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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Committee and the Report

• **Charge and Membership:** To assess the academic state of NYU’s Global Network and make recommendations to the President and Provost for improvements, including recommendations for how best to integrate the global Sites and Portals with schools and programs in New York and with one another.

• **Working Principle.** The Committee, though appointed by the Provost and Deans, resolved to maximize communication with the home units¹ of its members, and to work on behalf of the faculty and students.

• **Methodology.** The Committee formed numerous subcommittees, and met with a wide range of NYU constituencies, also gathering information through responses to our emails. Most of this work is reflected on the Committee’s website.

• The members of the Committee hold a wide range of views on the Global Network,² which we strive to reflect in this report. Thus our discussion addresses both the opportunities afforded by the Network as well as the challenges and concerns it raises.

• **The committee endorses the central administration’s commitment to maintaining the highest standards of research, teaching, scholarship, and creativity in the Global Network.** We also endorse the idea that this global network can be one—though by no means the only—distinguishing feature of our identity as a major research university.

• **The committee regards the idea of a global network as being consonant with the identity, history, and values of NYU.**

• The present Committee’s work should be extended into AY 2014-2015, paving the way for a Provostial-level standing committee, the **Steering Committee on the Global Network**, with members elected by the faculty.

• We warmly invite **COMMENTS AND FEEDBACK** on this report from all faculty members in New York, Abu Dhabi, Shanghai, and the Sites, so that the conversation begun this year will continue.

Areas of Significant Concern Addressed

• **Financial implications** of the Global Network.
  
  o What are the specific financial benefits for the University from the Portals?

---

¹ Throughout this report we use the term “unit” to refer to all academic programs at NYU, including departments, academic programs, academic divisions, and schools.

² The phrase “Global Network” here refers to NYU New York (here abbreviated to NYUNY), the University’s two new “PORTALS” (NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai, abbreviated below as NYUAD and NYUSH respectively), and the eleven “Study Away SITES” (Accra, Berlin, Buenos Aires, Florence, London, Madrid, Paris, Prague, Sydney, Tel Aviv, and Washington, D.C.). Both the Portals, like NYUNY, offer four-year programs of study that culminate in a degree awarded specifically by them; each Portal has its own “standing” (or full-time) faculty. Sites offer semester- or year-long programs only, and do not have full-time faculties. Since each of the Portals can serve as a Site for students enrolled in a different Portal or in New York, and since New York can serve as a Site for students enrolled in either NYUAD or NYUSH, the number of Site PROGRAMS (as opposed to SITES) is not eleven but fourteen.
o Do the Portals and Sites drain revenue from New York?
o Does participation in the Global Network create financial disparities among units
created, and how should this be addressed?

- **Key principles for global development.**
o Systematic, organic, and voluntary involvement of existing academic units
essential to the success of the Global Network.
o The need to preserve the autonomy and traditions of NYUNY departments.
o The need to foster distinctive identities and resist homogenization at Portals and
Sites.
o The need to balance institutional enthusiasm about global initiatives with deep
attention to programs in New York.

- The need to improve **information and communication** between the Office of Global
Programs and University units and faculty.
- **Transparency.** The need for explicit information on Global Network policies, including
provisional policies, which must have scheduled dates for review. Implications of
confidentiality agreements, including Non-Disclosure Agreements, with funding
partners.
- **Consistency and fairness.** The need to share the academic and financial benefits of the
Global Network among NYU’s many schools.
- Increased faculty **workload** created by the Global Network.
- **Labor conditions** in Abu Dhabi and Shanghai, and modes of faculty engagement on this
topic. Need for reliable and effective mechanisms for monitoring compliance with the
Statement of Labor Values adopted by NYUAD and NYUSH.

**Connectivity and collaboration**
- **How can this be fostered**, and how much should it be fostered?
- Proposal for “Global Network Faculty” status as a mechanism to foster deep
connectivity between units of the Global Network. Entails eligibility for but not
guarantee of teaching in New York.
- **Inclusion of full-time Portal faculty** into the University’s faculty governance structures
and in all university-wide communications. Importance of strong faculty governance
structures at the Portals.
- **Curricular collaboration.** Major academic initiatives at the Portals and Sites should
undergo a process of mutual information and consultation between all academic units
representing the discipline(s) involved and by the (proposed) Global Network Steering
Committee.
- **Faculty circulation in the Global Network** can benefit individual faculty, units, Sites, and
Portals, but it is expensive and must be carefully managed.

**Global Academics**
- **Academic and creative freedom** must be preserved and guaranteed at Portals and Sites,
as in New York.
- **Goals and problems** of various study abroad models.
- **Student experience at the Sites** is sometimes negatively impacted by disparities in
academic standards, course cancellations without sufficient notice, and the availability
of courses that fulfill student requirements for majors across the Sites. The Office of
Global Programs should continue to gather data and develop assessment tools to fine-tune our understanding of students’ experience in the Global Network, and should make the results available to faculty in New York, Abu Dhabi, and Shanghai.

- Student circulation has already reached impressive levels; site development should focus on quality rather than on increasing enrollments.
- We welcome the establishment of the Site-Specific Advisory Committees (SSACs), as a mechanism for (among other things) addressing quality concerns at Sites and fostering departmental involvement and oversight.

Graduate Programs

- Doctoral programs at the Portals, and circulation of doctoral students, are a sensitive issue. The participation of any New York unit in doctoral arrangements with the Portals must be entirely voluntary.
- Many of our professional schools and FAS departments are keen to explore the establishment of Master’s and Certificate programs at the Sites and Portals. A clearly defined mechanism for program proposals and approvals should be implemented in the near future.

Global Leadership and Administration

- The Committee is divided about whether there should be a separate academic leadership position for Global academics.
- All academic leadership positions at the Portals, as well as the position of Vice Chancellor for Global Programs, should be filled through formal search processes in which faculty members are centrally involved.
RECOMMENDED GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Committee recommends that all matters in the Global Network be guided by the following fundamental principles:

1. The development of the Global Network should not occur at the expense of the development of academic units in New York. The flow of financial resources, faculty, and students connected to the Portals and Sites must be managed to ensure that programs in NYUNY are not weakened in range and quality.
2. Global initiatives must be developed according to the principles of shared governance with the faculty of the University, and decisions regarding the curricula of all units must rest with the faculty of those units.
3. The Portals should be assisted in developing distinctive programs that are organically related to their locations, their institutional structures, and the educational vision and research agenda of their faculties. They should not be expected or required to simply replicate closely affiliated units in New York.
4. The selection of Global Network faculty leaders, in the form of deans and vice chancellors, must systematically involve members of the faculty.
5. Participation in global initiatives should be voluntary. Academic units, and their individual faculty, should not experience any coercion to participate, nor any punitive repercussions, financial or otherwise, for choosing not to.
6. The principles of academic and creative freedom must be preserved and defended throughout the Global Network, as at NYUNY.
7. The financial frameworks for global initiatives should be transparent.
8. Every effort should be made, and resources should be allocated, to enhance connections and facilitate collaboration between the faculty members and academic units that represent the same discipline in different parts of the Global Network, including by enabling the movement of NYU full-time faculty—from New York, Abu Dhabi, and Shanghai—through the network.
I. Introduction

A. Establishment, Composition, and Charge of the Committee

The Faculty Advisory Committee on the University’s Global Network, established by the Provost’s Office, began its work in April 2013. Members were appointed by the Provost, on recommendation of the Deans. All NYU schools are represented on the Committee, as are NYUAD, NYUSH, the Courant Institute, the Institute of Fine Arts, the Division of Libraries, three University-wide groups (Faculty Senators Council, Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee, and Faculty Advisory Committee on Academic Priorities), and the Student Senators Council.

