MINUTES OF THE T-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 25, 2016

The New York University Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, February 25, 2016 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Allgood, Amkpa (via audio-conference), Cappell, Davila, Disotell, Hoffman, Jelinek, Kamer, Lapiner, Ling, Mincer, Morning, Rajagopal, Ramey (by audio-conference), Stanhope, Sternhell, Van DeWasser, Weinberg, and Zagzag; Active Alternates Gillers and Ospina; Alternate Senators Frydman (for Backus), Lehrer (by audio-conference, for Jones-Rooy), Reiss (for Appiah), Seeman (for Uleman) and Tannenbaum. Former Member Moskowitz attended as a guest.


Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the January 28, 2016 meeting were approved as corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR T-FSC VICE CHAIRPERSON AND T-FSC SECRETARY 2016-2017

Chairperson Mincer, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, announced the list of candidates for the positions of T-FSC Vice Chairperson and T-FSC Secretary 2016-2017. For the position of Vice Chairperson, the candidate is Awam Amkpa of the Tisch School of the Arts. For the position of Secretary, the candidate is Arvind Rajagopal of the Steinhardt School. Additional nominations may be made from the floor the day of the election.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: ALLEN MINCER

Non-Disparagement Clause and Retirement Contracts

Chairperson Mincer reminded the Council this issue was brought to the Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications (PPTM) Committee’s attention in the fall. At the November 19 Council meeting, based on the Committee’s recommendations, the Council passed a resolution to obtain information from the Provost’s Office about the clause’s purpose and what is included in contracts. At the December 17 meeting Mincer reported back on the response of the administration. He has since had several discussions with the administration about this topic and the Council’s concerns. Mincer reported on February 4, he received a message from the Provost Office that reiterated that the use of such a clause is standard and considered best practices in employment law. Furthermore, the opinion of the Provost Office is that application of this clause would not impinge on academic freedom. However, because of T-FSC concerns about possible perceived impact, the University has decided to no longer routinely use the clause in faculty retirement contracts.
Stern School of Business Policy on Full-time Non-tenure Track Contract Faculty (FTNTT/CF)

Mincer reported when the policy was discussed at the December 17 meeting, the Council concluded that the PPTM Committee needed to receive more input from Stern tenured/tenure track faculty. The Committee would interact with T-FSC senators from Stern to discuss the issues.

He reported in light of the discussion with Stern faculty, the issue has now gone back to discussion between the Stern Dean’s Office and the Stern Faculty Council. Mincer assumes they will discuss and develop a revised document, and that document will go back to the Provost Office and then the Provost will come back to the Council for comment.

Meeting with President Hamilton and attendance at Council Meeting

The Executive Committee (EC) met with President Hamilton and brought up with the new administration the faculty concerns regarding the topics of T-FSC endorsement of the Faculty Handbook and the meaning of economic security. The President's Office agreed these are important issues and they have begun to discuss them internally.

T-FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS

Governance: Committee Co-Chairs Awam Amkpa & Jim Uleman

Faculty Handbook: January 2016 Edition

See attached Document C: Faculty Handbook.

Vice Chairperson Amkpa reported the Global Network University (GNU) Committee submitted a set of the recommendations to the T-FSC last year, including the two main issues of 1) the faculty handbook be revised to incorporate the Global Network University and the kinds of professoriates that would deliver the curriculum of the Global Network University, and 2) that a proposed Global Network University professorship be set up as a program that will enhance connectivity between Abu Dhabi, Shanghai, and New York. They were supported by the Council and communicated to the Office of the Provost.

In follow-up, the Provost’s Office proposed new language in the Faculty Handbook that recognizes and upholds the rights and responsibilities of faculty in the Global Network University and language on the Global Network University professor. The Governance Committee reviewed and is satisfied with these additions to the Faculty Handbook.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the motion to support the updates to incorporate the amended Bylaws and the additional new sections on “The Global Network” and “Faculty Appointments in More than One Unit” was approved by vote of the Council.

A Senator requested, as a point of procedure, that a copy of the previous version be placed in University archives.

A Senator asked if all revisions to the Faculty Handbook are reviewed by the T-FSC or if the Provost may add material to the Handbook without the Council’s prior approval.

It was confirmed that the Council insisted that any additions to the Faculty Handbook be sent to the Faculty Senators Councils for review and the Provost has followed this practice.

It was noted, under the official rules, it is possible for changes to be made without any input from the T-FSC, however the administration has agreed to the principles of shared governance and any revisions will be sent to the Council.
Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service Draft Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures

See attached Document B: PPTM Recommendations

Senator Jelinek presented the Committee’s review of the policy. The letter of transmission from the Provost Office noted the revisions to the existing policy include two minor but substantive changes: 1) to conform with University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, the tenure review subcommittee of the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (“P&T Committee”) may (is no longer required to) include one non-voting NYU faculty member of appropriate rank with a tenured appointment in a unit outside of Wagner and having substantive expertise in the candidate’s field of study, and 2) special provisions were added as footnotes in situations where required for the Master of Urban Planning program to comply with accreditation standards of the Planning Accreditation Board.

Jelinek stated the Committee developed a set of recommendations. He noted many recommendations are the same recommendation just noted in other sections, for instance the wording on voting procedure.

He noted Wagner faculty already voted on this policy and it was confirmed by a Wagner Senator that the Wagner tenured/tenure track faculty voted in agreement with policy.

The recommendations were approved unanimously by vote of the Council.

Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service Appointment and Promotion Standards and Procedures for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty

See attached Document C: PPTM Recommendations

Jelinek reported the Committee formulated its set of recommendations and the C-FSC Personnel Policies & Contract Issues Committee (PPCI) also developed their own recommendations. The Committees then met jointly and developed joint recommendations from these two drafts.

He reported the C-FSC has not yet voted on the recommendations and is waiting to hear back on the input of the Wagner continuing contract faculty regarding the document.

He noted the recommendations are for more clarity and detail in the policy. The policy is only four pages long and the recommendations are to get more definition on the details, for instance on the grievance procedure and length of appointments.

A Senator inquired on the one year initial appointment and potential for a one year reappointment. She stated the time-frame mentioned seems to be in conflict with the current university guidelines.

Jelinek responded that this concern is included in the recommendations. The Committee noted four months prior to termination of the contract is insufficient. The Guidelines state that, "Normally, a FTNTT/CF must be notified of the intention not to be reappointed no later than March 1 of the final year of the contract, if the appointment is to be terminated on August 31. Normally, a FTNTT/CF whose period of appointment is due to terminate on a date other than August 31 must be notified of the intention not to be reappointed no later than 180 days prior to the termination date."

The Committee recommended that the review be completed no later than February 1, with the notification to be made by March 1.
A Senator asked about the timing of the probationary period and making performance decisions only based on the first semester. Jelinek noted the recommendations address issues related to one year contracts and the probationary period.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the recommendations were approved unanimously by vote of the Council.

Chairperson Mincer will inform the C-FSC Chairperson of the decision, and then the Council will send these recommendations to the Office of the Provost.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Founder’s Day**

A Senator addressed the recommendation from Matthew Santirocco concerning Founder’s Day. Students who earn a grade point average (GPA) of 3.500 or higher receive a University Honors Scholar/Founders Day Award. There is concern that the award is becoming meaningless since so many students receive it. The Senator suggested the Council become involved in this issue and commented he believes Founder’s Day is an important event at the university. He noted it is a unique opportunity for undergraduates from each of the schools to get together and be recognized for their achievements. He suggested, if so many receive, to raise the GPA to 3.65 or so.

Senators questioned whether the intention was to cancel Founder’s Day or change the criteria for the award.

The Faculty/Student Relations Committee will look into this issue.

**Summer Calendar**

A Senator inquired on the change to the summer calendar, voted on at the last University Senate meeting. She commented she had no awareness this was going to be discussed and asked for more advanced notice on these issues.

Mincer made a request to all Committee Chairs and members of Senate or University Committees to put any upcoming vote being sent to the University Senate on the Council meeting agenda prior to the vote.

**Time of Council Meetings**

A Senator asked to discuss changing the time of Council meetings to earlier in the morning to accommodate Senators in Shanghai and Abu Dhabi.

The Senator from Abu Dhabi noted if the meetings were moved to 9 A.M. it would make it challenging to attend meetings in person because of flight times and course schedules, therefore he prefers the current 12 P.M. time.

**SPECIAL GUEST: PRESIDENT ANDREW HAMILTON**

President Hamilton thanked the Chairperson and Council and stated the importance of the Council.

He noted the benefits and challenges of his role as a President coming from the outside.

He reported a major focus during this first semester, is to visit the various schools and departments throughout New York City and also throughout the global network, to both learn from schools and departments of the challenges and opportunities they are seeking to develop.
He noted these early weeks have been an opportunity to begin to appreciate the scale that is NYU in New York City, from the academic activity in Greenwich Village, the concentration of health research in medicine, dentistry, nursing and global public health on First Avenue, to the bourgeoning set of activities in Brooklyn with the Tandon School of Engineering and the Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP).

He commented that he paid close attention to NYU from Yale and from Oxford, and he is well aware of the debates and the controversy among the global network. He noted he is very pleased to see the strength of activities going on in Abu Dhabi and in Shanghai. He also noted he had a chance to visit NYU London and commented he was enormously impressed by the scale of activity, the quality of the faculty, and the overwhelmingly positive student reaction to the experience. He commented a key priority for the University is to insure that the global network is as properly integrated as it can be and is financially sustainable, as well as academically sustainable.

He noted three issues that require urgent attention.

One is already in progress, and he is pleased with the serious approach that NYU took in the fall on the issue of diversity and inclusiveness. He noted his first meeting as President was with the co-chairs of the task force and he has since met with the full task force and had a long, frank exchange and expressed his strong commitment to the goals of the task force, and encourages them to come forward with strong recommendations. He commented the University needs to address issues that the students so clearly are experiencing as they pursue their studies at NYU.

The second is the critically important and urgent issue of affordability. In extensive discussion among the deans and directors, short-term and long-term steps were developed. Short-term the administration will send a strong message to the students and parents that tuition will be held next year to the lowest level of increase in more than twenty years at 2.9 percent. In addition, the administration will freeze room and board, which is one of the reasons why NYU rises to the top of the most expensive schools. And two or three smaller steps will be pursued to lower the fees and also to increase the availability of lower cost bed options for students. He noted NYU is a tuition-dependent institution and for the number of students NYU has, it would need five times Princeton's endowment to be comparable in financial-aid offerings.

In terms of longer term issues, there is discussion of offering students a less traditional pathway and time to degree. These offerings include the acceptance of credits earned in other institutions, such as community colleges or high school AP classes, and the use of technology to deliver introductory courses at the undergraduate level.

A Steering Group is being created and Ellen Schall will act as the coordinator. The group will coordinate with academic colleagues in all schools and departments to analyze steps that promote affordability but do not threaten academic quality. Schall has asked Allen Mincer to join the group and he agreed on behalf of the T-FSC.

The third issue focuses on competiveness. Hamilton noted collaboration and collegiality are important, but so is competition. He commented on the potential threat offered by the arrival of Cornell Tech in New York City. While it is a wonderful addition to the community of scholars in New York City, NYU is at risk of losing students to these new programs.

He suggested NYU needs to be more thoughtful and more coherent in its academic vision in this area. He noted a major building, 370 J Street, is being refurbished in Brooklyn. He asked Executive Vice President Bob Berne to bring together the academic leadership in these areas, including Tandon, Tisch, urban studies, business, law, and a wide range of arts and sciences.

Chairperson Mincer presented questions on behalf of the Executive Committee:
Question 1:

The faculty has very much appreciated its increased participation in governance at NYU over the last few years, and would very much like to see continued movement in this direction. We would be happy to hear anything you would like to tell us about your thoughts on this subject.

Hamilton stated he views universities as being only as strong as their faculty and faculty must be the principle drivers of the academic vision for a successful institution. He noted Oxford, throughout its history, has been a faculty governed institution. He noted he is very pleased to hear about the progress that has been made at NYU in areas of faculty governance, which fits into his view of the way universities are most successful. He commented he looks forward to making himself available, listening, and giving faculty and the faculty councils engagement in issues of significance.

Question 2:

NYU faces many budgetary pressures but also has many opportunities. Can we continue the trajectory of increasing excellence we have experienced over the last two decades?

Hamilton commented if a university does not have more ideas, initiatives, new degree programs, and research projects for the funds available, then it is not trying hard enough. He noted every university that he has been connected with is under budget pressure. He stated to him it is an inevitability of a university that is committed to excellence.

In addressing the question of how NYU can afford to continue a focus on excellence, he commented there would be far more dangerous and retrograde consequences if NYU were to stop investing in excellence. He noted NYU has had its difficult decisions to make in past years and those will continue in different forms. He noted the need to invest in the future of NYU’s academic and recruitment opportunities by providing new academic space and student and faculty accommodations.

Question 3:

Non-tenured faculty play an increasing role in the university in general, and NYU is not an exception to this trend. This has ramification both for teaching and research programs. How do you see this trend playing out in the future?

Hamilton noted NYU is a distinct and special place and one of the characteristics is that NYU is in New York City. An inevitable consequence of its location is that there are wonderful practitioners coming to NYU and offering their experience. This means that inevitably faculty whose concentration is not on research, but on other aspects of the scholarly enterprise, play a big role and perhaps a bigger role than most universities.

He noted he had a meeting with the Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council Steering Committee earlier this week and this issue was discussed at great length. And for him, there are two very important messages to send. One, that the continuing contract faculty at NYU play an absolutely essential role in the scholarly endeavor, particularly the educational endeavor of everything NYU does across the intellectual spectrum.

