MINUTES OF THE T-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 22, 2018

The New York University Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, March 22, 2018 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Duncombe, Economides, Figlewski, Frankl, Hoffman, Irving, Jacobs, Lapiner, Ling, Longuenesse, Maniatakos, Merritt, Mincer, Shapley, Van Devanter, Waltzman, Watson, Weinberg, and Zamir; Active Alternates Beckerman, Davis, Makarov, Manuel, Nonken, Regaignon, and Schlick; Alternate Senators Daughtry (for Livingston), Gunsalus (for Cappell), Ospina (for Smoke), and Tannenbaum.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 22, 2018

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the February 22, 2018 meeting were approved unanimously.

ELECTION OF T-FSC VICE CHAIRPERSON AND SECRETARY 2018-2019

See attached Document A: Candidate Statements.

Committee Chair Duncombe, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, announced the list of candidates for the positions of T-FSC Vice Chairperson and T-FSC Secretary 2018-2019. For the position of Vice Chairperson, the candidates include Nicholas Economides of the Stern School of Business and Darcey Merritt of the Silver School of Social Work. For the position of Secretary, the candidates include Robert Lapiner of the School of Professional Studies and Amanda Watson of the Division of Libraries.

The election took place by secret ballot. Duncombe and Nominating Committee Member Shapley supervised the counting of the ballots.

Due to a tie vote, it was decided to offer those Senators not in attendance the opportunity to complete their absentee ballots by noon on Tuesday, March 27.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: WEN LING

Response to Resolution on Faculty Representation on University Retirement Committee

Chairperson Ling reported Senator Jacobs asked the advice of law school colleagues regarding the issue of potential fiduciary responsibility of faculty members who may sit on the university retirement plan committee. Professor William Allen stated that in his opinion with regard to the scenario the Council described, a faculty member sitting on the retirement plan committee without voting power would not be considered a fiduciary for the funds overseen by the committee. Ling noted at the EC meeting with Provost Fleming on March 7, NYU’s Office of General Counsel had a different view.
Chairperson Ling read the response from Julie Boden Adams, Associate General Counsel, regarding the definition of fiduciary:

Although there are various definitions of what it means to be a “fiduciary” in the general legal context and under corporate or other trusts laws, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended (“ERISA”), provides specific definitions for who is a fiduciary under the act. The retirement plans that have oversight by the NYU/NYU Langone Retirement Committee (the “Committee”) are ERISA-governed plans. Specifically, ERISA’s definition of a fiduciary includes fiduciaries specifically numerated in the statute as well as functional fiduciaries; that is, even if someone is not a specifically numerated fiduciary she or he will become a fiduciary by conducting certain activities related to an ERISA-governed plan. Thus, in addition to plan trustees, ERISA’s plan fiduciary definition includes anyone who exercises any discretionary authority or discretionary control concerning management or administration of a plan, and anyone who serves as an investment advisor to fiduciaries of an ERISA-governed plan. The Department of Labor regulations regarding “investment advice” for purposes of the fiduciary definition are relatively broad, and encompass anyone who provides investment advice to a plan or plan fiduciary, and include recommendations regarding acquiring, holding, disposing of or otherwise managing investments in a plan. For these reasons, faculty members providing advice to the NYU Retirement Plan Committee are likely to be considered fiduciaries for that purpose.

As a result of ERISA’s definition of a fiduciary—which includes any entity or person who exercises discretionary control, has discretionary authority concerning the plan’s assets, renders investment advice or has any discretionary authority or responsibility—the Committee and its members, serving ex officio, are individual fiduciaries to the ERISA-governed plans overseen by the Committee. Further, those who provide advice to the Committee may also be fiduciaries.

For some legal references, please see: ERISA § 3(21), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(21), and 29 C.F.R. § 2510.3-21.

Ling reported on the response from Trish Halley, Co-Chair of the University Retirement Committee regarding sharing information with the Council on the Retirement Plan Committee’s activities.

Ling stated the retirement plan committee activities to be shared with T-FSC are as follows: agenda items; actions taken or decisions made at quarterly meetings as they relate to the benefits plans at which the respective council members participate; meeting minutes as they pertain to NYU Washington Square; review of due diligence reports prepared by Cammack Consulting Group. These latter include overviews of quarterly investment analyses including plan allocation, economic review, plan assets and contributions, investment analysis, and commentary on funds placed on watch list and fund performance versus benchmark.

