators raised questions regarding the contractual sections of the Faculty Handbook. The Executive and Governance Committees are investigating this question in their meetings with Linda Mills, Bonnie Brier, Katy Fleming, and Carol Morrow.

The recommendation was approved by vote of the Council.

**Administrative Issues: Committee Chair Hutchins**

*Recommendation on adding Google+ to suite of NYU's Apps for Ed*

Senator Hutchins reported that the Administrative Issues Committee reviewed the proposal presented by Vice President for Public Affairs John Beckman, related to offering Google+ Social network to the suite of NYU’s applications, as a choice, on an opt-in basis.

Google+ is a way of creating a contained, interactive social media space using NYU net IDs. The environment has similarities to Facebook but with items such as RSS feed and blogs contained within the site. It has more capabilities than NYU Classes. The privacy issue is that, unlike our agreement with Google mail, with Google+ NYU IDs are put into Google's mega-data.

The Committee met with John Beckman, David Ackerman (Associate VP, .edu Services, Executive Director, DLTS), and Devin Nix (Academic Technology Specialist) and discussed the following questions & answers:

**Question:** If this is offered on an individual opt-in basis, how would that procedure work?

**Answer:** The network is displayed as an additional black icon at the top of Gmail screen and the first time it is activated there would be a statement letting the user know this is offered through the Google commercial license, not the academic license. Any individual who has opted-in can later opt-out and the posting will disappear.

**Question:** Would there be any ability to associate local aliases, such as Stern usernames, to the NYU Net ID for this purpose?

**Answer:** Yes.

**Question:** We understand that collaboration features, such as video handouts, are useful. Are there limitations?

**Answer:** Up to 10 people can participate at once and this is a larger number than offered in Skype.

**Question:** Could the use case in teaching be described to us in more detail?
Answer: Some small classes are using this now. Students expressed interest in this type of application and some instructors are currently using Facebook for such purposes.

Question: What about the long-term stability for Google+ users given the highly competitive situation for Google in the ITS space.

Answer: The claim from ITS is that there is some evidence that NYU can be influential with Google by joining with others to alter preferred features.

Question: What about privacy?

Answer: Google+ cannot be offered under anything but the commercial license.

Active Alternate Tuzhiilin stated the Committee asked if NYU should move forward with Google+ before the new Social Media Policy is approved. Beckman did not see any significant problems in accepting Google+ before the Social Media Policy is approved. If there is a conflict between the two, the Social Media Policy should take precedence.

A Senator commented that in Shanghai, Google and Facebook are considered censored media and not available. But perhaps they will available at the new site in 2014.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the motion to approve use of Google+ on an individual opt-in basis was moved, seconded, and approved by a vote of 17 senators in favor and 9 senators opposed, with 6 abstentions.

Housing: Committee Chair Stokes

*Shared Cost-Plan Upgrades, Mediation, Rodent Control, No-Dog areas, and Bikes*

Senator Stokes announced he is serving as Chair of the Housing Committee for the remainder of the spring semester. The Committee met with Karen Gulino (Assistant Vice President, Faculty Housing & Residential Services) and Monica Lafaun Bullet (Director, Facilities and Construction Management) last week. They discussed the topic of upgrading apartments. The Office of Faculty Housing currently offers the complete interior painting of each residential unit at lease renewal. In lieu of painting at lease renewal, resident could pick from a menu of upgrade items. Examples of upgrades include: floor refinishing, wall base replacement with wood, kitchen cabinet re-facing, kitchen countertop and backsplash replacement, and new appliances. There would be an opportunity for cost-sharing for tenants to contribute for more expensive upgrades.

The Committee also discussed mediation for planned construction, including replacing the windows in Washington Square Village. Testing has been done and these reports will be sent to the Space Priorities Working Group.