NYU is a research focused and a research intensive university, but also very committed to high quality teaching and we have a large number of colleagues who are not part of the tenure track process and their contributions are immensely valuable, need to be celebrated, rewarded, and recognized as an essential part of our overall structure without diminishing our research intensity.

He noted one of the concerns expressed by the continuing contract faculty is that while some departments embrace, engage, and involve the continuing contract faculty, others do not. He said he prefers the University to be more like the former than the latter.
He commented on the ratio and stated what has grown is the teaching responsibility and some of that growth has been accommodated by continuing contract faculty who make vital contributions, but the research intensity and the space consequences of research intensity have not lessened.

Chairperson Mincer opened the floor to questions.

A Senator commented New York City is one of the most diverse cities in the world and there is an important opportunity to position NYU on that public element and honor the tradition as a private university in the public interest and a public interest that is quite diverse.

Hamilton agreed NYU is well positioned to be clear and strong in its commitment to its communities. NYU is absolutely intertwined with the city of New York, in Greenwich Village, in Brooklyn, on First Avenue, and other parts of the city. He hopes that the University seeks to play a positive role and send the message it is a private university in the public interest. He noted the community outreach of the College of Nursing and College of Dentistry. He also noted that 15,000 of NYU students are involved in extensive community engagement through volunteering activities. He also recognized NYU as an economic engine in the communities, through employment and bringing business to local stores, restaurants, etc.

A Senator mentioned she was on the committee that developed CUSP and noted Stanford’s interest in New York City.

Hamilton re-stated the importance of collaboration and competition, but also remaining competitive.

A Senator inquired on how NYU will fund initiatives to be competitive.

Hamilton noted NYU’s need to balance priorities as well as fundraise. He noted NYU is already in a strong position to directly counter Cornell Tech in a wide range of activities. The budgetary cost of the 370 J Street renovation is already in NYU’s long-term budget.

A Senator noted the corporatization of NYU and the feeling that pedagogy and research are minor concerns within facilities management. He commented he hopes NYU can redirect to a more faculty centric view so faculty are not making teaching decisions based on room assignments and failures of various systems on campus and instead focused on research and teaching and not real estate and square footage.

Hamilton noted that NYU’s decisions must be faculty centric. He commented he would push back on the word corporatization, and feels it is used often at major universities. He stated that large organizations need to be run efficiently and universities have a fiduciary responsibility as a non-profit to run as efficiently as possible. This might mean occasionally being corporate in the approach to grant accounting or human resource management. He stated when he examines real estate decisions that have been made by NYU, at least in the recent past, they have been made to provide accommodation for students and faculty. They have to be made with rigor and with scale, but are also are a vital part of academic planning. He noted these are construction capital project decisions that are underpinning the academic mission of the university.

A Senator suggested focusing residential real estate in other less costly neighborhoods such as Washington Heights, Brooklyn, or the Bronx. He commented these areas might be attractive to students, graduate students, young faculty, etc.

Hamilton agreed on this point and reported a broader focus of Ellen’s group will be to look at alternative student accommodations. One area, given the growth of NYU’s activities in the borough, is Brooklyn.

A Senator asked if he thinks faculty should serve on the Board of Trustees (BOT). She noted she found the presence of faculty on the Presidential Search Committee alongside BOT members to be very constructive.
Hamilton commented he has different experiences from his two different universities. At Oxford there is very significant faculty representation on what would be the equivalent of the BOT, versus at Yale where the board is exclusively external. Both of them had strengths and weaknesses. He noted the board’s fundamental purpose is acting in the best interests of the institution as a whole and to effectively choose among many priorities. He noted it is too early for him to go further than that in his view of how the NYU board operates.

The Council thanked President Hamilton.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
Recommendations Of
The Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council and
The Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council
In Regard To:

Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
DRAFT Appointment and Promotion Standards and Procedures
for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty

Background

From a letter dated July 14, 2015, sent by Provost David McLaughlin: “The Office of the Dean of the Wagner Graduate School of Public Service has completed a process within the school to create Appointment and Promotion Standards and Procedures for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty. The faculty voted on May 29 to approve this document. My office together with the Office of General Counsel worked with the school to edit the document to ensure consistency with University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments.”

The following document consists of recommendations made jointly by the C-FSC Personnel Policies & Contract Issues Committee and the T-FSC Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Committee in an effort to improve the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service Appointment and Promotion Standards and Procedures for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty and to ensure its compliance with the University Guidelines For Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointment

Substantive Major Recommendations

1. General recommendation:

The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, page 1, Section II state: “Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1 state: “In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate and/or amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the expectation that FTNTT/CF shall participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.”

We strongly recommend that any development of this policy follow the letter and the spirit contained in the above quote. We recommend that after the Provost has read the recommendations made by the C-FSC and the T-FSC and determined which recommendations for changes to the original school policy document are warranted, all school policy documents (along with the recommendations of the two senate faculty councils) be returned to the school in question for perusal, discussion and vote by the full faculty of that school, which policy must necessarily include the grievance/appeal process.
2. Page 1, Section I, Introduction:

This document sets forth the standards and procedures for participation in governance by, the appointment, reappointment and promotion, and grievance rights of full-time non-tenure track, contract faculty (FTNTT/CF) at the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service (Wagner).

a. Recommendation
   We recommend the inclusion of some information on the formulation of the document. Did the Wagner faculty participate in its formulation, and were FTNTT/CF among those faculty?

b. Recommendation
   We recommend that the following be added: “Any amendment to this Policy must be in writing, submitted in advance to the faculty for discussion, for the possibility for amendments, and for a vote.”

3. II. PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE

   Second Sentence
   Page 1

“At the department level, FTNTT/CF may participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion and tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure track faculty, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting the status of an FTNTT/CF member on the faculty at NYU.”

a. “... and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree ...
   What individual?
   As an academic, should not a FTNTT/CF member participate in degree granting?

b. “...or matters affecting the status of an FTNTT/CF member on the faculty at NYU.”
   This phrase is contradictory to: [III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
   C. Initial Appointment
   D. Periodic Review, Reappointment, and Promotion
   E. Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion,
   as these sections indicate that the FTNTT/CF participate by voting on the initial appointment, periodic review, reappointment, and promotion.

   Recommendation
   Re-write this sentence so that its substantive content does no conflict with other sections of this document and to clarify for which individuals the FTNTT/CF are excluded from participating in
matters that directly or indirectly affect candidacy for a degree.

If the meaning of: “... and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty at NYU.” is as indicated in the following sentence, end the existing sentence after “... tenure track faculty” and include the following sentence, otherwise rewrite this clause to clarify its meaning:

“A clinical faculty member does not participate in matters related to his or her candidacy for a degree or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty of NYU. “

4. Page 2, Section III, paragraph 3, end of paragraph

**Recommendation:**
Because contract faculty are non-tenured, add language describing the differences between tenured faculty expectations and non-tenured faculty expectations. A model might be the following (from the FAS Website, “Recruitment of New Faculty, Section 1.7, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professors, Overview,” http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.ppassocdean.recruitment.html):

“Clinical Faculty lines differ from tenure-track lines. Although clinical lines are without tenure, they are typically multiyear and research is not part of their formal responsibilities.”

5. Page 2, Section III, Part C, paragraph 2, sentence 2

The ad hoc faculty search committee shall report to the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee detailing the qualifications of any candidate for initial appointment and provide the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee any supporting documentation that the ad hoc faculty search committee deems appropriate.

**Recommendation**
We recommend that the composition of the ad hoc faculty search committee be described. Will it include continuing faculty, as specified in the Guidelines (“Schools are expected to include FTNTT/CF in the hiring process for full-time contract faculty.”)?

6. Page 2, Section III, Part C, paragraph 2, sentence 4:

Initial appointments are typically for one year, subject to review for reappointment pursuant to subsections D and E below.

**Recommendation**
As per the NYU Guidelines, "...wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts.” We recommend that initial appointments be for three years, with the first year probationary.

7. Page 2, Section III, Part C, paragraph 2, sentence 5:
Reappointments are typically for three years, but may be for less than three years.

**Recommendation**

a. We recommend that the circumstances under which a contract of less than three years would be given be specified, or that some examples of such circumstances be listed. Further, if a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean must supply a written justification, based on programmatic and academic considerations, to the Wagner faculty. To satisfy the requirement, as stated in the “University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments,” that “school policies shall include a rationale for a FTNTT/CF title(s) that carries a one-year appointment,” add the following language:

“If a one-year contract is adopted, the dean must supply a written justification, based on programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty.”

b. To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of faculty on one-year appointments (when the norm is three- and five-year appointments), add language allowing for a transition to a three-year appointment for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a third-year review, such as:

“Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to a three-year appointment.”

8. Page 3, Section III, Part C, paragraph 4, sentence 3:

“Such recommendation of the faculty shall be advisory to the Dean.”

**Recommendation**

For the sake of transparency, we recommend that this be followed by language, adapted from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty (http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html):

If the Dean’s decision is contrary on appointment or length of contact to that of the faculty, the Dean will provide the full faculty with his/her reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean’s decision is finalized.

9. Page 3, Section III, Part D, paragraph 1:

"... must include: (a) review committee, which is advisory to the dean and/or unit head, and rules determining how the committee is to be constituted; (b) a statement …”

**Recommendation**

We recommend that this committee should include FTNTT/CF and that all members should be elected by their peers.
10. Page 3, Section III, Part D, paragraph 2, sentence 2:

There is an expectation that the candidate is fully engaged at Wagner to help build and strengthen the school.

Recommendation
We recommend that this statement be deleted on the basis that the state of being "fully engaged" is too broad to be assessed for the purposes of review, reappointment, and promotion.

11. Page 3, Section III, Part D, paragraph 2, sentence 5:

“Performance shall be reviewed annually by the Vice or Associate Dean for Academic Affairs on the basis of a docket prepared by the FTNTT/CF member.”

Recommendation
a. What is the content of this docket (or report)? Is it part of the Annual Merit Review? If not, what is its purpose?

b. Specify how "performance" will be assessed. For example, the following factors might be considered: course materials (e.g., syllabi, lecture notes, assignments), course development and innovation, instructor development, collegial observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing, evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.

c. Add: "For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in reviews for reappointment and promotion."

d. Add the stipulation that the FTNTT/CF member will receive feedback from the review.

12. Page 3, Section III, Part E, Item 1, Reappointment:

Recommendation
We recommend starting this item with a reference to the review committee described in Part D, and adding the following as bullet points:

a. The Committee should choose its own chair, who then coordinates the creation of the committee’s report and recommendation for reappointment, which is then submitted to the dean. The duties of the chair should be included in this paragraph, as well as the process of evaluating the review material. The process of the creation of the committee’s report should be explicitly stated with language similar to the following:
“The committee will prepare a written review for the dean evaluating and summarizing the evidence of accomplishment, noting areas that require improvement, and making a recommendation regarding reappointment, and promotion and contract length (when applicable).”

b. Further, the committee should hold a secret ballot to determine the majority opinion. In that case, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

c. A majority vote of the Reappointment Review Committee shall be required for a successful review, all votes of that Committee shall be by secret ballot and re-voting by that Committee shall occur only if new material becomes available.

d. The review may be written by one or more member of the Review and Reappointment Committee, but all members of the committee should read the review before it is submitted to the dean. The review should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division of opinion, the dissenting opinion should be appended to the majority review.

13. Page 3, Section III, Part E, Item 1, Step 1, sentence 1:

First, a docket consisting of a personal statement documenting the qualifications for reappointment and evidence of teaching performance shall be prepared by the FTNTT/CF member under review and submitted for review to the Vice or Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for further review by the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Recommendation
Clarify the review procedures. For example, what role will the Vice or Associate Dean take in relations to the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee?

14. Page 4, Section III, Part E, Item 1, Step 1, sentence 2:

For FTNTT/CF members having one-year contracts, the review shall be commenced in the spring semester of the contract year or at least four months prior to termination of the contract.

Recommendation
a. The University Guidelines state that, "…wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts." Therefore, a reappointment to a one-year term should "include a rationale" for the contract, presented in writing to the faculty.

b. Further, four months prior to termination of the contract is insufficient. The Guidelines state that, "Normally, a FTNTT/CF must be notified of the intention not to be reappointed no later than March 1 of the final year of the contract, if the appointment is to be
terminated on August 31. Normally, a FTNTT/CF whose period of appointment is due to terminate on a date other than August 31 must be notified of the intention not to be reappointed no later than 180 days prior to the termination date." Therefore, we recommend that the review be completed no later than February 1, with the notification to be made by March 1.

c. Should the faculty member under review be completing the third such contract, the Guidelines state that, "In the first semester of the third year of continuous appointments, a FTNTT/CF member shall be subject to formal review comparable to those to which faculty members on longer multi-year contracts are subject. The process governing third-year reviews of faculty on continuous contracts shall include:

- a review committee, which is advisory to the dean and/or unit head, and rules determining how the committee is to be constituted;
- a statement of the academic criteria in the areas of teaching, program development, the creative arts (where appropriate), department and school service, and scholarship (where appropriate) that will guide the committee’s evaluation;
- the criteria of assessment in effect at the time, which shall be available to the faculty in print and on the web;
- a published and widely available calendar for department/school-level reviews and communication to faculty members that accords fair and timely notice of a review to take place and of its outcome. Schools may have different administrative calendars; however, all schools shall provide adequate notice for individuals to pursue alternative employment in the event of a negative decision. Normally, a FTNTT/CF must be notified of the intention not to be reappointed no later than March 1st of the final year of the contract, if the appointment is to be terminated on August 31. Normally, a FTNTT/CF whose period of appointment is due to terminate on a date other than August 31 must be notified of the intention not to be reappointed no later than 180 days prior to the termination date;
- the grounds for stopping the contract clock for reasonable cause (e.g., medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, same-sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation); and
- the grounds for grievance and appeal as laid out in this document (below, Section V.).

