MINUTES OF THE T-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 12, 2018

The New York University Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, April 12, 2018 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Cappell, Duncombe, Economides, Fenton, Figlewski, Frankl, Garabedian, Hoffman, Irving, Lapiner, Ling, Livingston, Logan, Longuenesse, Maniatakos, Merritt, Mincer, Shapley, Smoke, Uleman, Van Devanter, Watson, Weinberg, Weslake, Zagzag, and Zamir; Active Alternates Nonken and Schlick; Alternate Senators Alter, Dasanayake (for Kamer), Geppert (for Weslake), Ompad (for Parekh), Reiss, Tannenbaum, and Tenenbein (for Economides). Former Member Moskowitz attended as a guest.

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

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

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: WEN LING

EC Election Results

Chairperson Ling congratulated the newly elected 2018-2019 Executive Committee members. Nick Economides will serve a second term as Vice Chair and Amanda Watson will serve as Secretary. She thanked outgoing Secretary Robert Lapiner and Immediate Past Chair Allen Mincer for their contributions and service to the Council.

TIAA Mailing

Ling reported on the TIAA mailing sent to all faculty and employees regarding the move to the one record keeper of TIAA for employee’s retirement funds. With this change, the management fees for a number of funds will be lowered and there will be easier access to TIAA and Vanguard accounts from NYU Home. She noted there will be period during the transition when access to the website will be down, so employees should make any changes to their accounts prior to May 7.

Resolution regarding Faculty Representation on Board of Trustees (BOT)

Ling thanked the Governance Committee and others involved for their work on the resolution regarding faculty representation on the Board of Trustees. She noted the three resolutions regarding C-FSC, T-FSC, and student involvement on the Board of Trustees were passed by the University Senate. She reported that before the University Senate meeting, the Council Chairs received a letter from BOT Chair Mr. William Berkley, expressing his desire to further communication with the faculty. He gave examples regarding improved communication between the Board and the Council since he became the chair of the Board. He also made a commitment to continue to create opportunities for the faculty to communicate with the Board. Ling stated she replied to the letter, following the vote at the Senate meeting, and thanked him for reaching out to the Council and suggested a meeting between the Executive Committee and representatives of the Board sometime in the fall.
Following the University Senate meeting, Ling received an email from President Hamilton informing her he forwarded to Mr. Berkley the resolutions that the Senate passed and Mr. Berkley assured President Hamilton that the resolutions would be fully discussed and considered by the Board and their response would be sent in writing.

**Students Senators Council Resolution**

Chairperson Ling read the following proposed SSC resolution:

> Americans of Middle Eastern origin experience at Israel’s border and checkpoints, and reciprocity is the most basic condition of the Visa Waiver Program.

> Whereas Israel maintains its discriminatory treatment as it has not yet been included in the visa waiver program.

> Whereas the Department of State’s website warns that some U.S. citizens of Arab Muslim heritage including Palestinian Americans have experienced significant difficulties on equal and hostile treatment of Israel’s borders and checkpoints, U.S. citizens who have traveled to Muslim countries who are of Middle Eastern or Muslim origin may face additional questioning by immigration or border authorities.

> Whereas the Department of State’s website wants upon arrival at any of the ports of entry Palestinians including Palestinian Americans may wish to confirm with Israeli immigration authorities from what location they will be required to depart. Some have been allowed to enter Israel or visit Jerusalem but told they cannot depart Israel via Ben Gurion Airport without special permission, which is rarely granted. Some families have been separated as a result, and other travelers have forfeited airline tickets.

> Whereas NYU’s nondiscriminatory policy prohibits any bias based on race, gender, and or gender identity or expression, color, religion, age, national origin, ethnicity, disability, veteran, or military status, sexual orientation, marital status, or citizenship status.

> Therefore, be it resolved NYU must upgrade its commitment to ensure equal access to NYU sites and appeal to decision of entry within the global network.

She noted this may be on the agenda for the next University Senate meeting.

Senators expressed disagreement over the appropriateness of singling out one site.

With regard to the general issue of freedom of movement for faculty, students, and staff across the GNU, former Chair Mincer stated the Council had passed a resolution with respect to the need for information about mobility within the global networks. He noted this resulted in the Administration’s making the relevant data available in what is now the Annual Mobility Report.

**T-FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Governance: Co-Chairs Duncombe & Shapley**

*Report on Shared Governance Survey*

*See attached Document A.*

Chairperson Duncombe noted Committee member Uleman organized the qualitative data from the survey in a report.
Uleman stated he organized the qualitative data by school and published the respondents’ comments, with only minor spelling and syntax changes, in the report. He noted the intent is to distribute these results back to the faculty, to inform faculty on the responses and to take whatever action they deem appropriate.

A Senator noted concerns regarding anonymity. He stated by reporting responses verbatim, especially from smaller units, anonymity may not be preserved. He commented there is a potential for negative repercussions to those respondents.

Committee Chair Duncombe noted the Committee removed any identifying information. In addition, if there were under 10 respondents, the responses were not reported.

He affirmed that the goals of the survey were to 1) alert faculty to the principles of shared governance, 2) collect their responses, and 3) offer faculty a voice and way of communication.

It was noted the beginning of report is intended to make clear how the survey was conducted and how the report was compiled.

There were no further comments of concerns on the report.

**Educational Policies & Faculty/Student Relations: Co-Chairs Lapiner & Weinberg**

**Concerns regarding the Spring Admits Program**

See attached Document B.

Co-Chair Weinberg reported the Committee met with the C-FSC Educational Policies Committee regarding the Spring Admits program, begun this semester in Liberal Studies, and scheduled to be implemented at Steinhardt and Tandon next year. The Committee documented concerns communicated by faculty about the lack of information provided to the faculty of the affected schools, and the lack of consultation with faculty in the planning, implementation, and ongoing development of the program. The Committee compiled a list of specific concerns to bring to the attention of the Administration. T-FSC Ed Pol co-chairs Weinberg and Lapiner and C-FSC Ed Pol chair Illingworth will meet with MJ Knoll-Finn, Senior Vice President for Enrollment Management, to address these issues. It was noted faculty expressed particular concerns regarding the staffing of summer programs, use of adjuncts, and the general lack of involvement by full-time faculty in the planning process, and also the potential movement to a trimester.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

Clay Shirky, Vice Provost for Educational Technologies

See attached Document C.

Chairperson Ling introduced Clay Shirky. As Vice Provost for Educational Technologies he designs, develops, and enhances all academic aspects of technology-based teaching and learning, across the global network, including consulting with and providing support to schools for their online degree programs and online courses.

Shirky noted that in 2014 the Committee on the Future of Technology Enhanced Education (FTEE), decided the control over online classes and online degrees remains within the schools. He noted, as a result, there is relatively high variability across the schools.

Schools make the decision whether to launch an online class or program based on faculty interest, student interest, and interest by students in the online versus classroom experience.
NYU’s online options are centered on master’s degree programs. About 4% of the undergraduate population has taken an online class in the last academic year, whereas about 16% of the graduate population has taken an online class.

Among the information he shared:

- He pointed out the strong growth in academic year 2018.
- One of the university priorities in online education is affordability. Online study provides an opportunity for students to attend NYU even if they are unable to relocate to New York City or need to take classes part-time. Students thus avoid the costs of having to be in residence.
- With regard to the demographics of our online students, the data show there are more female students, underrepresented minorities, and more domestic students than in the demographics of in-person students. Moreover, the graduate student cohorts are considerably older cohort, which often means they are studying while mid-career.
- At present, there is more design work going into part-time options in order to improve retention.

The development of courses varies among schools. Some schools such as Tandon, Law, and College of Global Public Health build their own online offerings, while other schools, such as Steinhardt, use online program managers. NYU currently has contracts with 2U, HotChalk, and Noodle. He noted now every school has instructional designers to assist in co-designing courses with faculty.

The categories of faculty who teach online courses vary by school. For instance, the School of Professional Studies has many adjuncts teaching these courses, while Stern is launching an online degree that is 100% taught by tenured faculty.

A Senator asked if the University collects data on attrition and time to degree completion. Shirky noted this is included in the work being done on student success under MJ Knoll-Finn. They are in the beginning stages of collecting this data.

A Senator inquired on the types of support being offered to faculty to assist in producing effective and engaging online courses. Shirky noted one focus of the structural designers is coordinating between schools to examine the best and most effective strategies that might be replicated.

A Senator inquired about academic oversight and asked if the process is the same for online courses as it is for the development of in-class courses. Shirky responded that the process is the same, and pointed out that for purposes of accreditation, it is important that online programs be subject to the same academic review process as in-person classes.

A Senator asked about mixed or hybrid courses with a combination of in-person and online content. Shirky responded these are offered and mentioned the use of low-residency programs, which many schools have expressed interest in.

A Senator asked about the value of the online degree and how it affects job placement, particularly regarding employers’ impressions of an online versus in-person degree. Shirky stated these are degrees from NYU, and the degree does not indicate online versus in-person status. He noted there is not yet sufficient data on job placement across a wide range of programs for meaningful analysis.

The Senator asked about the Occupational Therapy program and questioned how these types of programs could be online. Shirky noted these types of programs set students up with clinical placements in their location.

A Senator asked about ownership and the division between commissioned work and scholarly production. Shirky noted the FTTE committee is working on this complicated issue and they plan to put forth a recommendation in the fall.
A Senator asked about legal issues and unintended consequences related to student trainings online. She noted the School of Social Work is concerned about liabilities in future outcomes in clinical therapy. Shirky noted they do work with a staff of lawyers to examine all issues. He commented the main special liability for online has been around violating state regulations rather than student outcomes. Further, he pointed out that there is no expectation to require conversion to online degree programs; the schools are autonomous in determining what’s appropriate and what’s not. He noted that University Administration has not set specific goals, targets, or objectives related to online, but instead is working with schools to address and support their individual needs.

A Senator asked about integrating the global network university. Shirky confirmed there is a strong interest in this area and they are working through different ideas and models.

The Chairperson summarized this is an ongoing conversation and the Council is interested in continuing the conversation and seeing further information on accreditation and licensing issues, attrition, graduation rates, job placement, and licensure exams.

Shirky noted he is working with the Office of General Counsel on intellectual property and licensing issues and will forward an interim report.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
Local Shared Governance at NYU
Results of a Faculty Survey Conducted by the C- and T-FSC

In May, 2017, the Contract and Tenure Faculty Senate Councils conducted a survey of all full-time faculty at NYU for two purposes. The first purpose was to inform the faculty again of what the principles of shared governance are. These were adopted by the Board of Trustees on December 12, 2012, with respect to the T-FSC, and on February 19, 2015, with respect to the C-FSC. The second purpose was to assess the implementation of these principles at the levels of each school, each department, and each program.

A recent issue of *Academe* (Jan.-Feb., 2018), the major AAUP publication, noted that the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), to which NYU belongs, issued a statement in October “to help guide boards and those who work with them to achieve and support healthy and high-functioning shared governance.” It consists of four principles.

1. Boards should commit to ensuring a broad understanding of shared governance and the value it offers an institution or system.
2. For shared governance to work, it must be based on a culture of meaningful engagement.
3. Shared governance requires a consistent commitment by institutional and board leaders.
4. Institutional policies that define shared governance should be reviewed periodically to ensure their currency and applicability.

This anonymous survey was conducted online through Qualtrics from May 15 through May 31. Questions were open-ended and respondents identified only their school, department, and program. Faculty who were polled numbered 4570, and 411 (9.0%) responded. A brief examination of responses showed that they differ greatly between schools (e.g., Tisch and the School of Professional Studies), and even between departments. But there were too few responses to permit analyses by department within school.

This qualitative report summarizes responses by school, from the largest to smallest, each following the organization of the five principles themselves: 1) representation, 2) information, 3) consultation, 4) reasoned justification, and 5) communication. Within each of the five principles, we asked about its application to “your school,” “your department,” and “your program.” Respondents usually let us know when this simple structure did not apply to them.

All schools except the School of Law had at least 5 responses. But to ensure even a modicum of reliability and representativeness, school results and comments are reported only when at least 10 faculty members replied. A copy of the complete survey is attached.

Results are organized by school, from the largest (Medicine) to the smallest (Wagner and Global Public Health). Of the 17 schools – Medicine, Arts and Science, Dentistry, Steinhardt, Tisch, NYU Abu Dhabi, Stern, Tandon, NYU Shanghai, Law, School of Professional Studies, Nursing, Gallatin, Libraries, Social Work, Wagner, and Global Public Health – 7 did not meet our very arbitrary “10 faculty” criterion for reporting: Shanghai, Law, Gallatin, Libraries, Social Work, Wagner, and Global Public Health. Within school, responses to each of the five principles are broken down as applied to “your School,” “Department,” and “Program.” Finally, general open-ended comments about the survey as a whole are reported by school.

The question “Does your DEPARTMENT have faculty representation on committees…” was sometimes interpreted as asking about committees within the department, and sometimes as asking about committees at the school or university level. The question about Reasoned Justification caused some confusion because it is about responses to written advice, whereas most communication among levels is less formal. Many answered this anyway, but some noted that written communications are rare or that they’re not aware of any written communications. The question about Communication was also unclear to many with its reference to “official
communication systems.” Some thought this merely referred to NYU email or to aliases provided by their department or program, which it does not.

Responses from schools other than your own may be of interest because they give some indication of practices in other schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># faculty</th>
<th>% faculty</th>
<th>responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisch</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandon</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU Shanghai</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. Libraries</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Public Health</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4570</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the T-FSC Governance Committee (Stephen Duncombe & Robert Shapley, co-chairs; and Sylvain Cappell, Bob Hoffman, Jim Uleman, Shamoon Zamir)

Survey designed by Stephen Duncombe
This report compiled by Jim Uleman
I. With 1418 full-time faculty (31% of the NYU faculty), the School of Medicine had a 3.2% (45) response rate. These were scattered across at least 23 departments and programs, so a more fine-grained summary at these levels is not possible.

A. Representation
In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” most respondents (> 30) said yes and some (~ 8) didn’t know. There were three extended comments.

“Yes, but the SOM administration controls who serves on these committees. Over the last decade there has been a concerted effort to undermine any true shared governance and the Faculty Council has become a rubber stamp for the administration. As an example: A recent election of members to the tenured/tenure track Grievance Committee was held without a call for nominations to the whole faculty. Nominees were hand-picked by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and included several of their own members. And the situation for contract faculty members is even worse. The SOM is exempted from the Faculty Handbook regulations concerning contract faculty, and as a result, these individuals can work without a contract (at-will) and their grievance procedure consists of a committee of one - the Dean of the Faculty. Note that this dean is often the object of said grievances.”

“I feel the FGP does a poor job in having physician leadership and the higher levels. I believe the Faculty group practice should be led by physicians rather that administrators as we are the ones who are ultimately responsible for the care of our patients.”

“Yes, there is representation, but to what degree this representation translates into university policy is unclear.”

In response to “Does your DEPARTMENT have faculty representation…,” most (> 30) said yes, 3 said no, and 8 were didn’t know. The one relevant comment noted “Yes, within our department we have active faculty involvement, unfortunately that does not transition into the FGP [Faculty Group Practice].”

In response to “Does your PROGRAM have…,” most (~ 30) left it blank; 9 said yes, and 3 said no, suggesting that this level of organization is not relevant in most departments.

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” there was a split opinion: 17 yes and 18 no. Five provided extended comments.

“No, particularly not with regard to salaries and promotion.”

“No. The School of Medicine tends to limit policy-making decisions to the upper echelons of the administration. While some transparency exists, it is much less than occurs at the main campus.”

“No. The policies about required extramural funding (REF) and salary reduction are different depending on who you ask. This is true even though REF policies exist and are in writing.”

“No, for example policy affecting promotion changes without representation.”

“No. Things are decided at the top and then disseminated to us (faculty) via Department Chairs.”
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your DEPARTMENT?” more think yes (> 20) than think no (~ 13). Some (~ 5) were uncertain or of mixed views. One commented that it is “Better than at the school level” and several said no regarding salaries.