The issue of rodents was raised, which has become a problem because of the removal of rat poison in Washington Square Park to protect the hawks. This will be addressed in the rodent control plan. The Committee also discussed the enforcement of no-dogs in designated areas, and the bike rooms and bike share program.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 PM.
March 11, 2013

Background on Presidential Search Best Practices and Standard Operating Procedures at NYU

BACKGROUND

This FSC-GC Report summarizes generally accepted principles and practices that govern Presidential searches at colleges and universities across the United States. It also compares and contrasts these accepted principles and best practices with the procedures followed in the most recent Presidential search at NYU. The goal of this report is to provide a framework for establishing recommendations to ensure that NYU’s next Presidential search process is consistent with nationally accepted principles and best practices for R1 universities.

A large number of documents were gathered and examined in preparation for this report, including: bylaws and legislative documents at NYU and other higher education institutions; policy whitepapers and research survey results by university governing boards and faculty interest organizations, statements by higher education search experts, including experts at search firms, as well as the personal experiences of faculty and administrative chairs of presidential search committees; news reports of past and current presidential searches; and information about current and recent presidential searches on university websites.

SECTION 1. NYU Presidential Procedures and Recent Experience

Responsibility for selecting the President rests solely with the NYU Board of Trustees.

A single provision, Chapter IV, Section 25(b) of the NYU Bylaws, governs the selection of the President:

“The President of the University will be elected by the voting Trustees after consideration of the recommendations of a committee established by the Chair.”

Bylaw 25(b) further stipulates that:

“Officers of the University may be elected for a specific term or may be elected without a stated term and serve until such officer’s sooner death, incapacity, disqualification, resignation, removal or until the person ceases to be an employee of the University whose employment duties, as determined by the President and Chancellor, correspond to the duties of the office. At the expiration of any term, any qualified officer of the University may be reelected.”

The Bylaws do not include guidelines regarding criteria for who is to be included as a member of the committee, or any procedures governing the committee’s process for developing their recommendations for Presidential selection. In fact, a strict reading of
NYU’s provision on this matter allows for the possibility that the committee actually conduct a “search,” given that the operative committee is not specified to be a “search” committee. Thus, under the current Bylaws, the Board Chairman might charge the extant committee with a mission that does not constitute a “search.” For instance, the Board might give the committee the charge to submit recommendations about whether the Board should elect a candidate already selected by the Board.

SECTION 2. Presidential Selection: Recent Practice at NYU

According to public records, the following briefly summarizes the search process for John Sexton, the most recent President selected by the NYU Board:

- Following the March 5, 2001 announcement that former President Jay Oliva would be vacating the office, Chairman of the Board Martin Lipton established a 13-member committee, referred to as the “Committee on the Future of the Presidency.” Andrew S. Schaffer, then a Senior Vice President, chaired what reports refer to as a “national search committee.” The committee consisted entirely of NYU Board members (the committee’s constitution was not known, however, until after the new President was named).

- Less than one month after the announcement that the Board had convened a committee, a senior administration official leaked to the New York Times that the committee’s sole candidate was John Sexton, then Dean of the NYU Law School.

- On May 8, 2001, the NYU Board announced its appointment of John Sexton as President.

- Faculty across the university spoke out against what they referred to as a “hasty and improper” search and selection process that was conducted “without any meaningful input” from faculty. In the wake of the decision, the faculty in two schools, Arts and Science (FAS) and Steinhardt, each passed separate resolutions calling for more faculty input into the Presidential search process. Similarly, the NYU chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) circulated a petition similarly objecting to the search process and calling for faculty participation input in the presidential search process.

- While the NYU Board of Trustees declined to release any details about the search process, it did state that it had “met some 15 times with elected representatives and other leaders of the various University constituencies – faculty, deans, students, administrators, and senior officers, and alumni – to discuss the search.”

---


2 Ibid.
Two conclusions can be drawn from what is known about this most recent Presidential search process:

1. The NYU Board has unlimited authority to select a president as current Bylaw 25(a) reads; and
2. The process and procedures by which the Board conducted its search were not transparent, nor were they accountable to the principles of shared governance.