The Committee’s charge was “to assess the academic state of NYU’s Global Network and make recommendations to the President and Provost for improvements, including recommendations for how best to integrate the global Sites and Portals with schools and programs in New York and with one another.”

The Committee understood this charge as a timely opportunity for increased faculty involvement in the strategic planning of our University’s global initiatives. We were clear that our role was not to represent the Office of Global Programs to the faculty but rather to serve as conduits and advocates for the concerns of all NYU faculty, research scholars, and students—graduate and undergraduate—in New York, at the two new Portals, and at our Study Away Sites.

We were also exceedingly conscious of the fact that we were not a committee that had been elected by our colleagues, but rather appointed by the administration. To our mind, the only way for us to remedy this was to proceed in as open, democratic, and representative a manner as possible. Though we were not elected, we resolved to maximize communication between the members of the Committee and their home units and schools, and to seek out input from all sectors of the NYU faculty. Appointed by the administration, we resolved to work on behalf of the faculty. We also therefore resolved to work closely with the existing, elected Global Network University Initiatives Committee, a standing committee of the Faculty Senators Council (FSC).

Finally, it is important to note that we did not view our charge to be that of assessing whether NYU’s Global Network is net value enhancing or diminishing for NYU, or whether any of the existing Portals or Sites should be discontinued. Rather, we took the current structure of the Global Network as a given, and focused on assessing its operations and governance with an eye to assuring that, going forward, the Global Network is governed and managed in a manner that is value-enhancing to NYU. This choice does not imply that we regard questions of closure, scale, etc., as settled; such questions may well form part of future faculty discussions.
B. Methodology

The Committee identified a preliminary list of agenda items to guide our work and established five subcommittees. Over the course of the year, the Committee (or one of the subcommittees) held meetings with many people and groups, including two with the Faculty Senators Council’s Global Network University Initiatives Committee. The Subcommittee on Departmental Involvement in the Global Network conducted 45-minute interviews with a number of department chairs and program heads, which in some cases included deputy chairs or other faculty involved in the Global Network. The main points that emerged from the conversations are all addressed in this report.

The Committee requested and received feedback on its work and on two of its initial documents from all New York-based departments and academic programs. These two documents were:

1. A working document, entitled “Principles and Tensions,” which articulated major themes and issues in faculty discussions of the Global Network. The “principles” tried to capture values to guide all global initiatives, while the “tensions” represented built-in pressures that need to be acknowledged now and carefully monitored going forward.

2. A questionnaire about Square-Portal collaboration that program heads at the Portals had generously responded to on behalf of their specific programs.

We received a great many valuable responses, both formal and informal, to our requests for input and feedback. Those responses, as well as further Committee discussions of the “Principles and Tensions” working document, have been integrated into this report.

The Committee also held an open meeting (“the Faculty Forum on Global”) to which all NYU full-time and part-time faculty members were invited. We did not, however, carry out a survey of the faculty, something that the proposed Steering Committee should consider.

Finally, the Committee created a public website that included meeting agendas and minutes, documents shared with the Committee, information on Site-Specific Advisory Committees, and responses to the Committee’s request for feedback and input from NYU departments and academic units to further faculty awareness of the Committee’s activities.

C. Evolution and Current State of the University’s Global Network

NYU’s global initiative dates back several decades, when the first semester (as opposed to summer) study away programs at global sites were established in Madrid (1958) and Paris (1969). These programs functioned fairly independently for many years, a structure that persisted even after the more recent addition of programs in Florence (1995), Prague (1998), and London (1999). The success of these programs and the growth in numbers of students attending them gradually heightened the need for more consistency and coordination among them, leading to the establishment and growth of an Office of Global Programs. In 2010, NYU Abu Dhabi became the University’s first four-year, degree-granting unit outside New
York, a development that—along with the establishment of NYU Shanghai three years later (2013)—vastly expanded the scale of the University’s global footprint. This expansion led to a range of administrative and structural changes, including new leadership and new mechanisms for greater departmental and faculty involvement (especially at the Sites).

D. Vision, Problems, and Prospects for the Global Network

The recent dramatic developments in the University’s global initiatives present significant opportunities as well as huge challenges, both of which have been the subject of considerable discussion and controversy throughout the NYU community in the past five years. Many members of the faculty expressed concern that the development of the Global Network might imperil the quality of operations and scholarship in New York. Others worried that units in New York might be pushed to participate in the Global Network even if such participation was not aligned with their educational missions or research agendas. Rumors suggested that units that collaborated on global projects with the central administration would receive preferential access to University resources. Some expressed concern about the quality of student education and the student experience at the Sites. Finally, there was concern that existing administrative structures in New York were becoming overburdened by the needs of directing a global network. This committee was formed, in part, as a response to such concerns.

The general prospect of an educational and research network spread over many locations is extraordinarily inviting, suggesting rich possibilities for academic—disciplinary, interdisciplinary, pre-professional, and professional—innovation. NYU students have enthusiastically accepted this invitation already: almost half of our undergraduates study at another location in the Global Network for at least one semester before they graduate. NYU faculty—both at the Square and in Abu Dhabi—are also increasingly involved in NYU programs in other countries, visiting them either to teach, to participate in conferences, or to conduct research. Many applicants to NYU, as well as many current students, identify NYU’s global programs as one of its most attractive features. Finally, the success of NYUAD in its first four years of existence has been remarkable, positioning NYU to become a visionary contributor to the globalization of first-rate higher education.

In Provost McLaughlin’s discussion with the Committee, he related the evolution of the Global Network to the University’s need to consolidate and extend the dramatic advances it has achieved over the past two decades, and specifically to NYU’s emergence as a major research university. In order to sustain this momentum, he said, the University needed an additional distinguishing mark. In his view, as well as in President Sexton’s, this additional distinction can and should be provided by the Global Network, which must be developed in accordance with the standards and expectations of a great research university.

While the NYU community is by no means unanimous in its endorsement of the central administration’s vision of a global research university, our committee fully endorses the central administration’s commitment to maintaining the highest standards of research,
teaching, scholarship, and creativity in the Global Network. We also endorse the idea that this global network can be one—though by no means the only—distinguishing feature of our identity as a major research university. Such a network offers unique opportunities not only to many of our students and faculty, but also, potentially, to many of the fields, disciplines and professions we represent, by identifying new intersections and opening up new sites for research and collaboration, and by making new faculty hires that both complement and expand existing expertise in New York. The numerous excellent conferences and seminars sponsored by the NYUAD Institute, and the ever-increasing faculty and graduate student participation in the Global Research Initiatives, are two examples of how this vision is already bearing fruit for many individual faculty and academic units under the NYU umbrella.

