MINUTES OF THE T-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2015

The New York University Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, September 17, 2015 in in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Adelman, Allgood, Amkpa, Appiah, Backus, Cappell, Davila, Disotell, Economides, Garabedian, Goodwin, Jacobs, Jelinek, Jones-Rooy (by audio-conference), Kamer, Ling, Livingston, Mincer, Morning, Rajagopal, Smith, Sternhell, Sundaram, Uleman, Van Devanter, Weinberg, and Zagzag; Active Alternate Senators Hawkins, Martin, and Swislocki (by audio-conference), and Alternate Senator Gunsalus, Iskander (for Porfiri), Lane, and Tannenbaum. Former Chairs Al-Askari, Lebowitz; and Former Member Moskowitz attended as a guest.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD MAY 7, 2015

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the May 7, 2015 meeting were approved unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: ALLEN MINCER

Chairperson Mincer welcomed the Council and expressed thanks to the outgoing chair and the outgoing Executive Committee for their hard work last academic year.

Executive Committee (EC) Breakfast with President-Designate Andrew Hamilton

Mincer reported the EC had breakfast with President-Designate Andrew Hamilton. He reported Hamilton will begin his position in early January.

Tisch Teacher Policy

Mincer stated the policy was discussed at the May meeting and it was decided to add an appendix to the policy, which was agreed upon by email, and then sent to the Provost. He reported most amendments were accepted but there was further discussion and clarification regarding the appendix.

Faculty Handbook

Mincer reported the Continuing Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) recommended including the Policy on Sexual Misconduct, Relationship Violence, and Stalking in the Faculty Handbook. The T-FSC endorsed this recommendation. The suggestions were approved by the Board of Trustees and the policy will be included.

University Senate Business

Mincer reported a Senate-level Committee will be formed to examine tuition remission benefits. He explained the T-FSC Benefits Committee opened up a conversation last year about the split in tuition remission, which is currently 90% for NYU tuition and $5,000 for portable tuition. The Committee considered if faculty members would prefer a re-distribution of this, meaning less in NYU tuition and more
in portable tuition. It was clarified that administrators also receive these tuition remission benefits. It was noted it may be the case that what faculty view as the best package for tuition remission may be different than what other groups view as the best package.

A Committee will also examine the University resources related to family care and work/life balance.

The Divestment Resolution passed by the T-FSC at the May meeting is under review by the Board of Trustees.

Mincer stated he discussed with the Chair of the Dean’s Council, the opportunity for committee chairs to receive information and data from School Deans. He stated the Deans are open to this, but the requests will be on a School to School basis.

Mincer reported the EC attended a meeting regarding the replacement facilities during the time of the Coles construction. He noted it is difficult to find space for a full size basketball court because a regulation size court is larger than the regulation size of a city block. There are also no tennis court options. A Senator asked about basketball games. Mincer responded the University is making arrangements with other colleges in the area. It was noted many NYU sports teams must travel to facilities, for instance NYU does not have a soccer field or a baseball field.

Mincer stated the EC will meet with the President and Provost during the semester, and asked Committee Chairs to pass along any suggested topics or issues to be discussed.

Mincer reported the EC will examine ways to better communicate to all faculty members. A Senator suggested a brief summary report from the Chair or Executive Committee be sent to all faculty members. Mincer replied this will be discussed by the EC.

**T-FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications: Co-Chairs Warren Jelinek & Nancy Van Devanter**

*Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty*

*See attached Document A: Recommendations of the C-FSC and T-FSC.*

Senator Jelinek reported the Committee worked with the C-FSC to develop joint recommendations regarding the policy. He noted there are no tenured/tenure track faculty in Liberal Studies.

Jelinek reported the Committee received the policy on April 23. The last T-FSC meeting was May 7, which did not allow enough time to complete the review by the final meeting. The Committees reviewed the policy and developed drafts of the recommendation, which were sent back and forth over the summer.

A Senator asked about the title of Clinical Professor. It was noted this title works better in some schools, and does not apply as well in others. Chairperson Mincer suggested we discuss this topic with the C-FSC.

Jelinek noted a few major points regarding the recommendations:

The LSP faculty were not given an opportunity to read, review, or make amendments to the policy or to vote on the policy. It was written jointly by the dean of Liberal Studies Program (LSP) and the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) dean and with the steering committee of the LSP faculty assembly. This is noted in the appendix of the recommendation.
Recommendations of the Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Committee include attempting to restrict the power of dean and increase the power of the faculty, and defining terms more explicitly to restrict interpretation by the administration.

The Committee also recommends offering longer term contracts to faculty that have already undergone favorable reviews. The document states that one year contracts should be temporary fixes to various conditions, for instance if a faculty member resigned and the department needs to fill the slot temporarily.

A Senator commented that the T-FSC received numerous complaints from faculty members in Liberal Studies about faculty rights, curriculum, reappointment, and other matters. Complaints were also received regarding the Dean. While this regards contract faculty, it supports tenured/tenure track faculty to make sure faculty rights are preserved. It was commented this is a philosophical statement: if it can happen to them, then it can happen to us.

Two examples were given. The current policy states that the dean is the chair of the reappointment and promotions committee and that committee reports to the dean. Therefore the dean is the chair of a committee that is reporting to himself. Number two, when last year the academic structure of the faculty was changed, in order to affect those changes there needed to be a two-thirds vote of the faculty. There was a 60% vote in favor, so it was not a two-thirds vote, and the Council received complaints regarding this issue.

Senators asked about the grievance procedure. It was stated that a grievance process and procedure for non-tenure track/contract faculty is currently being written.