We recommend including the University Guideline language to account for the third year review of continuous one-year appointments.

15. III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
E. Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion

1. Reappointment

Third Paragraph
Penultimate Sentence
Page 4

“Reappointments are typically for three years, but can be for less than three years.”
Recommendation 1
In keeping with the spirit of the proviso of the
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES FOR FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK/CONTRACT
FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
IV. HIRING, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT
Excellence in Faculty Appointments
Hiring Plan and Process
a. Duration of Contracts:

“Thus, wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts. However, in addition to providing schools with an essential degree of flexibility, one-year contracts are programmatically and academically desirable in a number of schools and academic programs within schools, and can be justified accordingly.”

a. Specify the atypical circumstance under which reappointments will be for less than three years.

b. Consider specifying that if a faculty member is appointed on a one-year contract and reappointed on two subsequent one-year contracts (a total of three one-year contracts) and has completed a successful third-year review he or she shall be moved to a three-year contract.

Recommendation 2
Consider specifying that for a faculty member whose position is to be eliminated at the end of his or her contract, if another position is vacant, the faculty member, if he or she so desires, will be evaluated as to his or her qualifications to fill that position, and if qualified, will be considered to fill that position.

16. Page 4, Section III, Part E, Item 1, Step 3, sentence 1:

“Third, the Dean’s decision is rendered”

Recommendation

Again, for the sake of transparency, we recommend that this be followed by language, adapted from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty (http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html):

If the Dean's decision is contrary on reappointment or length of contact to that of the faculty, the Dean will provide the full faculty with his/her reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's decision is finalized.

17. Page 4, Section III, Part E, Item 1, Step 3, sentence 2:
“Decisions regarding reappointment for FTNTT/CF members having one-year contracts shall be made at least three months prior to termination of the contract.”

**Recommendation**
We recommend that the review be completed no later than February 1, with the notification to be made by March 1.

18. **Page 4, Section III, Part E, Item 3, Promotion:**

**Recommendation**
No standards for promotion are given. We recommend an explicit listing of the criteria for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor and for promotion to Clinical Professor.

19. **Page 4, Section III, Part E, Item 3, Promotion:**

**Recommendation**
As a five-year appointment is the norm for Clinical Associate Professor, provide an increase in term of appointment for Clinical (Full) Professor; this is the case at certain schools (e.g., The Gallatin School).

20. **Page 4, Section III, Part E, Item 3, Step 1**

First, for FTNTT/CF members, a docket consisting of a personal statement documenting the qualifications for reappointment and evidence of teaching performance shall be prepared by the FTNTT/CF member under review and submitted for review to the Vice or Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for further review and reviewed by the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Recommendation**
Clarify the review procedures. For example, what role will the Vice or Associate Dean take in relations to the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee?

21. **Page 4, Section III, Part E, Item 3, Step 3**

“Third, the Dean's decision is rendered.”

**Recommendation**
Add a procedure for communicating the rationale for a negative decision, should that be the outcome, such as, "If the dean does not approve, the candidate is notified in writing, to include the rationale for the decision and a tally of the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee vote."

22. **Page 4, Section IV, sentence 1:**
“Eligibility to grieve, grounds for grievance and the grievance process are as outlined in the University Guidelines”

Recommendation
We recommend further elaboration here on the grievance procedure. Other items from the NYU Guidelines have been discussed in detail earlier in this document, and it is likely that upon careful consideration, some nuances not discussed in the NYU Guidelines will be appropriate within Wagner. These should be identified and explicitly described in this document.

The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, notes numerous requirements and procedures for the school grievance process, including specifying who may grieve, the grounds for grievances based on non-reappointment, as well as grievances related to other issues, the process of requesting the convening by the dean of the grievance committee, and the accessibility of that grievance policy to the faculty.

Additionally, we recommend the development of this grievance process should be undertaken by the Wagner faculty and submitted to the faculty for discussion and a vote by the faculty. The process of consideration must include the right to offer amendments, and the vote may occur during a regular faculty meeting or by electronic ballot, as the faculty governance body may determine.

23. Page 4, Section IV, sentence 2:

As set forth in Part VI of the Wagner Governance Bylaws, for a grievance related to appointment, tenure or promotion brought by an FTNTT/CF member, voting shall be by all Wagner Faculty Grievance Committee members, which Committee shall be expanded in such case to include at least one senior FTNTT/CF member.

Recommendation
We recommend that a link to the Wagner Governance Bylaws be added. Further, the Guidelines specify that all members of the committee, including the senior FTNTT/CF member, be elected: “Unless otherwise authorized in the school’s policy and approved by the Provost, each school shall either establish a new standing faculty committee for FTNTT/CF grievances, which will include senior FTNTT/CF and T/TTF elected by the voting members of the faculty; or shall expand its existing standing grievance committee for T/TTF to include (elected) senior FTNTT/CF who shall participate in hearing and evaluating only those grievances that are filed by FTNTT/CF.”

Substantive Minor Recommendations

1. Page 2, Section III, Part C, paragraph 1, sentence 2:
“Schools are encouraged to include full-time contract faculty members in the hiring process for full-time faculty.”

**Recommendation**

This quotation from the Guidelines is inaccurate. The final Guidelines state: "Schools are expected to include FTNTT/CF in the hiring process for full-time contract faculty."

**Minor editorial issues**

1. **Page 1, Section III, Part A, footnote 1:**


   **Recommendation**
   

2. **III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY**

   **A. Introduction**

   **Second paragraph**

   Page 2

   “At Wagner, FTNTT/CF hold the titles of clinical assistant, associate, and full professor.”

   **Recommendation**

   Add “clinical” before “associate” and “full professor” for precision.

   “At Wagner, FTNTT/CF hold the titles of clinical assistant, **clinical** associate, and **clinical** full professor.”

3. **III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY**

   **B. Qualifications and Responsibilities**

   **First paragraph**

   Page 2

   “Clinical assistant, associate and full professors will have a record of outstanding teaching.”

   **Recommendation**

   Add “clinical” before “associate” and “full professor” for precision.

   “Clinical assistant, **clinical** associate and **clinical** full professors will have a record of
outstanding teaching.”

4. III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
C. Initial Appointment
Second paragraph
First Sentence
Page 2

“For clinical faculty at Wagner, an ad hoc faculty search committee shall be appointed pursuant to Sections IV.B.3 and IV.C of the Wagner Bylaws.”

Recommendation
Add “the appointment of” before “clinical”.

“For the appointment of clinical faculty at Wagner, an ad hoc faculty search committee shall be appointed pursuant to Sections IV.B.3 and IV.C of the Wagner Bylaws.”

5. III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
C. Initial Appointment
Second paragraph
Third Sentence
Page 2

“The Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee shall then make a recommendation on initial appointment to the faculty, with a vote taken by closed ballot of TTT and FTNTT/CF members.”

It is not clear from the wording of this sentence whether the TTT and FTNTT/CF members of the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee vote on the recommendation they will make, or whether the faculty to whom the AP &T makes a recommendation vote. The confusion results partly because of the wording of the sentence and partly because the first full paragraph on page 3 also describes a vote on the recommendation for initial appointment at an executive session of a faculty meeting attended by the TTT faculty and FTNTT/CF faculty. Are these two different votes?

Recommendation
Rearrange the sentence for clarity as either:

“The Appointment, Promotions and Tenure Committee shall then make a recommendation on initial appointment to the faculty on which the TTT and FTNTT/CF members of the Committee shall vote by closed ballot.”
or

“The Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee shall then make a recommendation
on initial appointment to the faculty on which the TTT and FTNTT/CF members of the faculty shall vote by closed ballot,”, whichever applies.

6. III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
C. Initial Appointment
Fourth paragraph
First Sentence
Page 3

“Reports of the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee concerning initial appointment of FTNTT/CF members shall be reviewed in an executive session of the faculty meeting, with attendance limited to TTT Faculty and FTNTT/CF.”

Recommendation
Insert “the” before “initial appointment.”

As there is no antecedent indication of a faculty meeting, replace “the faculty meeting” with “a faculty meeting”

“Reports of the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee concerning the initial appointment of FTNTT/CF members shall be reviewed in an executive session of a faculty meeting, with attendance limited to TTT Faculty and FTNTT/CF.”

7. III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
C. Initial Appointment
Fourth paragraph
Second Sentence
Page 3

“Upon review and discussion of the committee’s report and such other materials as shall be gathered by the faculty or dean, TTTF and FTNTT/CF, shall vote by closed ballot on the recommendation of the faculty to the dean on initial appointment.”

Recommendation
Remove the comma after “FTNTT/CF” and insert “the” before “initial appointment”.

“Upon review and discussion of the committee’s report and such other materials as shall be gathered by the faculty or dean, TTTF and FTNTT/CF shall vote by closed ballot on the recommendation of the faculty to the dean on the initial appointment.”

8. III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
D. Periodic Review, Reappointment, and Promotion
"The University Guidelines specify, among other items, that the “process for review of full-time multi-year contracts of three years or more, including promotion reviews, must include: (a) review committee, which is advisory to the dean and/or unit head, and rules determining how the committee is to be constituted; (b) a statement of the academic criteria in the areas of teaching, program development, department and school service, and research and scholarship (where appropriate) that will guide the committee’s evaluation.”

Recommendation
Insert an “a” before “review committee” to make parallel with item (b).

9. Page 3, Section III, Part D, paragraph 2, sentence 5:

“Performance shall be reviewed annually by the Vice or Associate Dean for Academic Affairs on the basis of a docket prepared by the FTNTT/CF member.”

Recommendation
Replace "docket" with "report," to avoid confusion with the reappointment docket described in Part E.

10. III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
E. Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion
3. Promotion
Third Paragraph
First Sentence

“Second, the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee shall make a recommendation on promotion to the faculty, with a vote taken by closed ballot of TTT and FTNTT/CF members.

It is not clear from the wording of this sentence whether the TTT and FTNTT/CF members of the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee vote on the recommendation they will make, or whether the faculty to whom the AP & T makes a recommendation vote.

Recommendation
Rearrange the sentence for clarity as either:

“Second, the Appointment, Promotions and Tenure Committee shall then make a recommendation on promotion to the faculty on which the TTT and FTNTT/CF members of the Committee shall vote by closed ballot.”
or

“Second, the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee shall then make a recommendation on promotion to the faculty on which the TTT and FTNTT/CF members of the faculty shall vote by closed ballot.”,
whichever applies

11. III STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FULL TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTRACT FACULTY
E. Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion
1. Reappointment
Fourth paragraph
Third sentence
Page 4

“Reappointments of clinical associates and full professors may be for a term of up to five years in exceptional circumstances.”

Recommendation
Change “clinical associates and full professors” to “clinical associate professors and clinical full professors”

“Reappointments of clinical associate professors and clinical full professors may be for a term of up to five years in exceptional circumstances.”
Recommendations Of
The Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council
In Regard To:

Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
DRAFT Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures

Background

From the Provost’s letter of July 14, 2015:
“The Dean of the Wagner Graduate School of Public Service has completed a process within the school to revise its Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures to improve their readability and clarify certain provisions to comply with University Bylaws. The Wagner Faculty voted on May 29 to approve this document. After an iterative review with my office and the Office of General Counsel, the draft was finalized and submitted for my approval.”

Substantive Recommendations

1. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   2. Annual Reviews
   First Paragraph
   Page 2 – 3 (Note: page numbers referred to herein are the numbers printed on the pages of the policy, which do not accurately identify the physical pages of the policy, i.e., consecutive page numbering begins at “1” on physical page two of the policy.)

   “Each year, a subcommittee will be appointed to conduct the review and make recommendations to the full Promotion and Tenure Committee. The subcommittee will include one tenured faculty member who will serve as chair on all subsequent reviews of said junior faculty member during his or her probationary period (except when on sabbatical or on leave).

   Recommendation
   As it is not disclosed until the middle of the following page that the Promotion and Tenure Committee appoints the subcommittee, add “by the Promotion and Tenure Committee” after “appointed” to make that fact known at this earlier stage in the policy.

2. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   2. Annual Reviews
   Second Paragraph
   First Sentence
   Page 3
“For candidates with a seven or five year probationary period, the review in the first year is primarily intended to familiarize the candidate with the tenure review process and to help focus future reviews.”

The fact that the following sentence indicates that in subsequent years the subcommittee for review is appointed by the P&T Committee raises the question as to who or what entity appoints the review committee in the first year.

Recommendation
Indicate who or what entity appoints the first year review committee.

3. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
B. Procedures For Tenure Review
2. Annual Reviews
Third Paragraph
Third Sentence
Page 3

“The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote.”

Recommendation
Consider specifying in a following sentence, which is already included in the first full paragraph on page 7 and the last full paragraph on page 10 of the policy in regard to a vote by the P&T Committee: “Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.”

4. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
B. Procedures For Tenure Review
2. Annual Reviews
Third Paragraph
Fourth Sentence
Page 3

“A brief report summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and progress toward tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is forwarded to the Dean.”

Recommendation
As the candidate receives the report of the subcommittee and the Promotion and Tenure Committee is directed to include in its brief report to the Dean “... any actions recommended by the [Promotion and Tenure] Committee to the candidate ...”, describe how the “... actions recommended by the [Promotion and Tenure] Committee to the candidate ...“ will be transmitted to the candidate.
5. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW  
B. Procedures For Tenure Review  
2. Annual Reviews  
Third Paragraph  
Fifth Sentence  
Page 3-4  

“The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns identified in the report.”  