In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your PROGRAM?” most thought the question didn’t apply. Of those who found it relevant, responses were 2:1 (12:6) yes:no.

C. Consultation
In response to “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation… in your SCHOOL?” responses were fairly evenly split with 13 or 14 yes and no responses and almost 10 who didn’t know. Three gave informative comments.

“The only consultation is with the rubber stamp Faculty Council. The council has not communicated with faculty in several years.”

“Time: yes. But the consultation process does not necessarily pay attention to faculty concerns.”

“The School of Medicine does have its own Faculty Council, but the key decisions are in the hands of the administration. The decision-making process is often opaque.”

In response to “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time… in your DEPARTMENT?” more said yes (17) than said no (9); 4 said “some” and 8 didn’t know.

“Yes - regular meetings are held with agendas. Email updates are also regularly sent.”

In response to the same question “in your PROGRAM?” most thought the question didn’t apply. The few (8) who responded were evenly split between yes and no.

D. Reasoned Justification
In response to “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” there were too few responses either way to be informative because most were unfamiliar with such situations.

In response to the same question at the DEPARTMENT level, there were 7 to 8 responses on each side of this issue, almost as many who didn’t know, and many blanks.

In response to the same question at the PROGRAM level, most found that the question did not apply to their situation or left it blank.

E. Communication
In response to the question “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” most responses (28) were yes and 8 did not know.
The responses to the same question regarding “your DEPARTMENT” were overwhelmingly positive (32) or “don’t know” (5).

Responses to a parallel question regarding “your PROGRAM” were largely blank, but 12 said yes and 2 did not know.

F. Other comments
“FSC [the T-FSC] generally works in opposition to the school of medicine faculty council.”

“While shared governance is a term that is spoken of, it has a quite long way to go before it is remotely realized as a real working policy”

“Shared governance does not seem like a priority.”

“the professionalism of faculty is demeaned and we are employees of a corporate body.”

“The SOM is leading the way in the destruction of shared governance, and the rest of the University is catching up.”

“There is very little shared governance at the School of Medicine. For example the Faculty Council has directly nominated individuals for the Grievance Committee without consulting the entire faculty. In the past the entire faculty was solicited for nominations. As a result the Administration, which greatly influences the Faculty Council, controls the Grievance procedure.”

“Transparency is the most important issue.”

General Comments:
“We need more Physician governance and input in the faculty group practice.”

“FSC generally works in opposition to the school of medicine faculty council.”

“While shared governance is a term that is spoken of, it has a quite long way to go before it is remotely realized as a real working policy.”

“What was the purpose of this survey?”

“Shared governance does not seem like a priority.”

“The professionalism of faculty is demeaned and we are employees of a corporate body.”

“The SOM is leading the way in the destruction of shared governance, and the rest of the University is catching up.”

“There is very little shared governance at the School of Medicine. For example the Faculty Council has directly nominated individuals for the Grievance Committee without consulting the entire faculty. In the past the entire faculty was solicited for nominations. As a result the Administration, which greatly influences the Faculty Council, controls the Grievance procedure.”

“Transparency is the most important issue.”
II. With 977 full-time faculty (21% of the NYU faculty), the Faculty of Arts and Science, including the Liberal Studies Program, had a 10.8% (106) response rate. Even though each of the divisions (Humanities, Science, and Social Science) has about the same number of faculty, about 60% of the respondents were from Humanities, and about 20% were from the Sciences and 20% from Social Sciences. About 35% of the Humanities responses were from the Expository Writing Program, and about 20% were from Liberal Studies, so that over half of the Humanities respondents were contract faculty.

A. Representation
In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” most respondents (~ 90) said yes; the rest didn’t answer or didn’t know. There were three extended comments.

“Yes, although certain individual faculty who are popular with the administration are greatly ‘over-used’ and opportunities for membership on these committees should be shared more broadly among faculty. That includes search committees for admin positions.”

“Our program is often the guinea pig for testing new administrative programs (like online course evaluations or changes in NYU Classes), but with no role in the decision and no right to challenge the change. This has seriously affected faculty morale in our unit.”

“The problem is that the committees etc have little to no real power to make important decisions.”

In response to “Does your DEPARTMENT have faculty representation…,” most (~ 70) said yes, the rest didn’t know or said the question didn’t apply.

In response to “Does your PROGRAM have faculty representation…,” most (~ 40) said yes, the rest didn’t know or said the question didn’t apply.

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” there was a split opinion: About 30 said yes and 30 said no, while over 20 gave mixed verdicts. Those in the Humanities were more negative than positive; those in the Sciences were positive and mixed; and those in the Social Sciences who were positive equaled the number mixed and negative. Many provided extended comments.

“It's difficult for me to say because, of course, I don't know about matters that aren't shared with me. I find that there is a general commitment to communication, standardization, and transparency. But I know of a few people who have been negatively effected by a recent university-wide policy change about with there was no communication at the time that it happened, and about which there continues to be very fragmented communication at the administrative level.”

“There have been severe complaints about the lack of transparency in the change to faculty benefits for tuition remission and concern that such opacity will continue for dependent benefits.”

“Not even vaguely. We have no information about anything that happens, other than pronouncements from above. The Faculty Senate is entirely out of touch (other than Jim Uleman's helpful summaries, that he sends from time to time), and could be on Mars for all we
know. There is no communication, there is no effort to actually involve anyone in governance: that seems to be the point, however.”

“We are given information about decisions made by the Administration. Discussion with faculty about what decisions should be made is insufficient, if not lacking. (For example, FAS Full Faculty meetings just reel off decisions made elsewhere; there is no debate and hence they are very poorly attended since faculty feel their presence makes no difference.)”

“No really. 1. The faculty don't participate much because for years, there seemed to be no point. Autocracy ruled. 2. Some faculty don't participate because they don't bother. It's their fault if something bad happens. 3. Transparency? Not much. How are important committee or task force members chosen? How are named chairs chosen?”

“Transparency is not the norm. We are given information at the will of our Dean and sometimes the info is inaccurate.”

“Oh, I think it is for faculty that serve on committees with administrators, but faculty in general often feel clueless.”

“No. There are numerous consultations, but no real mechanisms for collective follow through. Some proactive measures to actually get people to attend faculty meetings, or to vote on serious matters at faculty meetings, or to have electronic referenda or voting, would make a big difference. I have attended many faculty meetings, and have never seen a single higher level dean remark on the sad performative quality to speaking to an audience of sometimes as few as five people who are not obligated to be in the room, i.e., who came voluntarily. One can and should blame the faculty, but administrators are also not there to be actors on an empty stage.”

“No. We do receive regular updates--of a very general nature--in emails that are widely distributed from many sources (the President, the Provost, the Dean) that rarely contain much information of substance. Budgets are delivered in such a distilled form as to be almost meaningless. Committees are much better at distributing information through minutes or reports, but difficult to tease out what is important and what isn't (pages of minutes might have to do with minor changes to, say, a department altering courses). Much of the reporting of information is after the fact. It would be helpful to have streamlined access to information (including executive summaries to highlight what is most relevant). It would be very helpful to know what actions or policies are being deliberated and by whom.”

“No. In the past, secrecy, intimidation, and retaliation against those who disagree.”

“No -- for example, we hear the word "affordability" in the context of denying requests for, e.g., faculty replacement without any indication of the relationship between affordability and a delay in hiring a faculty member.”

In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your DEPARTMENT?” the opinion was largely positive (> 55) rather than mixed (~10) or negative (~20). Positive responses were most frequent in the Social Sciences (>80%) and least frequent in the Humanities (~55%). Comments varied more by departments than by division. There were also some extended comments.

“We've moved only this year to a self-governance model. … directors still make some decisions with less consultation than would be ideal. Still, I think they try very hard to tell us as much as they can as quickly as they can.”

“We are in the process of changing the structure/governance of the department/program. Previously, I felt that there was troublingly little transparency--you often did not know what you
were being evaluated on, how, and why. Now, there is a commitment, as above, to communication, standardization, and transparency, yet I find that there is (maybe inevitable) under-correction and over-correction.”

“No. In the past, secrecy, intimidation, and retaliation against those who disagree.”

“It depends on the Chair. A previous chair was very transparent; current chair is clueless and thus everything happens by accident, it seems. So, policy is pretty opaque, but that may be because the Chair hasn't a clue what policy is.”

“Yes. The faculty are informed about the issues and reasons behind departmental policies. This is effected by the chair through regular monthly faculty meetings where there is time for information exchange, comment and revision with faculty feedback.”

In response to a similar question about “your PROGRAM?”
There was an additional comment:

“No. The processes by which policies—particularly review policies—are developed are not shared. When we try to develop policy with better attention to an inclusive, thorough process, we are dismissed or discouraged. I think a lot of our programmatic development is rushed. We teach a 3/3 load [in Liberal Studies], so when we have administrative responsibilities, as so many of us do in our self-governing program staffed by contract faculty, we aren't always able to take the time necessary to review materials presented to us or develop materials together. Those who do take such time seem to be criticized for their competence.

C. Time to consult. In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” responses were mixed. The majority of Humanities faculty agreed (~30) while a minority said No (~15) or gave a mixed reply (~7). Twice as many Science faculty agreed (~8) as said No (~4). And the Social Science faculty were fairly evenly split among the three response options. Here are some of their comments.

“No. The Senate seems so far out of touch and out to lunch; maybe it does things, maybe it doesn't. Ad hoc committees and assemblies and associations seem to have supplanted any Senate role, other than in the formal sense. No point in paying attention.”

“Sometimes, sometimes not. For example, the recent base pay raise for contract faculty was more or less a surprise to most of us (although a happy one for many), but raised many questions specifically for senior contract faculty who fear that they will now be making the same as new faculty. Perhaps this is not how it will turn out, but since there was no period of public consultation (I realize the C-FSC was involved, but even our Senators were surprised by the announcement) prior to the announcement we're somewhat in the dark.”

“’Input’ is not the power to genuinely affect decisions.”

“I'm not sure - it is difficult to make the time to even read over all the materials if/when they are sent out.”

“I would say yes, but there are occasional curveballs, as when a department in Tandon sought to supplant the Expository Writing Program.”
“We are often forced to rush through policies because the dean [of Liberal Studies] says we must.”

“Yes - indeed, sometimes change takes an inordinate amount of time. (Btw, if you consider the school of LS to be "FAS" (which isn't a school, but a faculty), then we have far less governance input and there is almost no transparency to FAS decisions affecting LS.”

“for some faculty, even if you talk directly to them, they will ignore material.”

“There is little consultation on most matters. To be fair to the Dean, I think that is in part because of faculty apathy.”

In response to a similar question about “your DEPARTMENT,” responses were overwhelmingly positive: over 75% for Humanities, and over 80% for the Sciences and Social Sciences. A few elaborated:

“Yes, the dept operates democratically, but has little power to make important decisions. The administration has taken all real power and provided the faculty advisory functions only in most instances.”

“Often yes; but in the time that I have been here I have always felt that we are not made aware of the policies and procedures of applying for reappointment (which have changed from year to year) far enough in advance--waiting until the last minute feels inefficient and disrespectful.”

In response to a similar question about “your PROGRAM,” responses were positive for over 55% of those in Humanities. In the Sciences and Social Sciences, most did not answer or indicated that the question did not apply to them. Here are comments from Expository Writing and Liberal Studies, respectively:

“This was not at all true of the review policy that became official policy in December 2015. The policy was developed in haste (basically pasted from another school's contract faculty policy), feedback from our Steering Committee was dismissed, and now that we are trying to move policy revision through a more deliberate process that pays attention to both the NYU Faculty Handbook and the particular nature of our program (as well as feedback from different segments of our program), we are discouraged by the program's administration.”

“Sometimes. We have a new democratic faculty governance system which requires that we do hours of additional service, but there is no compensation for it. In addition, it's unclear how it is to work, exactly, and whether the faculty gets decision-making power, or if it still lies with the directors.”

D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” Humanities responses were evenly split between Yes and No. Science faculty couldn’t recall relevant events, and a small number of Social Science faculty (5 of 7 respondents) said No. Some expanded on their answers:

“Explanations are provided that are not necessarily relevant.”

“This is just a bunch of bullshit. Reasoned justification is merely a way for the Admin to assert its right to override everyone for whatever reasons it wishes. It is simply never really
relevant, and doesn't even get communicated at all, so even less relevant. The whole place has become managerially dominated, so the procedural is stripped of any content whatsoever."

“There is a charade of submitting opinions and getting responses. But this is not genuine shared governance.”

“Again mixed. There is little consultation in decisions regarding finance and GNU [Global Network Univ.]. In some cases, the C-FSC has requested expanded explanation or justification regarding decisions about representation on committees and hiring and promotion guidelines.”

In response to the same question regarding “your DEPARTMENT,” Humanities faculty were generally (>70%) positive, although many noted that the question doesn’t arise at the department level. Other faculty noted the same thing, were positive, or didn’t answer. Some comments:

“I don't think it's entirely clear who is on the representative body and how the departmental leadership is separate; so, while I am pleased by many of the moves the department/program is making toward shared governance, the answer for now is no.”

“There has recently been a slate of proposals, many of which were redundant with moves the department had already made. Each proposal was met with explanation, context, counter proposal, and conversation.”

“Since all decisions are made via discussion and (where there is not consensus) vote at departmental Faculty Meetings, this doesn't arise. The Chair has never over-ridden majority Departmental opinion.”

In response to the same question regarding “your PROGRAM,” Humanities faculty responses were similar, and Science and Social Science faculty found the question didn’t apply.

E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” Out of the 44 Humanities faculty responding, 65% said Yes. Six or seven Science faculty, and Social Science faculty said Yes, and the others either left it blank or said they didn’t know.

“Nothing, nothing, nothing. Silence and more silence. Remarkable lack of communication, accountability, or anything.”

“The FAS Faculty Senators obtained permission to do this, but I gather it was a difficult process. I am not aware of any other faculty representatives having this possibility.”

“Yes, with the caveat that the channel for official program communications differs from the channels for inter-faculty communication. But all LS [Liberal Studies] faculty can reach all LS faculty via email aliases…”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over 85% of the responses from the Humanities were positive. All 13 Science responses were positive, as were all 18 Social Science responses.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” the pattern of responses was similar but with fewer responses.
General Comments:

“Shared governance doesn't happen at NYU. It hasn't for a very long time. Maybe there are procedures in place, but they are so devoid of content that the substance of sharing is entirely shorn of meaning. It is a joke. And I suspect it is supposed to be a joke: Admin's joke on the faculty.”

“Increasingly at NYU faculty is being consulted. The impact of the information gathered is not clear. There is a sense that consultation is carried for the sake of consultation, and that the process stops there.”

“This survey does not reflect the role that Trustees play in shared governance, which, after all, is a tripartite structure. The fact that faculty have no representation on the Board and that the doings of the Board are entirely non-transparent make shared governance at NYU profoundly dysfunctional. This is not the case at other universities where there is representation and (more) transparency. The transition from Sexton to Hamilton administration has seen no reforms in this area.”

“Communication has never been NYU's strong suite; things have been more transparent with the new administration.”

“Shared governance is a theory but only sometimes a practice in our program. It seems as if some administrators resent when faculty ask questions, seek to reconsider or revise policy—particularly administrative policy. I would like to see administrators treat faculty with more respect for their insight and efforts. Administrators seem to take it personally when we want to make changes in accordance with the NYU Faculty Handbook: but it isn't about the administrators, it's about fair, contextualized, well-researched, carefully developed policy.”

“Deans wield power over departments and programs. Program directors such as mine in EWP disclose only those details they choose to disclose such that the answer to almost any request on the part of faculty is 1- I can't do that; 2- I don't know how to do that; 3- I don't have the money to do that. This adds up to non-transparency, obfuscation, sins of omission transferred from the highest to the lowest levels.”

“The dean has to be bound by faculty decisions, especially regarding reappointment and curriculum.”

“One thing that's difficult is communication. The people involved in shared governance (me) probably feel very differently about almost all of these questions than the people who aren't. How, for instance, does the Dean of FAS communicate with the faculty at large about decision-making processes, not just about final decisions? Though I don't think the Dean is purposefully opaque, that's something that could be addressed in a more consistent and thoughtful way…”

“Thanks for your contribution to the school governance and i hope this communication will help us for the best and me to be more integrated into NYU.”