A Senator stated the review process is a critical issue in these continuous contracts. He commented the recommendations should underscore what the review process entails and bring it as close as possible to what tenured/tenure track faculty have in the faculty handbook, as well as the grievance procedure.

Jelinek stated the schedule is pretty definitive in this document. It is the penultimate tier of the contract. It is clearly laid out what is to be considered and what the faculty member who is up for reappointment or promotion needs to provide to the review committee and who gets the outside letters for promotion to the associate at the full professor level. There is no grievance procedure defined at the moment.

A Senator commented, at the School of Engineering, the main issue for the faculty is the length of contracts. He stated one year contracts should only be used under extraordinary circumstances and should never represent more that 5% of the faculty. He also stated the external letters required for contract faculty are unreasonable criteria.

It is stated in the document that one year contracts are used primarily to address temporary programmatic needs e.g. a leave or resignation.

A Senator asked about the nature of the complaints regarding intimidation by the Dean. It was noted these complaints were received before contract faculty had representation and a number of the issues being discussed could now be brought to the C-FSC.

A Senator noted the continued concern over the ratio of tenured/tenure track to contract faculty. He suggested the Council continue its advocacy to ensure that there is no regression of the ratio of tenured/tenure track to contract faculty across the university.

Senators asked about the process for joint reviews of policies, etc. between the two Councils. It was clarified it will be up to the co-chairs of the respective committees to determine whether to pursue an initial joint review or first do a separate review and then bring it to a joint committee or pursue a separate review.

A Senator asked why the T-FSC is reviewing this document when it has to do with non-tenure track/contract faculty. It was clarified that this is one of several documents regarding university policies on
contract faculty which the Provost Office will present for the T-FSC review and review of the C-FSC. A Senator stated he believes it is in the interest of the Council to be a part of the process and maintain its voice. If there is anything inimical to T-FSC interests in these proposals, members of the Council need to be able to state their concern.

A Senator stated he does not believe the Liberal Studies Program should exist. It is an unusual program, with no tenured faculty. There is nothing similar at peer institutions.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the recommendations were approved by vote of 25 senators in favor and 1 senators opposed, with 1 abstention.

Executive Committee: Chairperson Allen Mincer

**T-FSC Resolution: Thank You to President Sexton**

*See attached Document B: Proposed T-FSC Resolution.*

Chairperson Mincer presented the proposed resolution by the Executive Committee to submit the following thank you statement regarding President Sexton:

In recognition of John Sexton’s service as president of New York University since 2001, and in anticipation of the completion of his term of office, the T-FSC wishes to express its gratitude to the president for his 34 years of dedicated service to the University as a faculty member, including 14 years as Dean of the Law School and another 14 years as President. Under his leadership there have been significant advances in education, scholarship and research at NYU, as reflected in the University's increasing national and international prominence, and its continued importance as a center of academic excellence.

Mincer stated it is the case that in the past there has been disagreement, sometimes vigorous, between the faculty and the President’s office. On the other hand, the feeling of the EC is that President Sexton is a colleague who has been working hard at NYU and there have been tremendous changes for the good in this institution during his term as President. The EC therefore believes it appropriate to thank him.

A Senator commented that President Sexton has indeed done a number of things during his many years at the university, but not many of them are supportive of faculty or conducive to faculty interests. Sexton has saddled the university with a decades-long global construction program. And while his NYU marketing and branding campaign indeed brings in more students every year with increasingly higher tuitions, there has been little corresponding proportional increase in the number of faculty lines teaching those students. Last year there were extensive faculty votes of no confidence in Sexton and his leadership team. The Senator stated that for the NYU faculty’s representative body to now thank Sexton and sing his praises appears duplicitous.

Another Senator spoke against the motion in view of the many votes of no confidence in the schools of NYU, the many votes opposing the 2031 plan from many departments, the erosion of tenure at the School of Medicine where the administration has opposed faculty in court, the denial of the faculty’s right to approve the faculty handbook, and the fact that NYU has generally remained static in university rankings. He commented on Sexton’s general disregard for faculty opinion when it diverges from the central administration’s policy and recommended the motion be tabled.

Another Senator spoke in favor of the motion. He stated it is a matter of courtesy to an outgoing President. He stated the faculty has had disagreements but he does not believe there is anybody in the room who seriously doubts that Sexton has tried doing what he thinks is best for the university. He stated his belief that Sexton has worked very hard and it is a matter of courtesy to somebody who has led the University through a fairly strong period of growth and he deserves a public statement of thanks.
Another Senator also spoke in support of the motion. He stated it is a minority that has been dissatisfied at the Medical School. The Medical School has prospered tremendously under Sexton both on the clinical and scientific side and in rankings. The School of Medicine had a vote of confidence in favor of Sexton. This motion shows the faculty as a collaborative faculty that wants to work with the administration and the next President.

Another Senator spoke in support of the motion. He stated his belief that the feeling at the School of Law is that Sexton was a fantastic dean who completely transformed the School of Law and brought it to the very top ranks of American law schools and then went on to the university and did pretty much the same thing for the whole university which is so much stronger on so many different indicators than it was when he became dean. Sexton is considered to be one of the great leaders in higher education nationally and internationally.

A motion to table was moved and seconded. The motion to table was rejected by vote 11 senators in favor and 15 senators opposed, with 0 abstentions.

A Senator suggested an amendment to the motion to remove the second sentence. The motion would then read:

In recognition of John Sexton’s service as president of New York University since 2001, and in anticipation of the completion of his term of office, the T-FSC wishes to express its gratitude to the president for his 34 years of dedicated service to the University as a faculty member, including 14 years as Dean of the Law School and another 14 years as President.