The idea of a Global Network strikes us as broadly consonant with the traditions and history of New York University, even though its recent rapid growth may have made it feel like a departure from those traditions. NYU’s heritage as a first-generation immigrant school, its place within the country’s most cosmopolitan city, and its long-standing Study Away programs all make this university a natural site for creative thinking about higher education in the global 21st century. The Global Network is a powerful way to put that thinking into practice.

It must be noted that the two countries we have partnered with in developing our new Portal campuses, the U.A.E. and China, differ profoundly from each other and from the United States in their cultural and political profiles. Some of their political traditions are a particular source of concern to many in the NYU community. Their interest in partnering with us is evidence, however, of significant shared goals of developing new models of global higher education.

New opportunities are accompanied by new questions. How should research teams separated by twelve time zones mentor their graduate students effectively? What is the nature of the academic and administrative connections among scholars doing research in similar areas but based in different locations in the Global Network? How are resources to be allocated among these various units? What is the incentive for scholars to work across the Global Network, and what kind of resources (if any) should be allocated toward providing such an incentive? What economic costs are associated with the Global Network, including the financial ramifications of unusual situations in which NYU might be forced to temporarily suspend or even close down a Portal or Site? How do the difficulties of administering and monitoring such a range of global programs affect the education and quality of life of our students? How are student health and security needs provided for at different Sites and Portals, and what procedures are in place for NYU staff to work with local officials (such as health providers, police, etc.) to meet these needs? Finally, the political and legal systems in the countries where Portals and Sites are located raises concerns about potential curbs on academic freedom, violation of workers’ human rights, and discrimination against students and faculty on grounds of sexual orientation, religion, or nationality.
While the Committee recognizes the significant educational benefits the University would reap from an academically excellent global network, it is also deeply concerned about certain negative impacts—both actual and potential—of global initiatives, and certain difficult challenges they pose. The Committee heard many complaints about the enormous demands being made by the Global Network on the time, energy, and resources of individual faculty and departments, schools, and other academic units. While this kind of challenge can be addressed through careful reallocation and husbanding of resources, other kinds of challenges—especially those related to questions of disciplinary representation, curricular control, faculty governance, and institutional identity, authority, and integrity—will prove more resistant, and will require patient, long-term attention and wide-spread consultation with the faculty.

When the Committee began its work, we sensed a lack—or at least a lag—in one area of the Network’s evolution: the systematic, organic, and voluntary involvement of existing academic units. Our study of the subject makes us confident that such involvement is a *sine qua non* for the success of the Global Network as a whole.

A crucial corollary principle is that developments in the Global Network should not force unwanted alterations in the established practices, traditions, and values of academic units. Preserving the quality and strengths of existing operations in New York must remain a central goal in any discussion of the University’s future. Academic quality in New York cannot be sacrificed to allow gains in other elements of the Global Network.

Conversely, established practices and units in NY should not dictate the practices and cultures of new global programs, in particular the programs at the Portal campuses. NYU has never been a “one size fits all” institution, and the exigencies of the Global Network must not force unwelcome standardization on any of our schools, departments, Portals, or other academic units, nor compromise their potential to be distinctive, even unique.

Finally, the University leadership’s commitment to developing the Global Network, especially the two new Portals, has understandably required an enormous amount of institutional energy, time, and attention. It is extremely important in the coming years, however, to balance institutional enthusiasm and excitement about global initiatives with deep attention to programs in New York City. Such a rebalancing is both feasible, given that the Portals are now on-line and increasingly stable, and appropriate, given the centrality and size of the New York campus. Even when the Portals grow to their intended size, only 10%-15% of the University’s entire population of students will be in residence at the Portals and Sites; the rest will be in residence in New York. A renewed emphasis on maintaining current strengths and developing new strengths in New York will also benefit the Portals, given their growing and important programmatic interfaces with New York.
E. A Note on this Report

Although this is the final report of the Committee that was established over a year ago, we do not regard it as anything like a definitive statement on the topics it addresses. Our experience has convinced us of the complexity of this subject, and the importance of ongoing faculty involvement. With the expectation that the work we began this year will continue in the future, we have sought to present a range of views rather than a single vision, and to articulate useful questions rather than try to provide definitive answers.

The discussion and recommendations that follow are intended to contribute both conceptual clarity and practical pathways for protecting and furthering the achievements of the University’s Global Network in ways that balance its growth and excellence with the growth and excellence of the University as a whole. We particularly hope that this report will help to guide the University leadership teams—both the outgoing and the incoming ones—in the coming period of transition.
II. Major Topics, Findings, and Recommendations

A. Initial and Framing Issues

The following issues immediately came to our attention and were repeatedly reinforced by a wide range of constituencies.

1. Information

The Committee was immediately struck by the great disparities within the University community in terms of awareness and understanding of the Global Network. The term “Global Network University,” often abbreviated to “the GNU,” is often used on campus, but it is understood in widely differing ways. A fundamental confusion pertains to whether this phrase refers to NYU as a whole, or to the two new Portals, or to the Portals and Sites. A related confusion attaches to the word “Portal” and causes uncertainty about whether there are only two Portals or three, NYU New York being the third. The role of existing schools and departments in this entity is also unclear to many.

These questions are deeply entangled with questions of faculty governance and academic identity (which we will address further below), and therefore extraordinarily complex. For example, people often ask if the Portals are “like Schools,” in terms of their place in the institutional structure of the University. The answer seems to be (for good and complex reasons) “Yes, and no.” The Global Network has produced new kinds of institutional entities, and understanding their nature will take time. However, many requests for reliable information can also be answered more simply.

We therefore recommend the establishment of a well publicized, regularly updated, and comprehensive information hub, in the form of a website designed for the needs of academic units and the faculty who work in them. Among the goals and/or contents of such a hub should be:

- Clear definition of terms and standardization of usage.
- Clarification of administrative structures, with an organizational chart containing the names, titles, and lines of reporting for administrators and staff.
- Policies regarding faculty circulation within the network.
- Time-lines, flow-charts, and schedules for modes of involvement of academic units as well as of individual faculty in global initiatives. This would include information and guidance on how units can propose new courses, programs, or collaborations, and how faculty can apply to participate in the ongoing teaching, research, and creative activities of the network.
- The names and contact information of “Global Officers” in the dean’s offices of various schools, and of “Global Coordinators” in departments or programs that have them.
2. Transparency

A second major issue is a perceived lack of transparency in policies and practices pertaining to the Global Network. Faculty reported frustrating experiences with attempted contributions or collaborations, including some that had been initially invited by some part of “global leadership.” There is a pervasive sense of uneven access given to some units and individuals over others, with the sense of unfairness exacerbated by rumors of the financial benefits that might come with such access, especially in the case of NYUAD. This lack of transparency could be an effect of how quickly things developed in response to the opportunity offered by our U.A.E. partners. The practice of making policies explicit and public sometimes conflicted with the need felt, by people working “on the ground,” for flexibility and nimbleness of response; especially in the early stages of the development of a Portal, it was felt, a “trial-and-error” approach was needed.

A different kind of constraint on transparency may derive from confidentiality agreements and legally binding Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) with our funding partners at the two Portals. There is also the fact that our partners may need to institute certain changes in an incremental, culturally sensitive, and less public manner than that to which we in the United States are accustomed.