Ling reported on the update regarding the lawsuit that a law firm filed against NYU’s management of retirement funds.

In August 2016, a law firm based in St. Louis filed a lawsuit against twelve universities alleging management issues related to employee retirement funds. The lawsuit is a class action suit. Many aspects of the original lawsuits were dismissed, with two issues remaining: 1) eliminating TIAA real estate fund and the CREF stock fund with the rationale of poor performance from the portfolio of about a hundred funds, and 2) moving to a one record keeper to lower administrative fees for participants.

Ling reported the University will be moving to one record keeper, effective in May this year. A memo to that effect was sent from HR on March 19.
Senators expressed concern about only having information shared with the Council regarding the University Retirement Committee rather than having a representative in the room. Senators suggested bringing the University's response on fiduciary responsibility back to Professor Allen for clarification.

Ling stated she will bring the University’s response to Professor Allen and will also continue to pursue with members of the administration the issue of faculty representation on the committee.

The Benefits Committee will explore if other universities have faculty representation on their university retirement committee.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

[APII] Administrative Process Improvement Initiative: Introduction & Discussion

See attached Document E.

The following special guests presented on the APII: Peter Christensen, Assistant Vice President for Strategic Initiatives and Kari Hernandez of McKinsey consulting.

Christensen reported NYU, with the help of McKinsey, is undergoing a strategic analysis to use resources in the most effective ways possible. This is an overarching diagnostic of the current state and strategy development for the administrative functions of HR, IT, and finance. The focus is on improving service levels, quality, and satisfaction.

Hernandez stated the objectives in working with faculty are to 1) share context of the APII and budget management pilot, 2) get faculty input on the planned budget management interventions, and 3) agree on the engagement model for remainder of project (pilot and diagnostic).

She asked for input on the specific problems identified regarding budget management, including: 1) labor intensive processes, 2) availability and accuracy of information, and 3) financial controls that don’t improve financial planning, visibility, or risk management.

Senators confirmed issues with the cumbersome and time consuming process. A Senator noted the need for training on interpreting budget reports. A Senator noted the need to keep a separate spreadsheet to understand the budget.

A Senator noted in the reports regarding research funds it is difficult to decipher how much has been spent, how much is left, and/or what funds have gone to what kinds of uses within the research budget. She also commented that the regulations for reimbursable expense of research funds need to be better communicated. It was noted there is general confusion over the amount of money available during any given academic year within the three year term of many research grants. Another Senator commented on the lack of communication regarding when grant money must be used and how much and when grant money is available.

One Senator reported on payroll mistakes.

It was noted the APII will have a global application and will include Abu Dhabi and Shanghai.

Hernandez stated the presentation contains a slide with a high level description of some changes that are being put into place in the next couple of weeks. She asked if Senators had any additional feedback on these changes to contact her group.
T-FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS

Finance and Policy Planning: Co-Chairs Nick Economides & Maurizio Porfiri

Budget Planning Parameters for 2018-2019

See attached Document B.

Co-Chair Economides presented the Committee’s recommendations, which have been submitted to the Senate Financial Affairs Committee. He noted in addition to asking for an AMI pool increase of 3.5%, the recommendations ask the University to address the issue of pay inversion across the University, with newly hired Assistant Professors often earning higher salaries than Associate and even Full Professors in the same departments and areas of specialty.

The recommendations also ask the university to cut the administrative overhead. They state the University needs to pay attention to prioritize the areas in which it spends money, and it should prioritize in the areas of research and teaching.

The third point addresses the issue of transparency. The recommendations ask that the Council be informed in advance of major borrowing and major acquisitions/combinations.

Senators confirmed issues of pay inversion in departments. In response to a question on AMI, Economides stated it is the School Dean’s decision on how to allocate. He also stated NYU offers Deans a small budget for equity adjustments, but these decisions are at the discretion of the Deans.

Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications: Co-Chairs Phyllis Frankl & Nancy Van Devanter

C-FSC Resolution to Grant Emeritus Status to Continuing Contract Faculty

See attached Document C.

Co-Chair Van Devanter presented the C-FSC’s resolution regarding emeritus status, which the C-FSC asked the T-FSC to review. The Committee reviewed the resolution along with the NYU faculty bylaws to examine criteria and process for awarding emeritus status. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the resolution.

A Senator asked about length of time prior to retirement that a faculty member must have served to be eligible for emeritus status.