A Senator stated she believes it is factually incorrect to say that the rankings of the university have not increased over his tenure. She stated she believes it would be petty for the Council to not say something gracious to Sexton and include both of these sentences.

A Senator stated the faculty are clearly very divided. He commented the second sentence may be accurate to some people, but one-sided to many others.

A Senator suggested a secret ballot. It was decided by consensus vote to vote by electronic ballot first on the amended motion and second on the resolution, whether amended or original, subject to the outcome of the first vote. It was noted the electronic ballot will be sent to all Senators, whether or not they were present at the meeting.

Committee Agenda Items for 2015-2016: Committee Co-Chairs

See attached Document C: Committee Agenda Items, 2015-2016.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
Recommendations of the C-FSC and T-FSC in regard to:

Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies
Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty

Background

“Dean Tom Carew [FAS] has completed a process within Liberal Studies to establish a Policy for the Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Liberal Studies, working iteratively with [the Provost’s Office] and the Office of the General Counsel…. [The Policy] was submitted by Dean Carew…[and] was drafted by Dean Fred Schwarzbach in consultation with the FAS Dean’s office and the LS Steering Committee….” (Letter of April 23, 2015 from David McLaughlin to C-FSC and T-FSC Chairs)

The following document will enumerate various questions, comments and recommendations to the submitted Policy. Some questions and recommendations, however, are related to the process of inclusion of Liberal Studies faculty in discussions on, ability to suggest amendments to, and to vote on the Policy. These questions will appear in some of the responses to specific items in the Policy. A fuller discussion of these questions appears in Appendix A at the end of the recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Introduction, Page 1, paragraph 1, sentence 3:

“The primary responsibility of the LS faculty is a commitment to undergraduate education in LS and Global Liberal Studies (henceforth GLS).”

Recommendation
Delete. Sentences 1 and 2 in paragraph 1 adequately explain the role of LS faculty.

2. Introduction, Page 1, paragraph 2:

“The FAS Dean may make changes to these guidelines, in consultation with the Liberal Studies faculty.

Recommendation
Clarify specifically and explicitly the process of consultation with the LS faculty. Will any proposed changes be presented, discussed and voted on at the LS
Faculty Assembly, the LS shared governance body that “formulates recommendations concerning Liberal Studies’s management, development, and welfare”? ¹ Is another process envisioned? Mechanisms for timely distribution to the faculty, faculty discussion, as well as the ability for faculty to present amendments, make recommendations to and vote on the Policy in a regularly scheduled LS Faculty Assembly meeting following procedures outlined in the LS Faculty Charter, should be included and stated explicitly, such as:

“Any amendment to this Policy must be in writing, submitted at least two weeks in advance to the Liberal Studies faculty for discussion, for the possibility for amendments, and for a vote at a regularly scheduled LS Faculty Assembly meeting, following the LS Faculty Charter.”

3. Page 1, Section I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, paragraph 1.

Recommendation
This paragraph begins an explanation of the responsibilities, but not the rights, of LS faculty. Add language detailing the rights of LS faculty, including the right to academic freedom, the ability to apply for FAS funds and, where eligible, University-administered funds, health care benefits, retirement benefits, and portable tuition benefits.

4. Page 1, Section I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, paragraph 1, sentence 1:

“This Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty in LS hold the title of Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical (Full) Professor; some faculty will retain the title, Master Teacher, as detailed in the Appendix.”

Recommendation
Since LS faculty are exclusively non-tenured, add language describing the differences between tenured faculty expectations and non-tenured faculty expectations. A model might be the following:

¹ “Charters of the Faculty Assembly AND Steering Committee,” page 1, paragraph 1, from LS website
“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, and hence teaching loads
are greater.”

5. Page 1, Section I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure
Track/Contract Faculty, sentence 2:

“As the responsibilities of Liberal Studies faculty are both diverse
and flexible in order to meet the ongoing and changing needs of the
program, the following categories of responsibilities of LS faculty
are neither discrete nor mutually exclusive:”

**Recommendation**
Delete the first clause of the sentence preceding the comma. This section
introduces the responsibilities of LS faculty members; the introductory
clause states the obvious and is not needed.

6. Page 1, I. A. Teaching, paragraph 1:

“The standard teaching load for all full-time faculty is six courses
per year. This may vary depending on other assigned duties or
responsibilities. With the approval of the Dean, administrative and
professional duties and other professional activities that serve the
university or LS may substitute for one or more courses.”

**Recommendation**
Delete sentence two. The word “vary,” without further explanation might
imply that the teaching load could be expanded. Sentence three explicitly
states the mechanism for reduction of teaching load.

7. Page 1, I. A. Teaching, paragraph 2:

“Clinical faculty are also expected to:”

**Recommendation**
As the primary responsibilities of LS faculty is teaching, revise
language to:

“Teaching responsibilities may also include:” and adjust verb tenses
in bullet points accordingly.

---

2 FAS Website, Recruitment of New Faculty, Section 1.7, Clinical Assistant
Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professors, Overview,
http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html
8. Page 2, sentence 1:

“Serve, when asked, on senior thesis committees and, when appropriate, supervise independent studies.”

Recommendation
The language suggests that the additional duties are added to the course load. Add language specifying that supervising independent studies, which are typically very time intensive, is a choice of the faculty member, not required “when asked.” If it is, in fact, required, specify that this requirement becomes a part of the 6-course teaching load or that course load reduction is available.