“It is complicated for full time contract faculty to both teach full time and do committee work. We have just started doing this in EWP, but it is difficult and without the work contributing to tenure, many wonder why we should do it. While we all appreciate being informed of and involved in College and Department governance, perhaps salary increases/course releases should reflect this new work in some way.”

“The administration does not respect the faculty. Period.”

“Thanks.”
“Improving greatly these days.”
“There is virtually no shared governance. There is a charade of shared governance only.”
“It would be wonderful to clarify and strengthen the relationship of LSP/GLS [Liberal Studies Program/ Global Liberal Studies] to FAS. This is an old and fraught issue, but some positive changes over the last few years suggest the possibility of hope.”
“For the past ten years, there has been a myth of shared governance in Liberal Studies. There is the perception that departmental committees rubber stamp policies from the NYU Administration. Morale is low in the unit.”
“The common perception, which I share, is that NYU is run like a corporate organization with decisions being taken from above without prior consultation. This does not create a good atmosphere, which is a shame since we have wonderful faculty. This is true at the level of departmental staff too: new systems that increase their work load, and in some cases give NYU a bad reputation with outside scholars (e.g. required use of i-Buy to pay visiting speakers as if they were purveyors of furniture), are imposed on them without prior discussion with them about what systems would improve their work experience and make them more productive.”
“Comprehensively, in what cases can shared governance NOT overrule university policy?”
“Shared governance is coming across as a mess right now. Perhaps a necessary stage before things get better?”
“It's unclear whether faculty governance has any power. It seems like faculty can make recommendations through this channel, but the authority to make change seems it's still entirely at the whim of administration.”
“It is exciting to finally see shared governance being taken seriously by our department. Our director has made strides to seek faculty input and to establish a working environment that follows the principles of shared governance.”
“Shared governance is new at Expository Writing Program, and I like it very much so far.”
“Liberal Studies is kept out of the loop at NYU. We need to be a real part of FAS. At present, we are in a bubble. Often the administration uses us as the test group for new initiatives because we are all contract faculty members, and the administration knows we will put up a little resistance. We are not consulted or asked. And yet, we have a B.A. program now (for about 7 years). There needs to be more respect when it comes to shared governance at LS.”
“The faculty of our program is often blocked from knowing policies coming from the larger administrative apparatus of FAS--which frequently presents each new policy as a fait accompli. Within our faculty, in the past, our dean was punitive toward critics and unprofessional, and the effect was highly divisive.”
“As contract faculty in a program, there has not traditionally been a sense that I have access to pertinent information or that my opinion matters. It does seem to be improving, but that improvement appears to be from efforts of the faculty. Yet, there are big gaps in my knowledge. I have almost zero sense of the budget of my program, its source of funding, and how it compares to similar programs within NYU, for instance.”
“There have been instances in LS where there was insufficient communication between admin and faculty, but the situation has improved over time (with the one important exception that the reappointment/promotion procedures were not developed in an open and transparent
way. Curricular governance is very open, however). I would also suggest that any survey of this kind, to generate useful results, needs to be constructed in a way that makes answers quantifiable (Likert scale, e.g.), and it needs to define its terms in a way that makes sense for all units (eg, "School," "Department," "Program"). I think you'll find it very hard to draw any really convincing data from this survey, since all the answers are qualitative. I say this from long experience in conducting surveys that needed tin inform actions.” [Amen]

“TL;DR” [too long; didn’t read]
“I hope this survey makes faculty more aware of the principles.”
“Governance requires knowledge and many (most?) faculty do not know what is going on at NYU--for various reasons. Faculty Senators should interact more with other faculty members, and the administration should inform Senators more about what is important about what is happening at NYU.”

“Things like the Sexton plan, which was opposed by the faculty, went ahead anyhow. This was a major example of the top-down nature of NYU governance. I hope things are better under Andy Hamilton, although his independence from the board has not been explained to us. Sexton seemed to be the messenger boy for Lipton. Do not know the relationship between [William R.] Berkley [Chairman of the NYU Board of Trustees] and Hamilton.”

“It would really be great to feel like one could participate meaningfully in shared governance! (I.e., have a role shaping the direction, practice and decisions of FAS and NYU.)”
“This survey is preposterous.”
“As a visiting professor for 3 years, I feel I have no status at all, concerning nyu's life.”
“The questions on this survey were very specific, and I'm not sure I understood the context that motivated them.”

“The questions use vague terms and presume knowledge that make it difficult to provide precise answers.”
“What does the "Office of Faculty Governance" do? Time for an all-campus or all-FAS introduction?” [see https://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/university-senate/membership/councils/tenured-tenure-track-faculty-senators-council/senators-committees/office-of-faculty-governance.html]

“I think shared governance is working well at NYU.”
“There is no true "shared governance" when contract faculty and TT track faculty split representation. This has absolutely NOTHING to do with the relative merits of these faculty groups on substance and EVERYTHING to do with the structural inequalities between TT faculty guaranteed academic freedom and contingent faculty who are-- by definition--CONTINGENT on the will of the administration. The joint representation is a farce, a means of diluting the strength of TT faculty, and one of my biggest dissatisfactions in working at NYU.”

“FAS has dragged its heels on the inclusion of contract faculty in governance, especially on the Committee on Committees and Rules (where contract faculty still are without representation) and in Liberal Studies. The new FAS Faculty Assembly has helped; but there is a widespread sense of alienation among FAS contract faculty, which the deans have done little to address.”

“The questions are too vague for me to be able to answer. Concrete examples of what you mean would have helped.”
“FAS Rules and Procedures authorize a temporary committee (i.e. 1-year vs. regular 3-year term) the Committee on Committee Rules (CCR) composed of 6 elected faculty. This committee has limited jurisdiction and must report its recommendations to the Policy and Planning Committee (P&P) who then deliberate and present their recommendations to the full faculty for a vote. In an effort by the administration to railroad through controversial CCR recommendations P&P was bypassed in the Spring of 2016. CCR’s recommendations were put to a vote at the last Full Faculty Meeting of the year where faculty attendance was very low and lots of administrators were present. The administration opposed a proposal that CCR's recommendations be voted on by electronic ballot in the coming Fall thus preventing faculty from having a more robust discussion of CCR's recommendation (that had not been vetted or approved by P&P). FAS faculty also elect representatives on two university created task forces: 1) Undergraduate Academic Standards Committee; and 2) University Global Network Committee. Finally two years ago the administration initiated a proposal to experiment with a very different model of faculty governance a Faculty Assembly. FAS faculty were divided in their support (it passed by a narrow margin) and the Faculty Assembly was viewed by many as administrative backlash to the successful faculty Vote of No Confidence in the Sexton Administration. A faculty member from my department was elected (1-year term) to the Faculty Assembly for its first year (2015-16). No report(s) were made to the department nor was there any departmental discussion concerning the Faculty Assembly in its first year. There was no election for a 2016-17 departmental representative to the Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Assembly has no representative listed on their website for the Politics Department. Members of the Politics Department therefore had no representation on the Faculty Assembly during its second year of existence. If Politics faculty have been elected representatives or appointed to committees task forces etc. the fact is that department meetings occur only for the purpose of discussing and voting on hiring making promotion and tenure decisions and reviewing graduate student progress (once a year). There are department committees whose members are appointed by the chair (the chair is the only elected officer). Only two department committees seem to meet: 1) Recruitment; and 2) Promotion and Tenure committees. We know this because their decisions require our votes. If other department committees actually meet they have not informed and/or deliberated with the department. Put simply shared governance does not function in the Politics Department. If we had institutional Norm of Transparence scale say ranking from 1 to 5 with 5 as the highest FAS is at 3. Using this same scale for my department Politics is a 1, on the one hand when faculty committees are informed of administrative matters that affect us it has been my general experience (as an active faculty representative) that if faculty engage press for information and press again for information we produce a consultation process. On the other hand the principle of consultation is violated when the FAS administration makes unilateral deals (i.e. without faculty consultation) with the University administration under the guise of it's an administrative not academic decision. For example FAS administrators unilaterally made a deal with the University administration to administratively house a program (Liberal Studies Program) from a different school (School for Continuing and Professional Studies). FAS administrators promised the Policy and Planning Committee there was an administrative fire wall between the College of Arts and Science's (CAS) academic program and Liberal Studies'. Not true they actually created a backdoor into CAS without faculty consultation, Again faculty more often than not have to press the administration to get a coherent answer (i.e. intelligible and
meaningful), on average yes. We speak the same language; usually write coherent responses to applicable in FAS faculty representatives on the Policy and Planning Committee pressed this issue with the then acting-dean who with our backing negotiated with the Provost. This was a good process. It also has contributed to strengthening transparency consultation and more responsive faculty representation. The leadership of my department has not direct control over this matter. We have each other's' email addresses, but in my view we should re-think if not reverse the recent (in the past 10-15 years) practice of not including assistant professors in department school and university policy making. As assistant professor in the early-1980s my generation learned about the norms of shared governance as we exercised them by serving on committees deliberating with colleagues and working with students and administrators. It is healthy to build shared governance and challenging too. Thank you for putting together this important survey. You've contributed to shared governance. I'm looking forward to your findings.”

“They don't really provide rationale. They say this is what it is too bad. For example when we have pointed out how our promotional process is much more arduous than other contract faculty in other schools we were given no clear reason as to why this is so. Because we don't have tenure we often are at the mercy of our deans. They can intimidate and bully us and we are not protected.”

“Don't think the Expository Writing Program is taken very seriously by larger bodies within the university which is sad and problematic because the work we do is absolutely fundamental and foundational to the rest of students' academic careers. And we are pretty good at what we do (and getting better). But with 118 faculty members its clunky and difficult to have a conversation.”

“A grudging email or letterhead dismissal will eventually be circulated to the T-FSC of course, think this sort of situation never even comes up. By this point I am starting to wish I was in a program… only in restricted circumstances. I suppose the T-FSC chair might do so but rarely does. The chair of the FAS body has done so regularly--but often there is push back from select FAS members themselves indirectly on behalf of the administration it could be argued. There's a chilled atmosphere just hit reply alone the last chair's email when the spirit moves us.”

“And I'll bet that the 'results' of this survey are whitewashed.”
III. With 276 full-time faculty (6% of the NYU faculty), the College of Dentistry had a 9.8% (27) response rate.

A. Representation
In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” most respondents (> 90%) said yes, but two did not know. A comment:

“Yes, but it is dominated by the largest department, Cariology [The study of dental caries and cariogenesis], and the basic scientists have very little representation. We would like to be more involved at the University level.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over 70% said Yes, two said No, and 5 didn’t know.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” about 35% said Yes, and the others were about evenly divided among No, N/A, and blank.

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” there was a split opinion. Over half said Yes, about 30% said No, and 15% gave mixed responses. Some comments:

“Transparency can be to a "selected" group and after decisions have been made not necessary transparent during the process.”

“yes and no. Decisions are top down.”

“NO- faculty hiring and appointments sometimes done with little transparency and little to no competition. Rank on clinical track assigned somewhat arbitrarily without specific requirements and more senior rank sometimes appears to be based on age rather than record or achievement.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” almost 79% said Yes and fewer than 25% said No.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” almost 40% said Yes but 50% didn’t respond or said N/A.

C. Time to consult. In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” responses were split between Yes (~45%) and No (~35%), with the remainder mixed or blank.

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over 60% said Yes while under 30% said No

“VERY TOP DOWN - DEPT. CHAIR IS A BULLY.”

“The chairman usually sends out a survey regarding his performance at the end of the year.”
In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” responses were split at 25% each between Yes and No.

D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” more said Yes (35%) than said No (15%).

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” 46% said Yes, a few said No, and the rest didn’t know or didn’t respond.

“The faculty have a very informal relationship to many of the chairs, including our department. Issues are discussed openly but there is no written and formal protocol for communications departmentally.”

“There is no representative body of our department. There are reps on faculty council but they are there to do what the chair wants, not what the faculty want and need.“

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” five said Yes and most said N/A.

E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” most responses (77%) were Yes and the rest were blank.

“The mode of communication from senators is to report to College of Dentistry Faculty Council, and they in turn share with the faculty at large. Formal direct email communications to faculty have not taken place.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” responses were the same.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” there were 6 Yes responses; the rest were blank of N/A.

“Mass” communications go through department administrator and have to be approved before they are sent out by the Program Director for the appropriateness of the content and most importantly to assure compliance with patient confidentiality and issues specific to patient care.”

General Comments:

“Some things are like a black box. School runs like a country club at times. Department is totally ignoring academic principles, philosophy, and shared governance. I am not sure this information I provide will be kept anonymous. Your survey did not assure people of that. But I have expressed my views to the dept and the school. If you need valid data, you should encrypt the responses.”

“NYU is not unique...at 3 other universities it seems that committees are set up to obfuscate and to give one the sense of being able to criticize but the issue has already been decided.”
“How does true academic freedom exist when we are limited in our articulation of ideas and expression? We must hold something back ignored to not alienate those who reappoint us yearly. As such, our governance will always be limited compared to the tenured faculty.”

“Thanks for the survey.”

“SCHOOL IS RUN BY A COUPLE OF BULLIES WITH THEIR OWN AGENDA. ONLY INTERESTED IN THEIR OWN CAREERS.”

“The bylaws were changed so Cariology did not so dominate the Faculty Council, and we now have one representative. But the clinical faculty have a different agenda from the basic scientists, so representation is still a problem.”

“Don't know if the following is appropriate to this survey, but in general I have mixed success in the few times I attempted to engage the NYU faculty council or the dental college faculty council and no success with the administration of either NYU or NYU dental college.”

“The dental school has a large faculty body, naturally the main gripe is salaries, but I am sure that is in every school division. The dental school seems to be on the right track. Sometimes the loudest complainers do the least in making a division better!”

“Almost no translucency—all seems to be secretive—with no real communication from administrative area and down to faculty.”
IV. With 265 full-time faculty (5.8% of the NYU faculty), the Steinhardt School had a 13.6% (36) response rate.

A. Representation
In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” virtually all (97%) faculty said Yes.

“Yes; on the department level we treat C and T faculty the same, and so appoint anyone who is interested in serving. Generally speaking, C faculty are more willing to be in leadership positions than tenure faculty--right now, all program heads are led by C faculty.”

“Yes. School's Faculty Senate/Council has the following committees: Academic Affairs Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, School Planning Committee, Doctoral Affairs Committee, and Courses and Programs Committee.”

“We have faculty representative in the Senate, and several committees. The faculty are selected by their department chairs and/or a vote within their department. Committees range from academic issues, to student issues. The faculty committees work in conjunction with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT?” 89% said Yes and the others said No or did not know.

“yes, the department faculty representative for the Steinhardt Council also sits on the standing committees.”

“Yes: this has been abiding at all levels of faculty governance as well as on School and/or University committees as needed (from Dean's Search Committee to Diversity Initiative to Technology Committee, to Global initiatives, as well as all issues re: promotion & tenure, class evaluation forms, etc.).”

“Yes, on the department level as noted, C faculty are more engaged in governance than T faculty.”

“[My department] has developed a committee structure that is now quite effective. A Study Committee resolves issues that are not dealt with in the by-laws. There is some concern that this committee acts as de facto governance (and I sit on it). Administratively, we are often at the mercy of the deans and provosts: a faculty appointment was turned down by the Provost's office under the previous incumbent, which was highly detrimental to the department's efforts to diversify itself.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM?” about 35% of faculty said Yes, over 25% didn’t respond, 25% gave a mixed response including N/A, and 4 said No.

“Yes. One member of program faculty serves on the committees mentioned above.”

“We do not assign a faculty member from our program to sit on school committees although at least 2 out of 5 serve on some school committee representing our department.”

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” about 50% of the responses were Yes, 30% were mixed, and the rest were No.
“There is a lot of communication among the deans and faculty at Steinhardt both C and T. And they have made transparency their motto; there are always people complaining about various aspects, but in the main, the administration communicates its policies/procedures to us. Not everyone is "tuned in" (meaning: not everyone reads the emails or attends faculty meetings) so not everything comes across ... but that isn't the fault of the administration.”