However, it appears that this 2001 NYU presidential selection process is an aberration with respect to presidential searches that came before. At least since 1962, NYU faculty participated significantly in the selection processes for all presidents, except for John Sexton. Faculty were involved in the selection processes of former Presidents, including James Hester (1962-1975), John C. Sawhill (1975-1980), John Brademas (1981-1991), and Jay Oliva (1991-2002).

FSC Senator Emeritus Eric Simon participated on the faculty advisory committee that selected John Sawhill. That committee consisted almost entirely of faculty and, though advisory to the Trustee committee, ultimately joined the trustees in interviewing and deliberating on candidates. Faculty and other members of the university community were also invited to participate in offering input about desired candidate qualifications, as well as nominating candidates. Similarly, former FSC Chair, Salah Al-Askari, was a member of the search committee that recommended Jay Oliva, where the outcome of faculty feedback, in particular, led to the decision not to conduct a search from outside the university.

SECTION 3. General Principles & Characteristics Governing Presidential Searches

A. Presidential Searches, a Priority for Shared Governance

Faculty participation in presidential selection is the norm in American Colleges and Universities. Since 1966, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has regarded presidential searches as “one of the most significant instances of shared governance in the life of a university.”5 It also notes, however, that in practice, joint participation in presidential selection is “challenging.”6 A 2009 study published by the

---

3 See Appendix A for section documentation.
4 See Appendix B.
6 Ibid.
TIAA-CREF Institute and sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, of which NYU is a member, surveyed the degree and tenor of faculty influence and joint engagement between faculty and Trustees at colleges and universities across the country. One of their principal findings was that engagement on presidential search committees was the most substantive form of Faculty-Trustee interaction reported by those surveyed. Participants identified presidential search committees as a more common site of interaction than participation on university governing committees in general, as well as other university activities, such as fundraising and alumni activities. Second only to curricula, 58% of private institutions, 63% of public and 58% of all institutions cited presidential searches as the most common issue that faculty and trustees not only should but do address together.

B. Presidential Search Considerations

While it is generally recognized that governing boards have the institutional and legal responsibility for selecting senior administrators, including Presidents, such boards must take into account, and make decisions consistent with the principles of shared governance with faculty as they seek to conduct presidential searchers. Further, governing boards, faculty interest groups, and higher education experts recognize that fulfilling these principles can be accomplished in a myriad of ways. No matter what decisions are made about the following issues, the principles of faculty representation, broad input, and meaningful consideration of faculty recommendations are the foundations that underlie any practical effort to carry out presidential searches. The following are a number of those issues to be considered (largely extracted from AAUP materials found here and elsewhere):

**Committee Composition.** While some institutions use a two-tiered committee structure – one representing the faculty, one the board, the most common practice is to appoint a single committee, made up of Trustees, faculty and other university constituencies, where faculty representatives reflect the primacy of faculty concern. However many caution against committees containing more than 13-18 total members. Generally, the faculty members of the committee are given the responsibility for soliciting and communicating the input and interests of the faculty at large. Search committee chairs – almost always a member of the Board, are usually appointed by the Trustees in advance of constituting a search committee. Finally, search committee members representing various constituencies, including faculty, usually name their own appointees to the committee.

**Committee Charge.** Formulated by the Trustees, in consultation with faculty and other university constituencies, the committee charge outlines the primary criteria of the search in terms of its scope (national, regional, internal), statement of necessary presidential qualities, expectations about whether and to what degree search consultants will be used, the number of candidates that should ultimately be recommended to the board for final decision, and the expected deadline for submission.
Confidentiality. It is generally agreed that the search process will be made public to the university community, and that faculty representatives will keep their constituencies apprised of the progress of the search. However, it is also almost universally agreed that confidentiality is necessary when it comes to search candidates specifically, especially at the early stages of the search process. Such confidentiality is viewed as necessary to attract the best candidates (many of whom will only agree to be considered under such circumstances), and to preserve the integrity of committee deliberations about specific candidates throughout the process. Faculty representation, meaningful consultation, and consideration on the search committee and throughout the search process should mitigate any potential negative impact due to confidentiality.