9. Page 2, paragraph 2, bullet point 3 and 4:

Recommendation
Since service is one of the criteria on which faculty review is determined, give examples of service (“outreach to community at large”), e.g., providing community service by working with non-profit organizations assisting less fortunate members of the NYC community. Public identification of the faculty member doing such important work as an LS faculty member should not be required.

10. Page 2, Section C. Professional Activity, first sentence:

“LS faculty are generally practitioners and/or experts in their fields, and it is expected that they will demonstrate continuing intellectual and scholarly engagement in their fields or continuing practice at a higher level, as appropriate to the area of the appointment.”

Recommendation
The sentence is not clear: what are the criteria for evaluating the expected “continuing intellectual and scholarly engagement in their fields or continuing practice at a higher level”? And what exactly does “at a higher level” mean and who determines that? Clarify language as follows:

LS faculty are generally practitioners and/or experts in their fields. Continued creative, intellectual, and scholarly engagement in their fields is encouraged, though not required, as appropriate to the area of the appointment.

11. Page 2, Section C. Professional Activity, paragraph 1, last sentence:

“In support of professional, scholarly, and creative work, each faculty member draws upon an individual Professional Development Account (currently $2500 p.a.).”
Recommendation
Because professional, scholarly, and creative work is encouraged, as well as the expectation of a six course teaching load per year, research leave eligibility, or a sabbatical, of at least one semester should be provided to further support that professional, scholarly, and/or creative work. A description of that eligibility, and the process governing it, should be added.

12. Page 3, sentence 1:
“LS faculty will submit an Annual Activity Form, usually in March of each academic year, to report on their teaching, service, and professional development.”

Recommendation
“Development” is an ambiguous term in this context. Because the Annual Activity Form has a role in determining Annual Merit Increases, the language should be unambiguous. Change to “activity,” so sentence reads:

“LS faculty will submit an Annual Activity Form, usually in March of each academic year, to report on their teaching, service, and professional activity.”

13. Page 3, Section II. Appointment of Clinical Faculty, A. Titles, 1. Clinical Assistant Professor of Liberal Studies, line 2:

Recommendation
Delete “at a level of demonstrated excellence”; the phrase is ambiguous.

Change sentence to read:
“Faculty initially appointed at this rank have three years of superior teaching experience and performance (which may have been as a graduate student and need not have been full time), and demonstrated or potential expertise and accomplishment in their discipline or area of practice.”

14. Page 3, II. C. Terms of Appointments, One-year appointments:

Recommendation
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 LS Dean must supply a written justification, based on programmatic and academic considerations, to the LS Faculty Assembly.”
15. Page 3-4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, One-year Appointments:

“If a faculty member receives three continuous one-year appointments, a formal review, as defined below in Section III, shall take place in the third year as a condition for re-appointment.”

**Recommendation**
To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of LS 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 the third-year review, such as:

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

16. Page 4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, Three-year appointments, sentence 2-3:

“Faculty are reviewed for reappointment during the penultimate year of a contract. Subsequent appointments may be for one year or three years.”

**Recommendation**
There is no explanation as to why a Clinical Assistant Professor on a three-year appointment would have his or her length of contract reduced to less than three years. Change sentences to read:

“Faculty are reviewed for reappointment during the penultimate year of a contract. Subsequent appointments shall be for three years.”

17. Page 4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, Three-year appointments, sentence 4:

“(With respect to promotion and apart from reappointment, Assistant and Associate clinical faculty have the option to request review for promotion in the last year of the second three-year contract, or at any time thereafter.)”

**Recommendation**
Delete “and Associate.” Following the next section, if five-year appointments are the norm for Clinical Associate Professors, they would not be on three-year contracts.

18. Page 4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, Five-year appointments:

“Five-year Appointments: Normally, five-year contracts are awarded only upon promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical (Full)
Professor.”

**Recommendation**
One may interpret the sentence to mean that there are cases when a Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical (Full) Professor might receive a contract of less than five years. For clarification, delete the above sentence. Replace with the following,

“Five-year Appointments: Five-year Contracts are awarded upon promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.”

**19. Page 4, II. C. Terms of Appointments, Five-year Appointments:**

**Recommendation**
Add language about subsequent appointments, for example:

“Subsequent appointments for Clinical Associate Professor are for five years.”

**20. Page 4, Section II. C. Terms of Appointments:**

**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). Also include language about subsequent appointments for Clinical (Full) Professors.

**21. Page 4, Section III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty, paragraph 1, sentence 2:**

“A positive review establishes that a faculty member is eligible for reappointment:….“

**Recommendation**
Clarify “a positive review” from whom; change language to read:

“A positive review by the Review Committee establishes that a faculty member is eligible for reappointment:….“

**22. Page 4, Section III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty, paragraph 1:**

“This section sets out the process and criteria for performance reviews. A positive review establishes that a faculty member is eligible for reappointment: reappointment is subject to the academic and curricular needs of the program and the University. Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and
structural changes and improvements in academic programs. Appointments automatically terminate at the close of the period of time stipulated in the contract, unless there is an official notice of renewal.”

**Recommendation**
The policy should indicate that curricular or structural changes do not automatically warrant a denial of reappointment. Instead, the denial should have a rational basis, and it should include a process for determining whether the professor can or cannot teach under the new curriculum or structure. Add the following language after the penultimate sentence:

“In such event, the review would focus on whether the LS professor would be able to teach in the new revised curriculum or academic structure and, if so, in what capacity.”

23. Page 4, Section III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty:

**Recommendation**
Add language specifying that the Committee for Reappointment and Promotion shall be the committee that conducts reviews for both reappointment and promotion. Separate language regarding Committee’s role and process by function, i.e. put process for review and reappointment in section on review and reappointment, and put process for review for promotion in section on promotion.