Van Devanter noted there is not a specific length of time and read the general statement in the resolution: “members of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty who have served New York University with academic distinction for a long enough time prior to retirement to have become identified historically in the profession as New York University professors.”

The Council passed their support of the resolution by unanimous vote.

Governance

Co-Chair Duncombe reported the Council’s resolution regarding faculty representation on the Board of Trustees will be presented for support of the Senate at the next University Senate meeting. It will be presented along with the Student Senators Council (SSC) and the C-FSC resolutions.

Ling clarified the reason for bringing this to the Senate is to have an official discussion at the university level about support for faculty representation on the Board of Trustees.
Global Network University (GNU): Co-Chairs Sylvain Cappell & André Fenton

Ling read the GNU’s committee report, which detailed the Committee’s interview with a NYU faculty member who was denied access to the United States.

A Senator suggested an assistance program be put into place to help university members when issues such as this arise. He also requested a report from the University with information on any such incident at any NYU site.

Ling reported that Josh Taylor in the Office of Global Programs is the person responsible for collecting this data. The 2017 calendar year report included all campuses of NYU and all incidents of visa denial of faculty, researchers, and students.

UNIVERSITY SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs

Committee Co-Chair Lapiner reported the Committee will present a resolution to the University Senate regarding a change on the methodology of defining grades. The current grade point values at New York University are defined using 1 decimal place, but NYU transcripts display grade point averages using 3 decimal places and this inconsistency results in a mathematical inequality with some adverse effects.

The Senate Academic Affairs Committee resolution recommends to the University that the University’s grade point values be defined using 3 decimal places beginning September 1, 2018.

NEW BUSINESS

New P&T Guidelines for NYUAD

NYU AD Senator Zamir asked for clarification about the process of reviewing School P & T Guidelines.

Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications (PPTM) Committee Co-Chair Van Devanter responded that the School sends the guidelines to the Provost’s Office, the Provost’s Office then sends to the Councils for review, the Councils send their recommendations back to the Provost who then works with the School to develop the final document.

Chairperson Ling stated each school may have a different process with regard to faculty involvement in revising a document. She noted the recent situation in which a school’s faculty were consulted, but the majority of faculty voted against the policy. In that situation, the Council asked the Provost to send the policy back to the School prior to formal Council review.

Zamir noted several changes being proposed, including increasing the letters of external review from five to at least eight letters.

Senators discussed different standards and processes at the schools.

The policy will be brought to the PPTM for review once sent from Provost’s Office.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
Dear Colleagues:

I am honored to be a nominee for the position of T-FSC Vice Chair.

I am a professor of economics at the Stern School of Business specializing in high technology industries, antitrust and public policy issues.

I have served at the T-FSC on and off for over 15 years. I have been head of the Finance Committee for a number of years, and I have also served in the Tenure Modification Committee, the Housing Committee, and the University Judicial Board. Earlier, I served at the Stern Faculty Council.

The “shared governance” regime at NYU has afforded a special role to tenured faculty to shape the university’s direction. Sometimes we (T-FSC) were able to play our role effectively, other times we failed. In my opinion, the key factor of success was how effective and efficient our leadership was in the Executive Committee and the other T-FSC committees. Time at the full Council meetings is very limited and should be used wisely to deal with issues that cannot be resolved in committees.

NYU, very heavily tuition-based, faces significant financial challenges in the next five years. In the last couple of years, it has become clear that future tuition increases will be limited. Nevertheless, NYU has embarked on an ambitious investment plan that will require extensive borrowing in an era of upward-tending interest rates. Very tight supervision of finances and increased transparency will be necessary. In this environment, it will be crucial to preserve and enhance the key role of NYU tenured and tenure track faculty in cutting edge research and teaching as a top priority, and reduce other spending. I hope that the T-FSC will emphasize this, whether I am elected or not.

Best regards,

Nick

Nicholas Economides
Stern School of Business
www.stern.nyu.edu/networks/
Fellow Colleagues and Senators:

I am delighted to have been nominated to serve as T-FSC Vice-Chair. I am an Associate Professor at NYU Silver School of Social Work and a Faculty Fellow at the school’s McSilver Institute for Poverty Policy and Research. I have extensive experience as a practitioner in the private and public child welfare systems, and as a researcher with interests including child maltreatment prevention; maltreatment type definitional issues; neighborhood structural impact on parenting; and experiences of those served by public child welfare systems. I have served on the Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty Senate for the past two years, as co-chair of the Inclusion, Equity and Diversity committee, and a member of the Housing and Benefits committee.