SECTION 4. Recent Examples of Presidential Searches

Princeton, Yale and Carnegie Mellon have all undertaken presidential searches in recent years. NYU at times regards these as peer institutions, in terms of being private universities with similar governing structures. What we know about their search processes can be considered a model for how shared governance in presidential searches should be undertaken.

Princeton University’s Board of Trustees appointed a 17-member committee in the Fall of 2012 to search for a replacement for outgoing President, Shirley M. Tilghman. The committee includes nine trustees (including the search committee chair), four faculty members, two undergraduates and one graduate student, and one university staff member. At its first meeting, the committee agreed to solicit input, via a survey hosted on its website, from the university community regarding the principal qualities, characteristics, skills and experiences deemed desirable in its next President and comments about the challenges the next president would face. Participants were also invited to submit names of potential candidates to be considered by the search committee. The committee also decided to hold a number of open forums, meetings and other forms of outreach to faculty, students, staff, alumni and its community. The search committee operates a dedicated website that features information about search committee members, the search process (including deadlines, and announcements of all public meetings and forums) and a description of the outgoing President’s legacy.

Yale University initiated a search in the Fall of 2012 to replace outgoing President Richard C. Levin. A publicly accessible pdf document, available on the university’s website, provides details of the characteristics it seeks in its next President, a description of the search process (which began with the appointment of a Senior Fellow of the Yale Corporation to serve as the committee’s Chair), and the following statement:

“The Corporation and the Presidential Search Committee are committed to using the search process as an opportunity to receive input from and to have conversations with individuals from the wide range of constituencies that are
integral to Yale’s continued role as one of the world’s leading education and research institutions. To that end, the search process has been designed to permit open and broad engagement across the Yale community, both on campus and around the world.

Yale’s search committee consisted of twelve members, all of whom appear to be Yale Corporation Fellows. Several of the fellows are current Yale faculty members. The Yale Corporation also devised a number of mechanisms for faculty engagement in the search process. It designated specific Trustees as “Trustee Liaisons” to university stakeholders, including faculty, students, staff and alumni. These liaisons were responsible for “ensuring that there are opportunities for wide consultation with each of the constituencies…” Additionally, the Yale Corporation designated a set of “Counselors” for the faculty, staff and alumni to work with the Liaisons in soliciting input. The Liaisons and Counselors are empowered to convey any confidential views or information to the search committee, if deemed necessary. The Yale search committee also maintained a dedicated website that featured announcements about specific outreach and comment events, as well as an email address whereby members of the university community could convey comments directly to the search committee.

Carnegie Mellon University’s (CMU) 20-page pdf document provides a rich description of the university’s history, governing structure (including a statement about shared governance), financial situation and academic achievements. It also includes a description of the university’s present and future challenges and opportunities and six primary characteristics it is looking for in its next President. The CMU search committee is comprised of sixteen members, including seven faculty members, each representing the seven colleges and schools at CMU. The CMU search website includes a contact email address and invites “nominations, applications, confidential inquiries and questions regarding the search process.”

The principles of shared governance in presidential searches, the recent practice of peer institutions currently conducting presidential searches, and NYU’s historical precedents lead to a number of recommendations that are formulated, separate from this document, into a resolution proposing changes to current NYU Bylaws.

---

7 Yale Presidential Search. Online at: http://presidential-search.yale.edu/about-search
8 Section documentation included in Appendix C, which is a separate Pdf document.
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FSC Resolution Recommending the Amendment of NYU Bylaws

To Include Provisions for Conducting Searches for University President

Background

See document, Background on Presidential Search Best Practices and Standard Operating Procedures at NYU.