“No. I have no idea what he school is up to most of the time.”

“Faculty meetings at the school are largely informational--it is rare that there is a debate or a vote on an issue. The school operates largely through the deans, in part because the departments are so different but mostly out of desire to centralize. NYU Central continues to 'tax' Steinhardt, meaning that the school has limited freedom of operation.”

“No. There's a lot of obscuring of info, especially as relates to expenditure on faculty/education/research vs. administration. We are provided data -- sometimes historical -- on the sheer #s of faculty vs. administration staff. We are never provided that data on the basis of the amount spent on those two categories. It seems quite likely that there has been a big shift in that domain over the past 10-20 years.”

“I don't know that I can answer this: for several issues, clearly; for other issues (i.e. regarding salary equity vis-a-vis, for example, gender, rank & length of service, harder to tell).”

“Yes. Faculty who serve on committees are required to report back to the department during staff meetings.”

“Selective transparency.. all information and decision making not shared in an open forum with all faculty.. and if done.. decision has already been made..”

“there is a certain welcome level of transparency, but the strategic vision for the school remains the deans' prerogative despite lip service

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” almost 60% of responses were Yes and the rest were split between mixed and No.

“We have a strong department chair who makes some decisions behind closed doors but does try to keep faculty in the loop. Ultimately though, he will make decisions in what he deems the best interest of the department even without faculty consensus.”

“No. The Department Chair does not share with faculty her decision-making process or the nature and content of conversations with the Deans or school-wide Chairs meetings. The Department Chair also does not share with faculty information on the department budget or doctoral funding allocations.”

“We have annual budget meetings with the Chair and staff; we have regular faculty meetings where budgetary issues are discussed, and faculty report on Steinhardt-wide policies. Again, if C faculty or T faculty don't attend the meetings or stay in touch with their program head, they would not know about the policies. The system is set up for transparency; its up to faculty to avail themselves of the system if policies are important to them.”

“Of necessity the chair, DUS, and DGS are party to far more information than they can reasonably share, though the dept is on the whole quite functional and there tends to be broad agreement about policy. hiring and doctoral admissions can be divisive, but not for lack of transparency.”
In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” fewer than 40% of the responses were Yes, many were blank, and the rest said N/A (16%) or No (11%).

C. Time to consult. In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” responses

“No. Faculty input is not important on the school level. The administration does not appear to value shared governance.”

“Most often because there are committees, and they meet at regularly scheduled times. Sometimes there are ad hoc committees set up, and those meetings are not regularly scheduled, and there is often not enough lead time to plan for those meetings. However, attendance at ad hoc is not mandatory, so there is that trade-off.”

“No. Faculty input is not important on the school level. The administration does not appear to value shared governance.”

“Not always. There have been many times when a decision has been announced and people in the School didn't even realize a policy was going to change and therefore didn't have time to provide feedback.”

“Not really since the University has been building programs of study and research that substantially overlap with existing programs. Too often feels like faculty are chess pieces in this game. Our dept lost several faculty to a new school, even as it was not their choice to do so.”

“Tough question...consultation on a very limited basis and with very select faculty.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” two-thirds of the responses were Yes, a sixth were No, and the rest were mixed or blank.

“No. Things are often rushed, ill-considered, erupt at a faculty meeting and then require decision. There is a "get rid of this issue" attitude that rules the day.”

“Yes. Faculty meet twice a month, so if there is any issue to bring up, that is a great forum to do so--you just ask for your issue to be put on the agenda, and you put forward your issue to the faculty in your department.”

“Administrative pressures are high in the department: I think most people feel we take decisions too quickly without sufficient discussion because there's always pressure of time to get this thing done and move onto the next and because the common hour is the only time for such meetings, meaning that all discussion and information has to be shared in 75 minutes.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” almost 40% said Yes, over 10% said No, and the rest were mixed, blank, of N/A.

“Not necessarily since some key decisions, e.g., regarding hiring of faculty and/or staff, are made at the level of the chair without program faculty input.”

“we could be more thorough but that would mean more meetings.”

D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” responses were evenly split between Yes and No (20% each) with many others unaware of any such events.
“I can't think of a single instance where faculty didn't agree with a school policy of late ... but if that did happen, the faculty would discuss at the department meeting and then if necessary, ask our chair to put the issue forward at the Steinhardt's chair meetings. So we have a system.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over 20% said Yes, half that number said No, but most left it blank or noted that communications are oral, not written.

“As a faculty we discuss issues and if a consensus cannot be reached (or if key faculty are not present at the meeting) we either schedule an ad hoc committee to meet with the absent faculty and/or set up a special meeting to resolve. This has happened on a few issues this year, and we were able to resolve them through meetings/discussions that extended beyond our faculty meeting system.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” responses were similar to your DEPARTMENT.

E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” half the responses were Yes and the rest were unsure or blank.

“This is explicitly encouraged, particularly in the development of new courses and programs. They cannot go forward without input from faculty inside and outside the program/department. Sometimes other schools are consulted. This is the area where there is the most frequent communication outside the department.”

“Yes. E-mails can be distributed to all faculty members of the School.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over 75% said Yes with the rest blank or uncertain.

“Actually, Department faculty members have the Department e-mail list and do not need the Department administration's approval to send e-mails to colleagues.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” almost 40% said Yes, with the rest blank or N/A.

F. General comments:
“I would be interested in seeing the results of this survey.”
“The Steinhardt school is moving in a direction that erodes shared governance, and with that, apathy seems to be spreading among faculty. For example, long-term (10+ year) contracts with outside vendors to design and deliver on-line degree programs, consistently replacing tenure-track lines with clinical lines, and favoring 1-year and visiting contracts (or other short-term contingent arrangements) over multi-year contracts all serve to concentrate power within the Deans office and remove influence of full-time faculty.”

“Enormously inconsistent and unwritten ways things operate, ways that, while one comes to know them, do not serve for open governance. That said, Steinhardt is the most responsive and
open administration I am aware of at NYU. The Tenured Faculty in Steinhardt are less willing to share governance with TT and Contract Faculty.”

“One aspect not covered is transparency around promotion as well as length of contracts for C faculty. The policies are getting clearer, but it is still a murky area for many C faculty.”

“People are not very engaged at school level because it is perceived that the administration takes faculty governance very lightly. Moves to online MAs and other high-impact moves were largely decided by deans, even if a rubber stamp of approval follows.”

“University transparency re: the budget and allocation of funds among the schools.”

“We try to keep all program faculty involved in decision making but ultimately the department chair and program director make all final decisions, The School takes process very seriously. Any changes are voted on first in standing committees then in the School Senate and finally brought to a full faculty vote. We only meet as a department faculty once a month so sometimes decisions need to get made at the top level without input from all faculty. It is the only efficient way to run the department. We tend to talk things out over the course of a decision and only take a vote once a year. We have never found the School administration negate anything that faculty presented in writing, don't recall the faculty every presenting something to the Chair in writing but I imagine if this occurred we would receive a timely response. Same as above answer. The School senate sends emails to the full faculty without needing to go through administration. Administration provides the school faculty senate with an email distribution list each year. We have an open department and each faculty member I believe feels comfortable sending out emails to the full department. Same as above although most emails related to the program come directly from the program director, feel as though the Steinhardt School is a model for faculty governance and transparency at NYU.”

“I'm not that familiar with school and university level procedures. In the department I've found that norms of communication and consultation are generally followed right up until the moment when senior faculty really want something very badly at which point they can become fairly creative in their efforts to obtain whatever it is. It's fascinating. Really all the people who speak so loudly against Trump's disregard for the rule of law while showing such little respect for it themselves in their own domains. Is this what you were asking?”

“The Chair of our department is open and candid with challenges as they arise; is a powerful advocate/representative of our Department. This has been true of the past several chairs in our Department. Our Department has a history and tradition of working collaboratively; sharing responsibilities; valuing each other's work/contributions; there are multiple ways that faculty can participate in matters relating to the department--I do not get the sense that faculty feel marginalized,” etc: the most obvious includes preparing for promotion/tenure/sabbatical and/or leaves. Crystal clear within the School, the Department is extremely pro-active and positive in providing on-going mentoring assistance and feedback on all issues relating to retention, assessment, tenure, promotions, leaves, etc, generally yes. Some recent issues: it would be helpful for greater candor/responsiveness. Cannot fully assess at this time, our Chair and prior chairs have been very responsive in a timely manner, all governance reports are posted as well as available at all full-faculty meetings so information is available. Too our faculty reps. regularly report to the faculty at Departmental meetings (these minutes are circulated/available). If there is an emergency sensitive issue outreach via email does occur, of course.”
V. With 256 full-time faculty (5.6% of the NYU faculty), the Tisch School had a 16.8% (43) response rate.

A. Representation
In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” most (90%) faculty said Yes; a few were unsure.

“Yes to all of the above. See Tisch By Laws, also there has been the creation of a body called, TFC Tisch Faculty Council made up entirely from faculty elected by faculty without any obligation or allegiance to the administration in any manner whatsoever.”

“Yes. the faculty-administration relationship is evolving. for instance, it seems, though I don't have first hand information, that the School's Budget Committee has become more than simply a body to be consulted and ultimately ignored.”

“Yes. Tisch has mostly contract faculty, so they have long been on school wide committees. I will say that the teacher rank has only recently been invited to sit on school wide committees. I think that is slowly changing now.”

“Sometimes. We have a faculty council that is consulted by the administration, but some other committees and task forces (like the faculty welfare and governance committee) are appointed by the dean and department chairs.”

“Yes--faculty have always been on School standing committees, in appointed capacities: academic affairs, grievance, Faculty Welfare and Governance and Finance and Budget Policy. There is now a Tisch Faculty Council, an elected body with 1 rep from each department and program of Tisch.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” about 84% said Yes and 2 said No.

“Yes, although we have trouble getting faculty to volunteer for these positions because there are so many to fill if you include those internal to the Dept.”

“yes. our faculty from time to time over the decades must remind our chairman of the limits on their power and / take charge when the chair is lax. Currently the faculty is consulted on all decisions. we have revived a Committee which is purely to air faculty concerns confidentially. the Committee then acts as appropriate to relieve the faculty member's complaint.”

“somewhat. chair tends to place his loyalists on these committees.”

“Yes. Our department has bylaws that outline the various required committees. Committees are comprised of all full time faculty and are organized and populated by the Chair.”

“no -- we are a very small department running three degree programs and often do not have enough faculty to share departmental AND school- and university-wide service obligations; this is a problem (as we are not always fully represented by the school representatives -- since TSOA is majority NTT but we are all, or nearly all, T/TT).”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” about 35% said Yes. The others left this blank or replied N/A.

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” about 55% said Yes, about 20% said No, and other responses were mixed or blank.

“Yes. There are many avenues to get information. The one thing that is a bit "mis-named" is the so called "Faculty Meeting" Tisch has 4 times a year. It should really be re-named, Tisch Dean's Meeting, (which would still be needed and necessary). Routinely the Dean takes this meeting to report about things going on or relevant guests are invited - at times faculty can discuss with other faculty faculty matters but it is rare and not a "safe" zone to have these discussions outside of ear shot of the Administration.”

“It is hard to judge what is NOT conveyed since, obviously, it is the very definition of non-transparency. Having said that, I do trust and have confidence in my School's deep investment in transparency and respect for its faculty and the principle of faculty governance.” My perception is that transparency is the norm where possible and I wouldn't say the administration is interested in transparency from the faculty. I feel the current Dean's administration is attempting to make transparency a norm.

“My perception is that the previous Dean's administration was much more veiled practiced "deliberate privilege" more regularly.

“The TSOA administration does an excellent job disseminating information in a timely manner to the faculty that effects educational and administrative policy.”

“When it's useful to those who control transparency.”

“I think to a certain extent yet. I think the main problem is the amount of time and effort true transparency would take. It is not always possible and then we are down a rabbit hole of perception and misperception.”

“Declared norm, but not always reality, not practice. Secretive system sometimes.”

“Yes--we have 2 all-school faculty meetings a semester which are usually well-attended by the faculty. Information is given there, as well as in committee meetings.”

“To some extent. There is not transparency around salary and gender parity, and have been told the University Administration will not reveal or does not have statistics regarding that - - which seems odd and highly unusual. There has not been transparency around rationale for certain appointments made outside of normal faculty promotion/appointment protocol, e.g. spousal appointments/targets of opportunity/targets of excellence. While most hires may be appropriate and legit and well within Provost/Dean/Chair purview, the lack of explanation or communication of reasons has created some tension.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” responses were about the same as above.

“It's not so much about transparency its more about opportunity. The Department is not "collective governance" friendly. There are few adequate and meaningful meeting opportunities for the faculty to meet let alone discuss and collaborate about directional questions in regards to the course of the department. The Chair operates very much from a "managerial" or "director" style. Manages information in order to chart the course which is most favorable to the Chair. The Chair in this department is here for long stints of time. The last Chair was here for 25 years, this one is approaching 10 years and counting. Equally the Area Heads have been there for 20+ years, 15+ years and 7+ years respectively with no sign of change. This entrenchment attitude dampens inspiration or feelings of inclusion - as it would naturally be in any human scenario - so it is not
personal, there are wonderful respectable people in these positions, but the shortcomings to the paradigm are achetypical and beyond any singular human.”

“[My] Department has a new Chair this year and I would say that we have great hope the he is guiding the Department with a strong valuation on transparency. Our Department is still recovering from a dark period when a National Search for a new chair produced a candidate who cultivated paranoia and distrust throughout the program.”

“My department is very large (the size of a small liberal arts college). It is no possible for the various parts of the program to communicate, or for ht administration to communicate with everyone.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” over 30% were Yes, about 10% were mixed, and there was one No. Most didn’t answer or responded N/A.

C. Time to consult. In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” half the responses were Yes and about 15% were mixed and 15% No.

“This would be a committee question really, this is how our governance activity is parsed out. I'm assuming yes. Individual faculty members, when School wide elections are done, yes. At times, as in a recent case, the Dean of Faculty retired and a new one was being sought, the Dean's Office has reported that once the candidates had been narrowed down to three, the full faculty would have an opportunity to view their position papers and CV and weigh in. This never happened. On the flip side, the new Dean of Faculty candidate pool was comprised solely from nominations from the Faculty - which was incredibly empowering.”

“Again, with so much going on, and such a large contract faculty body, it is difficult to get input on all matters. The question then becomes what is important enough to have all faculty weigh in on, and how would that happen?”

“Yes--our Faculty Welfare and Governance Committee developed the Arts Professor and Teacher Policies after long consultation and iterative process with the entire faculty, each fully discussed and eventually voted on at faculty meetings.”

“Seems so, though the issue and implementation of online evaluations and how that came to pass seemed like input was ignored. Most faculty in the school seemed to be against it.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” responses were distributed about as in the prior question.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” about 25% said Yes, 2 said No, and most didn’t answer.

D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” over 15% said Yes, about 12% said No, and most didn’t answer because they were unaware of written exchanges.
“Our representative faculty body at Tisch is very new—I would say in it's first few years of existence. There still is a lack of clarity on how governance works at the school level, what the responsibility of the faculty etc. is.”

“Not exactly. Often the reply is verbal rather than written. I think the verbal explanations at faculty meetings are good, but it makes sharing that response with other faculty or reviewing the reasons given more difficult. Both would be better.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over 20% said Yes, half that said No, and many noted that written communications and advice are rare at the department level.

“No, there is no such representative faculty body in place as a whole. The expectation is that if you have a matter, you bring it personally to the Area Head and the Area Head will then deal with it or pass it on. The chair does a good job in responding to individual matters that are brought up by me in regards to the department. I don't ever feel like there is no explanation given. The shortcoming of course, and this is by design, is that individual faculty members don't communicate with each other in a way that promotes self-governance or momentum. There are no community issues explored and there is no extensive space or time in the schedule to do so.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” about 16% said Yes, one said No, and most noted N/A.

