

**To:** Una Chaudhuri, Eliot Borenstein  
Faculty Advisory Committee on the GNU

**From:** Subcommittee on Labor Issues  
Jian Chen, Liliana Goldin, Martin Klimke, Ritty Lukose, Arvind Rajagopal

**Subject:** Final Report

**Date:** June 15, 2015

---

Our subcommittee on labor issues in the GNU had three meetings, all of which were productive. At our first meeting we talked through various issues, including following up more expansively with Martin Klimke about what the conversations about labor issues on the campus at NYUAD are. He provided us with a good overview of the many initiatives and structures that have been put in place. It is clear that all of this is very robust. One issue that was raised had to do with workload issues. As faculty engage in compliance issues, this generates increased workload and raises concerns about equity across the GNU, however, our colleagues in AD indicate that any engagement in labor issues and committees in AD is entirely voluntary and that after establishing the various committees and task forces and corresponding reports, in addition to the appointment of an external compliance monitor, things should calm down significantly with regard to workload.

As we waited for the Nardello Report, the subcommittee proceeded to learn about compliance issues at NYU. To that end, the second meeting involved meeting with Bob Roach who is VP and Chief Global Compliance Officer at NYU. He gave us an overview of the organizational structure of the compliance system. We were meeting with him just after our meeting about the Andrew Ross situation. He suggested that as an employee of NYU, Andrew Ross' situation merited consideration under the compliance structure of the University. He was not aware of the situation, as he had just returned from a trip. He indicated to us that he would pose various questions about Andrew Ross' situation to the Administration. To this date, he has indicated that he has received no response. We posed questions to him about how mobility issues through the GNU, as an aspect of academic freedom, would come under compliance guidelines. He seemed to suggest that they would. It was also made clear how different compliance at Washington Square is in relation to the other two campuses because of the partnership structures of the Abu Dhabi and Shanghai. We also heard from Jian about the labor situation at NYU-Shanghai, where they have formed a Labor Values Committee to make sure that labor values are respected and Chinese labor laws are followed.

In our third meeting, we met with Erum Raza, Chief Compliance Officer at NYU-AD. This was on the heels of the meeting with the larger committee about the Nardello report. In that meeting Erum Raza outlined the possibly six-month process that the University

will go through to provide compensation to those 200-250 workers most directly affected. John Sexton, in his last email to the University says the following:

This summer, Tamkeen, NYU's Abu Dhabi partner, will issue an RFP to bring on a third party that will manage payments to those workers not covered by the compliance-monitoring program to bring their compensation into line with the project's labor standards.

It would seem right for our committee to ask the administration to clarify what the scope of worker compensation is going to be for the construction phase, based on the Nardello Report. When President Sexton states what he does above, does that refer to the 200-250 workers who were affected by deportation? Does this include all workers who incurred recruitment debt for the \$1000-\$3000 amounts found in the Report (the report suggests this could be 25,000 workers). Ellen Schall, in the larger committee meeting, stated that NYU would not be doing the latter because they could not convince their partners to compensate workers for recruitment fees. Is this the case and if so why? If so, could the administration clarify the precise scope of the compensation NYU and their partners are engaged in?

Erum Raza also outlined to the committee some of the difficulties in reimbursing recruitment fees to workers as they are expected to provide receipts, not always rendered in the originating sites.

The Nardello Report outlines serious institutional failures. The current efforts towards transforming labor conditions and compliance and monitoring are laudable. In order to strengthen institutional accountability for these failures, it would seem important for the University to clarify and make transparent the process by which they will address the findings of the Nardello Report, particularly in the area of compensation, which seems to be the least clarified. That is the only way the movement from the past to a better future can be productively ensured. Compensation for the workers affected needs to be outlined clearly and the process made transparent. This is true most importantly for those workers directly affected. But as faculty within NYU, it is also important to affirm the values of the institution we work for. For those many faculty distressed by the findings of the Nardello Report, clarification about the scope of compensation is an important aspect of NYU moving forward in a productive way.