24. Page 4, Section III. A. The Review Committee, paragraph 1:

“The Committee for Reappointment and Promotion consists of three LS faculty elected by the LS FT faculty (at least two of whom will be [Full] Professors), two LS faculty appointed by the LS Dean (at least one of whom will be a [Full] Professor), and two non-LS outside members from FAS appointed by the FAS Dean, one of whom will be a Clinical [Full] Professor and one whom will be tenured.”

**Recommendation**
The committee of 7 includes a majority of members appointed by the LS and FAS Deans. This is a significant change from current Liberal Studies review policies (see “Guidelines for Review of Faculty for Contract Renewal,” available from Liberal Studies website) and represents an erosion of faculty responsibility to conduct faculty reviews for presentation to the LS Dean. The reasoning followed in the University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty

Appointments for the formation of elected school grievance committees should be followed here. The following language should replace the above:
“The Committee for Reappointment and Promotion consists of five LS faculty elected by the LS FT faculty (at least three of whom will be [Full] Professors) and two non-LS outside members from FAS, one of whom will be a Clinical [Full] Professor elected by the FAS Continuing Faculty and one whom will be a tenured Professor elected by the FAS Tenured Faculty.”

25. Page 4
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
A. The Review Committee
First Paragraph
First sentence

“The Committee for reappointment and promotion will consist of three…”

Recommendation
Because terminology is not consistent throughout the Policy, the compositions of the review committees for promotion to Associate Clinical Professor and to Clinical (Full) Professor referred to in IV. A. are not clear.

Name the review committee, e.g., “Committee for Reappointment and Promotion”, and refer to it by name in:
III. A., second paragraph and IV. A. Review Committee, as the parent Committee from which members of the review committee for reappointment and members of the review committee for promotion will be drawn.

26. Page 4, Section III. A. The Review Committee, paragraph 1:
“The committee will be chaired by the LS Dean, who does not vote.”

Recommendation
This suggests that the Dean chairs a committee that submits a report to the Dean. It is not at all clear why the LS Dean is on this committee that reports to her/himself, and further suggests an erosion of the historical role of faculty in (and confidence in the ability of the faculty to) conduct faculty reviews. 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 LS 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 LS 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).”
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. (This conforms roughly to procedures in place at FAS and also produces a fuller accounting of the committee’s findings, which can then be accurately submitted to the LS Dean. It also provides the necessary record of process in the event that the faculty member receives a negative review.)

27. Page 5
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
A. The Review Committee
First Paragraph on page 5

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

28. Page 5, paragraph 1:

Recommendation
Between sentence 2 and 3, add language detailing the process governing the creation of the review committee’s report, similar to that found on the FAS website, “Procedures for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty (http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html) adapted as follows:

“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 LS 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.”

29. Page 5, Section III, paragraph 2:

“The LS Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s evaluation, as well as his or her own assessment and continuing programmatic need for the appointment.”

Recommendation
Because more detailed information and clarification is needed, and a review of promotion process needs to be included, add the
following (adapted from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty: http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitmen.html)

“The summary letter to the candidate must include the recommendation that the LS dean is making to the FAS dean, including promotion and the length of reappointment (if that is the decision), and a signature block for the candidate.”

30. Page 5, paragraph 2, last sentence:

“The LS Dean will send a written recommendation to the FAS Dean, who will make the final decisions regarding reappointment.”

Recommendation
To ensure that the FAS Dean receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendation of the LS Dean, add the following (again adapting from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty: (http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitmen.html)

“The LS Dean must forward the review packet to the FAS Dean along with the committee's recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”

31. Page 5, Section B. Process and Timetable, timeline:

Recommendation
Add language similar to:

“During the first week of the academic year in the penultimate year of an appointment, faculty member receives notification that she/he is up for review.”

32. Page 5, Section B. Process and Timetable, timeline:

Recommendation
Specify the grounds for and process of stopping the contract clock by adding language satisfying the following from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, page 6:

“Each school process for review of full-time multi-year contracts of three years or more, including promotion reviews, must include:...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;”
33. Page 5, Section C. Materials, list of materials:

“Two peer observations of teaching”

Recommendation
Clarify the process of peer observation by referring to the explanation provided in the LS “Guidelines for Review of Faculty for Contract Renewal, Appendix A, Guidelines for Peer Classroom Observation,” pgs. 11-12.

34. Page 5
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
C. Materials
Seventh Bullet

“Summary of professional, service, scholarly, and artistic activities and accomplishments during the appointment period”

Recommendation
Add “, provided by the candidate” for accuracy and consistency

“Summary of professional, service, scholarly, and artistic activities and accomplishments during the appointment period, provided by the candidate.”

35. Page 6
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
C. Materials continued
Eighth Bullet

“If appropriate, copies of publications and creative productions during the appointment period.”

Recommendation
Add “, provided by the candidate” for accuracy and consistency

“If appropriate, copies of publications and creative productions during the appointment period, provided by the candidate.”

36. Page 6, Section C. Materials, after 2nd full paragraph ending with “LS Dean.”

Recommendation
Add the following as a new paragraph (adapted from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty: http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html): 

“If the LS Dean's decision is contrary on appointment, title, or length of
contract to that of the Review and Reappointment Committee, the Dean will provide the committee with the 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.”

37. Page 6, paragraph 3:
“NOTE: A school-level grievance/appeal process for faculty who are not reappointed is being developed and will be added to this document when it has been approved by the Provost.”