In light of an ever-changing and volatile political and economic environment, our university is vulnerable to a host of consequences threatening our flexibility in providing rigorous academic programs within our national and global reach. I believe the Senate Executive Committee in concert with our more focused committees is uniquely positioned to represent our faculty at large in the spirit of shared governance in ways that honor our collective commitment to innovative and rigorous research, excellence in education and pedagogy, and leadership in mitigating inequities and inequality in higher educational settings. There are many moving pieces that complicate our best intentions and I believe faculty senate representatives are best suited to advocate for balance and transparency while maintaining our overall mission for academic and humanistic excellence as first priorities. Given, NYU’s commendable national and global reach, as a prospective Vice-Chair, I propose three points of proactive focus: advocacy regarding immigration issues and our DACA students; social justice initiatives in higher education spaces; and the protection of portable academic freedom.

I would welcome the opportunity to represent my colleagues in the leadership capacity of Vice-Chair of the T-FSC. I very much appreciate your consideration of my candidacy.

Respectfully,
Darcey Merritt, MSW, Ph.D.
Silver School of Social Work
Candidate Statement for T-FSC Secretary,  AY2018-19

Robert Lapiner

I would be honored to be able to continue to serve you for a second year as Secretary for our Council

Robust shared governance is foundational for sustaining excellence in the University’s missions of teaching, research, knowledge-creation, and institutional social responsibility. Especially during this unsettled period in our external environment, partnering with and paying heed to the voice and the diverse expertise of the faculty must be advocated at every turn. As a member of the executive committee, I share our Chair’s vigilance to make sure that we are consulted, heard--and effective.

Working to reciprocal benefit between the two cultures of administration and faculty has been fundamental to my experience as both a faculty member and former administrator at NYU and at UCLA. And a formative earlier career in cultural diplomacy and international higher education was dedicated to achieve academic cooperation among institutions in more than a dozen countries, often in the face of ostensibly conflicting goals--not to mention political and ideological differences among my interlocutors.

These experiences forged the listening and problem-solving skills and collegial temperament that I would bring in service to the work of our Council and our members if, as I hope, I am able to have your ongoing support.
Candidate Statement for T-FSC Secretary 2018-19

Amanda Watson

Dear colleagues,

I am honored to be a nominee for Secretary of the Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty Senators Council.

I'm the subject librarian for English and Comparative Literature, a position that involves numerous outreach responsibilities and brings me into contact with faculty, staff, and students from all over the university. I began serving on the T-FSC in 2016, representing the Division of Libraries; I currently serve on the Administration and Technology Committee and the T-FSC Nominating Committee. In 2013-14 I was secretary for the NYU Libraries' faculty body; I have also served in a similar capacity on executive committees for within the Modern Language Association and the Association of College and Research Libraries. I would bring all of this experience to this position.

In an external political and social environment in which the values and relevance of higher education are regularly challenged, it is more and more important for faculty to have a voice in the governance of our university. As a member of the Executive Committee, I would facilitate the committee's work and advocate for the interests of the faculty. It would be my honor to serve in this position, and I thank you for considering my candidacy.
To: Anthony Jiga & Members of the Senate Financial Affairs Committee
From: Finance and Planning Committee of the Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Senators Council
Re: Budget Planning Parameters for 2018-2019

This request builds on efforts of this Committee in recent years that have sought to enhance the degree of transparency of the University’s finances and financial planning to the faculty and explore ways in which the University might save costs resulting in funds that could be used to increase faculty salaries. With this in mind, we make these recommendations:

1. **Salary/AMI/Equity.** Because tenured and tenure track faculty are the engine of the University through their commitment to research, teaching, and service, we underscore the importance of maintaining levels of compensation that make NYU an attractive employer for talented scholars and teachers. We recognize that the University provides significant non-monetary compensation to faculty that comes from outside the official salary pool, including healthcare benefits, tuition remission benefits, and housing for some of them. But, without discounting the value of such non-monetary compensation, we again bring to your attention that since 2000, salaries of tenure/tenure-track faculty have not kept up with inflation in NYC. As a result, we are now witnessing an anomalous pay inversion across the University, with newly hired Assistant Professors often earning higher salaries than Associate and even Full Professors in the same departments and areas of specialty. The severity of the pay inversion can even be exacerbated by different non-monetary or monetary compensations for newly hired faculty versus existing ones, such as faculty housing or housing allowances. We believe that an effort at the University level should be undertaken to address these issues and set up guidelines for Schools to create a more equitable environment, where raises of a faculty member are disentangled from the availability of external offers. To support this vision, we recommend an AMI pool increase of 3.5% and guidelines on how to distribute it based on the number of years of tenure in the School be given to Deans. This should be part of a multi-year endeavor that should seek to retain and reward our faculty.