“I don't think the leadership could care less what the faculty think and just does whatever is easiest. Any feedback as above is generally met with defensive hostility.”

E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” almost 60% said Yes and 3 said No. Many were unclear about what an “official communication system” is besides NYU email.

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over 2/3 said Yes and a few gave a qualified Yes. The question was unclear to many.

“sometimes - but, there is heavy editing by chair which often distorts the truth.”

“Yes, with permission.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” about 35% said Yes and most did not respond.

General Comments:
“The school's views on retirements have not been made clear to faculty and it would be great if they were, going forward.”

“Throughout our program the faculty and administration have taken many steps in the right direction. We're evolving in positive ways on many fronts. The results of several years of deliberation and work are paying off.”

“The TSOA is a model for successful shared governance across program, department and school levels.”
“I think there are many people in Tisch who either don't understand, or have little interest in academic governance. It is difficult to teach a population something that they may or may not want to learn about, especially when people are so busy trying to teach, do all the committee work and create a very high level of artistic product at the same time.”

“TISCH IS A MODEL OF SHARED FACULTY GOVERNANCE”

“At Tisch I think strong shared governance is pretty much the norm.”

“As a full time contract faculty member (15 years) I am happy to see we are now represented within the Faculty Senate. There has to be more uniformity across the schools in regard to the influence of non tenure full time faculty. Tisch is simply not offering it (or so I have been told) like it used to, or at all. However, if contract faculty were to vanish - so then would Tisch (very similar in fact in regard to adjunct instructors). Leadership of faculty governing bodies just need to wake up to the fact that a new reality is upon us. At times we feel penalized for not attaining something that is not offered, therefore not possible - tenure.”

“I would like more transparency on hiring and appointments, and on gender/orientation salary parity.”

“seems to be working well as a process.”

“Sometimes I would like more time to consider matters that are coming up. That may not be available to us In my department we are privy to the why's and why not's. Having been a rep for my department on TFC I believe it is important to bring up issues at a faculty meeting and not just email. There are too many emails and the issues get lost. There needs to be more face to face.”

“not always, not always, unclear, unclear, unclear, unsure and don't use, unsure and don't use, unsure and don't use,”

“Don't you know shared Governance is a fiction at NYU.”
VI. With 214 full-time faculty (4.7% of the NYU faculty), NYU Abu Dhabi had a 6.1% (13) response rate.

A. Representation
In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” those who answered (85%) said Yes.

“Yes. We have representation on the NYUAD faculty council, as well as senate.”
“NYUAD has reps in Senate, on GNU committees & diversity task force.”
“Yes. NYUAD (finally) has Faculty Senators, though it took too long to get.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over half the responses were Yes and 2 were No.

“Within Abu Dhabi, yes. Social Science has reps on FCSC, UCC, ACC etc.”
“No. Departments don't exist at NYU Abu Dhabi, for reasons I truly do not understand.”
“Yes, but only within-discipline curricular/administrative issues (which is appropriate).”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 46% said Yes, 23% said No, and one response was mixed (“sometimes”).

“Yes, we have a science rep on various curricular committees as well as on the NYUAD faculty council.”
“Yes. We were represented on the FCSC by Ken Nielsen who served as chair. Nielsen currently serves on the undergraduate research committee for A&H. Marion Wrenn serves on the Core Curriculum Committee.”
“No. My program currently has little to no representation on such bodies.”

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” 46% said No, 23% said Yes, and 23% gave a mixed response.

“No. For example, the recent decision to change the titles of all contract faculty renewing their contracts at NYUAD came with no warning, and essentially no consultation with the faculty.”

“yes and no. In areas such as strategic planning and hiring, no. We also do not have a clear idea about how resources are allocated. Other things, yes.”

“Sometimes. Generally there is open communication through faculty forums and faculty councils. However, occasionally some decisions are made in the background and appear to have been done in a vacuum.”

“Somewhat. Although many things are communicated via faculty councils/forums, far too many things seem to occur by administrative fiat, with no faculty input. Adjustments to rules related to research budgets, travel, even summer teaching salaries are generally taken at admin level and poorly communicated. Faculty housing is totally opaque . . . list goes on.”

“Over the first seven years of NYUAD the key issue between the Administration and Faculty has been the need for transparency which has not always been the norm. The reasons are complex: sometimes simply due to the new nature of the institution. But the Administration has not been good at understanding the importance of transparency.”
“No, or better "hah." Very few decisions are actually made in discussion with Faculty Council here, to put it mildly. Instead, decisions are made by parts of the administration or small committee, put in place, and then the Faculty Council is possibly informed or told to vote "Yes" with no meaningful opportunity for input.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” half the 10 respondents said No while the others split between Yes and Mixed.

“Mostly, but things change with each Dean: too much arbitrary power in hands of deans.”

“Dean is reasonably good about communicating important info, but does not divulge everything.”

“We do not have input into the strategy for recruitment or the vision for growing the division or program. We also do not know how funds are allocated or what is given priority for funds.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 77% said Yes and 15% said No.

“Yes. Our program head does a very good job of letting all the faculty (TT and contract) have input in these issues - with almost everything being decided after a true discussion and vote.”

C. Time to consult. In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” 46% said Yes, 31% said No, and 15% were mixed.

“NO -- administrators at NYUAD regularly make decisions that affect faculty without any consultation.”

“No. Letting faculty consult after decisions are made (i.e., negative time) surely isn't reasonable.”

“no. . . policies are typically implemented first. Affected faculty then pull a fire-alarm (fcsc); fcsc then raises issue with administration. Sometimes it works; sometimes it doesn't.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” 38% said Yes, 15% said No, and 15% were Mixed.

“Faculty are generally informed in broad brush-strokes of direction where policies are headed. Most don't pay attention.”

“Varies with each new dean.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 62% said Yes, 20% were Mixed, and 8% said No.

“Yes, for the most part. The administration does ask for decisions too quickly much of the time (i.e., <2 weeks).”

D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” about 38% said No and 15% were Mixed.
“Generally faculty dialogue at NYUAD goes on at town hall style faculty councils, where various points of view can be aired. Major decisions are then voted on, with recommendations made to NYUAD. While these are non-binding recommendations only, the administration has generally adopted faculty recommendations. In cases where it did/could not, the reason why was communicated back through the faculty council committee.”

“No comments, I don't know of such a situation ever occurred at our school.”

“Local administration listens; they are quite good (sometimes great!) at reacting; not always great at being pro-active.”

“Very often not. Once the advice is given, quite often it disappears into a black whole - the deans’ council - and then sometime later a decision is announced or not even announced.”

“Writing? No. That means a record...”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” 38% said Yes.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 54% said Yes and one said No.

“The program has numerous faculty meetings over the year (8 this year, I think) and decisions are communicated at these meetings.”

E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” 69% said Yes and one said No.

“Yes: the Faculty Council Steering Committe is the main conduit through which individual members can address others regarding governance issues.”

“Yes; there is a separate Google group for T/TT and contract faculty, as well as a combined group for communication at NYUAD. The only issue is that the lists are difficult to maintain as HR uses different nomenclature than academic titles, making administration of the list (who belongs on which list) somewhat problematic... but this is a systems issue, not due to official resistance of any sort.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” 62% said Yes.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 69% said Yes.

F. General Comments.

“Essentially, faculty have little real input or influence on decisions made here.”

“In some cases, the shared governance seems a little overkill: for instance, I do not think we need to provide lots of input on how classes are scheduled during ramadan or how to go about starting a book buy back program at the book store. In cases like this, executive decisions are fine by me. However, in areas such as how much space is allocated to faculty researchers, or how teaching load is established, these need input and discussion at both the school and division level.”

“Shared governance at NYUAD works reasonably well in my opinion (I'm on FCSC). We have a fire-alarm model: admin takes decision (sometimes without Al/Fabio's knowledge); if decision causes ruckus, FCSC goes to Al/Fabio; they listen; generally problem get negotiated, if
not resolved. Faculty struggle to reign in legal & HR, which often make puzzling decisions with respect to personnel/research. Resolving bad decisions by legal/HR can be very time-consuming."

“NYUAD is a young institution still putting in place structures of shared governance. While the senior administration is in fact supportive and benign by comparison with many others, it does not always understand the need to clear guidelines and procedures (as opposed to relying on good will on a case by case basis). The advice and support of colleagues in New York is therefore crucial.”

“Faculty governance at NYUAD is sad, sick joke which unfortunately has been getting worse in the last few years. Program governance here is fine, but faculty still are not regularly and responsibly consulted about faculty / academic issues, and the faculty leadership lately here has been extremely ineffective (at best) or negligent / complicit (at worst) on this issue.”

“Links to the square are essential to maintain shared governance, academic freedom, and research quality at NYUAD and NYUSH, and thus protect the reputation of NYU as a whole, including NYU on the square. Not sure whether NYUSH has this same problem, but what would help in this regard is more standing faculty at NYUAD and more affiliates from the square. What seems not to be working is the increased number of "global network faculty" (faculty from the square who stay for years on contracts that seem to be negotiated without faculty consent or even consent of the dean) since they are often placed in administrative positions without relevant experience, prevent new lines for standing faculty from opening, and seem to operate for short-term personal interests rather than long-term institutional goals.”
VII. With 211 full-time faculty (4.6% of the NYU faculty), Stern had a 14.7% (31) response rate.

A. Representation
In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” everyone said Yes.
“Yes - there are many committees and task forces. Some have membership elected by faculty, some have membership appointed by the dean, some have a mix.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” almost all said Yes, but 2 said No and a few were confused by the question.
“Yes - there is a 6-member Executive Committee that meets regularly with the department leadership to discuss issues. This group gives input, but ultimately policy is determined by the chairman in consultation with the dean, whatever the views of this committee might be.”
“Only ad hoc.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” two said Yes and the rest left it blank or said N/A.

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” about half said Yes and the rest were evenly split among No, Mixed, and no response.
“There is some transparency, but mostly initiatives are presented to faculty by committees and task forces in at least moderately final form.”
“I guess this depends on what type of information you are talking about. Criteria used for raises are specified but the real criteria used are not transparent, for example.”
“Generally yes, although somewhat more for decisions under consideration by standing committees than by ad hoc committees.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” there were a few more Yes and fewer No responses.
“Most of the faculty are completely unaware of decisions that are being made until they hear them at a department faculty meeting. This is not necessarily because details are being hidden; much of it is because people don’t ask.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” there were 2 Yes and 2 No responses, and the rest were blank or N/A.

C. Time to consult. In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” about 58% said Yes, 16% said No, and the rest were mixed or didn’t know.
In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” about 65% said Yes, 16% said No, and the rest were blank or N/A.

“No. I find that many committees do not get their act together in time for me to have a thorough read of their proposals, especially within my department.”

“There is plenty of time for input on general issues and concepts, but often little time for input when detailed proposals are made available.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” only 4 faculty responded and they all had different responses.

D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” most were unaware of such events. But about 25% said Yes and 16% said No.

“The ‘representative faculty body’ of my School has never, in my knowledge, submitted advice in writing to the dean. It relied on informal discussions.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” about 16% said Yes. The others left it blank, didn’t know, or did not understand the question.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” most left it blank or noted N/A.

E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” over 75% said Yes although it was clear from comments that some were referring to ordinary email. Most of the others left it blank or didn’t know.

“Not automatically; they must be approved. Most are approved, I guess, but not all.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” responses were the same.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” except for 2 Yes responses, most left it blank or noted N/A.

General Comments:
“Again, … as tenure-track faculty here… I’ve been exceptionally pleased with transparency and information sharing and representation within department, and at school (Stern) level as well. I know less about university level.”

“No offense but this seems like a very broad sort of survey to understand what local shared governance means. I have not been at NYU for my whole career and my experience at other institutions in terms of local shared governance was that it was much deeper as well as encompassing many more aspects of the university.:”

“A lot depends on who the dean is and who the dept. chairman is. Present (outgoing) dean is OK. Immediately previous dean made the outrageous move to close the web site of a
faculty member without sufficient cause, creating a university-wide crisis. The dean before that
one had created a severely oppressive environment that lead a number of leading scholars to
leave NYU, and a number of others to "check out." Input by faculty on the appointments of
deans and chairpersons, even though solicited, is not seriously taken in consideration. There is a
strong feeling that decisions are taken elsewhere (central administration in the case of dean's
choice, dean's office in the case of chairperson's choice) and the faculty hardly has a say.”
“Stern has a long way to go. Individual departments vary in terms of shared governance,
given their history, culture, and who serves as Chair.”
“My final thoughts are that I welcome the voice and communication that the continuing
faculty senate council has brought, and that I hope for increasing transparency about actions and
decisions on all levels, university and school and program/department.”
“I strongly support shared governance.”
“It does not seem in anyone's best interest to speak up about any issue if you are not
tenured.”
“guess so, more or less, EPT is pretty good at this, Not really sure this is a great survey.
Also not sure the answers will be that meaningful.”
VIII. With 166 full-time faculty (3.6% of the NYU faculty), Tandon had a 9.6% (16) response rate.

A. Representation
In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” over 60% said Yes, a few gave mixed replies, and one said No.

“There are many standing and ad hoc faculty committees that deal with various educational issues. However, there are also quite a few initiatives that come from the administration without sufficient faculty input.”

“Yes, but representation does not mean that execution is affected.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” almost 70% said Yes, one said No, and the rest were blank.

“Yes. Both tenured/tenure-track faculty and contract faculty serve on department committees for undergrad and MS programs. PhD program and research related committees generally only involve tenured/tenure-track faculty.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” over 30% said Yes, one said No, and one response was mixed.

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” answers were evenly split between Yes and No (38% each) and there were a couple of mixed replies.

“Transparency is the norm with small policy decisions, but not with more major strategic planning. There are committees that include faculty for various "big" issues, but they are generally appointed, not elected, and do not seek input from other faculty early enough in their processes. The Dean does meet roughly once a month with the Faculty Executive Committee, which is an elected body and with the entire faculty; this provides some transparency and opportunity for input, but it is still not always clear how the big decisions are being made.”

“No. There is too much talk about transparency, but it does not really exist.”

“Generally, my sense is that not many people in the faculty have a clue what is going on with and in Tandon.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” over 55% said Yes but 25% said No, and there was a mixed reply.

“For the most part, yes, but there are some faculty within the department who are able to "behind the scenes" input into some important decisions.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” most left it blank or said N/A. 25% said Yes.

C. Time to consult
In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” about 63% said Yes and 2 said No.
In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” about half said Yes, and 2 each said No or were mixed.
   “Yes, but what is the point of giving time if one's opinion is not considered?”
   “Yes - only specific faculty are invited to participate on specific discussions and decisions.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” almost a third said Yes, and there was one No and one mixed response.

   D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” 25% said No, almost as many said Yes, and most were blank or N/A.
   “This is the fourth university I have worked at in my career and I have never understood so little of what goes on in my college.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” almost a third said Yes, 3 said No, and almost half left it blank.
   “Usually these matters are negotiated in person. If you have to reach the point of written briefs, it is usually too late.”
   “I believe that there are issues related to this question.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 3 said Yes and 2 others gave different responses.

   E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” almost 44% said Yes and there were 2 different replies as well.

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” 75% said Yes.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 50% said Yes.

General Comments:
   “Shared governance is just a nice idea, but it is not practiced. Administrators (may) consider the faculty opinions, but act on their own.”
   “This survey is totally confused. It presumes whoever is answering is aware of your deliberations. Questions are a bit vague and/or poorly worded.”
   “In the year that I have been here, I have tried my best to figure out what is going on in Tandon. After a year I have simply drawn the conclusion that the place is a state of disarray and I have begun to retreat into my own group and my own work.”
IX. With 116 full-time faculty (2.5% of the NYU faculty), the **NYU Shanghai** had a 6.0% (7) response rate. With fewer than 10 responses, any summary and comments would be misleading.

X. With 114 full-time faculty (2.5% of the NYU faculty), the **School of Law** had a 1% (1) response rate. With fewer than 10 responses, any summary and comments would be misleading.

XI. With 89 full-time faculty (1.9% of the NYU faculty), the **School of Professional Studies** had a 41.6% (37) response rate.