Recommendation:
The grievance/appeal process, of crucial importance to the faculty, should be developed by the faculty and added to the Policy document before it is approved by the Provost.

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. The policy does not address any of this, while still developing new mechanisms and policies for appointment, reappointment and promotion.

Additionally, the development of this grievance process should be undertaken by the LS faculty and submitted to the Faculty Assembly for discussion and a vote by the faculty. The process of consideration by the Faculty Assembly must include the right to offer amendments, according to the assembly’s published procedures (i.e., Robert’s Rules), and the vote may occur during a regular assembly meeting or by electronic ballot, as the assembly may determine.

38. Page 6, Section IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty, sentence 2:
“In addition to the consideration of teaching, service activities, and professional, scholarly, and creative work, recommendations also may be based on a prognosis of the clinical faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of Liberal Studies and Global Liberal Studies.”

Recommendation:
Delete the above sentence. Substitute the following:

“Recommendations will be based on teaching, service activities, and
professional, scholarly, and creative work.”

Stating that recommendations will be based on “a prognosis of the clinical faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of Liberal Studies and Global Liberal Studies” is overly ambiguous and does not satisfy the following (from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014):

“each school shall set exacting standards embodying the highest levels of achievement that ensure the distinct excellence of the school’s educational and training programs.”

Basing a promotion on “dependability,” “growth,” “potential,” or “versatility” is not exacting, as terms such as these do not name objective standards for academic advancement.

39.  Page 6
IV.  Promotion of Clinical Faculty
A. Review Committee

“The Review Committee for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor shall consist of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee. For review for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor. The committee will be chaired by the LS Dean, who does not vote.”

Recommendation
The review committees for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor and to Clinical (Full) Professor should be comprised of at least five members. Because of inconsistent terminology for review committees used throughout the Policy the composition of the various review committees is unclear – see Substantive Issue #1

“The Review Committee for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor shall consist of the members of the Committee for Reappointment and Promotion. For review for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Committee for Reappointment and Promotion who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

40.  Page 6
IV.  Promotion of Clinical Faculty
A. Review Committee
Recommendation
Specify that all votes of the Review Committee for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor shall be by secret ballot and that re-voting by that Committee shall occur only if new material becomes available.

41. Page 7
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
D. Materials

“In conducting its review, the review committee shall consider evidence of accomplishments in the areas of teaching, service, and professional activity.”

Recommendation
Include for consistency that for faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in reviews for promotion, as indicated in I. B. on page 2.

42. Page 7, Section D. Materials, sentence 1:

Recommendation
Add “for promotion” before the comma, so the sentence should read:

“In conducting its review for promotion, the review committee….”

43. Page 7
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
D. Materials
Second paragraph, bullet list items

Recommendation
Include in each bullet item where appropriate “, provided by the candidate” for accuracy and consistency with the bullet list in III. C.

44. Page 7, Section D, paragraph 3, penultimate line:

“referees (not nominated by the faculty member), if necessary in consultation with faculty in the candidate’s area of expertise.”

Recommendation
Delete “if necessary”; there is no explanation of when such consultation would or would not be necessary.

45. Page 7, Section D, paragraph 5, final sentence:
“A majority vote will be required to constitute a recommendation for promotion.”

**Recommendation**

Clarify the sentence and the process of voting by changing the sentence to read:

“Specify that all votes of the Review Committee for Promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor shall be by secret ballot and that re-voting by that Committee shall occur only if new material becomes available.”

**46. Page 8:**

“NOTE: A school-level grievance/appeal process for faculty who are not reappointed is being developed and will be added to this document when it has been approved by the Provost.”

**Recommendation:**

The grievance/appeal process, of crucial importance to the faculty, should be developed by the faculty and added to the Policy document before it is approved by the Provost.

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. The policy does not address any of this, while still developing new mechanisms and policies for appointment, reappointment and promotion.

Additionally, the development of this grievance process should be undertaken by the LS faculty and submitted to the Faculty Assembly for discussion and a vote by the faculty. The process of consideration by the Faculty Assembly must include the right to offer amendments, according to the assembly’s published procedures (i.e., Robert’s Rules), and the vote may occur during a regular assembly meeting or by electronic ballot, as the assembly may determine.

**47. Page 9**

Appendix: Transition Plan

I. Process

b. final sentence

“The change from Master Teacher to a clinical title at this time will not be
regarded as a promotion and will not bring with it a promotional salary increment."

**Recommendation**  
As the declination of a promotional salary increment for Master Teachers who achieve a positive review for a Clinical title after the transition period appears to be punitive for not opting in or achieving Clinical title status during the transition period, particularly for those who receive a positive review for the title of Clinical Associate Professor of Clinical (Full) Professor, reconsider the declination of a promotional salary increment stipulation in these instances.

48. Page 9, Section I. Process, paragraph d:

"An appointed committee (one senior clinical FAS faculty, one additional NYU faculty member [who may be clinical], and one member external to NYU, all appointed by the FAS Dean) reviews CVs etc….."

**Recommendation**  
Specify that the two NYU faculty members both be full-time, continuing faculty members. All of the faculty in Liberal Studies are continuing faculty members; NYU continuing faculty should constitute the majority of the appointed committee.

49. Page 10, paragraph 2 (Section f), sentences 1 and 2:

"Faculty who believe determination of rank to be incorrect will have a limited window to appeal to the FAS Dean. The Dean’s decision is final and there will be no further right of appeal."

**Recommendation**  
Clarify the length of the “limited window” for appeal to the FAS Dean.  
Also, explicitly state the process of appeal to the FAS Dean.