2. **Mission of NYU and level of administrative overhead.** We are proud of the several initiatives that our University is undertaking with respect to a number of pressing needs, including Affordability, Diversity, Sustainability, and Safety. However, the creation of new senior administrative positions and related offices creates new costs to the University, which add to very significant increases in administrative staffing and overhead of the last two decades. We believe that it is urgent to re-examine our administrative overhead to carefully assess the existing organizational chart and identify many possibilities for a leaner, less costly administrative structure. The University has for many years operated in an environment that allowed high tuition increases which were not passed on proportionately to faculty. Instead, the major beneficiary of the significant increases in revenue of the last two decades has been the administrative structure of NYU that expanded significantly. At this point in time, when tuition is expected to increase very much slower than in the last decade, we believe that it is important for NYU to reset its priority to teaching and research and to significantly trim other activities. This is especially important as NYU has already embarked in a very ambitious investment program that is expected to absorb all retained earnings for a decade.
3. **Transparency.** The university is a complex and expanding entity. Often it goes to financial markets for major borrowing, and other times it combines with competing and complementary entities. At this committee, we typically hear this information *ex post*. We believe that this committee should hear this information *ex ante*, especially when large amounts of money are involved. In particular, we expect to be informed in advance of major borrowing and major acquisitions/combinations.
Date: December 13, 2017

Memo to: Katherine Fleming, Provost

From: Mary Killilea
Chairperson, C-Faculty Senators Council
A/Y 2017-2018

Subject: C-Faculty Senators Council Resolution to Grant Emeritus Status to Continuing Contract Faculty

The C-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached resolution regarding granting Emeritus Status to Continuing Contract Faculty, passed at the December 12, 2017 Council meeting.

cc: Carol Morrow, Vice Provost
Ellen Schall, Senior Presidential Fellow
Cybele Raver, Vice Provost for Academic and Research Affairs

C-FSC Steering Committee Members:
Susan Stehlik, C-FSC Vice Chairperson
Lauren Davis
John J. Gershman
Leila Jahangiri
Larry Slater
Beverly Watkins

Antonios Saravanos, C-FSC Governance Committee Chair
C-FSC Resolution to Grant Emeritus Status to Continuing Contract Faculty

Approved 12/12/17

At the December 12, 2017 meeting of the C-Faculty Senators Council, the Council passed the following resolution:

Resolution:

WHEREAS the members of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty are recognized to be a distinct and important part of the University academic community and contribute significantly to the University’s academic missions;

WHEREAS there are members of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty who have served New York University with academic distinction for a long enough time prior to retirement to have become identified historically in the profession as New York University professors;

RESOLVED that the status and title of Emeritus may be bestowed upon formal retirement from active service, or at least from full-time service after a vote by department faculty recommending the title, which the department forwards with his or her endorsement to the Dean who follows normal procedures applicable to other academic titles;

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Handbook be amended to include an additional sub-section under the section “FACULTY POLICIES APPLICABLE TO FULL-TIME CONTINUING CONTRACT FACULTY” entitled “Retirement” to read:

Awarding of the Status of Emerita or Emeritus

The titles of Emerita and Emeritus are given only to continuing contract full professors who have served New York University with academic distinction for a long enough time prior to retirement to have become identified historically in the profession as New York University professors. This title is given only upon formal retirement from active service, or at least from full-time active service. It is not automatic; it must be recommended by a department and approved through the normal procedures applicable to other academic titles. Comparable principles apply to the use of the designation Emerita and Emeritus for tenured faculty and administrative personnel.
Administrative Process Improvement Initiative (APIII)

Faculty Check-In
March 22, 2018
Objectives

• Share context of APII and budget management pilot
• Get faculty input on planned budget management interventions
• Agree on engagement model for remainder of project (pilot and diagnostic)
APII is about spending more time and resources on things that matter, and less time and resources on things that don’t

• Improving service levels, service quality, and faculty and staff satisfaction, while taking into account the culture at each school and college, is the primary objective of this initiative.