Recommendation  
a. The indicated report is presumably the subcommittee report, as it is the only report indicated for transmittal to the candidate. For clarity add “subcommittee’s” before “report”.  
b. Consider, also for clarity and context, moving this sentence immediately after: “The candidate receives the subcommittee report to provide a sense of the faculty in regard to the candidate’s progress toward tenure.”  

6. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW  
B. Procedures For Tenure Review  
3. Intensive Review  
Second Paragraph  
Fifth Sentence  
Page 4  

“The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote.”  

Recommendation  
Consider specifying in a following sentence, which is already included in the first full paragraph on page 7 and the last full paragraph on page 10 of the policy in regard to a vote by the P&T Committee: “Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.”  

7. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW  
B. Procedures For Tenure Review  
3. Intensive Review  
Second Paragraph  
Sixth Sentence  
Page 4  

“A brief memo summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and progress towards tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is forwarded to the Dean”
Recommendation
As the candidate receives the report of the subcommittee and the Promotions and Tenure Committee is directed to include in its brief report to the Dean “... any actions recommended by the [Promotions and Tenure] Committee to the candidate ...”, describe how the “... actions recommended by the Promotions and Tenure Committee to the candidate ...“ will be transmitted to the candidate.

8. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
B. Procedures For Tenure Review
3. Intensive Review
Second Paragraph
Seventh Sentence
Page 4

“The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns raised in the report.”

Recommendation
a. The indicated report is presumably the subcommittee report, as it is the only report indicated for transmittal to the candidate. For clarity add “subcommittee’s” before “report”.
b. Consider, also for clarity and context, moving this sentence immediately after: “The candidate receives the subcommittee report to provide a sense of the faculty in regard to the candidate’s progress toward tenure.”

9. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
B. Procedures For Tenure Review
4. Tenure Review
Fourth Indented Paragraph
First Sentence
Page 6

“The letter of solicitation for external evaluation should come from the subcommittee chair of the Wagner School, and should follow the prototype attached Appendix A.”

Recommendation
The phrase “subcommittee chair of the Wagner School” is confusing. Is this subcommittee different from the subcommittee appointed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee? If so, describe it or give a reference to it. If it is the subcommittee appointed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, modify the sentence to read:

“The letter of solicitation for external evaluation should come from the chair of the subcommittee appointed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and should follow the prototype attached Appendix A”
10. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   4. Tenure Review

   Sixth Indented Paragraph
   Final Sentence
   Page 6

   “The vote by the subcommittee on any recommendation for tenure shall be by closed ballot, with a tally of the vote included in its report.

   Recommendation
   Consider specifying in a following sentence, which is already included in the first full paragraph on page 7 and the last full paragraph on page 10 of the policy in regard to a vote by the P&T Committee: “Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.”

11. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   4. Tenure Review

   Seventh Indented Paragraph
   Second Sentence
   Page 6

   “The vote by the P&T Committee on whether tenure should be granted shall be by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote.”

   Recommendation
   Consider specifying in a following sentence, which is already included in the first full paragraph on page 7 and the last full paragraph on page 10 of the policy in regard to a vote by the P&T Committee: “Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.”

12. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   4. Tenure Review

   Eighth Indented Paragraph
   Second Sentence
   Page 7

   “After a discussion, a vote will be taken and tallied. The vote shall be by closed ballot, and only those present in person or by means of conference telephone or similar communications are entitled to vote on tenure..”

   Recommendation
   Consider specifying in a following sentence, which is already included in the first full paragraph on page 7 and the last full paragraph on page 10 of the policy in regard to a
vote by the P&T Committee: “Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.”

13. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   4. Tenure Review
      Third Paragraph
      Ninth Indented Paragraph
      Third Sentence
      Page 7

      “The Dean will inform the full faculty entitled to vote on tenure of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of submission.”

      It isn’t clear at this point in the policy, although it does become clear upon subsequent reading, whether “submission” refers to the transmittal by the Chair of the P&T Committee of the P&T Committee’s report to the Dean or the transmittal of the Deans proposed recommendation to the Provost.

      Recommendation
      Clarify the object of “submission” by adding “of the P&T Committee’s report” at the end of the sentence.

      “The Dean will inform the full faculty entitled to vote on tenure of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of submission of the P&T Committee’s report.”

14. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
   B. Procedures for Promotion
   First Paragraph
   Second Indented Paragraph
   Second Sentence
   Page 9

   “The vote by the P&T Committee on whether to seek external review shall be conducted by closed ballot

   Recommendation
   Consider specifying in a following sentence, which is already included in the first full paragraph on page 7 and the last full paragraph on page 10 of the policy in regard to a vote by the P&T Committee: “Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.”

15. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
   B. Procedures for Promotion
   First Paragraph
“If the decision is not to proceed with external review, the Committee will notify the candidate and prepare a report documenting the rationale for its decision which will be provided to the Dean.”

Recommendation
Consider adding after this sentence a statement to the effect that the Dean or other responsible person will inform the candidate as to why it was decided not to proceed with external review and to convey to the candidate recommendations, if there are such, as to improvements that are expected for subsequent successful promotion to full professor. This might be accomplished by transmitting the Committee’s report or relevant sections of it to the candidate.

16. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
   B. Procedures for Promotion
   First Paragraph
   Third Indented Paragraph
   First Sentence
   Page 9
   “Third, if the P&T Committee (or full faculty as specified above) determines to proceed with the case and seek external review, the Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the promotion review docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report with to the full P&T Committee assessing the candidate’s scholarly work/research, teaching and service, and providing a recommendation on promotion”

   The parenthetical expression, “(or full faculty as specified above)”, is confusing, as there is no specification above indicating that the full faculty makes a determination regarding whether the P&T committee will proceed with its deliberations on promotion.

   Recommendation
   Either delete the parenthetical expression or specify the procedure by which the full faculty determines whether the P&T will proceed with the case and seek external review, etc.

17. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
   B. Procedures for Promotion
   First Paragraph
   Seventh Indented Paragraph
   Second Sentence
   Page 10
   “The vote by the P&T Committee on whether promotion should be granted shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice
vote.”

**Recommendation**
Consider specifying in a following sentence, which is already included in the first full paragraph on page 7 and the last full paragraph on page 10 of the policy in regard to a vote by the P&T Committee: “Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.”

18. **III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**
   B. Procedures for Promotion
   First Paragraph
   Ninth Indented Paragraph
   Third Sentence
   Page 11

   “The Dean will inform full faculty entitled to vote on promotion of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of submission.”

   **Recommendation**
   For clarity, add "of the P&T report after “submission”.

19. **III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**
   B. Procedures for Promotion
   First Paragraph
   Tenth Indented Paragraph
   Page 11

   “In the event of a negative decision on promotion, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University’s Faculty Grievance Procedures specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook issued March 1, 2015 (pp. 4850).

   **Recommendation**
   Consider adding a statement to the effect that in the event of a negative decision, the Dean or other responsible person will inform the candidate as to why it was decided not to promote to full professor and to convey to the candidate recommendations, if there are such, as to improvements that are expected for subsequent successful promotion to full professor.

20. **APPENDIX: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS**
   TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW
   First Paragraph

   “Josephine Smith, currently an Assistant Professor in the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, is being considered for tenure and promotion. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of her published and unpublished research.”
Recommendation
Consider requesting that the external evaluator keep confidential the candidate’s unpublished research.

Minor editorial issues

1. Throughout the document the term “Promotion and Tenure Committee” is used, although the formal name of the Committee is the “Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee”.

   Recommendation
   For consistency and to avoid confusion, either replace “Promotion and Tenure Committee” with “Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee”, or with “P&T Committee”, as defined at the top of page 1, second line.

2. I. Introduction
   Second Paragraph
   First Indented Paragraph
   Third Sentence
   Beginning Page Without A Page Number
   “To give weak advice to the Dean on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at a later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an abdication of responsibility…”

   Recommendation
   Delete “…” at the end of the sentence.

3. I. Introduction
   Second Paragraph
   Second Indented Paragraph
   Second Sentence
   “Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and “advocacy” assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration…

   Recommendation
   Delete “…” at the end of the sentence.

4. I. Introduction
   Second Paragraph
   Second Indented Paragraph
   Fifth Sentence
   “Ethical behavior includes a clear obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings, since confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.
Recommendation
Replace “since” with “as” as “since” is an indication of passed time.

5. I. Introduction
Third Paragraph
First Sentence
Page 1

“Pursuant to the Wagner Governance Bylaws, an Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee) is appointed by the Dean with the advice of the Faculty Advisory Committee which is elected by the faculty.”

Recommendation
Consider adding a link to the Wagner Governance Bylaws.

6. I. Introduction
Third Paragraph
Second Sentence
Page 1

“As is detailed below, in conducting promotion and tenure reviews, the P&T Committee will prepare a docket, including a report from the P&T Committee with a recommendation on promotion or tenure, which is then provided to tenured faculty of appropriate rank\(^2\) who make a recommendation to the Dean.

Recommendation
In footnote 2, consider eliminating the word “cases” and re-writing as:

“That is, associate professors and full professors for promotion to associate professor and conferral of tenure, and full professors for promotion to full professor”

7. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
A. Standards for Tenure
First paragraph
Second Indented Paragraph
Second Sentence
Page 1

“Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the department?…”

Recommendation
Delete “…” after the “?”.
8. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
      1. Introduction
         First Sentence
         Page 2
         “Nontenured tenure track faculty include all full time Wagner faculty who are appointed for a tenure track position and are eligible for tenure status as specified in Academic Freedom and Tenure Title I, Section V (NYU Faculty Handbook issued March 1, 2015, pp. 31-34).”

         Recommendation
         The current version if the Faculty Handbook is dated September 1, 2015, Title I, Section V is located on pp. 31-34.

9. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
      1. Introduction
         Second paragraph
         Fifth Sentence
         Page 2
         “The reviews are also intended to advise the candidate on adequacy of progress towards tenure, with a goal providing early notice to the candidate if tenure appears unlikely.”

         Recommendation
         Add “of” before “providing”.

10. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
    B. Procedures For Tenure Review
       2. Annual Reviews
          First Paragraph
          Second Sentence
          Page 3
          “The subcommittee will include one tenured faculty member who will serve as chair on all subsequent reviews of said junior faculty member during his or her probationary period (except when on sabbatical or on leave).”

          Recommendation
          The parenthetical “(except when on sabbatical or on leave)” seems more aptly to apply to the chair of the subcommittee rather than to “said junior faculty member during his or her probationary period “.

          If so, rearrange the sentence as:
"The subcommittee will include one tenured faculty member who will serve as chair (except when on sabbatical or on leave) on all subsequent reviews of said junior faculty member during his or her probationary period."

11. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   2. Annual Reviews
      First Paragraph
      Page 3
      Third First-Level Bullet Item

   "Service at Wagner, at NYU, in his/her scholarly field(s) of interest, and to the public; and"

   Recommendation
   The "and" at the end of this item appears to signify another missing item(s). Either add the missing item(s) or delete the "and".

12. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   4. Tenure Review
      Second Paragraph
      First Sentence
      Page 4

   "First, the candidate submits by September 15th of penultimate probationary year materials required for inclusion in the tenure docket including a CV, personal statement, all publications, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations for all NYU courses."

   Recommendation
   Add "the" before "penultimate".

13. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
   B. Procedures For Tenure Review
   4. Tenure Review
      Third Paragraph
      Third Indented paragraph
      First Sentence
      Page 6

   "At Wagner, external evaluators generally will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, and will be recognized leaders in the candidate’s field."

   "At Wagner" is somewhat confusing because external evaluators are not at Wagner.
Recommendation
Delete “At Wagner” and begin the sentence with “External evaluators ...”

14. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
B. Procedures For Tenure Review
4. Tenure Review
Fourth Paragraph
Page 7

“In the event of a negative decision on tenure, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedures as specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook issued March 1, 2015 (pp 48-50).”

Recommendation
The date of the current version is of the NYU Faculty Handbook is September 1, 2015 and the relevant pages are 31-32.

15. II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW
B. Procedures For Tenure Review
4. Clock Stoppage
First Paragraph
Page 7

Recommendation
The date of the current version is of the NYU Faculty Handbook is September 1, 2015 and the relevant pages are 31-32.

Tenure Clock Stoppage remains on page 47-48 in the September 1, 2015 issue of the NYU Faculty Handbook

16. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
A. Standards for Promotion
Second Paragraph
Fourth Sentence
Page 8

“Wagner recognizes the importance of public service and the potential for scholarship and research to have in an influence on public policy, management, and planning, and a candidate’s contributions in these areas may also be considered.”

This sentence is awkward.

Recommendation
Consider rephrasing as:

“As Wagner recognizes that public service and the potential for scholarship and research may
have an important influence on public policy, management, and planning, a candidate’s contributions in these areas may also be considered"

17. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
   A. Standards for Promotion
   Second Paragraph
   Fifth Sentence
   Page 8

   “There is an expectation that the candidate is fully engaged at Wagner to help build and strengthen Wagner’s academic programs and scholarly community, including significant effort in mentoring junior faculty.”

   Recommendation
   Consider rephrasing as:
   “It is expected that the candidate is fully engaged at Wagner to help build and strengthen Wagner’s academic programs and scholarly community, including significant effort in mentoring junior faculty.”

18. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
   B. Procedures for Promotion
   First Paragraph
   First Indented paragraph
   Second Sentence
   Page 9

   “By September 15th of that year, the candidate submits materials required for inclusion in the promotion docket including a CV, personal statement, and all publications, course syllabi and teaching evaluations since tenure.”

   Recommendation
   Add “was conferred” after “tenure”.

   “By September 15th of that year, the candidate submits materials required for inclusion in the promotion docket including a CV, personal statement, and all publications, course syllabi and teaching evaluations since tenure was conferred.”

19. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
   B. Procedures for Promotion
   First Paragraph
   First bullet item
   Page 9

   “Detailed description of the candidate’s scholarship and research accomplishments clearly delineating scholarship and research since tenure;”
Recommendation
Add “was conferred” after “tenure”.

“Detailed description of the candidate’s scholarship and research accomplishments clearly delineating scholarship and research since tenure was conferred;”

20. III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR
B. Procedures for Promotion
Third Paragraph
First Sentence
Page 9

“Third, if the P&T Committee (or full faculty as specified above) determines to proceed with the case and seek external review, the Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the promotion review docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report with to the full P&T Committee assessing the candidate’s scholarly work/research, teaching and service, and providing a recommendation on promotion.”

Recommendation
Delete “with” in the phrase “… prepare a report with to the full P&T Committee …”
I. INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth standards and procedures for tenure and promotion at the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service (Wagner). It is intended to support a comprehensive and fair review of candidates, while ensuring high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotion. Standards and procedures for promotion with tenure are detailed in Section II, with standards and procedures for promotion to full professor described in Section III, and for external hires with initial appointment with tenure (associate or full professor) in Section IV.

The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines\(^1\) include the following:

The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is perhaps their highest responsibility. Their review is central to the process, and it is highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor. To give weak advice to the Dean on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at a later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an abdication of responsibility…

The review for tenure and promotion will not ignore candidates’ defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and “advocacy” assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration…It is essential that tenured faculty members who participate in the promotion and tenure review process uphold high standards of responsibility and ethical behavior. Responsibility includes the obligation to give careful attention to the materials of a tenure case and to share the results of that deliberation with eligible colleagues. Ethical behavior includes a clear obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings, since confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.

Pursuant to the Wagner Governance Bylaws, an Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee) is appointed by the Dean with the advice of the Faculty Advisory Committee which is elected by the faculty. As is detailed below, in conducting promotion and tenure reviews, the P&T Committee will prepare a docket, including a report from the P&T Committee with a recommendation on promotion or tenure, which is then provided to tenured faculty of appropriate rank who make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean reviews the docket and recommendation of the faculty, and makes a recommendation to the Provost who has ultimate authority for the decision on promotion and tenure.

II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW

A. Standards for Tenure

The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines include the following general standards:

A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching in the context of a research university is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU, as is the promise of effective contributions toward the work of the individual’s department or school and the intellectual life of the University. Once these prerequisites are met, outstanding scholarship or creative work in the arts is the requirement for tenure. Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research together with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the department?...

It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case shall be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context may be a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. All these factors will be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure or promotion.

At Wagner, we recognize that both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s field may cut across several disciplines and sectors. Engagement in public

---

2 That is, associate professors and full professors for tenure cases and promotion to associate professors, and full professors for promotion cases to full professor.
service is encouraged at Wagner, and we value faculty scholarship and research that has the potential to influence public policy, management, and planning. In making appointments and decisions on promotion and tenure, Wagner will attempt to balance its collective needs and talents, and, accordingly, the weighting of these standards may differ among individual candidates.

B. Procedures For Tenure Review

1. Introduction

Non-tenured tenure track faculty include all full time Wagner faculty who are appointed for a tenure track position and are eligible for tenure status as specified in Academic Freedom and Tenure Title I, Section V (NYU Faculty Handbook issued March 1, 2015, pp. 31-34). These faculty are reappointed annually, typically with a pre-tenure probationary period as follows:

- Seven years for faculty appointed at the assistant professor level, with tenure review conducted in year six;
- Five years for faculty appointed at the associate professor level, with tenure review conducted in year four; or
- Four years for faculty appointed at the assistant or associate level following “a term of more than three years i.e., not less than seven semesters of full-time teaching in one or more institutions of higher education other than New York University in the ranks or ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor,” with tenure review conducted in year three.

All non-tenured tenure track faculty are reviewed annually during their probationary period by the P&T Committee (or a subcommittee thereof) to assess performance at Wagner and progress toward tenure, and to make a recommendation to the Dean on reappointment. A special, more intensive, review is conducted in the third year for faculty with a seven-year probationary period, the second year for faculty with a five-year probationary period, and early in the second year for faculty with a four-year probationary period. Reviews are typically conducted in the spring of the academic year, except for the tenure review which commences in the fall of the penultimate year of the probationary period. These annual reviews leading up to tenure review are intended as a mentoring process to help guide the candidate in development of his/her academic career and to prepare the candidate for tenure review. The reviews are also intended to advise the candidate on adequacy of progress towards tenure, with a goal providing early notice to the candidate if tenure appears unlikely.

2. Annual Reviews

Each year, a subcommittee will be appointed to conduct the review and make
recommendations to the full Promotion and Tenure Committee. The subcommittee will include one tenured faculty member who will serve as chair on all subsequent reviews of said junior faculty member during his or her probationary period (except when on sabbatical or on leave). In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty\(^3\), the subcommittee chair shall be a faculty member with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty.\(^4\) The candidate shall submit a CV and a memo for discussion with the subcommittee that includes a description of:

- Scholarship/research to date (attaching publications/manuscripts under review from the current year) and a description of future plans including:
  - A description of the candidate’s field(s) of interest for scholarship and research;
  - A listing of leading scholars/researchers in the field(s) of interest; and
  - A listing of journals targeted for current and future publication;
- Teaching activity at Wagner, with course syllabi and student evaluations attached;
- Service at Wagner, at NYU, in his/her scholarly field(s) of interest, and to the public; and

For candidates with a seven or five year probationary period, the review in the first year is primarily intended to familiarize the candidate with the tenure review process and to help focus future reviews. In subsequent years, except for the intensive review and tenure review described below, an annual review will be conducted by a subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee. The goal is to provide guidance to the candidate in his/her academic career and to monitor continuing progress towards tenure.

The review process typically involves one or more meetings of the candidate with the subcommittee, and the subcommittee makes a written report to the full P&T Committee characterizing its findings, including a recommendation on reappointment. The candidate receives the subcommittee report to provide a sense of the faculty in regard to the candidate’s progress toward tenure.\(^5\) The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. A brief report summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and progress toward tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is forwarded to the Dean. The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean.

---

\(^3\)A “primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty,” as such term is used herein, is a distinction that is made at hire or at some later point by agreement with the Dean.

\(^4\)This document contains special provisions for the Master of Urban Planning program to comply with accreditation standards of the Planning Accreditation Board.

\(^5\)In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, if the subcommittee does not recommend reappointment, the matter shall first be referred to the Urban Planning Program for consideration by Urban Planning faculty members of appropriate rank, who shall make a recommendation to the full P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall consider, but not be bound by, the recommendation of the Urban Planning faculty.
acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns identified in the report.

3. Intensive Review

A special, more intensive, review is conducted in the third year for faculty with a seven-year probationary period, in the second year for faculty with a five-year probationary period, and in the first year for faculty with a four-year probationary period. The goal of the review is to assess whether the candidate’s progress toward tenure is satisfactory. The candidate’s field(s) of scholarship/research are expected to be well defined, publications to date and in progress strong, teaching and service at Wagner/NYU satisfactory, and any potential influence on public policy, management, and planning described.

The candidate will submit an updated CV and personal statement for discussion with the subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee and meet with the subcommittee. The subcommittee will submit a written report to the full P&T Committee assessing progress to date and likelihood of the candidate achieving tenure status, including a recommendation on reappointment. The candidate receives the subcommittee report to provide a sense of the faculty in regard to the candidate’s progress toward tenure. Where there are significant uncertainties or deficiencies, the report should include specific actions recommended by the subcommittee. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. A brief memo summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and progress towards tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is forwarded to the Dean. The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns raised in the report.

4. Tenure Review

The process of reviewing candidates requesting consideration for tenure by the P&T Committee in the penultimate probationary year involves six steps:

First, the candidate submits by September 15th of penultimate probationary year materials required for inclusion in the tenure docket including a CV, personal statement, all publications, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations for all NYU courses. The personal

6 In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, if significant uncertainties or deficiencies are noted or if the subcommittee does not recommend reappointment, the matter shall first be referred to Urban Planning faculty members of appropriate rank, who shall make a recommendation to the full P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall review and consider, but not be bound by, any recommendation of Urban Planning faculty.
statement should include:

- Detailed description of the candidate’s scholarship and research accomplishments;
- Summary of teaching activity at Wagner and student evaluations;
- Description of service at Wagner, NYU, his/her scholarly field(s) of interest, and the public; and
- Any evidence of potential influence on public policy, management, and planning.

Second, the P&T Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the tenure review docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report to the full P&T Committee assessing the candidate’s scholarly work/research, teaching, and service, and providing a recommendation on tenure. The subcommittee shall include at least three tenured Wagner faculty members of appropriate rank (i.e., associate professors and full professors). The subcommittee may also include one non-voting NYU faculty member of appropriate rank with a tenured appointment in a unit outside of Wagner and having substantive expertise in the candidate’s field of study. Where feasible, subcommittee members will not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.

The tenure docket prepared by the subcommittee should include:

- The materials submitted by the candidate as described above;
- Letters from the director of the candidate’s program and specialization at Wagner assessing the candidate’s teaching and service engagement;
- Letters from at least five external reviewers as described below;
- The subcommittee report;
- Such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate.

The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide that:

External letters shall be from evaluators who are not scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associates. Nor shall they be scholars that have been suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators. If the Department inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate, this must be noted in the departmental report. The Department may also choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the docket. The University’s policy regarding the confidentiality of such external letters and other tenure decision materials is found in Section C of the statement on Legal

---

7In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, the subcommittee shall be chaired by a faculty member with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty and the majority of its voting members shall be Urban Planning faculty members.

8Co-authors will be acceptable reviewers only in certain fields, such as fields with very small membership or fields in which papers typically have a large number of authors (i.e. multicenter clinical trials; large epidemiology studies, etc.), and then only acceptable with permission of the Dean.
Protection for Faculty Members in the Faculty Handbook.

At Wagner, external evaluators generally will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, and will be recognized leaders in the candidate's field. Evaluators should be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations.

The letter of solicitation for external evaluation should come from the subcommittee chair of the Wagner School, and should follow the prototype attached Appendix A. The letter should explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate’s peers, and it should not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators should be preserved; only eligible voters (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner) may be allowed access to the letters. Neither the names of writers, nor the content of the letters may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond faculty eligible to vote (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner), not even in summary form. In all communications with them, external reviewers must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, to the extent allowed by law, and that they will be seen only by faculty members entitled to vote, the Dean, and the Provost's Office.

The report of the subcommittee should include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined. All communications with potential evaluators should be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written should be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for any declinations.

The report of the subcommittee should provide a detailed summary and assessment of the candidate’s scholarship/research, teaching, service, and actual and/or potential public policy, management, and planning engagement and impact. The report should not be an advocacy document, but should strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The report will generally include an explicit recommendation on whether tenure should be granted, with a detailed rationale for the recommendation. The vote by the subcommittee on any recommendation for tenure shall be by closed ballot, with a tally of the vote included in its report.

Third, the report of the subcommittee will then be reviewed by the full P&T Committee. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether tenure should be granted shall be by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. A report from the full P&T Committee (generally an amended version of the subcommittee report incorporating any discussion or additional views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the vote of the full committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket will be made available to all

---

9In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, the subcommittee report shall first be reviewed by the Urban Planning faculty of appropriate rank, and a recommendation made to the full P&T Committee on tenure. The P&T Committee shall review, but not be bound by, any recommendation of Urban Planning faculty.
Fourth, the chair of the P&T Committee will present the case to tenured faculty of appropriate rank at a meeting with due notice as provided in the Wagner Governance Bylaws. After a discussion, a vote will be taken and tallied. The vote shall be by closed ballot, and only those present in person or by means of conference telephone or similar communications are entitled to vote on tenure. A tally of the number of absent members should be recorded and reported separately. The Chair of the P&T Committee shall transmit the tally of the vote and a summary of the discussion to the Dean and shall notify the candidate of the faculty’s decision. Reasonable doubt for granting tenure precludes a favorable recommendation. If a reasonable doubt exists, the Chair of the P&T Committee shall indicate as much to the Dean in the Chair’s report to the Dean. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.

Fifth, the Dean will review the docket and report from the P&T Chair and transmit the docket and recommendation on tenure to the Provost. The Dean may also solicit additional external reviews. The Dean will inform the full faculty entitled to vote on tenure of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of submission. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the faculty, the Dean will provide the faculty entitled to vote on tenure with a statement of the reasons. The faculty will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the full faculty eligible to vote on tenure and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

In the event of a negative decision on tenure, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedures as specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook issued March 1, 2015 (pp 48-50).

Any time prior to the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost, an untenured faculty member may voluntarily withdraw his/her candidacy for tenure. However, such faculty member shall not be eligible for a full-time appointment or position at NYU any time beyond his/her probationary period, as provided in Title I, Section V, Paragraph 3 of the Statement in Regard to Academic Freedom and Tenure.

5. Tenure Clock Stoppage

Pursuant to the guidelines provided in the NYU Faculty Handbook issued March 1, 2015, tenure clock stoppage may be granted for a maximum of two semesters during the probationary period for any one of, or combination of, the stipulated personal reasons (pp. 47-48). In other cases, as further stated in the NYU Faculty Handbook, a request for tenure clock stoppage will require advance approval by the Dean and the Office of the Provost.
6. Early Tenure Review

Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure are considered extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution to propose candidates for tenure ahead of schedule. The Dean must be consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. It must be noted that external letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

A. Standards for Promotion

The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines include the following general standards for promotion to full professor:

The inquiry for such cases is essentially the same as for a tenure candidate: Is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in her/his field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers at other comparable prominent institutions or in other relevant settings? In addition, there is a presumption that the candidate will have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be work that marks significant new scholarly research since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which scholarly work and publications distinguish the candidate’s achievements since awarding tenure.