50. Page 10, paragraph 3 (Section g):

"Faculty who opt for the initial review for Clinical Assistant Professor and subsequently are not deemed qualified for the entry level rank will continue on appointment as Master Teachers, and will be eligible for reappointment as Master Teachers.”

**Recommendation**  
LS faculty currently on three- or more year appointments have been through a rigorous evaluation process, similar to that envisioned in this new policy, in order to attain the multi-year appointment. Add language such as:
“Current service as a Liberal Studies Master Teacher on a contract of three years or more should be regarded as automatically sufficient to qualify for the title of Clinical Assistant Professor.”

51. Page 10, Section II. Salary Adjustments, paragraph a:

“New baseline salaries will be established for each clinical rank.”

**Recommendation**
Specify, for current faculty considering opting into the new faculty structure, what the new baseline salaries for each rank will be.

52. Page 10, Section II. Salary Adjustments, paragraph b:

“Future promotions, i.e. those that take place after the completion of the transition process, will earn a promotion increment (TBD).”

**Recommendation**
Specify, for current faculty considering future promotions, what the new baseline salaries for each rank will be.

53. Page 10, Section II. Salary Adjustments, paragraph c:

“Those who continue as Master Teachers in future will receive AMI awards as appropriate, but no other salary increments, and will not be eligible for base line salary adjustments.”

**Recommendation**
The denial of further salary increments to LS faculty who do not opt into the new faculty structure seems punitive. If opting in is not a requirement, why are those faculty members denied further salary increments and base line salary adjustments? Change sentence to read:

“Those who continue as Master Teachers in future will receive AMI awards as appropriate, and other salary increments as appropriate, and will be eligible for base line salary adjustments.”

**Appendix A**

As noted in the above Background (page 1 of these Recommendations, paragraph 2) significant questions have been raised by LS faculty regarding the process of development of this policy, specifically the denial of LS faculty to meaningfully participate in its development through the ability to make amendments to and vote on the policy in the LS Faculty Assembly, the LS shared governance structure with published, clear rules of procedure. Denying the faculty a meaningful role in the establishment of school policy seems to deviate
from the spirit embodied in the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, page 1, Section II. Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1:

“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 from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, allowing the LS faculty, acting, according to its charter, through its Faculty Assembly, an active, essential and meaningful role in forming and approving any new policy, which policy must necessarily include the grievance/appeal process.

Minor editorial issues:

1. Page 1
   I. Responsibilities of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty:
   “Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty in LS hold the title of Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical (Full) Professor; some faculty will retain the title, Master Teacher, as detailed in the Appendix.”

   Recommendation
   Change “Assistant Clinical Professor” and “Associate Clinical Professor” to, respectively, “Clinical Assistant Professor” and “Clinical Associate Professor” for consistency with the titles indicated in II. B

2. Page 3
   II. Appointments of Clinical Faculty
   A. Criteria
   First paragraph
   Third sentence:
   “Based on the discipline, a doctoral degree is not necessarily required to be a clinical faculty member.”

   Recommendation
   A doctoral degree cannot be required to be a clinical faculty member.
   Rearrange as:
   “Depending on the discipline, a clinical faculty member may not be required to hold a doctoral degree.”
3. Page 4, footnote 1

“Faculty on appointment before September 2015 who continue at the rank of Master Teacher will be reviewed using the same process and the same criteria as Clinical Assistant Professors.”

Recommendation
Add “for”:

“Faculty on appointment before September 2015 who continue at the rank of Master Teacher will be reviewed using the same process and the same criteria as for Clinical Assistant Professors.”

4. Page 4
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
A. The Review Committee
First Paragraph
First sentence:

“The Committee for reappointment and promotion will consist of three LS faculty elected by the LS FT faculty (at least two of whom will be [Full] Professors), two LS faculty appointed by the LS Dean (at least one of whom will be a [Full] Professor), and two non-LS outside members from FAS appointed by the FAS Dean, one of whom will be a Clinical [Full] Professor and one of whom will be tenured.”

Recommendations
Change both references to “[Full] Professors” to “Clinical [Full] Professors”

5. Page 4
III. Review and Reappointment of Clinical Faculty
A. The Review Committee
Second Paragraph
First sentence:

“For review for reappointment of Clinical (Full) Professors, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

Recommendation
Rephrase as:

“The performance review committee for reappointment of Clinical (Full) Professors shall be comprised of the members of the Committee for
Reappointment and Promotion who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

6. Page 5
Second paragraph
First sentence

“The LS Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s evaluation, as well as his or her own assessment and continuing programmatic need for the appointment.”

**Recommendation**
Rephrase as:

“The LS Dean will provide the candidate with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s evaluation, the Dean’s own assessment, and the continuing programmatic need for the appointment.”

“Candidate” and “faculty member” are used interchangeably to indicate the person being considered for reappointment or promotion, even in the same context, throughout the document. For example, see the top of page 6.

For consistency, use only either “faculty member” or “candidate” throughout as applicable in context.

7. Page 5
C. Materials
Second paragraph

“The review committee will consider the following as well as such other materials that the candidate may supply or the committee request:”

**Recommendation**
Add comma after “following” and “may” after the second “committee”

8. Page 6
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
A. Review Committee:
Second sentence
“For review for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor, the committee shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment Review Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

Recommendation
To make parallel with the previous sentence, rephrase as:
“The review committee for promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor shall be comprised of the members of the Reappointment and Promotions Committee who hold the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor or (Full) Professor.”