The Committee understands these operational realities and sympathizes with colleagues who have to deal with them. We also understand that practicalities and time pressures can sometimes conflict with processes of wide consultation and due deliberation. Nevertheless, we wish to reaffirm the importance of maximizing clarity and transparency in the planning and unfolding of the global initiatives. We therefore recommend that every effort be made to make all new and existing policies, even provisional ones, as explicit, clear, and widely known as possible. Provisional policies should have clear timetables for review and renewal attached to them.

3. Consistency and Fairness

NYU’s many schools receive the academic and financial benefits of the Global Network to varying degrees. Certain schools have played bigger roles than others in developing the academic programs at the Portals and Sites, for very good reasons. FAS/CAS, for example, has naturally had more to do with NYUAD, a liberal arts college with a full curriculum in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. Professional schools like the Polytechnic School of Engineering, Steinhardt, Stern, and Tisch have also contributed and benefited. As Master’s programs grow throughout the network, more schools will participate.

Yet not all units, including many departments in FAS, have had opportunities to be involved in the Global Network. Some have expressed a desire to participate, but their overtures and proposals have not yet been taken up. No doubt this is due to planning exigencies and roll-out schedules at the Portals, but such exclusions and omissions have financial ramifications ranging from access to resources for hiring new full-time and visiting faculty, to the ability to
sponsor the programming that maintains the visibility and vitality of units, to schemes of faculty support (publication subventions, increased faculty research funds, etc.). The disparities that have already emerged threaten the morale and community of NYU faculty.

We issue the following recommendations to alleviate such inequities.

- First, the University leadership and school deans should carefully monitor financial disparities among units that result from uneven participation in the Global Network.
- Second, the University leadership and school deans should work together to develop plans to counter such disparities when they are inappropriately affecting the schools’ priorities, whether through revenue sharing or some other mechanism.
- Third, such inequities should be considered when developing Global Network policies pertaining to interactions between New York and the Portals and Sites, and kept in mind by all hubs of global administration and governance.

4. Quality

This issue is relevant for all units of the Global Network, including units in New York, but the Committee found that it came up most frequently with reference to the Study Away Sites. We noted a frequent sense that curricular offerings at many of them were not yet of the standard they should be. This view was often based on anecdotal evidence, chiefly reports from the occasional dissatisfied students upon their return to New York, but some faculty also noted that students were not fully prepared for their electives after taking required courses at Sites. Other faculty reported being mystified by the processes of curricular development, course approval, and faculty hiring at the Sites, despite the fact that mechanisms have always been in place for all courses taught and all faculty hired at the Sites to be approved by the relevant academic unit in New York. While many faculty members—including several members of our committee—had first-hand knowledge of the hard work of Site Directors and Site faculty to ensure departmental consultation and academic excellence, others remain perplexed.

The Office of Global Programs has taken significant steps to address the problem underlying this dissatisfaction: the fact that academic units at the Square have participated in the Sites “at one remove,” relying on the mediation of Site Directors (who were often spread thin in terms of responsibilities and lines of reporting). To enhance connectivity and allow units to have a more organic role in curricular development and faculty oversight, it has devised two kinds of relationships to be established between specific units and specific Sites: Global Academic “Partnerships” and “Affiliations.” A second and extremely promising new mechanism is the “Site-Specific Advisory Committees” (SSACs) based on these relationships.

A final perspective on the issue of quality is the reputational impact of the Global Network on NYU as a whole, as well as on specific schools and departments. For example, China may become the biggest education market in the world and, by all accounts, NYU Shanghai
is attracting widespread positive attention in China. The quality and success of our Portals could have major repercussions for the University’s reputation and future prospects.

5. Finances

The Committee recognizes that the finances of the Global Network are an issue of great concern to many throughout the NYU Community. Questions include:

- To what extent is the Global Network self-financing?
- Are resources being diverted from NYUNY to global Sites and Portals?
- Is NYUNY receiving demonstrable financial benefits from the operation of the Global Network?
- To what extent do financial decisions drive the structure, development, and operation of the Global Network (particularly in areas that overlap with academic concerns)?
- Is there any possibility that financial pressures from our government partners in NYUAD and NYUSH could lead to shifts in the student profile over time, with implications for quality and other issues, like possible research foci?

Martin Dorph, Executive Vice President, Finance and Informational Technology, met with the Committee and provided a financial overview of the various budgets of the Global Network. Some of the key points he made were:

- NYUAD and NYUSH operate on break-even budgets with aspects that financially benefit NYUNY.
- The agreements with NYUAD and NYUSH include provisions to cover costs in the event of a closing or suspension of activities (including two years of salary protection for standing faculty).
- The tuition revenues of students studying at the global Sites (minus financial aid, which the students carry with them) adequately cover the expenses associated with operating the global Sites.
- Student housing at the Sites is expected to run a deficit this academic year of $3.5 million (due to the start-up of Sydney and D.C. Sites and vacancies during the summer); the Office of Global Programs plans to eliminate these housing deficits within the next two years.
- The University has implemented a set of risk control measures (liability insurance; emergency medical/evacuation policy; currency risk reserve; and regular audits of global centers to meet local tax and payroll requirements).

The Committee believes that it is important to acknowledge that one of the most persistent worries about the Global Network is that it might involve large and substantial transfers of money that are draining the Square of much-needed funding. Although the financial information that the University provided to the Committee indicates that the Portals operate on break-even budgets and the tuition of students studying at the Sites (minus financial aid) covers expenses, the best way to allay such concerns is to involve faculty in financial oversight.
Recognizing that financial matters are often confidential—some even covered by legally binding Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs)—we recommend that two members of the proposed Global Network Steering Committee be appointed (through a process of nomination by the Committee, and vetting and approval by University administration) as the Steering Committee’s Finance Liaisons, to be confidentially briefed by Martin Dorph on any financial issues that are of concern to faculty. These two individuals could be bound by the same NDAs as the administration, and would serve as representatives of the faculty inside any necessary firewall of confidentiality. The Committee also recommends that the proposed Global Network Steering Committee receive annual budgetary updates from the University administration.

Finally, with regard to the issue of quality and reputational impact, the proposed Global Network Steering Committee will need to monitor global finances to ensure that the budgets at the Portals are adequate for sustaining the quality of NYU programs being developed there.

B. The Portals

1. Identity and Connectivity

We jump now to what is probably the most complex set of issues in the development of the Global Network. As Provost McLaughlin articulated it, and as the Committee agrees, imbricating the Global Network into the University’s identity as a major research institution will require cultivating high degrees of connectivity. How do we foster this connectivity without compromising the integrity and independence of academic units, either in New York or at the Portals? How do we ensure that global interaction and collaboration are maximized while all academic units retain significant control over their curricula, the composition of their faculties, and the structures of their programs of study? How do we ensure that students can fulfill their academic goals across the Global Network, be assured consistency in academic standards, and be fully informed about course offerings, requirements and similar matters in a timely manner?