In applying these standards, Wagner values both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s “field” may cut across several disciplines and sectors. The standards of “excellence and effectiveness in teaching” and “effective contributions toward the work of the individual’s department or school and the intellectual life of the University” cited in the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for tenure are also applied when promotion is considered. Wagner recognizes the importance of public service and the potential for scholarship and research to have an influence on public policy, management, and planning, and a candidate’s contributions in these areas may also be considered. There is an expectation that the candidate is fully engaged at Wagner to help build and strengthen Wagner’s academic programs and scholarly community, including significant effort in mentoring junior faculty.

B. Procedures for Promotion
The P&T Committee shall assume the same role as with tenure review, except that only full professors shall participate in the process. The process largely parallels that for tenure review and involves six steps:

First, the candidate notifies the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Dean by May 15th of the intent to seek promotion during the following academic year. By September 15th of that year, the candidate submits materials required for inclusion in the promotion docket including a CV, personal statement, and all publications, course syllabi and teaching evaluations since tenure. The personal statement should include:

- Detailed description of the candidate’s scholarship and research accomplishments clearly delineating scholarship and research since tenure;
- Summary of teaching activity at Wagner and student evaluations;
- Description of service at Wagner, NYU, his/her scholarly field(s) of interest, and the public; and
- Evidence of engagement and potential impact on public policy, management, and planning.

Second, the P&T Committee members of appropriate rank will meet to review the promotion docket to make a determination on whether to proceed with the case and seek external review of the candidate. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether to seek external review shall be conducted by closed ballot. If the decision is not to proceed with external review, the Committee will notify the candidate and prepare a report documenting the rationale for its decision which will be provided to the Dean.

Third, if the P&T Committee (or full faculty as specified above) determines to proceed with the case and seek external review, the Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the promotion review docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report with to the full P&T Committee assessing the candidate’s scholarly work/research, teaching and service, and providing a recommendation on promotion. The subcommittee shall include at least three Wagner faculty members with full professor rank. Where feasible, subcommittee members will not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as co-author or other close associate.

The promotion docket prepared by the subcommittee should include:

- The materials submitted by the candidate as described above;
- Letters from the director of the candidate’s program and specialization at Wagner assessing the candidates teaching and service engagement;

---

10 In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, the decision to seek outside review shall first be considered by the Urban Planning faculty of appropriate rank and a recommendation made to the P&T committee. The P&T Committee shall consider, but not be bound by, the recommendation of the Urban Planning faculty.

11 In the case of an Urban Planning candidate, the subcommittee shall be chaired by an Urban Planning faculty member and the majority of its members shall be Urban Planning faculty members.
• Letters from at least five external reviewers as specified in Section II for tenure review;
• The subcommittee report;
• Such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate.

Letters from outside evaluators shall be obtained in a manner and according to the process described above for tenure review. The report of the subcommittee should include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined. All communications with potential evaluators should be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written should be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for any declinations.

The report of the subcommittee should provide a detailed summary and assessment of the candidate’s scholarship/research, teaching, service, and public service engagement/impact. The report should not be an advocacy document, but should strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The report will generally include an explicit recommendation on whether promotion should be granted, with a detailed rationale for the recommendation. The vote by the subcommittee on any recommendation for promotion shall be by closed ballot.

Fourth, the report of subcommittee will then be reviewed by P&T Committee members of appropriate rank. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether promotion should be granted shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. A report from the full Committee (generally an amended version of the subcommittee report incorporating any discussion or additional views from the full Committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket shall be made available to all Wagner faculty of appropriate rank.

Fifth, the chair of the P&T Committee will present the case to the faculty of appropriate rank at a meeting with due notice as provided in the Wagner Governance Bylaws. After a discussion, a vote will be taken and tallied. The vote shall be by closed ballot, and only those present in person or by means of conference telephone or similar communications equipment (provided that all persons participating in the meeting can hear each other) are entitled to vote on promotion. A tally of the number of absent members should be recorded and reported separately. The Chair of the P&T Committee shall transmit the tally of the vote and a summary of the discussion to the Dean and shall notify the candidate of the faculty’s decision. Reasonable doubt for granting promotion precludes a favorable recommendation. If a reasonable doubt exists, the Chair of the P&T Committee shall indicate as much to the Dean in the Chair’s report to the Dean. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.

\[12\text{In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, the subcommittee report shall first be reviewed by Urban Planning faculty of appropriate rank, and a recommendation made to the full P&T Committee on promotion. The P&T Committee shall review, but not be bound by, any recommendation of the Urban Planning faculty.}\]
Sixth, the Dean will review the docket and report from the P&T Chair and transmit the docket and a recommendation on promotion to the Provost. The Dean may also solicit additional external reviews. The Dean will inform full faculty entitled to vote on promotion of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of submission. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the faculty, the Dean will provide the faculty entitled to vote on promotion with a written statement of the reasons. The faculty will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the full faculty entitled to vote on promotion and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

In the event of a negative decision on promotion, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedures specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook issued March 1, 2015 (pp. 48-50).

Any time prior to the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost, the candidate may voluntarily withdraw his/her candidacy for promotion from Associate to full Professor.

IV. INITIAL APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE

In the case of initial appointment of a faculty member with tenure as an associate or full professor, the P&T Committee may conduct the review on an expedited basis in a manner consistent with the process and intent of the guidelines and procedures set forth above. The docket and committee report shall be presented at a meeting of the full faculty entitled to vote and the process for faculty vote and review by the Dean shall be conducted as provided above and in a manner consistent with Wagner Governance Bylaws.
APPENDIX: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS

TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

Dear xxxx:

Josephine Smith, currently an Assistant Professor in the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, is being considered for tenure and promotion. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of her published and unpublished research.

I am enclosing Professor Smith's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies and/or descriptions of her work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor Smith's work with respect to scholarly research, originality, scope, and significance. We also request an explicit comparison of her work with the following individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers: Scholar 1 (University 1), Scholar 2 (University 2), and Scholar 3 (University 3) Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor Smith's teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor Smith would be considered a strong candidate for promotion and tenure in other leading departments or schools in the field. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure at Wagner is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the School? Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s “field” may cut across several disciplines and sectors.

We would like your letter within _____ weeks, sooner if possible. The University's promotion procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current curriculum vitae. Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the tenured professors of the School, and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University, to the extent allowed by law.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely,
SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER, EXTERNAL SENIOR APPOINTMENT

Dear xxxx:

Professor X of the University West at East is being considered for a tenured appointment at the rank of full professor at the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research.

I am enclosing Professor X's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies or descriptions of his/her work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor X's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, scope, and significance. We also request an explicit comparison of her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor X's teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your comments on these matters as well. Please indicate in your letter how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor X would be considered a strong candidate for appointment as a full professor in other leading departments and schools in the field. The process of evaluating a candidate for appointment at Wagner is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the School? Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s “field” may cut across several disciplines and sectors.

We would like your letter within _____ weeks, sooner if possible. The University's promotion and tenure procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current curriculum vitae.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the full professors [and associate professors if hiring is at the associate level] of the School, and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University, to the extent allowed by law.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely,
Greetings:

Am I correct that this goes to the Governance Committee?

Best,
Allen

--------- Forwarded message ---------

From: Carol Klaperman Morrow <ckm1@nyu.edu>
Date: Mon, Jan 4, 2016 at 12:00 PM
Subject: Faculty Handbook, January 2016 Edition
To: Allen Mincer <allen.mincer@nyu.edu>, Fred Carl <fc11@nyu.edu>
Cc: Pietrina Scaraglino <pietrina.scaraglino@nyu.edu>, David McLaughlin <david.mclaughlin@nyu.edu>

Dear Allen, Fred,

As you know, the University Trustees approved amendments to the University Bylaws on December 9, 2015, effective as of that date. The amended Bylaws, which you have already received from the Office of the Secretary, are available here: http://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president/general-counsel/office-of-the-secretary.html. Amendments to Bylaws that are cited in the Faculty Handbook memorialize the new names of the Tandon School of Engineering, the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty and the Full-time Continuing Contract Faculty Council; and add the Deans of the Faculty of Health, College of Global Public Health, and the College of Nursing to the Deans Council.

The Faculty Handbook has been updated to incorporate the amended Bylaws. In accordance with the Principles of Shared Governance, I am attaching for your input a redlined copy and a clean copy of the updated Handbook.

Please note that additional substantive amendments to the Handbook were made at this time: At the request of the FSCs and the Faculty Committee on the Global Network, two new sections are added on “The Global Network” and “Faculty Appointments in More than One Unit.” The proposed text is presently under review by the FSC governance and GNU committees and by the Faculty Committee on the Global Network. Additional amendments were made to reflect the Presidential transition.

Please review these documents and provide your input, coordinating C- FSC and T-FSC input if possible.

List of Amendments to the Faculty Handbook (with page references to the redlined copy)

I. Amendments that update the name of the Tandon School of Engineering
II. Amendments that update the name of the Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty and the Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council

- Faculty Handbook, List of Contents, The Faculty.
- Bylaw 61, The University Senate, Members as cited in Handbook, The University Senate. Page 8, 9
- Bylaw 66, The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council, as cited in Handbook, University Councils and Committees. Page 9, 10
- Faculty Handbook, Principles of Shared Governance. Page 10, 11
- Bylaw 70, Graduate Program Committee, as cited in Handbook. Page 12
- Bylaw 71, Undergraduate Program Committee, as cited in Handbook, Page 13
- Bylaw 82, Faculty Membership, as cited in Handbook, The Faculty, Faculty Membership, Faculty Meetings, and Faculty Titles. Page 16, 17
- Bylaw 83, Number of Faculty Meetings, as cited in Handbook, Faculty Meetings. Page 17
- Bylaw 86, Tenure Track Faculty, as cited in Handbook, Faculty Titles. Page 17, 18
- Bylaw 87, Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, as cited in Handbook, Faculty Titles. Page 19
- Bylaw 88 Other Faculty, as cited in Handbook, Faculty Titles. Page 20
- Bylaws 87,88, and 89 NonTenure Positions as cited in Handbook Non-Tenure Positions. Page 20
- Faculty Handbook (section heading), Faculty Policies Applicable to All or Most Members of the Faculty Including Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty, Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, and Other Faculty. Page 22
- Faculty Handbook, Restriction on Outside Employment. Page 24
- Bylaw 81c, Degrees, Degree Programs by Faculty as cited in Handbook, Limitation on Degree Candidacy. Page 25
III. Amendments to the Handbook to add two new sections

- The Global Network. Page 15
- Faculty Appointments in More than One Unit. Page 30

IV. Amendments to the Handbook with respect to the presidential transition

- Deleted, Letter from the President, to be updated in time as appropriate. Page i
- A Brief History of NYU, amended to reference appointment of President Hamilton. Page 3

V. Amendment to incorporate by link the Sexual Misconduct, Relationship Violence and Stalking Policy

- In Summer 2015, the FSCs asked that the Policy be incorporated in the Handbook and added to the list of Selected University Policies, Selected Policies Concerning the Protection of Rights and Other Matters, found on the final page of the Handbook, as well as in the Table of Contents. As you may recall, when the current September 2015 edition of the Handbook was being prepared, the Policy was still being finalized to comply with New York State legislation.

VI. Archives of the Faculty Handbook

In accordance with our protocol, when the January 2016 Handbook is finalized and posted, the Handbook Archives (which you can see at http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook.html) will be updated:

- The September 2015 Handbook will be posted in Archive of Faculty Handbooks.
- A redlined version of the September 2015 Handbook (with the amended text constituting the January 2016 Handbook) will be posted in Archive of Amendments to the Text of the Faculty Handbook.
- A redlined version of the Interim University Guidelines for Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty Appointments (amended only to incorporate the new name of the faculty) has been posted in Archive of Amendments to University Policies Accessed from Links in the Faculty Handbook.
I look forward to hearing from you,

Carol

Carol Klaperman Morrow, Ph.D.
Senior Associate Provost
Chief of Staff to the Provost
New York University

P:  (212) 998-4798
F:  (212) 995-4552

NOTICE: This e-mail (including any attachments) is intended solely for the designated recipient(s) and may contain privileged, proprietary, confidential or otherwise private information. Unauthorized use, copying, disclosure or distribution of this e-mail, in whole or in part, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete the original (including any attachments). Thank you.

--
**********************
Allen I. Mincer
Department of Physics
New York University
4 Washington Place
New York, NY 10003

Tel: 212-998-7707
Fax: 212-995-4016
**********************
APPLICATION OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES The University statement on Developing University Policies provides: “University policies articulate the values and principles the University upholds and the obligations imposed on members of the University Community. Thus, University policies apply in connection with the operations and activities of the University regardless of location. As a Global Network University that operates in an expanding international environment, the University will encounter varying laws and business practices as it conducts its affairs outside the United States. To the extent that a University policy or a provision of a policy conflicts with the laws in another country, the University seeks to comply with the laws of the jurisdiction in connection with its operations and activities in that jurisdiction. However, differences between University policy and foreign laws may not be self-evident and can be complex. Therefore, whenever there is a question regarding the University’s legal responsibilities at locations outside the United States, the University’s Office of General Counsel must be consulted to evaluate the University policy in the context of foreign laws and to advise on the appropriate course of action.” The statement also provides that, “Schools, colleges, institutes, operating units, Global Network University sites, and University Affiliates are encouraged to use the standard policy format to help ensure uniformity of form and appearance for policies and procedures throughout the University. Their policies or procedures may not be contrary to University policies in language, purpose, intent or application. Any such policy that is contrary to University policies is void and will not be enforced unless approved in advance by the University President or his/her designee.”