Resolution

Whereas: Faculty participation in, and consultation on searches to select NYU presidents has historically been the norm, and

Whereas: The most recent search departed significantly from that norm, and

Whereas: The current NYU Bylaws include no detailed provisions for how Presidential searches will be conducted, it is

Resolved: The Faculty Senators Council recommends that the NYU Board of Trustees amend Chapter IV, Section 25(b) of the NYU Bylaws as follows:

A. Officers of the University. The President of the University will be appointed by the voting Trustees, following the completion of a search carried out by the Presidential Search Committee and the review of the Committee’s recommendation to the Board of Trustees. A Trustee appointed by the voting members of the Board of Trustees will chair the Presidential Search Committee, consisting of both Trustees and Faculty in accordance with the following guidelines:

(i). Committee Membership. Full-Time, tenured faculty shall constitute no less than one-third of the Committee’s total voting membership. Each faculty representative on the Committee shall be elected by the voting members of the Faculty Senator’s Council at the time the Committee is first constituted.

(ii). Committee Charge. The Presidential Search Committee shall be tasked with conducting a thorough review of potential nominees for the Presidency, and make recommendations to the Board regarding the nominees. To accomplish this task, the Committee will be charged
with developing and publicizing a process that clearly articulates a procedure for soliciting input and providing information back to constituencies within the University. Specifically, the Committee will solicit input regarding, but not limited to, the following: the desired experiences and qualifications of presidential candidates; what are viewed to be the opportunities and challenges facing the new President; and the names of potential presidential candidates.

(iii). **Transparency & Confidentiality.** The Presidential Search Committee shall maintain an official website that will include, but is not limited to: the names and titles of each search committee member; a description of the Committee’s charge; information about the general search process and procedures; description and details of scheduled outreach efforts; and a request for comments, suggestions, questions, as well as other feedback. The Committee shall make transparency and open communication its norm of operation, reserving and invoking confidentiality with respect to the following: (a) The revelation of names of candidates being actively vetted by the Committee; and (b) any information that the Committee receives from NYU constituencies during its outreach and consultation process that the Committee deems confidential.

(iv). The Presidential Search Committee and its procedures will be governed by NYU’s five principles of Shared Governance, which serve as a framework for ensuring Faculty representation, information, consultation, reasoned justification, and communication (see The Faculty Handbook)
To: The Faculty Senators Council  
From: Joint Committee (Tenure Modifications and PAAC)  
Re: Library proposal to create a non-tenure track  
Date: March 4, 2013

Background

The Joint Committee convened to discuss the proposed revisions to the Bylaws of the New York University Libraries Faculty Handbook. The revisions centered around the creation of a new non-tenure track faculty position. Currently, there are no long-term, non-tenured faculty positions in the library. A three-year appointment as a Library Associate is a position currently offered to potential tenure-track candidates who lack the necessary double degree to qualify for a tenure-track position. The rationale for creation of a non-tenure track appears to be two-fold: 1] the need to hire librarians for limited durations, and 2] the need to hire librarians whose duties will have limited scope. It has been pointed out that every other school of the University has such non-tenure track positions.

Recommendation by the Joint Committee

While the committee members acknowledged the trend in hiring non-tenure track faculty personnel and conceded that overall this proposal should be approved, certain objections were raised to specific aspects of the revision that need explanation.

1] The committee members had a problem with wording of the introduction, namely the sentence “As with all NYU and School policies, these guidelines are subject to change and it is the policies in effect at the time of any action that apply.” It was the understanding of the committee that in certain instances it is the policy in effect at the time of hire that is controlling. This issue needs to be clarified. In addition, the last sentence of the introduction with respect to the ease by which changes to the bylaws could be made needs further clarification as to the process and approvals required for such changes.

2] The committee had questions relating to the process by which this proposal was generated. In particular, were the changes proposed to the Library Council discussed beforehand with said Library Council? Was the general proposal brought to the Council before being presented to the whole faculty for a vote?

3] With respect to reappointments and promotions on the new non-tenure track, it is unclear what the criteria are and who will do the evaluation. Exactly what are the “expected performance standards?”

4] The committee suggested that in the case of appointments made for 2, 3 or 5 years, notification of reappointment or non-reappointment be made no less than 1 year before the appointment expiration date.

5] Will it be possible to switch tracks between tenure and non-tenure track? And if so, under what circumstances?