The Global Network has already replicated a tension long familiar at the Square: wanting to preserve the special character and traditions of our different schools while maximizing our students’ and colleagues’ opportunities to interact, collaborate, and benefit from synergies. In terms of academic programming, we will want our Portals and Sites to reflect and engage with the unique cultural identities of their respective locations, while at the same time being navigable for all our students and upholding shared rigorous academic standards.

Ease of navigation and shared academic standards can be achieved either by centralization or by enhanced collaboration. We favor the latter, with facilitation of collaboration being a key responsibility of any centralized hub of the Global Network, such as the Office of Global Programs, the Office of the Provost, and the proposed Global Network Steering Committee.
The development of the Global Network has already produced an unprecedented acceleration of centralization of control, partly because the scale and range of locations—and the vast variety of special issues (legal, governmental, etc.) raised in each location—make it necessary to route departmental involvement through centralized operational structures. It is essential that those centralized structures not conflict with the values and needs of academic units. Most importantly, these centralized structures should not in any way infringe on academic units’ control of their own curricula or their own prescribed programs of study (requirements, sequence of course work, schedule of internships or field work, etc.)

The goal of facilitating collaboration without compromising academic authority will require a shift in the culture of the University towards more creative and voluntary collaboration between units representing the same or cognate disciplines in different parts of the network—especially at the Square and the Portals. This culture will take time to emerge, and should be supported by University leadership with resources, administrative mechanisms, and new institutional policies.

2. Faculty

a. Governance

The Committee applauds the strides made by the faculty of NYUAD towards establishing their own governance structures, and looks forward to similar developments at NYUSH in the near future. The success of the Portals will depend on the vision and confidence of their faculties, and these in turn will depend on their direct and full involvement in the workings of their campuses.

We also applaud the work that the Faculty Senators Council is doing to bring Portal faculty into the University’s faculty governance structure. We strongly support their efforts to expand the University Senate to add representatives from NYUAD and NYUSH. We are convinced that these developments will do much to foster the collaboration and connectivity needed to realize a globally networked research university.

Finally, we strongly recommend that a concerted effort be made by the administration to start including full-time Portal faculty in all NYU faculty mailing lists, so that they receive all communications at the same time as faculty in New York.

b. Modes of Faculty Affiliation between the Portals and NYUNY Units

We believe that the Global Network’s goals of enhancing connectivity while preserving the integrity of our academic programs will best be achieved by giving faculty groups the opportunity to forge close, clear, and collaborative relationships among the faculty who represent each discipline in various parts of the network.
One important mechanism for doing this would be—as it has been at existing units in New York—through the forging of formal relationships between individual faculty members and units other than their primary unit. While existing modes of affiliation and association can and should be used for this kind of connectivity in the Global Network, there is also value in creating a new and specific faculty structure and supporting mechanisms that would recognize the special nature of the connection between Portal faculty and their colleagues in New York.

We therefore support the creation of a new, University-wide academic title, “Global Network Faculty,” to designate members of the full-time faculties of NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai as participants in the research and teaching activities of appropriate units in NYUNY.

Proposal for a new faculty designation: “Global Network Faculty.” Details.

3. Curricular Custody, Development, and Collaboration

A concern the Committee shares with many other members of the NYU faculty is that the Global Network not produce a set of departmental “clones,” stifling the potential for distinctiveness provided by the network’s geographical and cultural diversity. This concern is nowhere more urgent than in the matter of curriculum and curricular development.

The development of new programs often reveals deeply divergent perspectives, among different groups of faculty, about disciplinary directions and priorities. Thus legitimate and appropriate differences may arise between the ways the same general discipline presents itself in New York and at the Portals. Ideally, this situation will lead to the stretching of disciplinary paradigms in valuable ways, including ways that will eventually foster new intersections between departments representing cognate disciplines here at the Square. The Psychology program at NYUAD, for example, has been enriched by its collaborations with its counterparts in both FAS and Steinhardt.

However, to negotiate differences successfully, we recommend that mechanisms be developed that produce meaningful consultation and dialogue, on a regular basis, between the faculties of all units representing the same discipline at various NYU locations.

Such mechanisms should also work to prevent situations where colleagues working in a discipline at NYU (in New York or at the Portals) suddenly learn that there is a new program in their discipline that they know nothing about and had no role in creating. Such news is often conveyed to units by their own students, and is often accompanied with a request that the courses at the new program be counted towards requirements. Even worse are those situations when units who have been working with some part of the Global Network to propose a new program learn that a similar program has been established without their knowledge. The Committee heard many complaints from individuals and units that proposals to Portals and offers of collaboration had been ignored or allowed to languish. We recommend that mechanisms be established to assist faculty and units to propose new
programs—such as a major, minor, concentration, certificate, or new degree—at the Portals (the new SSACs will fulfill this function—among others—for the Sites).

Finally, it must be remembered, that connectivity is not just desirable for faculty but necessary for students. There is an urgent need (which we know is already being addressed by the Office of Global Programs and by the Portals) to clarify how curricula across the Global Network interlock and overlap, and how programs of study can be pursued across several locations. There have been some reports of difficulties in setting up courses so that students from the Portals could have the right prerequisites to take courses in New York. The proposed Global Network Steering Committee will need to monitor the mechanisms of integration, and to consult broadly with faculty about how they feel or what they think about such forms of integration, and whether they believe that this kind of curricular connectivity is good for teaching and learning, or not.

4. Academic Freedom and Freedom of Artistic Expression

All the core elements of academic work—teaching, doing scholarship, making creative work, conducting research, training graduate students, and publishing—depend heavily upon the exercise of open and uncensored intellectual and artistic inquiry. As the Committee understands it, the agreements underlying all the University’s global initiatives, including the Portals in Abu Dhabi and Shanghai, explicitly affirm the bedrock principle of academic freedom, and the rights of University faculty and administration to determine its application. Nevertheless, as the principle itself is understood and applied differently in different countries and cultures, its actual status and stability in the Global Network is a matter of great concern to the faculty and the Committee.

Professor Andrew Ross, President of NYU’s AAUP chapter, addressed this concern when he visited the Committee, focusing in particular on the status of academic freedom on and off campus at NYUAD. Professor Ross reported a sense that faculty and students at NYUAD were not always clear about their rights off campus in Abu Dhabi. He said there should be a written policy that clearly articulated rights of academic freedom within and outside of the NYUAD campus. The Committee agrees, but also understands the constraints placed on NYUAD colleagues by local cultural and legal differences. We applaud all the efforts that NYUAD faculty and administration have been making to supplement the Portal’s public statement of academic freedom with detailed information and guidance that is made available to students in an appropriate—institutionally internal—way.

Several specific aspects of this issue were addressed during a conversation with Professor Ivan Szelenyi, Dean of Social Sciences at NYUAD, when he visited the Committee. Asked if he was aware of any restrictions placed on the research and publication of students, faculty, or NYUAD Institute activities, Dean Szelenyi said that he has neither experienced any infringements on his own academic freedom at NYUAD, nor has he observed any cases of restrictions on the academic freedom of other faculty or students at the Portal. Reports by standing and affiliated faculty confirm that classrooms at NYUAD enjoy as much academic
freedom as those in New York, including the freedom to discuss any topics, including those that may be deemed sensitive in the region. Off campus, U.A.E. law applies, including laws pertaining to political speech. Faculty and students who are new to the Abu Dhabi campus are advised during orientation that, while there are no restrictions on academic freedom while on campus, there are limitations to what can be said or done off campus. However, as far as field research is concerned, while various permits are required for gathering data and interviewing subjects off campus, NYUAD students have successfully conducted research off campus. Dean Szelenyi said that it will take time to establish trust with local institutions, and that expanding research off campus will be a gradual process. In terms of conducting laboratory studies on human subjects, NYUAD does have experimental labs and is working on developing a pool of subjects. They are also recruiting a research field coordinator who will be tasked with reaching out to various communities in order to develop subject pools.