NEW The Global Network, to be added as a final new paragraph section under the listing THE UNIVERSITY, ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION which you can see here: http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-university/organization-and-administration.html

The Global Network.

New York University, which is primarily located in downtown Manhattan and Brooklyn in New York City, encompasses a global network (New York University, the largest independent research university in the United States, is primarily located in the heart of downtown Manhattan and Brooklyn. Beyond our campus in New York City lies a world opportunity within NYU’s global network. With NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai, our new degree-granting campuses, as well as 11 international academic centers in Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and South America, NYU offers global experiences to all members of its community.

NYU has embarked on the project of becoming a Global Network University, a university that challenges the idea that a university can only deliver education at a single home campus. Instead, we have created a structure that allows students and faculty to gather in a set of key locales around the globe to forge new ideas, advance the questions we ask about the world, and create solutions for the problems that beset us all.

This Global Network University model has emerged as a natural and logical extension of NYU’s research and teaching agendas; flowing from our eco-systemic relation to New York City, the diversity of thought represented by all of our schools, colleges, and programs—and our internationally connected and collaborative faculty. Students and faculty interact with their urban environment in countless meaningful and essential ways, using these locations as a major asset.

Students and faculty alike broaden the scope of vision and knowledge through international learning. Opportunities include study abroad programs, direct-exchange programs with world-renowned institutions, and curriculum-driven international programming offered through the specific schools or departments. All locations within the network are also accessible for individual research that springs from individual academic ideas and goals.

Access to the World
NYU has never thought of itself as a gated community. It has always encouraged its students to think of themselves as participants in and shapers of a complex and changing environment. Indeed, part of NYU’s teaching mission consists in preparing students for lives in a diverse world, and faculty at NYU believe that such preparation is most effective when the outside world is not held at bay. This same principle holds true as we create a Global Network University that is both “in and of the city” and “in and of the world.”

Our locations beyond our campus in New York City include NYU Abu Dhabi, NYU Shanghai, and 10 academic sites in Accra, Ghana; Berlin, Germany; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Florence, Italy; London, England; Madrid, Spain; Paris, France; Prague, the Czech Republic; Shanghai, China; Tel Aviv, Israel; and Washington, DC.

Direct exchange programs with 12 distinguished partner institutions, 27 summer session locations, an ever-changing roster of intersession programming offered by NYU’s various schools, colleges, and programs, and curriculum-driven initiatives expand the global network—from Beijing to Johannesburg, Santiago to Vienna.

Around the world, students work closely with faculty and with their peers on shared commitments. They apply what they learn and develop the skills and qualities—that both needed and expected in this increasingly integrated, global climate—to make a real difference in the world.

THE FACULTY, FACULTY POLICIES APPLICABLE TO ALL OR MOST MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY, INCLUDING TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, FULL-TIME CONTINUING CONTRACT FACULTY, AND OTHER FACULTY which you can see here:  http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/other-faculty-policies.html

Faculty Appointments in More than One Unit

Faculty appointments in more than one school (cross-appointments) may be made in one of three University approved categories, Joint, Associated, and Affiliated, which carry designated rights, privileges, and responsibilities. Terms of appointment, including recruitment and review for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, are governed by University policies and school procedures. Cross-appointments between the University’s global network of degree-granting campuses in New York, Abu Dhabi, and Shanghai use the Global Network Professor title,

(GLOBAL NETWORK PROFESSOR TITLES FACT SHEET AND GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSING

I. Eligibility The Global Network Professor title:

i.  Is conferred upon all full-time tenured/tenure track faculty, Arts Professors, and Music Professors at NYUAD and NYUSH by a New York department and school;

ii. May be conferred upon other select full-time non-tenure track/contract faculty at NYUAD and NYUSH upon recommendation of the provost of NYUAD and/or NYUSH and with consent of a New York school and department;
iii. May be offered to select tenured/tenure-track faculty members, Arts Professors, and Music Professors at NYU New York who have deep sustained and continuing commitments at NYUAD and/or NYUSH as 'affiliated faculty' upon initial recommendation of the provost at NYUAD and/or NYUSH, with agreement of the school/department in New York, and at the consent of the individual faculty member;

iv. For the New York-based faculty, the title of Global Network Professor will typically be for the duration of the professor's appointment at NYU. For the Abu Dhabi or Shanghai-based faculty, the title of Global Network Professor will typically be for the duration of the professor's teaching assignment at that campus; under rare circumstances the title may be revoked upon the request of the faculty member or by NYUAD and/or NYUSH and/or NYU New York;

v. May be held concurrently with additional Associated or Affiliated appointments across the global network.

II. Format The Global Network Professor title:
  i. Is conferred as an additional secondary title;
  ii. Has Assistant/Associate/Full Professor ranks, matching the rank of the home unit;
  iii. Designates the campus and may designate the discipline; and
  iv. Is listed in websites and catalogues of both campuses.

III. Examples of Titles
  • For NYUAD-based faculty: Assistant Professor of Biology, NYU Abu Dhabi;  
  1Issued August 10, 2015 Network Assistant Professor of Biology, Faculty of Arts and Science, NYU.
  • For NYUNY-based faculty: Professor of Cinema Studies, Tisch School of the Arts, NYU; Global Network Professor of Cinema Studies, NYU Abu Dhabi.
  • For NYUNY-based faculty: Professor of History and French, Faculty of Arts and Science, NYU; Global Network Professor of History, NYU Shanghai.

IV. Rights, Duties, and Privileges For a Global Network Professor title conferred upon a faculty member at NYUSH and/or NYUAD by a unit in New York:
  i. The probationary timetable of the tenure track professor is the timetable of the home unit – NYUAD or NYUSH.
  iii. The Global Network Professor is eligible to teach and mentor graduate students in the New York unit.
  iv. The Global Network Professor participates in faculty governance in the home campus only (at NYUAD or NYUSH) and has no rights or obligations with respect to tenure or governance in New York.
  v. For a Global Network Professor title conferred upon a New York faculty member by NYUAD and/or NYUSH:
    i. The Global Network Professor is typically an affiliated faculty
member at NYUAD and/or NYUSH with teaching responsibilities.

ii. Global Network Professors are eligible to participate in the faculty governance of NYUAD and/or NYUSH in accordance with the eligibility provisions of each respective campus, but are only eligible to represent their home school in the University Senate, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The Cross Appointments chart summarizes the rights, duties, and privileges associated with the Global Network Professor title, as compared with traditional cross appointments at NYU.

V. Coordinated Appointment, Third Year, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review

NYUNY units that confer Global Network Faculty status participate in the appointment, third year, tenure, and promotion review of the tenured/tenure track faculty and the appointment, reappointment and promotion review of Arts and Music Professors, as described in the Provost’s memo regarding Both/And Decision Making in Searching for, Hiring, and Tenuring Faculty at NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai), consistent with existing procedures in the schools and campuses for cross appointments, and in accordance with the New York department’s policies.

NYUAD and NYUSH do not participate in reappointment, promotion, tenure, or salary review of the New York-based Global Network Professor.

(A full statement about coordinated appointments across the global network may be viewed at Faculty in the Global Network. Issued August 10, 2015 2)

which is conferred as an additional secondary title upon eligible faculty based in NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai, and may be conferred upon eligible faculty based in New York.

(c) Division of Libraries. The University also comprises the Division of the Libraries which performs academic functions across school lines and is governed by its faculty and officers in accordance with procedures defined and approved by the President and Chancellor.
August 10, 2015

Memorandum to: Vice Chancellors and Provosts, NYU Abu Dhabi, NYU Shanghai
Deans and Directors, NYU New York

From: David W. McLaughlin, Provost

Subject: Global Network Professor Title

As you know, connectivity across the global network is an essential component of the academic development of NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai. Toward that end, we have insisted that all tenured/tenure track faculty, Arts Professors, and Music Professors hired at NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai must have an affiliation with a unit in New York that grants them eligibility to teach and mentor graduate students in the New York unit. In addition, we have an established process by which full-time NYU faculty in New York participate in Abu Dhabi and Shanghai as Affiliated Faculty.

At this time, acting upon your authorization, the University is introducing a new faculty title - Global Network Professor - that clearly identifies full-time members of a faculty at one campus as participants in the research and teaching activities at a second campus, and clarifies their roles and responsibilities. The title was first proposed by the Faculty Advisory Committee on NYU’s Global Network in its June 2014 report. In December 2014, the proposal for the Global Network Professor title was presented to the Deans by Committee co-Chairs, Professors Una Chaudhuri and Eliot Borenstein, together with Professor Awam Amkpa, co-Chair of the T-FSC Global Network University Committee (jointly convened with the C-FSC). In May 2015, at University Common Days, the leadership of NYUAD and NYUSH and the New York Deans and Directors enthusiastically authorized the new title.

Effective September 1, 2015, Global Network Professor will be conferred as an additional title upon all full-time tenured/tenure track faculty, Arts Professors, and Music Professors at NYUAD and NYUSH. This title may also be offered to other select full-time non-tenure track/contract faculty at NYUAD and NYUSH upon the recommendation of the provost of the particular campus and with the consent of the New York school and department. The New York unit that confers the title thereby confers eligibility on NYUAD and NYUSH faculty to teach and mentor graduate students in New York, with the New York department making specific assignments in accordance with its own policies. The New York unit participates in the appointment, third-year, tenure, and promotion review of the tenured/tenure track faculty member (for Arts and Music professors, appointment, reappointment and promotion review) at their home campus. The title does not confer rights or obligations, either upon the faculty member or the New York unit, with respect to tenure or department governance in the New York unit.
Global Network Professor may also be offered as an additional title to select tenured tenure track faculty members, Arts Professors, and Music Professors based in New York who have deep sustained and continuing commitments at NYUAD and/or NYUSH as “affiliated faculty.” The recommendation to confer the title is initiated by the provost at NYUAD and/or NYUSH, must be endorsed by the school/department in New York, and is conferred at the consent of the individual faculty member. New York-based Global Network Professors are eligible to participate in the faculty governance of NYUAD and/or NYUSH in accordance with the eligibility provisions of each respective campus. NYUAD and NYUSH are not involved in promotion, reappointment, and tenure review processes of these faculty members in their NYU home campus.

The Global Network Professor title can be held concurrently with Joint, Associated, and Affiliated appointments in additional departments across the global network.

The Global Network Professor title, including provisions with respect to eligibility, terms of service, responsibilities and privileges, will be re-assessed by the Office of the Provost in Fall 2017.

More detail about the title and the administrative procedures for rolling out the new faculty title are outlined in the following pages. Please feel free to seek assistance and consult Carol Morrow, Senior Associate Provost and Peter Gonzalez, Assistant Provost for Academic Appointments.

Cc: Deputy Provost Katherine Fleming
    Linda Mills, Vice Chancellor for Global Programs and University Life
    Senior Associate Provost Carol Morrow
    Assistant Provost Peter Gonzalez
    (Senior) Vice Provosts
    School Deans/Directors of Faculty Appointments
    Professor Una Chaudhuri, Co-Chair, Faculty Committee on NYU’s Global Network
    Professor Eliot Borenstein, Co-Chair, Faculty Committee on NYU’s Global Network
    Professor Awam Ampkpa, Co-Chair, T-FSC Global Network University Committee
    Professor Arvind Rajagopal, Co-Chair, T-FSC Global Network University Committee
    Professor Allen Mincer, Chair, T-FSC
    Professor Fred Carl, Chair, C-FSC

Attachments:
Global Network Professor Titles: Fact Sheet and Guidelines for Administrative Processing
Appendix A: Summary of Cross Appointments at NYU
Appendix B: Request for Global Network Professor Title
GLOBAL NETWORK PROFESSOR TITLES

FACT SHEET AND GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSING

I. Eligibility

The Global Network Professor title:

i. Is conferred upon all full-time tenured/tenure track faculty, Arts Professors, and Music Professors at NYUAD and NYUSH by a New York school and department;

ii. May be conferred upon other select full-time non-tenure track/contract faculty at NYUAD and NYUSH upon recommendation of the provost of NYUAD and/or NYUSH and with consent of a New York school and department;

iii. May be offered to select tenured/tenure track faculty members, Arts Professors, and Music Professors at NYU New York who have deep sustained and continuing commitments at NYUAD and/or NYUSH as 'affiliated faculty' upon initial recommendation of the provost at NYUAD and/or NYUSH, with agreement of the school/department in New York, and at the consent of the individual faculty member;

iv. For the New York-based faculty, the title of Global Network Professor will typically be for the duration of the professor’s appointment at NYU. For the Abu Dhabi and Shanghai-based faculty, the title of Global Network Professor will typically be for the duration of the professor’s teaching assignment at that campus. Under rare circumstances the title may be revoked upon the request of the faculty member or by NYUAD and/or NYUSH and/or NYU New York;

v. May be held concurrently with additional Joint, Associated, or Affiliated appointments across the global network.

II. Format

The Global Network Professor title:

i. Is conferred as an additional secondary title;

ii. Has Assistant/Associate/Full Professor ranks, matching the rank of the home unit;

iii. Designates the campus and may designate the discipline; and

iv. Is listed in websites and catalogues of both campuses.