• Improved attraction and retention of high quality staff through increased job satisfaction is also a key goal.

• There will be no presupposition of solutions (e.g., centralization) and reducing head count is not a primary objective of this initiative.

• Final recommendations will be made by the Steering Committee on behalf of the various schools, units, functions, and roles represented within the university, to the President and Provost.

• Targeted stakeholder engagement will ensure collaborative process to engage leaders, executors, and users from across the NYU community.

• In the short term, we will prioritize one process to redesign, as a test case for how we will work together to solve the problems that matter most.

• After the pilot, and incorporating feedback from stakeholders, we will broaden the scope to develop a full-scale plan for improvements across the administrative operating model.
### High level overview of APII timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Project management tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct initial targeted stakeholder engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and fast-track one priority process to make significant near-term improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Refinement &amp; tracking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop summary fact base on administrative operations performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop perspective on future administrative operating model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outline administrative organizational strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop implementation roadmap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For today's discussion:

- Dean’s council introduction
- T-FSC introductions
- C-FSC introductions
- Open house
- Open house
**Selected for pilot processes considered (not exhaustive)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Select processes considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Procure goods and services and pay vendors | 1. Determine what I will buy and from whom  
2. Register / onboard vendors*  
3. Make routine purchases and track progress*  
4. Receive invoice and pay vendors*  
5. Manage vendors and purchase history  
6. Get support |
| Transition to and away from NYU | 1. Get set up for payroll*  
2. Get access to buildings and systems  
3. Get oriented to university, school, and role so I can do my job*  
4. Keep updated on available resources, and get help*  
5. Prepare to leave university / school / role |
| Implement and manage a budget | 1. Load approved budget  
2. Allocate budget to users  
3. Manage budget and make changes*  
4. Analyze variances to budget |

* Identified most frequently as a pain point by administrative staff and leaders through interviews and workshops

---

While the pilot will only focus on one process from one area, the full diagnostic and strategy development will include Finance, HR, and IT
What we’ve observed and heard from the pilot design team on “defining the problem”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End-state objective</th>
<th>Ensure the right people are able to most easily spend the money they need when they need it to execute on the academic mission, enabling finance to be a true business partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the problem?</td>
<td>What evidence do we have or beliefs do we share?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Faculty generally feel supported by finance staff, but due to inconsistent and labor intensive processes, staff waste time on non-value added activities | • Staff perform a high volume (~12K/year) of bud mod transactions to make funds available for faculty spend  
• Poor communication and understanding of roles, policies, timelines and expectations creates duplicate work  
• Bottlenecks lead to delays in actual spend |
| The right information isn’t easily available when faculty need it to make planning or spending decisions | • Faculty and staff don’t know their balance because they don’t trust the data or it isn’t easily accessible  
• Staff feel compelled to use shadow systems to create standard reports needed to make business decisions and to confirm data in the university system |
| Financial controls often don’t improve financial planning, visibility, or risk management | • Central approvers often aren’t able to add value to decision making  
• Staff can easily override controls currently in place  
• Time-consuming controls compliance reduces time spent on strategic decisions |

Questions for faculty committee:
• Do you agree with the problem statement?  
• When do you need access to your budget? What do you need access to?  
• How else would you articulate the challenges with budget management?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Redesign standard reports to cater more to user needs and business decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Redesign budget control to enable greater flexibility while appropriately controlling for risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ensure all systems check for invalid chart-field allocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interventions prioritized for immediate launch**

**Potential longer term interventions**

- Implement standard forecasting tool for budget creation & use throughout the year
- Design standard training program to support select set of common finance activities for appropriate roles
- Re-align financial plan timeline with enrollment, hiring & staffing, and research and financial aid planning
- Redesign position management system and supporting processes
### Questions for faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Questions for faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign standard reports to provide information on available balance</td>
<td>• What information do you need in order to run your day-to-day operations, and when do you need it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any specific suggestions for the content, format, or style of this report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign budget control to enable greater flexibility while appropriately controlling for risk</td>
<td>• Are you supportive of this intervention? Are there any risks or concerns we should be aware of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any specific suggestions for changes that might make sense?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Any other thoughts, reactions, or feedback to the pilot or the project overall?**
Objectives

• Share context of APII and budget management pilot
• Get faculty input on planned budget management interventions
• Agree on engagement model for remainder of project (pilot and diagnostic)