A second area of study containing some unusual grey areas is arts practice. Students conducting projects in film, theatre, visual arts, etc. often face uncertainty about the legal and cultural boundaries they might inadvertently cross as they work in the new cultural worlds in which they find themselves. The experience in NYUAD, which has just graduated its first class of student-artists, suggests that this is yet another area where faculty and students have a steep learning curve ahead of us. While no senior art capstone project completed this year ran into any serious difficulties, several required a great deal of thoughtful guidance on the part of faculty and administrators. The student-artists all managed to address their subjects—from areas including gender, sexuality, and politics—with great sensitivity and thoughtfulness. They also managed to successfully navigate issues related to field research, location permits, talent releases, exhibition, and ownership. Going forward, however, the Portals will need to continue their efforts to develop explicit and unambiguous guidelines to support faculty and students’ efforts to engage creatively with the world in which they find themselves in, and to do so without compromising their integrity or unwittingly offending their fellow students and the local communities to which they belong.

Another important issue relating to academic freedom is that of access; specifically, an institution’s right to invite anyone they wish for academic activities like lectures, conference participation, and research. The Committee inquired about restrictions on travel imposed on various groups to either of the Portal sites. Dean Szelenyi said that since the U.A.E. does not recognize Israel it does not issue visas on Israeli passports. Israelis who hold other passports, however, are able to enter using those. This committee regards such limits to access as unacceptable, even as we realize government policy may not change in the short run on this issue. We wish to reaffirm the principle that access to all parts of our University, including our New York campus, our Portals and Sites, should not be limited based on a faculty member’s or student’s race, gender, sexual orientation, or nationality.

The issue of academic freedom intersects in delicate ways with a factor recognized earlier, our Chinese and Emirati funding partners’ need to introduce certain educational values in an incremental, culturally sensitive, and less public manner than we might. While remaining sensitive to these considerations, the University needs always to uphold the principle of academic freedom throughout the Global Network, as in New York. Faculty and students, at home and abroad, must be assisted in understanding how the demands of free inquiry are
subject to the behavioral norms, cultural traditions or tensions, and laws in different places. By the same token, it must be understood that the line between political and academic speech is often far from clear. Every effort should be made to address these issues publicly and transparently so that neither academic speech nor research is diminished by fear or uncertainty. An important role of the proposed new Global Network Steering Committee will be to monitor issues of academic and creative freedom.

5. Labor Conditions in China and Abu Dhabi

This topic has received a great deal of attention both at the University and in the national and international press. It was also raised by Professor Andrew Ross, when he visited our committee, and subsequently. Professor Ross said that while NYU had worked to improve labor standards for the construction workers who are building NYUAD’s new campus on Sa’adiyat Island, citing the Statement of Labor Values adopted in 2009, the issue of monitoring compliance with these standards remains a serious problem. Recent articles in the New York Times and elsewhere report serious violations of workers’ rights. The committee fully agrees with President Sexton’s statement that “these reports, if true as reported, [are] troubling and unacceptable.” The committee strongly supports the commitment made by NYUAD and its U.A.E. government partners to conduct a full and transparent investigation into the alleged violations. We endorse the progressive spirit of the Statement of Labor Values, which establishes the highest labor standards in the region, and strongly urge University leadership to develop the monitoring mechanisms that will assure compliance with these high standards.

The co-chairs of the Committee, along with the chair of the FSC’s Global Network University Initiatives Committee, had conversations with the leadership of the Portals, Vice Chancellors Alfred Bloom (NYUAD) and Jeffrey Lehman (NYUSH), about how NYU faculty could engage effectively and helpfully with difficult issues faced by them and our other colleagues at the Portals. Vice Chancellor Lehman described some of the cultural expectations that shape his interactions with Chinese colleagues, both our partner institutions (East China Normal University and the governments of Pudong and Shanghai) and the companies the university hires for various services, including campus construction. He is especially alert to the fact that certain modes of interaction that we in the US regard as acceptable could be interpreted, in China, as evidence of a disrespectful and arrogant lack of confidence in Chinese professionalism. He is concerned to safeguard the mutual respect and trust that is essential to the success of NYUSH, a goal that may necessitate lengthier timetables than some of us might want for getting responses and information. At the same time, he fully agreed with our view that stable and reliable mechanisms must be developed to facilitate communication with the faculty of NYU on the issues that concern us, especially ones like compliance with our stated labor values (as to which, he reports, there are no significant culture-based disagreements).

With regard to mechanisms for NYU faculty to seek and discuss information and issues about this (and other) issues pertaining to the Portals, several ideas were discussed. One idea
is to designate a member of the FSC (or of the proposed Global Network Steering Committee) to serve as a liaison between NYU faculty and the Portals’ leadership—including (for labor issues) their Compliance Officers. Another is to have a regularly scheduled bi-annual meeting of each Portal’s Vice Chancellor (and/or Provost, Deans) with the FSC’s Global Network University Initiatives Committee and the proposed Steering Committee, in joint session, at which faculty concerns would be presented and addressed.

We find it important and encouraging that this is a topic that receives a great deal of academic attention at NYUAD, being the subject of many recent events and talks, etc. NYUAD students, too, have been doing both academic work (research), and volunteer work with groups from different local populations, including migrant workers. A recent issue of the student paper, The Gazelle, was devoted to the topic of labor. Finally, it is very clear that the faculty of NYUAD is deeply and creatively engaged with this topic, and committed to working with leadership to improve the mechanisms of monitoring compliance with the high labor standards articulated in the Statement of Labor Values. A recent statement by the Steering Committee of the NYUAD Faculty Council details the ways in which this issue can be seriously engaged going forward. Finally, a statement signed by many NYUAD faculty members and published in the Chronicle of Higher Education lays out their perspective on and expectations about this complex topic.

The Committee’s focus on academic and faculty governance issues this year did not leave us time to study this complex topic further. Investigations and discussions of the topic are currently underway in various places, and are likely to continue in the months ahead. The proposed Global Network Steering Committee will make it a priority to participate in these processes, and will work with the FSC, with the NYUAD Faculty Council Steering Committee, and with University administration to strengthen mechanisms for monitoring and improving compliance with stated standards.

6. Increased Workload for Existing Units and Faculty

The Committee heard many complaints about the enormous demands being created by the Global Network on the time, energy, and resources of academic units as well as of individual faculty. The Committee was, however, reassured that administration is aware of these concerns and is taking steps to address them. One such step, which the Committee applauds, is the FAS/CAS initiative to provide stipends for departments to compensate a faculty colleague who will serve as the department’s “Global Coordinator,” and to provide them with the necessary additional administrative support, where appropriate. We recommend that this model be expanded to all units that have substantial global involvement.