9. Page 7
IV. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
C. Criteria for Promotion
2. Criteria for Promotion to Clinical (Full) Professor
First sentence
“A clinical faculty member ordinarily should have spent at least twelve years as a full-time faculty member (with up to six years counting from full-time employment at other colleges or universities) and at least six as an Associate Professor, before applying for the rank of (full) Professor. Promotion requires sustained excellence in teaching, service and administration, artistic and professional activity, and peer recognition in the applicable field.”

Recommendation
For consistency, insert the word “Clinical” and capitalize “full” as:

“A clinical faculty member ordinarily should have spent at least twelve years as a full-time faculty member (with up to six years counting from full-time employment at other colleges or universities) and at least six as a Clinical Associate Professor, before applying for the rank of Clinical (Full) Professor. Promotion requires sustained excellence in teaching, service and administration, artistic and professional activity, and peer recognition in the applicable field.”

10. Page 9
Appendix: Transition Plan
I. Process
d. first sentence

Recommendation
Replace “clinical” with “Clinical”
11. Page 9
Appendix: Transition Plan
I. Process
d. iii.
  first sentence

Recommendation
Add “Clinical” before (Full) Professors
Proposed T-FSC Resolution
Presented by the Executive Committee for consideration
at the T-Faculty Senators Council Meeting, 9/17/15

In recognition of John Sexton's service as president of New York University since 2001, and in anticipation of the completion of his term of office, the T-FSC wishes to express its gratitude to the president for his 34 years of dedicated service to the University as a faculty member, including 14 years as Dean of the Law School and another 14 years as President. Under his leadership there have been significant advances in education, scholarship and research at NYU, as reflected in the University's increasing national and international prominence, and its continued importance as a center of academic excellence.
AGENDA ITEMS

Administration & Technology: Kwame Anthony Appiah & Thomas Wisniewski

- Social Media Policy
- Personal Digital Content Policy

Educational Policies & Faculty/Student Relations: Todd Disotell & James Martin (fall)

- Seek University-wide admissions data to disaggregate it by school for greater transparency. There are perceptions amongst many faculty that students transferring between programs may not be as well prepared for their new programs.
- The Committee also plans to vet the numerous student, faculty, and other petitions and proposals that may affect our educational mission before they are brought to the full Senate for consideration.

Faculty Benefits & Housing: David Backus & Wen Ling

- Housing: Survey results
- Retirement: Evidently offers have been sent to some people in some departments. Is this something we want to look into?
- Portable tuition remission: There’s some desire, not unanimous, to expand tuition remission for students attending schools other than NYU. Should we continue to explore options?
- Healthcare: This will almost certainly change in noticeable ways as the Affordable Care Act rolls out. It raises lots of questions because we have what it colloquially called a "Cadillac plan," which the ACA makes much more expensive. If NYU pays the "tax" on such plans, where does the money come from? If we don't, does that free up money for other benefits? Are there more tax-friendly ways to provide benefits?

Finance and Policy Planning: Maurizio Porfiri & Dan Smith

- Creating and sharing a template for presenting and analyzing financial data (in each school)
- Creating a financial dashboard (for each school)
- Obtaining "executive-level" (i.e. Board of Trustees) financial data on the GNU
- Meeting with the new Presidential administration on the university's budget process

Global Network University: Awam Amkpa & Arvind Rajagopal

- Review of governance, research and connectivity within the GNU
- Financial data on GNU is needed; in situ agreements with portal campuses need to permit faculty senate discussion/monitoring
- Incorporate descriptions of the Global Network University Professorships, rights and privileges within the Faculty Handbook
- Liaising with appointed GNU committee and deans council to study and monitor implementations of the GNU professorships
- Following up on key issues and recommendations from the Nardello report and the university's response
- Seeking clarifications on finances and intersections with each portal campus
- Specifically, information on the estimated "investment phase" of the global sites, and on the anticipated shift to "revenue-earning phase."
- Following up on proposed structures for monitoring the GNU

**Governance: Awam Amkpa & Jim Uleman**

- Restoring the T-FSC role in approving the "Faculty" Handbook;
- Exploring further action on the erosion of tenure at NYU, particularly at the School of Medicine in light of recent court cases
- Seeking principles on which to base a recommendation to SCOG on the representation of each council on the university senate, now that the C-FSC (Continuing Faculty Senate Council) has been added
- Active monitoring of actual election procedures for the T-FSC in each school of NYU, relative to the "best practices" we adopted last year
- Seeking clarification from the administration on the circumstances in which it attempts to have travel bans imposed by sovereign states on faculty members lifted, when they travel abroad in pursuit of their academic research, and information on what those efforts and their success
- Exploring whether revisions of the Faculty Handbook grievance procedures are called for, in light of the C-FSC's and the GNU portal campus's new status

**Inclusion, Equity, & Diversity: Sinan Antoon & Ann Morning**

- Survey NYU's current diversity efforts, both university-wide and on a school-by-school basis
- Meet with key actors and units (e.g. Ulrich Baer, Vice Provost for Faculty, Arts, Humanities & Diversity; Office of Equal Opportunity)
- Research other universities' diversity efforts, with an eye to identifying best practices
- Propose a set of policy recommendations for NYU

**Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications: Warren Jelinek & Nancy Van Devanter**

- Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service Appointment and Promotion Standards and Procedures for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty
- NYU Stern School of Business Policy on Full-time Non-tenure Track Contract Faculty (FTNTT/CF)
- A number of school-level FTNTT/CF policies are being finalized at this time, and they in turn will also be sent to the T FSC and C FSC for review
- Also anticipated: A P & T policies from the College of Dentistry, the College of Nursing, the College of Global Public Health, and perhaps also a separate policy from the Faculty of Health
- Non-disparagement clause in retirement contracts