**A. Representation**

In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” about 68% said Yes and another 30% said No.

“*Yes, but they have always be appointed by administration never elected by faculty. therefore the faculty of our school is not represented, the administration is.*”

“Faculty representation at committees, task forces, etc. theoretically exists, but in reality it is a farce. The dean of the school exercises autocratic control over all such committees and he considers them all "advisory", i.e. he is under no obligation to even consider the recommendations of these committees if he disagrees with them. There is no room for dialogue or discussion. If he is challenged at a forum or faculty meeting, he fumes and rudely cuts people off, reminding everyone who's in charge. Given that all SPS faculty are contract faculty, people are afraid of participating in the process lest they be retaliated against or even fired. This has been repeatedly the case with all internal SPS so-called faculty governance. On paper, the structure looks fair, in reality, it's a joke.”

“*Yes, it usually does. It is however often obvious that decisions have been made by leadership before the faculty committees have been convened - leading to the general feeling that faculty representation is 'just for show'.”*

“SPS does have faculty on a variety of committees but in all such capacities the faculty are clearly told they are advisory ONLY. The newest and closest we have come to faculty input is the relatively new Faculty Council which meets with the Dean relative to any policy, procedures and change. This year the faculty worked diligently to increase one year contracts to two or more. I am a full Clinical Professor and used to have a 3 year contract. When the Faculty Council felt they had finally agreed upon the specifications, many administrative contraints were added to the final document taking major power away from the faculty. This unfortunately though with necessity ended in a negative vote against the contract proposal. All faculty initiatives were overriden by administrative perogatives to change the function and direction of the contract.”

“*We do not have meaningful representation. Agenda's are set by the Dean's office, with little or no interest in faculty-initiated concerns. After holding tightly controlled meetings, the Dean's office does what it likes.”*
“We had a faculty senate representative up till last week when he was dismissed by the dean among 10 others. We were not informed and now the whole school is shaken as must be his intention.”

“Yes, we have representation on the Faculty Global Committee and on the Future of Enhanced Technology Committee. We have representation on the GCP and on the Teaching Excellence Award Committee.”

“Yes. School is involved in most NYU committees, including tenured and contract faculty councils, grad and undergrad program committees, curricular and research development challenge fund, etc.”

“I am using this opportunity to vote "NO CONFIDENCE" IN DEAN DENNIS DILORENZO OF THE SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES.”

In response to the same question about “does your DEPARTMENT have faculty representation on committees, task forces, or other bodies…,” (meaning, are there faculty on department committees), about 2/3 said Yes, about 16% said No, and there were a few mixed responses.

“My department has faculty representation in the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Curriculum Committee, Student Affairs Committee and Scholarship Committee.”

“I believe that my department has representation in most relevant committees within SPS.”

“My department has two people on the Faculty Council of SPS. There are also some members on other committees, such as the Rank, Title, and Privilege Committee and the Grievance Committee. The Assistant Dean of the Division of Languages and Humanities sits on the Dean's Leadership Council. If others are serving on other bodies, I am unaware of it.”

“Yes. We have faculty on the Faculty Council, the Assessment Committee, the Rank Title and Privilege Committee, and the Grievance Committee.”

“Yes but the associate dean often makes unilateral decisions.”

“Yes but these are largely advisory/dispositive to the dean so that it doesn't feel like we have a lot of voice even though we put a lot of time in on these committees.”

“No. On the contrary, our departments run on few full time faculty, and some have but one who would also be obliged to serve as Chair or Academic Director and thereby barred from all levels of faculty representation according to the dean's ruling. Moreover, faculty are told, not consulted, as to what to do, by department heads who in this school are administrative "directors" and associate deans - are "professors" in name, but neither teach nor necessarily have any identification with the academic programs or fields under their charge.”

“We do not have meaningful representation. Agenda's at the department level are set by the Dean's office, with little or no interest in faculty-initiated concerns. Our Associate Dean is not focused on faculty input to educational and administrative policy, and so does nothing to alter this situation.”

“Yes, there is faculty representation on committees. On some committees (e.g. hiring committees for new associate deans) however, only one faculty member per department is represented (a severe under-representation), and they are not allowed to share details on the recruitment process.”
In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” about 46% responded Yes, 19% No, and the rest were blank.

B. Information
In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” 16% responded Yes but 57% responded No and there were a few mixed responses.

“There is some support for transparency, ie where it is required and necessary, but the real decisions are made behind closed doors, and there is no commitment to decentralization, collaboration or shared governance.”

“No challenges within Faculty Council.”

“No. Programs have undergone reorganization without faculty input.”

“No. What I consider transparent doesn't seem to be what the dean views as transparent.”

“No. Decisions are made in a non-transparent, top-down manner. The school has changed course on certain initiatives (e.g. ALI) without consultation.”

“There is no transparency. I have no confidence in the dean. He has shrunk our programs blaming outside factors when it was his own doing.”

“Transparency is not the norm in the SPS. Decisions come from the top down, with much discussion of "management imperatives" but with little sense of the larger, university wide picture.”

“No. For example, when supposedly openly discussing updates to the School's appointment and reappointment policies for full time contract faculty, the Dean forbade the School's Faculty Council from relaying drafts of the updated policy to the contract faculty body. My understanding is that he also made material changes to the terms of the proposed policies that went beyond the changes he discussed with the Faculty Council. The Dean also kept material information about policy implementation from the Faculty Council, which resulted in the Council's presenting misleading information to the full faculty body. Specifically, the Dean told the council that he would provisionally implement multi-year contract policies ahead of the provost's review (pending approval by the provost) without reporting that this would only effect a small number of 'randomly chosen' faculty, because of the time required to review and approve individual, multi-year contracts. Finally, the full faculty body had a very short time period (just several days) to review, question and comment on the finalized draft.”

“There is very little transparency in policy as it relates to my School. I regularly learn about decisions after the fact and with little information about how they will impact the School and my department.”

“Not at all. The Dean makes unilateral decisions and committed are just a show. The general feel across the school is: He fired people who disagree with him; he rules like a dictator; program changes with little research about either the problems or solutions. He surrounds himself with people with O advanced degrees, with no no research capacity, but are loyal to him. Just look at the upper level administration at SPS. He creates an atomosphere of fear so no one challenges him. I vote no confidence for SPS Dean Dennis Di Lorenzo. We need special investigation into this school and the damage he has done. 10 of our full-time faculty members were fired/contract not renewed. We received a letter on May 6 Friday around 4 pm, notifying all of us scheduled a 30 min to meet the Dean and the Associate dean. And then we heard the 2nd person, the Senator of the whole school was fired. At the end of the day, our faculty members are
reduced to 1/2 size. All through the school year, we were told that our roles may change but no one's job would be eliminated. The faculty who will leave are required to sign an agreement that they could no longer teach at NYU anywhere. This is very damaging for the division because those faculty members are dedicated teachers and each teach 4-6 courses. Why not ask them to teach so the transition may be smoother? This is for the benefit of the students and to stabilize the division. Further, there is NO plan regarding what the division will be. We also never given reason why and how Dean's new plan may save this division? Where is the research? We were never shown research or rational explanation about any solutions.”

“No, entire programs are cut by the dean with no input from faculty.”

“No, I do not believe so. For example, one of the programs in my department was eliminated without consulting us (the faculty or the department heads) and certainly against our objections. I know that recently several (10) of my colleagues in the McGhee Division were denied reappointment, and the Faculty Council was not included in this decision at all. The ISSC was created and has vastly expanded its role without the consultation of faculty, to my knowledge. Overload appointments have recently been disallowed without consultation, as well.”

“Absolutely not. The Dean has established a range of committees and we now have a faculty charter; however, all educational and administrative policy decisions are made by the dean, in consultation with a leadership council comprised of associate deans, and directors. The aforementioned faculty charter does establish a faculty council, which is a very positive development, but all it's decisions, including those that are unanimous, can be overridden by the dean.”

“No. Significant strategic decisions, including a recent termination of contracts of a number of faculty in the Paul McGhee school and a re-naming of the Paul McGhee school, are taken without consultation. Information on the school budget is not shared. The process of development of the SPS policy on appointments and reappointments was insufficiently transparent, with a reluctance by the School leadership to share drafts for comment until a final one was circulated.”

“No, it is not. Communication of the Council representatives with their constituency regarding strategic plans and documents of critical importance for faculty (e.g. appointment/reappointment policy) is closely monitored by the Dean, and during the course of the last year, has been impeded several times.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” strong opinions were mixed with 43% Yes, 24% No, and 11% mixed.

“Transparency is the norm in the Division of Languages and Humanities. The leadership team has an open door policy, and questions are dealt with openly for the most part.”

“No. For example, during the past couple of years, a longtime-employed, widely regarded faculty and a similarly-regarded program administrator have been abruptly dismissed. The Dean and our Associate Dean provided no information regarding the reasoning for the faculty member's dismissal. The quality of these employees is evidenced by thier subsequent hiring by a local university to start a directly-competing program.”

“More collegiality and shared information at Department level.”

“As much as it can be in a non-transparent school.”
“Lisa Springer is fantastic - transparency is the norm.”
“I have never heard of "deliberate privilege" being invoked in our department.”
“No, I do not believe so. As I mentioned above, one of the programs in my department was eliminated without consulting us (the faculty or the department heads) and certainly against our objections. In recent years, we were asked to become very involved in testing both our students and the students at SPS in general; this has suddenly stopped without our being consulted and against our objections. We were asked to develop several new courses for a program that may or may not be eliminated this fall; if it is eliminated, it will be over our objections.”

“Absolutely not. Educational policies are made which fly in the face of current research in the field. Explanations offered to faculty, who, in theory at least, are the experts in various areas, boil down to "Well, I, as your dean, had to make a decision." That is neither here nor there as a rational, fact-based, theoretical coherent argument. Another example was the watering down of English language support for SPS international students. At the same, at an all faculty meeting, he asked the degree course faculty how is it that they complain about the quality of their students yet still give the overwhelming percentage of students A's & B's. That's a valid point; however, he used the same final grade data to argue that international students no longer require English language courses, that workshops at the International Student Support center, which are excellent but obviously limited, are sufficient. I understand the need to attract students, but the moves the dean has made seem more concerned with creating as much distance between the idea/reality of shared governance and day-to-day reality of the educational needs of the students and the work of the faculty. For example, the elimination of certain language requirements has been greeted with quite a bit of anger by the students. They have said that not offering language courses just proves that NYU only cares about getting the students' tuition dollars, not in providing them with the skills they need to effectively participate in their courses. If there was shared governance, the dean would have received a vote of no confidence years ago, but he is protected by institutional arrangements which do give faculty some voice, but really no substantial say in policy.”

“Uneven levels of transparency. Consultations are rich on matters of planning new courses/concentrations, hiring new faculty, and planning events. On matters such as the budget of the department, the management of the administrative staff and the designation of their roles and responsibilities, there is no consultation.”

“During the 2016-17 academic year, faculty relentlessly tried to elicit from the Associate Dean what "the plan" for the department was. On Friday, May 5 at 3:47 pm, all faculty members received an email that summoned them to the SPS Dean Office on May 8. This day, 10 faculty members of the Department were let go. Those who remain and those who were let go do not know why. Transparency???”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 35% said Yes, 16% said No, and 5% were mixed.

“No. Faculty searches for example are a joke. The Associate Dean asks for volunteers to hold informal interviews with full time faculty candidates that he aims to hire, instead sanctioning true search committees.”
“Our program is the mirror opposite of the larger SPS. We have a wonderful Associate Dean in Lisa Springer. She is a classic example of an excellent teacher who is also a more than capable administrator who understands education. Unfortunately, she too must follow the dean’s directives, regardless of whether or not she agrees with them. He has done so much to eviscerate our program, and Lisa is left to smooth things out as much as possible.”

C. Time to consult. In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” 22% said Yes, 43% said No, and 16% were mixed.

“Governance is a mantra without much substance at SPS, even if there is apparent consultation of faculty bodies. Faculty inputs are not taken into account by the Dean as for instance, the appointment/reappointment policy. As a result, The Dean’s final text was voted down by the all faculty of the School.”

“yes, when we get a chance to input, there is reasonable time provided. However, there is a preference by the head of the School to share perspectives and policy/strategy positions orally, in faculty meetings, and to invite feedback at that time. This suffers from two problems. First, faculty meetings for the whole school are not attended by a consistent representation (and certainly not a comprehensive group) of faculty therefore any faculty reactions (and there are usually very few comments) are not representative. Second, communication of School strategy and policy in this manner does not enable faculty adequate opportunity to absorb information and analyze its implications.”

“Absolutely not. An example is the change in faculty spending funds which was voted on at the last minute at a retreat. It was, to say the least, a joke.”

“It is difficult to consider what the timeframe is for consultation when we are rarely consulted. Recently, though, the school was given a reasonable amount of time to consider the Appointment and Reappointment Policy.”

“not at all over the last year, with change in top levels of Administration.”

“No....At times it seems as if decisions are made by a small group of people who aren’t completely in touch with what goes on with faculty and in the classroom.”

“Yes but again all input is advisory.”

“Not always. For example, at an SPS-wide faculty meeting several semesters ago, Dean DiLorenzo asked the faculty if we would like to keep our annual $1,500 faculty spending budget and be allowed to pursue professional development opportunities and purchase technology with the money (keeping the then-current system unchanged) or whether we would prefer to see an increase in funding to $2,500 but only be allowed to use the money for professional development (not technology purchases). There was no advance notice given to faculty that this choice would be presented at the meeting, and the Dean called for an immediate decision by show of hands (precluding anonymity). The atmosphere in the meeting felt intimidating, particularly since voting was not anonymous, and no faculty member asked the Dean for time to deliberate the decision, although those that I spoke with afterwards said they did not want to vote at the time and, instead, wished they had been given both a reasonable period to consider the choice and an anonymous voting system.”

“Not at all. The Dean eliminated an undergraduate English course for CAS foreign born when we are the experts and have done it for year. I have no confidence in the dean. The Dean
eliminated courses for graduate students at SPS. These students desperately need help. He is no longer concerned with the quality of the student.”

“While creation of elected Faculty Council was a step forward consultation is limited primarily to academics. Time is not the issue, decision making, even on academics, is top down, faculty role at best advisory, often disregarded.”

“Yes - the length of time is not the issue. The issue is rather that only feedback in support of proposals (which are really decisions by the time they come before faculty) is welcomed.”

“Finding a convenient time for multiple faculty members to meet is a difficult task. At times, I feel there is enough time for consultation. But very often, the overseer would like a decision when there isn't enough time. E-mail works only so much because there are details and nuances that slip when about ten representatives must decide.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” 49% said Yes, 24% said No, and 5% were mixed.

“The department leadership has sometimes seemed to be surprised by upper level decisions.”

“Yes, faculty are provided with a great deal of information by the department and have a reasonable length of time to provide input. Faculty are often those who generate concerns that lead to policy changes.”

“Yes. In the ALI, faculty are included at many levels of decision-making and are given reasonable time to participate. I consistently feel heard and validated within the program.”

“Absolutely not because policy changes come down unexpectedly, and then are abandoned for something new, which then is also later abandoned.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” 38% said Yes and 19% said No.

D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” 27% said Yes and 27% said No, with 8% mixed.

“Yes, the administration does provide reasons but the representative body is generally not allowed to share them with the faculty it represents.”

“Yes, but more often than not, the reasons go counter to the advice.”

“Yes, reasons are provided. However, the support for those reasons (for example, budget figures) are not usually provided. We must take the Dean's word that a certain action is too costly.”

“The Dean verbally qualified as "stupid" the Council's first version of the appointment/reappointment policy for the school. During retreats, Faculty members have to give back the Dean's strategic plans. As mentioned earlier, consultation of faculty by their representatives is haphazardly judged "appropriate" or not, and authorized or not, by the Dean.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” 24% said Yes, 16% said No, and one was mixed.
“During one of the faculty meetings of this year, the faculty engaged in another brainstorming exercise aiming at finding ways to improve enrollment and retention in the Department. No follow-up was ever provided and none of our solutions implemented. Instead, half of the faculty was let go on May 8.”