It is also worth noting that the burden of work is likely to alter considerably as the Portals grow and have the personnel (faculty and staff) that will allow them to assume more of the workload of faculty searches, hires, and promotions.
C. The Sites

1. Study Abroad: Goals and Problems

Many faculty members at NYU see the general benefits of studying in another country or different environment. But the nature of Study Away at NYU is different from the traditional “study abroad” model, and generally less connected to the long-term academic study of a specific language, culture, and society. For the most part, students are traveling to countries whose language they do not speak; even when they do study language at an away site, there is a limit to the proficiency that can be achieved in the course of four months without significant prior preparation. The proposed new Global Network Steering Committee will need to take up the issue of language study in the coming years.

More generally, the University and faculty need to develop a clear articulation of the goals and value of studying away for a semester, particularly given the interruptions in a student’s academic life on his or her home campus. Students at NYUNY also need to develop their connections with advisors, mentors, and peers here in New York. If we believe studying away is worthwhile, then we as faculty must explain the rationale. This, too, needs to be taken up by the proposed Global Network Steering Committee.

The Committee notes that NYU has already achieved a 38% participation in Study Away, and that this is an unprecedented achievement for an American university. Any efforts to increase student participation must be driven by academic and curricular concerns, and not simply by the desire for higher numbers. In addition, though we recognize that some students would benefit from two semesters spent away, we do not regard this as a necessary or desirable goal for all NYU students.

2. Site-Specific Advisory Committees

The Faculty Committee on the Global Network welcomes the work of the newly established Site-Specific Advisory Committees (SSACs), which bring together faculty representatives of the units that have areas of expertise or particular stakes in a specific Site. Besides serving as a clearinghouse for academic and curricular matters related to a given Site, each SSAC will, we hope, further the goal of greater departmental involvement and oversight of academic matters at the Global Sites.

A number of Site-related issues raised in the course of our work are presumably being addressed by the new SSACs. They include:

• Resolving conflicts that may arise when an academic unit has not been able to partner or affiliate with a Site that it has identified as a priority;
• Involving academic units in decisions that transform the curriculum at the Sites;
• Balancing possible conflicting interests among academic units, such as when a departmental course intended for majors and minors also serves students from other disciplines;

• Making detailed and comprehensive student evaluations of courses in each Site available to faculty involved in the global coordination of their academic units in New York, Abu Dhabi, and Shanghai (i.e. Global Coordinators, Department Chairs, Program Heads, Directors of Undergraduate Studies, etc.).

D. Faculty Circulation in the Global Network

History:

The modes of faculty engagement with the University’s global programs, both Sites and Portals, have been varied, ranging in length (from one-time to multi-year), and sources of funding (Portals, Office of Global Programs, schools and units, Global Research Initiative). In recent years, the Portals and the GRI have been responsible for most of the University-based (as opposed to outside-sourced) funding, but the Office of Global Programs has also funded the following semester-long teaching visits: AY 2011-12: 6 faculty; AY 2012–13: 8 faculty; AY 2013–14: 7 faculty (Sites involved: Accra, Florence, London, Paris.) In addition, some departments have long-standing and continuing programs of faculty circulation to specific Sites, notably the Department of French to Paris, the Department of Italian Studies to Florence, and the Department of Spanish and Portuguese to Madrid.

The area of faculty circulation has undergone significant changes in the past few years. The Portals have instituted occasional or multi-year visits from NY-based faculty who teach for varying lengths of time, attend conferences, or conduct research. As for the Sites, the Office of Global Programs has temporarily suspended its program of funding semester-long teaching assignments in anticipation of this committee’s input. However, they have been continuing to discuss this issue with the new SAACs and the Site Directors, and the general consensus is that faculty circulation to the Sites will henceforth be closely related to the Office of Global Programs’ commitment to making Site development more department/unit-driven than ever before. Where previously it was mainly individual entrepreneurial faculty members who availed themselves of the opportunity to teach at Sites, or to develop new programs there, the Office of Global Programs expects—and this committee agrees—that these opportunities must in future be more unit-driven, serving the interests and needs of the units as much as those of the Sites. However, everything should be done—by the Office of Global Programs, working in concert with units—to ensure that this new framework does not have the effect of discouraging or stifling faculty initiative.

Benefits:

The benefits of creating opportunities for NYU faculty members to interact with global programs other than their own are obvious and numerous: Spending time in each others’ programs produces the deepest forms of connectivity, both among individual colleagues and
among programs, departments, and units. It opens up exciting new research opportunities and collaborations for faculty at both the Sites and the Portals. It also gives individual NYU faculty unique intellectual and personal opportunities, similar to those—travel to new places, exposure to new cultures—that make study abroad so attractive to our students.

Costs:

All these benefits must be weighed against the financial and institutional costs that any large-scale program of faculty circulation would entail. If the program emphasizes semester-long teaching assignments, the costs can be very high, depending on the faculty member’s personal situation (e.g., size of family, need for children’s schooling while abroad). In her discussion of this topic with us, Vice Chancellor Linda Mills said the average cost—not including the base salary—for a faculty member to visit at a Site for a semester-long teaching visit ranges from $15,000 - $75,000. Moving faculty families to a location abroad also entails considerable staff time and logistical support, and the many legal and consular differences between the different Site locations complicate the picture further.

An additional cost—or concern—is the impact of this kind of travel on programs at the Square. The flow of New York-based faculty to the Portals and Sites must be managed to avoid any shortfall in the scale, range and quality of curricular offerings and research activities in NY units. Ideally, this long-term planning should involve a process of mutual consultation by the academic unit in New York with their respective disciplinary counterparts at the Portals/Sites to ensure the maximum benefit of this arrangement to all parties. Units must have final approval over which of their personnel and activities participate in other parts of the University’s Global Network, and when. Clear guidelines should be established regarding which kinds of student mentoring responsibilities—most importantly, graduate supervision—remain in effect even when a colleague is teaching at a Portal or Site.

Recommendation:

After discussing the various types of faculty circulation, their relative priorities, how best to manage their costs, and how best to minimize harmful effects on academic programs in New York, the Committee endorses the following framework for faculty circulation at the Sites:

1. For faculty who wish to advance their research at a global Site, the appropriate mechanism is the GRI-supported research centers at the Sites.

2. For departments and schools who believe that it would be useful to have one of their faculty members in residence at a Site for the initial development of their program there, the Office of Global Programs should provide support for such visits as a start-up cost; the residencies can be designed to minimize financial and legal burdens and hence would normally involve program building responsibilities for the faculty member in residence but not teaching responsibilities.

3. The Office of Global Programs should also provide support for visits of shorter duration to the Sites, especially for faculty members of New York departments and schools that are academic partners with the Site; in addition, the Office of Global Programs should be
prepared to fund short visits of Site faculty to New York to meet with faculty members of the academic unit that sponsors their courses offered at the Site.

4. If a New York department or school believes it would be beneficial for purposes of faculty recruitment, retention, or general connectivity to offer additional semester residencies at a partner site, the NY unit would be responsible for paying the salary of the faculty member in residence; the Office of Global Programs would provide transportation and a per diem for housing (analogous to what is provided to fellows at the research centers of the Sites).