III. Examples of Titles

- For NYUAD-based faculty: Assistant Professor of Biology, NYU Abu Dhabi; Global Network Assistant Professor of Biology, Faculty of Arts and Science, NYU.
- For NYUNY-based faculty: Professor of Cinema Studies, Tisch School of the Arts, NYU; Global Network Professor of Cinema Studies, NYU Abu Dhabi.
- For NYUNY-based faculty: Professor of History and French, Faculty of Arts and Science, NYU; Global Network Professor of History, NYU Shanghai.
IV. Rights, Duties, and Privileges

For a Global Network Professor title conferred upon a faculty member at NYUSH and/or NYUAD by a unit in New York:

i. The probationary timetable of the tenure track professor is the timetable of the home unit – NYUAD or NYUSH.

ii. The Global Network Professor is eligible to teach and mentor graduate students in the New York unit.

iii. The Global Network Professor participates in faculty governance in the home campus only (at NYUAD or NYUSH) and has no rights or obligations with respect to tenure or governance in New York.

For a Global Network Professor title conferred upon a New York faculty member by NYUAD and/or NYUSH:

i. The Global Network Professor is typically an affiliated faculty member at NYUAD and/or NYUSH with teaching responsibilities.

ii. Global Network Professors are eligible to participate in the faculty governance of NYUAD and/or NYUSH in accordance with the eligibility provisions of each respective campus, but are only eligible to represent their home school in the University Senate, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

The chart attached as Appendix A to this document summarizes the rights, duties, and privileges associated with the Global Network Professor title, as compared with traditional cross appointments at NYU.

V. Coordinated Appointment, Third Year, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review

NYUNY units that confer Global Network Faculty status participate in the appointment, third-year, tenure, and promotion review of the tenured/tenure track faculty and the appointment, reappointment and promotion review of Arts and Music Professors, as described in the Provost’s memo regarding Both/And Decision Making in Searching for, Hiring, and Tenuring Faculty at NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai, consistent with existing procedures in the schools and campuses for cross appointments, and in accordance with the New York department’s policies.

NYUAD and NYUSH do not participate in reappointment, promotion, tenure, or salary review of the New York-based Global Network Professor.

A full statement about coordinated appointments across the global network may be viewed at Faculty in the Global Network.

VI. Appointment Procedures

All faculty titles at NYU New York, Abu Dhabi, and Shanghai campuses are officially processed through the NYU Office of Academic Appointments (OAA).
For NYUAD and NYUSH faculty receiving the Global Network Professor title:

i. The process typically begins in the recruitment phase, when, in accordance with Both/And Decision Making, relevant academic units in New York, Abu Dhabi, and/or Shanghai cooperate in formulating search plans for approved faculty lines and considering candidates. To propose Global Network Faculty status for a prospective faculty member, NYUAD and/or NYUSH (through the appropriate chair and/or dean) provides the candidate’s full professional dossier to the relevant New York unit. Following its own procedures, the New York unit conducts a discussion, initiates procedure to confer the status of “Global Network Professor” on the candidate, and makes a recommendation to the New York Dean.

ii. Going forward, NYUAD and NYUSH coordinate with NYU New York to submit the Request for Global Network Professor Title (included as Appendix B) for each new appointment. This request form requires signature approvals from NYUAD, NYUSH, and NYU New York. The appointment is not final until it is officially processed in OAA with the request form.

For 2015 only, for existing faculty at NYUAD and NYUSH, NYUAD and NYUSH are asked to:

• Confirm the existing tenured/tenure track faculty, Arts Professors, and Music Professors to receive the additional Global Network Professor title;
• Consult with the relevant New York departments; and
• Submit to the Office of Academic Appointments for each faculty member a Request for Global Network Professor Title by September 15; OAA will officially process the appointments as of October 15, 2015.

For NYUNY faculty receiving the Global Network Professor title:

i. NYUAD and/or NYUSH initiates the nomination of selected full time members of the New York faculty to receive the Global Network Professor title at that portal. Upon agreement of the New York department, the offer of the appointment is made to the New York faculty member.

ii. NYUAD and/or NYUSH coordinates with the relevant New York school/department to submit a Request for Global Network Professor Title for each appointment. The appointment is not final until it is officially processed in OAA with the request form.
## APPENDIX A
### SUMMARY OF CROSS APPOINTMENTS AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

**Cross Appointments:**
*Rights, Privileges, Responsibilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th></th>
<th>Global Network Professor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>Associated</td>
<td>Confirmed on Portal-Based Faculty</td>
<td>Confirmed on NY-Based Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Additional Title</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Probationary timetable per primary unit only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Voting rights for University senatorial representation in primary unit only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participation in faculty governance of both units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Listing in all units' catalogs and websites</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Expectations for teaching/training/mentoring in both units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shared third year, promotion, tenure review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject to the eligibility provisions of each respective campus
REQUEST FOR GLOBAL NETWORK PROFESSOR TITLE

Faculty Name: 

Current Rank/Discipline/Department/School/Campus: Tenure Status: 

Faculty Member’s New Title (Showing Rank, Discipline, Department/School/Campus):  

Participating Schools/Departments: 

1. [ ] NYUAD   [ ] NYUSH Division: 

2. NYU NY School/Department:  

Effective Date of Global Network Title:  

Approvals: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NYUAD/ NYUSH Division Head</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYUAD/NYUSH Provost</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Department Chair/Director</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Dean</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE FSC-GNU REPORT: OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The FSC-GNU Committee (now jointly convened with the NTC-FC) has over the last year met to deliberate on the role of faculty in various aspects of the GNU and the global network’s goals of enhancing the capacity and quality of knowledge production and dissemination within NYU. The committee has also focused on the development and management of coherent curricula structures that buttress faculty governance. As indicated in our preliminary report to the FSC on December 11\textsuperscript{th} 2014, our committee has established two important relationships—one with the appointed advisory committee on the GNU, and the other with faculty governance structures at NYUAD and NYUSH. These consultative relationships continue to foster better communication and offer broad means for pursuing a coherent campaign of faculty advocacy.

The idea of the Global Network University takes NYU into an uncharted territory within which we have confronted, or contended with differences in the worlds of scholarship, teaching and research, and will continue to do so. While we fully recognize the GNU’s promise for promoting our university’s academic mission, a key faculty concern and matter of vigilance centers upon the question of academic freedom: how is such freedom advanced, rather than hampered by the university’s broader spheres of operation? Faculty are committed to freedom of inquiry and expression as well as to shared governance in our institution across the multiple locations where its vision of excellence and exchange in the realms of knowledge production and dissemination has unfolded. Our innovations and institutional enhancements should, in our committee’s opinion, remain true to these principles.

In this report we will highlight some observations, make some recommendations and propose a motion we hope the FSC will further develop.

OBSERVATIONS

- We observe and commend the detailed work and recommendations by the GNU Advisory Committee.

- The issue of connectivity and its translation into the academic culture of the GNU continue to challenge our institution. We support the assertion by the Provost that:

  “The processes that govern searching, hiring, reviewing, and tenuring faculty at the portal campuses embody University – wide “core and essence” principles that ensure appropriate input by the leadership of NYU, the leadership in NYU Abu Dhabi, and the leadership in NYU Shanghai. These principles, which must be reflected in school-level processes, focus on points of “both/and” decision-making, that is, points at which both an approval by the portal campus and New York are required.”

We continue to hope the connectivity promised by the GNU also warrants ensuring the basic rights and responsibilities of faculty at the Portal and academic sites to further
enhance this important goal. Collaborations and interactions among the sites guarantee our academic standards as well as enhance each section of the university.

A more overtly developed and strategically integrated university with distinctive and connected portals and academic sites will go a long way in stemming ‘silo’ mentalities across the university. Such mentalities, if allowed to proceed unchecked, will have a direct impact on shared governance and create obstacles to the movement of faculty, student and ideas across portal sites.

- Our committee recently received a recommendation for deliberating on the idea of a ‘GNU faculty’ designation from the GNU Advisory Committee. We support the idea, raised questions on governance issues, and have recommendations on the topic. We have reservations about the limited scope of the proposed designation, and have developed a set of recommendations to complement the concept. We will state these shortly.

- Fair Labor Conditions

While we observe the complex and unusual contexts within which NYU has to function in different parts of the world, we continue to be concerned that fair labor conditions are not fully met in all places in which NYU has operations. The recently released Nardello report on the labor conditions during the construction of the Saadiyat campus of NYUAD, while highlighting clear and groundbreaking achievements for 65-70% of the workforce in terms of labor practices and benefits, also illustrated several troubling shortcomings with regard to an unduly complex compliance regime that led to the *de facto* exemption of a third of workers from the compliance regime, miscommunication and lack of clarity among the key parties, as well as failures to deliver on promises in the area of recruitment fees and passport retention policies.

The committee welcomes the NYU’s institutional response and the plan to compensate workers that were either exempt or not covered by the labor standards and strongly supports a timely implementation of Nardello’s recommendation.

The committee also applauds the comprehensive and multi-faceted efforts by NYUAD faculty, staff and students that have, in cooperation with its administration, led to the creation of a robust labor committee and compliance infrastructure over the past year to build a truly inclusive community after the move to the new campus and the end of the construction phase.

The committee will continue to deepen the dialogue with the various faculty labor committees both in NYUAD and NYUSH and we would recommend the establishment of a similar committee in NYUNY. In addition to these local bodies, we would also propose a more integrated university-wide forum whose mandate goes beyond advisory roles and which would help predict, trouble shoot and forestall the variety of challenges across all of NYU’s portals and sites.
The GNU Representative from NYUAD will give a brief report on how the faculty is responding to the subject of labor conditions as well as share a summary response to the recent Nardello Investigative Report.

We refer you to NYUSH website information on the same remit and processes being put in place about labor issues. ([http://shanghai.nyu.edu/about](http://shanghai.nyu.edu/about))

LABOR AS AN OBJECT OF SCHOLARLY INQUIRY / OPPORTUNITY

We observe NYU’s construction projects will be long term and call for ‘labor’ to be a well supported object of scholarly inquiry across the GNU.

The Sites committees

- Course Approval and Hiring Processes for the Academic Sites

We applaud the impressive procedures for engaging departments and schools in the Square with the academic sites. We however note fundamental shortfalls in the procedures outlined.

Firstly, the procedures are somewhat ahistorical and they do not sufficiently articulate the genealogies of each site and their possible relationships with current iterations of global education even when suggesting better strategies for ensuring wider departmental participation. NYU Paris and NYU Madrid are cases in point. Departmental and programmatic oversights are indeed most important but they should engage more firmly with the histories and residual developments of the sites.

The provision of greater opportunities for the circulation of students among New York, NYUAD and NYUSH in the sites has not been fully addressed within the ‘connectivity principle’ of the GNU.

- Our committee sought information on labor laws relevant to faculty hiring at the academic sites so that we can develop a common understanding of the basic rights of such faculty consistent with NYU's traditions and make appropriate recommendations to the FSC’s Governance committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The FSC-GNU committee recommends the following:

- A revision of the Faculty Handbook to recognize NYUAD and NYUSH as well as the academic sites as parts of NYU, and to accord them the same rights and responsibilities under a common Faculty Handbook.
• We affirm the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on the GNU that a new faculty designation called ‘Global Network Faculty’ be developed. Our position, however, varies from that of the advisory committee in that we propose that such a designation be awarded as an added value to the status of faculty hired at Abu Dhabi, Shanghai and New York.

The designation should reflect the recipient’s scholarship and teaching profile, and serve to connect portals to each other as well as sites, thereby illustrating the circulation of people and ideas, and promoting collaborative curriculum development across the university.

We strongly recommend that the designation ‘GNU Faculty’ be granted post-tenure in cases of tenure track faculty. In cases of long-term contract faculty, it should indicate recognition of such faculty during re-appointment. The conferment of the status should be collaborative between schools, portals and approved by Deans and Provosts. If deemed necessary, rankings through Associate to Full GNU Professorship should be considered to reflect a broad spectrum of faculty.

The review process and grievance procedures for GNU Faculty/Professorships should be similar to that of other faculty positions.

We recommend that GNU Faculty/Professors should have voting rights and governance responsibilities in the units they serve. They should, like other faculty, play roles in the academic lives of their collaborative units.

A critical mass of such faculty (GNU Faculty) will constitute a core group that would continue to endow and sustain the principles of connectivity, collaboration and exchanges across the university.

The GNU Faculty/Professorship should be distinguishable from the already recommended ‘Joint Faculty Hires’ between portals.

The GNU Faculty/Professorship should not replace the principle of collaborations between departments and schools in hiring, retaining and developing faculty within the GNU. Rather, it should enhance a broad spectrum of collaborations among NY, AD and SH.

The Faculty Handbook should include the status of GNU Faculty/Professorships under a category describing the GNU and its faculty governance structures and review processes.

• Our committee deliberated on the need for a Vice Provost for GNU Academics as an extension of the Advisory Committee’s recommendation for a ‘GNU Dean’. Such a person should work with a faculty advisory committee. We
believe GNU curriculum, faculty movements, hiring and review processes and grievance procedures should be the focus of such a position.

- We strongly recommend a review of GNU administrative personnel with clear designations and mandates that reflect an organic university administration.

- We recommend a significant information hub that includes information on processes and procedures for faculty research, travel and collaborations across the GNU.

- Academic Freedom: The FSC-GNU committees have consulted with all elected representatives at NYUAD (FCSC as well as Senators) who have collectively confirmed that until now there has been no infringement of their academic freedom as they discharge their duties and continue to engage in diverse forms of research. We hope this continues and hold strongly to the assertion of the president and provost that NYU is fully committed to the principles of academic freedom foundational to our educational mission.

- We join the Advisory Committee on the GNU is recommending an “Inter-Portal Faculty Forum” to provide a context for sharing information and developing strategies for faculty governance between the Portals.

The recent Nardello investigative report should be an opportunity for a commitment to radically overhaul the GNU vision and to forestall the emergence of a fragmented university.

We conclude our statement by re-stating the importance of the recent FSC resolution on academic freedom and freedom of movement within NYU.