“Always in a timely manner, although not necessarily in writing. Please note that delivering this information orally HAS NOT been detrimental. Most interactions of this kind at the departmental level occur via discussion rather than through more formal, written methods, and this interaction and engagement heightens the sense of shared governance and finding common ground between faculty and administration.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” about 30% said Yes, 16% said No, and most left this blank or noted that reasons are seldom written at this level.

E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” about 38% said Yes, 14% said No, and a few were mixed. There was confusion about what “official” means.

“No, not to my knowledge. I believe that the Faculty Council has asked for this, but it cannot reach us directly. I think all emails have to pass through the Dean's office.”

“Technically, yes. But, I would be hesitant to do so as the environment doesn't seem safe enough to allow for this.”

“I've always thought that we can sent emails, but we can't send certain attachments. When we discuss or email with faculty, we can not refer to print.”

“Unknown what the exact procedures are. We, the faculty, generally receive emails pertaining to elections/votes through official communication systems and updates through nyu emails.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” about 49% said Yes and about 5% said No.

“At times….it depends on the subject.”

“yes -- I am assuming this simply means using the nyu email system.”

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” responses were very similar.

“Yes, we are free to email any of our colleagues at any time, but there is no official communication system for this.”

General Comments:

“On the positive side, our governance structures are still new + will be fine-tuned as we discover weak spots. On the negative side we had 10 of 18 faculty abruptly dismissed last week (due to shrinking profits not performance) and have no representation or influence over the manner in which they have been let go.”

“There is really no meaningful shared governance at SPS. The system is highly centralized and all committees and council decisions are purely advisory.”

“THANK YOU -- IMPORTANT SURVEY”
“The dean has an autocratic leadership style. Governance is not shared. He shares no budget information in support of program reorganizations that result in significant faculty cuts.”
“I think the relationship is good but it can always get better and should always be growing.”
“Governance at the school level is not so much shared when the Council is constantly reminded that it is advisory and advisory only.”
“Morale is extremely poor, SPS compliance with NYU policy and norms is poor, there are favorite programs, faculty and staff treated with excessive advantages while others are ignored, and there is retaliation for expressing any opinions that differ from those of the School Dean. PLEASE RECEIVE THIS AS A NO CONFIDENCE VOTE ON THE DEAN OF SPS.”
“I am using this opportunity to vote no confidence in the leadership of SPS.”
“SPS is still administrative/staff driven (like a business), number of full time faculty has been decreased, but seems to be more staff. Creation of elected faculty council following university guidance is a step forward, but authority very limited. Lots of faculty meetings and discussion, but faculty can rarely lead and does not feel fully valued.”
“We have a terrible dean who has been leading our school to the ground. He has lost the confidence of the entire faculty.”
“I am using this opportunity to vote NO CONFIDENCE in the SPS Dean. This is for the reasons noted above as well as several others not queried in this survey. For example, the educational and administrative agendas pursued by the SPS Dean's office are focused on discipline, uniformity and micro-management instead of furthering the faculty's ability to maximize the quality our students' academic and civic experiences. Specifically, the administration is mandating (or about to mandate) a variety of superficial, school-wide procedures for the administration of student internship courses, guest speakers, measurements of students' learning outcomes (which are statistically ineffective) and other items. These almost Kafkaesque edicts require an inordinate amount of unnecessary paperwork while inhibiting the flexibility, creativity and thoughtful analysis that is needed to foster faculty excellence and quality education. This is all occurring while important issues of educational quality (that I do not feel comfortable listing in this document as they would probably identify me) go unaddressed.”
“I AM USING THIS OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE NO CONFIDENCE IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THIS SCHOOL AND DIVISION.”
“I take this opportunity to vote NO CONFIDENCE in Dean Dennis DiLorenzo.”
“I think it's fair to say there have been concerns and issues within SPS over the past few years. Whether it is communication with faculty, reappointment process, multi-year contracts, questionable Associate and Assistant Dean hires without official job postings, questionable promotions of select members of the administrative staff who work directly with the Dean, abrupt firings of employees, and the constant changes with regard to the school's direction have caused anxiety throughout the faculty and administrative staff. It seems as if governance applies to certain situations and non-existent in others. For instance, administrators can no longer become directors anymore, but the Dean's office still maintains this practice. Consistently inconsistent is an appropriate phrase to describe SPS.”
“I believe governance at SPS is quite transparent and opportunities for participation are abundant. Whether faculty take advantage of the opportunities is another question.”
"It is my general sense that major changes happen at SPS without much consultation with the faculty. We now have a Faculty Council, which is new, but its members have reported being frustrated by their lack of impact on decisions that affect most of us. Recent eliminations of programs and faculty members have left us feeling quite vulnerable and unable to predict our futures."

"The morale at SPS is rock bottom. The undergraduate program has been eviscerated. The graduate programs are not offering the language support which is fundamental to the international students performing effectively in their courses. A note about the adjunct faculty which is over 95% of the SPS faculty. Ill-advised changes to our program will lead to the lay off of a number of these colleagues, many of which have contributed tremendously to our school. The removal of the dean and the establishment of an SPS search committee would be a first step in righting this ship. I have to add that I hold no personal animus towards the dean. In fact, he has always been nothing but gracious and cordial in our exchanges, but, nonetheless he is not suited to run a school."

"I believe our school, division and program are doing a very good job in the area of shared governance."

"I am using this opportunity to vote No confidence in Dean Di Lorenzo."

"We do have faculty representation but the faculty is expected to execute the will of the Dean. He will countermand any decisions with which he disagrees. Our department faculty representation is completely defunct. Our associate dean uses them to keep us busy while she quietly and behind closed doors makes the decisions about our program that suit the will of Dean DiLorenzo. The associate dean will delay or even lie to our faces in order to conceal the work she is doing. Under Dean DiLorenzo there is zero transparency about anything. Each year at a faculty retreat he distributes numbered copies of his magical strategic Plan and allows the faculty a few minutes to read it. We have no idea what thinking contributes to this ersatz academic planning. Again not only is there no transparency in our program there is active deception about the plans as the associate dean has lied to our faces on repeated occasions. There is NO MEANINGFUL CONSULTATION. Dean DiLorenzo stages events which he no doubt uses to demonstrate to the University administration that he has faculty participation and buy-in with his academic planning. Instead these events are more akin to assemblies of the North Korea parliament. There is no discussion and no dissent. Then he uses these staged events where he filibusters the faculty for an hour or more as signs of faculty participation. At the program level what is a reasonable amount of time for consultation when the consultation involves the associate dean attempting to cover up her real plans. When our faculty council has provided written advice to Dean DiLorenzo he responds with anger and reminds the faculty that their participation is only advisory that they are being irresponsible and ridiculous and disappointing (his words) and that he is free to ignore their advice. He does. In fact after the full faculty of SPS voted down his proposed appointment reappointment and promotion policy he sent it on to the Provost anyway. His contempt for the faculty could not be more clear. Again at the program level the associate dean is doing the bidding of Dean DiLorenzo and will delay dissemble and otherwise obstruct the faculty. Dean DiLorenzo has in fact threatened the faculty council upon learning that they wished to communicate with the faculty about matters he disagreed with. So while communications are allowed what does communication mean when paired with threats for attempting it. The faculty do not dare to communicate about anything meaningful to them via
email. I am using this opportunity to vote NO CONFIDENCE IN DEAN DENNIS DILORENZO OF THE SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES. Dean DiLorenzo has been presiding over SPS for five years of chaos intimidation favoritism and general lack of professionalism. He has no advanced degree no teaching experience and no research experience. He contends with his glaring lack of qualifications by intimidating the faculty and by making decisions without their input. He dominates meetings by talking relentlessly and by challenging anyone who questions him. Meanwhile there is a constant turnover of administration and faculty leading to an atmosphere of fear and no surprise apparent consent. I believe the word for this state of affairs is authoritarian That style of leadership seems a bit out of place in university to say the least. The real scandal here is that the prior and present University administrations have been made aware of these kinds of complaints about Dean DiLorenzo and many of his associate deans on many occasions. Some of the complaints have led to investigations. But nothing has changed. It has been over a year and a half since President Hamilton has been in office and nearly a year for Provost Fleming and no action has been taken to correct this situation. One can only conclude that this state of affairs is no problem since they only involve the humble School of Professional Studies. As long as it produces revenue what could go wrong? Ask the many faculty and administrators over the years who have lost their positions and careers (13 people in the last two weeks alone) due to DiLorenzo's chaotic authoritarian and non-transparent style that makes a mockery of faculty governance. The responsibility for this condition rests now with President Hamilton and Provost Fleming. Is this the first failure of their tenures in office? To repeat: they have been warned numerous times of the complaints. They need to take notice of each of these survey responses which declare: I am using this opportunity to vote NO CONFIDENCE IN DEAN DILORENZO OF THE SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES.”

“I vote no confidence. The associate dean also makes unilateral decisions and often refused to communicate. No. She does not act like a leader with a vision and she has wounded the morale. The Dean does what he wants- little evidence that the new plans would work. In fact some of his program changes have resulted in lower enrollment. I vote no confidence, but the faculty's committee work had little effects. For example 2 senior humanities faculty members were working on with restructuring their divisions and two of them were fired. The associated dean showed little understanding of programs beyond student enrollment. She is new and at the end of the first year she and the dean fired half of the faculty. Her performance for the first year deserves a D. No. I heard stories that he manipulated/ intimidated the council members. The Council opposed certain policies and he acted on what he wants. I vote no confidence, Sometimes. But the Associate Dean has no leadership and is more like a puppet to carry out the Dean's idea. Faculty Affairs committee tried to meet her regularly to express our concerns now 3 of the five members got fired, as far as I know the council can't send emails on their own, think so SPS is a terrible place to work now. We need special investigation about this school to understand why people were fired or programs were changed and why faculty members were rarely consulted. I also think the Provost and the president should be responsible to allow this to happen for so long. There have been many complaints sent to HR and the president and the Provost. So why didn't they investigate??”

“I do not think that any one even the head of the faculty council believes that the faculty have significant input. Faculty are frightened to assert themselves other than in agreement. Morale and fear of administrative power overrides our entire Division and has been so for the
last 2-3 years in the extreme. There are virtually no new initiatives and collaborative ingenuity as everyone is trying to keep up with the ever expanding administrative work and stay under the radar. Several years ago a new faculty structure was introduced to give the faculty greater say in the important elements of academic principles and protocol. Three committees were set up: The Faculty Affairs Committee; The Curriculum Committee and the Student Affairs Committee. For a short time this structure was appreciated and proactive initiatives and sound intellectual parameters were established by the faculty. Soon thereafter upon the first meeting of the Committees each was given a HARG by the Program Dean as to what the respective committees should and should not work on. Faculty input was again diminished! Indeed...the Committees function with constraint rather than innovative academic initiatives. Hard to separate department from program. Essentially the same unless I consider my own specific program comprised of a perfect 14 D & I mix of 13 faculty esprit d' corps and constant inclusion of adjuncts who I mentor respect and engage in all of our activities. We build on we belong together!!! Every program director or leader at the dean's level has espoused transparency as a major ingredient of leadership. I I design and teach leadership classes and I consult outside the university in high level women's leadership development programs. I teach them the incredible value of transparency.!! I have not encountered any genuine transparency in the last 7-8 years! Although espoused not followed by any means!!!!!! Has lead to low morale fear isolation and negativity that is contagious. We hear one thing and then the reverse becomes apparent. I am in McGhee so you might consider me biased. I am a research methodologist and believe in the validity and reliability of my answers. I would have answered the same way last year with the exception I think the non faculty participation has led to an increased magnitude of disruption lack of compassion ethics and total disregard for the human element of one's life. With reference to our curriculum is similar to above. Have never been in an environment with such disrespect for the faculty.... should really think more about educational instead of combining education and administrative does not carry any construct validity. Faculty are more concerned about curriculum. The increase in administrative responsibilities thwarted the deep value of our curriculum. In the future do not combine administrative with curriculum. Then Dean tells us what is about to happen. Faculty input is in the form of brown bag lunches or meetings when we are told being fired on Monday with no warning and as a cancer patient ...doing in next day for surgery...... Let me know what length of time that is. Put my body in a compromising position and not healthy. Absolutely. Many of these questions overlap... Most could simple be answered "absolutely not", AGAIN NO... would be shocked unless there is a policy I do no know about!!!! Bur not sure if this is politic, want desperately to talk to someone...can you make that possible for us? Being totally alone that would be a protest gift of gratitude!!!!!!”

“Similarly representation to university-wide committees is not based on elections by the faculty the dean simply appoints faculty members or administrators that he deems loyal and acceptable to him. It's all a charade a facade designed to convince or more accurately deceive the university leadership team that SPS is a democratic institution with significant faculty input in educational and administrative decision-making. There is a committee structure but it is totally ignored by the administration. Faculty control over the curriculum has been taken away by the office of the SPS dean and decisions over curricular matters are no longer made by the members of faculty. The organizational structure of SPS's various programs precludes local decision-making over the curriculum and other academic matters. Transparency at SPS is non-existent.
On the contrary decisions that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy are made by the SPS dean and his leadership team and transmitted to the faculty typically in memos sent out on Friday afternoons. For example the decision made regarding the future of the School's McGhee Division which resulted in the termination of ten faculty positions and numerous staff lines were made by the dean and his team without rhyme or reason. Faculty input was either not solicited or rejected outright. As a result faculty members were informed on afternoon that they are to meet with the dean on Monday ostensibly to discuss curricular and administrative matters only to be humiliated and fired on the spot. Transparency is not the norm and has not been the norm since the current SPS dean was appointed. Transparency has not also been the norm with the dean's newly-appointed associate deans at the various divisions of the School. On the contrary mendacity has been the operating principle of the School and its various components. Once again the School structure does not lend itself easily to notions of departments and programs. What has been mentioned earlier applies throughout the school and its component parts. In the few instances where faculty input is solicited appropriate time is never given to the faculty to consider discuss.”
XII. With 74 full-time faculty (1.6% of the NYU faculty), the **College of Nursing** had an 18.9% (14) response rate.

**A. Representation**

In response to “Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation…,” everyone said Yes.

“We have faculty council, workgroups for undergraduate and graduate programs, and many other committees such as curriculum CQI committee that cut across programs.”

“yes, Tenure, Contract and Graduate Program Committee Representation; also Provost's Academic Advisory Committee.”

“Yes, we have a shared governance model, established recently, with by-laws, faculty council, elected committee members and other structures and processes.”

“Absolutely. We have a formally structured program of faculty governance. Faculty elections are held annually and faculty sit on curriculum, search, by-laws, grievance, and a variety of committees essential to the management and administration of a quality school.”

“Yes. We have many elected committees based on our bylaws, including curriculum, grievance, bylaws, nominations and elections, faculty council steering committee, appointments promotion and tenure (tenure/tenure-track), appointments and promotion (contract faculty).”

“Yes, we have implemented shared governance over the last 3-4 years and it has been excellent.”

In response to the same question about “your DEPARTMENT,” several noted that there are no departments in Nursing, while 4 said Yes.

In response to the same question about “your PROGRAM,” responses were the same.

**B. Information**

In response to “Is transparency the norm… in your SCHOOL?” about half said Yes and the rest were split between No and Mixed responses.

“Transparency is the norm for educational policy (e.g. curriculum) but is obfuscated and largely lacking in admin from finance, to policies and beyond.”

“Transparency is the policy but does not always translate in day to day activities.”

“Meeting minutes are taken at each meeting. The minutes are read and reviewed by all meeting participants and once approved are posted on Meyers [Nursing] intranet for all to view. In addition to meeting minutes being made available to all faculty, faculty who represent Meyers on U-wide committees report out from those meetings. This information is shared with all faculty via meeting minutes into which information is recorded.”

**C. Time to consult.** In response to the question, “Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect [sic] faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?” about 86% said Yes, one said No, and the other was Mixed.

“For education, yes. For admin, no, decisions are often made behind closed doors and with limited input.”
“Four to five Faculty Council meetings are held every academic year; Faculty Council Steering Committee meetings are held monthly, and provide faculty with the opportunity to speak to the FCSC and bring ideas or issues to that body for consideration by the whole Faculty Council. 6 FCSC meetings are held with the Dean and provide for a free exchange of ideas and concerns.”

“The workload is overwhelming. Being a part of leadership requires free time.”

D. Reasoned justification. In response to the question, “When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely manner?” about 36% said Yes and there was one No.

“Our higher level administration is very responsive to feedback.”

“Good question. I do not think so because I have not heard of this.”

“Since I have been at the school, all bylaws, committee appointments, etc. have been accepted in full so no experience in not accepting things.”

E. Communication. In response to the question, “Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communication systems?” all but one said Yes.

“Not directly; need to ask an admin ass't to do it.”

“No. Every email is a risk of being forwarded. Any dissenting voice is subject to punishment.”

“Yes. We have email direct, which is approved by our communications department, as well as list serves for faculty and committees.”

General Comments:
“While our school tends to work on a consensus system, there are major gaps, specifically related to budgeting, workload, and contracts that are opaque at best.”

“We have only had a faculty governance structure for about 4 years at Meyers [Nursing] so we are still working on fine tuning all of the bylaws and procedures. We had witnessed a cultural shift over the past 2 years such that faculty are much more engaged and participative in the faculty governance structure. It's exciting.”

“We have developed, over the last 4 years, an effective faculty governance system. We have a Steering Committee that is responsive to the Faculty Council (whole faculty), and which meets regularly and when needed with the Dean. We have representatives on University level committees that report back to the FCSC, Dean and at Faculty Council meetings. Elections are timely and faculty feel comfortable self nominating or nominating agreeable colleagues. We have made significant progress in our College and are proud of our process and current outcome (which is constantly being refined and updated to conform to needs and University guidelines).”

“Shared governance works at the Meyers Nursing. It is a process, but it is evolving with mutual respect and a unified goal to provide the best nursing education possible.”

“Our Faculty Council was established approximately 4 years ago and is clearly and quickly moving to becoming a more mature, professional and inclusive model.”
“I realize we may not be the norm as we have excellent working relationships between faculty and administration and active governance processes.”
XIII. With 58 full-time faculty (1.3% of the NYU faculty), the **Gallatin School** had a 13.8% (8) response rate. However, with fewer than 10 responses, any summary and comments would be misleading.

XIV. With 55 full-time faculty (1.2% of the NYU faculty), the **Division of Libraries** had a 14.3% (8) response rate. However, with fewer than 10 responses, any summary and comments would be misleading.

XV. With 42 full-time faculty (0.9% of the NYU faculty), the **School of Social Work** had an 11.9% (5) response rate. However, with fewer than 10 responses, any summary and comments would be misleading.

XVI. With 37 full-time faculty (0.8% of the NYU faculty), **Wagner** had a 24.3% (9) response rate. However, with fewer than 10 responses, any summary and comments would be misleading.

XVII. With 37 full-time faculty (0.8% of the NYU faculty), **Global Public Health** had a 13.5% (5) response rate. However, with fewer than 10 responses, any summary and comments would be misleading.
Local Shared Governance at NYU

The Governance Committees of the T-FSC and C-FSC are undertaking a University-wide survey to get a better picture of the Principles of Shared Governance as they apply to decision making bodies of the schools, departments and programs of New York University. For this we need your help.

The University Board of Trustees approved the following Principles set forth below with respect to the Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council, formerly the Faculty Senators Council (December 12, 2012) and with respect to the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (February 19, 2015). These principles are included in the current Faculty Handbook.

While these principles refer specifically to University-wide governance, they were meant to be applied at the school, department and program level as well. The principles are as follows:

PRINCIPLES OF SHARED GOVERNANCE REPRESENTATION
The Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) and the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) will each have a representative (from each FSC or its designee), on University committees, taskforces, or other University-wide bodies that are convened by the administration to advise on matters that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy.

INFORMATION
Transparency with respect to information regarding matters that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy is the norm. The use of “deliberative privilege” is the exception to this norm, requested only in circumstances wherein an individual(s) or the University's interests would be harmed by public disclosure. In such instances, the University administration will provide appropriate reasons for invoking “deliberative privilege”.

CONSULTATION
Except under rare, extraordinary circumstances, the University administration will provide a reasonable length of time for T-FSC and C-FSC consultation and input on all matters that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy. This means that the administration must plan in advance to allow enough time for at least one regularly-scheduled T-FSC and/or C-FSC meeting to occur before the consultation period comes to a close on any particular matter.

For urgent decisions, such as decisions that must be taken during the summer or winter holiday, when the T-FSC and C-FSC are not in session, each Council will establish a “provisional review committee” and a set of procedures for timely consultation and input regarding University administration decisions on matters that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy. All decisions reached by each Council’s provisional review committee are subject to full Council review and approval. Each Council will promptly convey its final decision on the matter to the administration, which in turn will reconsider the provisional policy, based on new or additional advice provided by the Council. The administration will then promptly convey its final decision to the each Council.

REASONED JUSTIFICATION
When the T-FSC and/or the C-FSC submits advice in writing to the University administration and the administration does not agree with or accept the Council’s advice, the administration will provide its reasons for not accepting the Council’s advice to the Council(s) in writing and in a timely manner.

COMMUNICATION
Predicated on the understanding that communications will pertain to Senate-related matters relevant to faculty colleagues within the Senators’ schools, and that the communication systems will be used in a reasonable and responsible manner consistent with the norms of civility, the Deans will enable Senators to send emails to faculty colleagues within their schools. Such communication will clearly convey whether its content is an official Council communication or if it reflects the personal view(s) of the author(s).

Please answer the following as completely as possible and with as much detail as necessary. If a question is not relevant or does not apply to you, just skip over it. The survey should take no more than 15 minutes.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Your colleagues in the Governance Committees of T-FSC and C-FSC
1. What is your School? *  
(If you have a joint appointment, please identify the school with which you primarily identify.)

2. What is your Department?  
(If you have a joint appointment, please identify the department with which you primarily identify.)

3. What is your Program?  
(if applicable)

**Representation**
Principle: The Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) and the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) will each have a representative (from each FSC or its designee), on University committees, taskforces, or other University-wide bodies that are convened by the administration to advise on matters that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy.

4. Does your SCHOOL have faculty representation on committees, task forces, or other bodies that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy? Please give as much detail as necessary.

5. Does your DEPARTMENT have faculty representation on committees, task forces, or other bodies that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy? Please give as much detail as necessary.
6. Does your PROGRAM have faculty representation on committees, task forces, or other bodies that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy? Please give as much detail as necessary.

Information
Principle: Transparency with respect to information regarding matters that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy is the norm. The use of “deliberative privilege” is the exception to this norm, requested only in circumstances wherein an individual(s) or the University’s interests would be harmed by public disclosure. In such instances, the University administration will provide appropriate reasons for invoking “deliberative privilege”.

7. Is transparency the norm with respect to information regarding matters that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL? Please explain if necessary.

8. Is transparency the norm with respect to information regarding matters that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy in your DEPARTMENT? Please explain if necessary.

9. Is transparency the norm with respect to information regarding matters that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy in your PROGRAM? Please explain if necessary.

Consultation
Principle: Except under rare, extraordinary circumstances, the University administration will provide a reasonable length of time for T-FSC and C-FSC consultation and input on all matters that affect faculty in educational and administrative policy. This means that the administration must plan in advance to allow...
enough time for at least one regularly-scheduled T-FSC and/or C-FSC meeting to occur before the consultation period comes to a close on any particular matter.

10. **Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy in your SCHOOL?** Please explain if necessary.

11. **Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy in your DEPARTMENT?** Please explain if necessary.

12. **Are faculty provided with a reasonable length of time for consultation and input on all matters that effect faculty in educational and administrative policy in your PROGRAM?** Please explain if necessary.

**Reasoned Justification**

Principle: When the T-FSC and/or the C-FSC submits advice in writing to the University administration and the administration does not agree with or accept the Council’s advice, the administration will provide its reasons for not accepting the Council’s advice to the Council(s) in writing and in a timely manner.

13. **When the representative faculty body of your SCHOOL submits advice in writing to your local administration, does the administration provide its reasons for not accepting the faculty’s advice in writing and in a timely matter?** Please explain if necessary.
14. When the representative faculty body of your DEPARTMENT submits advice in writing to your chair or other departmental leadership, do they provide reasons for not accepting the faculty's advice in writing and in a timely matter? Please explain if necessary.

15. When the representative faculty body of your PROGRAM submits advice in writing to your program leadership, do they provide reasons for not accepting the faculty's advice in writing and in a timely matter? Please explain if necessary.

Communication
Principle: Predicated on the understanding the communications will pertain to Senate-related matters relevant to faculty colleagues within the Senators’ schools, and that the communication systems will be used in a reasonable and responsible manner consistent with the norms of civility, the Deans will enable Senators to send emails to faculty colleagues within their schools. Such communication will clearly convey whether its content is an official Council communication or if it reflects the personal view(s) of the author(s).

16. Does the administration of your SCHOOL enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their school through official communications systems? Please explain if necessary.

17. Does the leadership of your DEPARTMENT enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their department through official communications systems? Please explain if necessary.
18. Does the leadership of your PROGRAM enable faculty representatives to send emails to faculty colleagues within their department through official communications systems? Please explain if necessary.

Further Comments

19. If you have any final thoughts on shared governance at your school, department or program level, please share them with us here:
The parallel committees of the T-FSC and C-FSC met on March 22, 2018 to discuss shared areas of interest. We focused on the introduction of Spring Admits to NYU schools and programs, and we developed the following set of questions in relation to this development and the values of joint/shared governance. A core interest is in understanding how faculty will be involved in the ongoing development and planning for the implementation of this initiative.

Planning Process and Governance Concerns:
- What process was used to reach the decision to begin a Spring Admits program?
- What faculty (Deans, Chairs, Tenure, Contract) were included in that process?
- How will shared governance be engaged moving forward in decisions to expand/alter the Spring Admit program?

Program Size:
- How many Spring Admits are expected to enroll for 2019, broken down by school?

Spring Course Scheduling:
- With respect to the spring semester, in what courses within schools will Spring Admits be required to take that typically are not offered in the spring semester?
- Aside from courses that may require fall semester prerequisites, will Spring Admits be “mainstreamed” into regularly-scheduled spring semester courses, or are special classes planned for them as a cohort of brand-new freshmen to ensure they’re getting the attention they need in learning environments shared with students who have been in college for the fall semester?
- How have faculty who are currently responsible for teaching those courses been included in planning for these new enrollments?

Summer Course Scheduling:
- With respect to the summer, what plans have been made to meet the anticipated increase in summer course demand for the Spring Admits?
- In what courses within schools will Spring Admits be required to take that typically are not offered in the Summer semester?
- To what extent is the University planning to create new courses and/or increase enrollments in existing courses?
- How has the University included relevant faculty in such planning?
- Does the University expect Spring Admits to catch up to the prior year’s Fall Admits after completing their summer coursework?

Fall Course Scheduling:
- In addition to a potential increase in summer course offerings, does the University anticipate a potential increase in course offerings for the following Fall semester as well?
Faculty Responsibilities for Teaching, Administration, and Service:
- Has the University set forth a policy or set of principles with respect to balancing the number of adjunct versus full-time faculty who will be responsible for teaching these potentially additional course offerings/sections?
- Has the University set forth a policy or set of principles with respect to an anticipated necessary extension for faculty planning and oversight during the summer?

Budget and Affordability:
- How does the University expect the Spring Admits program to impact the University’s budget and affordability due to the potential need to hire additional adjuncts and/or full-time faculty who will have increased responsibilities for teaching, advising, and mentoring, particularly during the summer?
- To what extent does the University believe that AP credits or college credits earned by Spring Admits during the Fall semester prior to NYU Spring matriculation may ameliorate some of these issues?

Meeting Course Requirements:
- What is the planning to ensure that required core academic courses and prerequisites in pursuing a major are available to Spring Admits each semester as needed?
- To what extent have discussions focused on the differential needs of Spring Admits who are pursuing sequential majors (e.g., in the STEM areas) versus non-sequential majors?

Support Services:
What support services have been planned to help Spring Admits acculturate as new NYU students or even as new college students? (Unlike transfer students, Spring Admits may not be bringing prior full-time collegiate experience with them.)
- What is the planning to support Spring Admits academically to ensure that they do not face retention issues the way transfer students often do?
- How is the University planning to incorporate Spring Admits into University residential life so as support their community-building without increasing their isolation?
- Will Spring Admits have an opportunity to join the Explorations Program from the outset of their NYU careers?

Fall Semester Prior to NYU Spring Matriculation:
- What is the University’s expectation, if any, of how these students will spend the Fall semester prior to their Spring matriculation at NYU?
- Will Spring Admits be permitted to enroll in classes at NYU on a part-time basis in the Fall semester prior to their NYU spring matriculation?
ADDENDUM

This addendum contains additional points raised at the C-FSC meeting on April 5, 2018 where the document, Concerns regarding the Spring Admits Program, was a major point of discussion.

- The C-FSC is broadly supportive of the document and strongly believes that this is a vital issue to address.

- The C-FSC fully supports the idea that the Councils, jointly, should proceed with scheduling a meeting with MJ Knoll-Finn.

- A C-FSC colleague on the Academic Priorities Committee reported that at their meeting with the Provost, MJ made a presentation regarding Spring Admits and reported nothing but 'positive feedback', which reinforces the need to meet with her and express these concerns.

- There is real concern among the FAS faculty given the number of "service" courses that the school offers to the rest of the university. Particularly in areas like languages etc. Is there an "adjunctification" of these courses?

- There has been trouble in getting answers in FAS from its Dean and others.

- The C-FSC believes we need a dedicated conversation with the Provost on these issues.

- The Liberal Studies faculty received no information/consultation in advance of the roll-out of the Spring Admits Program.

- Within Liberal Studies, there is an issue with continuity of classes, which requires those who teach during the summer to teach the next course in the sequence during the winter. This means that such faculty could quickly end up in a 12 month cycle not of their own choosing.

- There is concern that compensation is not consistent for summer courses. In some schools it is in proportion to a faculty member's salary. In others, it is a fixed amount far below that percentage.

- There is concern about the lack of opportunity to negotiate teaching summer courses in the schools that are actually being asked to teach these courses.

- There is concern about 'soft coercion' into teaching summer courses to more vulnerable faculty.

- The C-FSC desires a faculty staffing plan for Spring Admits. It is in favor of 'student success' and applauds the student focus of this initiative, but strongly believes that it is important for there to be a faculty staffing plan for this program.
# NYU Online Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Global Public Health</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross School Programs</td>
<td>MS in Cyber Risk and Strategy</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxation-Executive Program</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>Professional Writing</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPS Access - Hospitality</td>
<td>Non Matric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>Communicative Sci &amp; Dis(Online</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counsel Mntl Hlth Wins (Online</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling and Guidance</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandon School of Engineering</td>
<td>Cert Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cert Telecomm Network Mgt</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Tandon</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisp Sidy in Engr</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Manufacturing Engineering</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Org Behavior, Syst &amp; Anlyt</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Telecommunication Networks</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tandon Bridge Programs</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Growth

Online Master's Programs
Registered Students

Enrollment counts are current as of the night before the dashboard is run. Registrations for future terms are incomplete. See Same Time Last Year tab for comparative data.
Undergraduates: 1350 students took any online class last year. (4%)

Graduate students: 4093 Graduates (4.6%)/4093 Grads 16% (1332) 5%

28799/24706
Master's Program Demographics
Most Recent Fall Semester

Legal Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online Headcount</th>
<th>In-person Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underrepresented Minorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online Headcount</th>
<th>In-person Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented minorities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnicities</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online Headcount</th>
<th>In-person Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other students</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Does Design Work?

CGPH: In-house
FAS: In-house*
Law: In-house
Steinhardt: 2U, Hotchalk, Noodle
Stern: Bisk
Tandon: In-house
Wagner: Noodle

Moving to:
- School Instructional Designers work closely with faculty
- NYU IT provides complex services
- Outside vendors provide for specialist and rapid needs