The Committee also recommends that the Office of Global Programs commit enough funds to allow a certain number of faculty members to teach at Global Sites each year above and beyond whatever programs particular schools have currently put in place to support particular projects. The standing principle should be that faculty should not suffer financially from teaching at these Sites, but neither should they need to be rewarded financially for doing so (e.g., the NYUAD model). Thus financial resources should be provided to ensure coverage of (i) visas and other required documentations, (ii) travel to and from the Site for the faculty member and her or his family, (iii) schooling for children, (iv) housing expenses beyond what one can receive from subletting one’s NYU apartment, and (v) tax protection and tax preparation services.

A standing procedure should be put in place for faculty to apply for and/or departments to nominate people for these slots with clearly delineated instructions and time-lines.

Finally, there should be oversight of this process to ensure that over time the program is being utilized to ensure equitable access across all units throughout the Network. We suggest an annual review and report by the successor to our Faculty Global Committee.

E. Academic Life in the Global Network: The Students’ Experience

The Subcommittee on the Student Experience in the Global Network formulated a series of issues and questions designed to produce an initial overview of important issues related to undergraduate experiences in the Global Network, with particular focus on the Sites. These questions and topics were initiated through a process of consultation and collaborative exploration with Vice Chancellor Linda Mills, which we believe can be a model for discussion and exchange of information going forward on a range of issues. This process also resulted in several reports, summaries, and recommendations, some in response to statistics and information gathered by and provided to the Subcommittee by the Office of Global Programs.

Recommendations:

Consider the student experience in all evaluations of the Global Network:
All considerations of the Global Network’s value to the University should take into account the incremental and cumulative enhancement the Global Network brings to the student
experience. This includes exposure to global cultures and expanded academic opportunities and challenges. Hence, the student experience is central and fundamental to the importance and development of the Global Network and should be a key factor in all evaluation and planning.

**Implement additional tools to assess the student Study Away experience:**
Design and implement assessment tools in a broad number of areas, and determine not only the optimal tools to be used, but who should administer them. Consider broadening the scope of the assessment metrics to include multiple aspects of the student Study Away experience, and collecting data from students during and after their study abroad experience. These tools should be adapted on an ongoing basis to meet changing developments and needs within the Global Network in general and at specific Sites and Portals. The subcommittee has identified a list of areas for further study of the student Study Away experience.

**Initiate broader studies of the global models, programs, and student experiences at comparable institutions:**
Consider comparable global institutions, possibly formulating a review, survey, or other information and data-gathering method. A comparative study might identify potential new policies or directions to enhance the student experience of the Global Network. It may also highlight aspects that distinguish the student experience and provide valuable data points for future planning.

**Provide a stronger communication system for students in regard to majors, degree requirements, and quality control:**
Student satisfaction with matters including course offerings, course cancellations, and the ease of completing requirements and general approval of the quality of the classroom experience greatly influence the student experience. As the Site-Specific Advisory Committees move forward with their work, it may be important for them to consider a stronger communication system enabling students to have better knowledge of the course offerings and general department and graduation requirements across the Global Network. Currently there is student frustration on a number of issues including a discrepancy in the availability of courses at different Sites as well as the timing and accuracy of when students receive this course information. In addition, it may be helpful to communicate more broadly and systematically what advisement resources are available to help students determine how to best meet their degree requirements while benefitting from study abroad.

**Make evaluative metrics and future planning accessible:**
The Office of Global Programs is currently gathering academic, administrative, and faculty-requested metrics in order to better facilitate course offerings at Sites and Portals and in future planning. It would be very helpful if this data could be made available to the Faculty Advisory Committee on the Global Network and its successor committee.

**Gather and analyze data on the academic experience of students returning to their home campuses:**
It was reported that the Site-Specific Advisory Committees are developing an instrument for evaluating the experience of students returning to the Square, including whether students find
the level of academic rigor and scholarship comparable, greater, or less than that on the Square. Furthermore, one important data set that is currently being collected and analyzed compares average departmental/school course evaluation results at the Square with course evaluation results at the global Sites. It will be very helpful for the proposed standing Committee on the Global Network University to have the opportunity to review the evaluation methods used for this data. As data continues to be collected and analyzed, a mechanism should be developed to share such information with appropriate academic bodies including but not limited to the Site-Specific Advisory Committees and any standing committees that are appointed or elected as a follow-up to the work of this committee.
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F. Graduate Programs

The Subcommittee on Graduate Education, focused on graduate education and research in the Global Network, has spent several months reviewing current procedures and proposed future practices for graduate education at the Abu Dhabi and Shanghai Portal campuses. The following recommendations take the form of general principles; we believe and hope that these general principles articulate core values of the NYU faculty as it works to maximize the success of the growing Portals and the continuity of the entire enterprise at NYU.

1. Graduate programs include Master’s, Certificate, post-B.A. Continuing Education, and Doctoral programs. While we recognize that graduate programs at the Portals are designed to meet their specific campus needs, any new graduate program at the Portals should be developed in consultation with the relevant units at NYUNY. The goal is to maximize the benefits of possible intercampus cooperation and joint programs, while avoiding duplication and competition.

2. Graduate teaching, faculty recruiting, and tenure policies have always been treated at NYU as separate issues, independent of each other. They must continue to be discussed and governed separately.

3. There has been significant uncertainty about whether, or to what extent, graduate programs at the Portals will someday become independent of (although remaining heavily interconnected with) graduate programs in NY. While there is no doubt that the graduate programs at all Portals will benefit from permanent and rich interconnections, we believe that the University community should continue to discuss the possibility that some of the graduate programs at the Portals may become autonomous at some future time. Just as the graduate programs at the School of Medicine and Arts and Sciences are interconnected but autonomous, we believe that leadership should continue to explore that well-tested NYU model at the Portals. One advantage of adopting this strategic posture is that it encourages NYUAD and NYUSH to build and grow graduate programs in a way that suits the specific needs of their Portals while still serving the needs of the Global Network. These recommendations regarding graduate programs are provisional, and intended to cover an initial period lasting five years. By four years, they should be reevaluated within the framework of any larger discussions about the relative connectivity and autonomy of the Portals.
4. Getting doctoral students to NYUAD and NYUSH in the immediate future should, in our opinion, follow two key approaches: First, NYUNY students choose to travel during the course of their graduate study abroad to complete research at a Site or Portal. Second, doctoral students receiving stipends tied at the time of their admission to Abu Dhabi and Shanghai travel abroad to complete their dissertation research. The first of these approaches is already well developed in a wide variety of forms at NYU. It provides the foundation for much of the existing circulation by graduate students through our Study Away Sites. It has provided, and should continue to provide, great strength to our graduate programs. The second newer approach is specifically aimed at building capability for endemic graduate education at NYUAD and NYUSH. We note here that this new approach need not require a new model for graduate education – just a new source of funding. We note that the FAS Departments of Biology and Chemistry and the School of Engineering have endorsed this approach and have completed agreements with NYUAD on the sources of funding for it. We wish to point out once again that such arrangements must be voluntary, and that programs that do not feel comfortable with this approach should not be expected or required to adopt it.
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5. Many of our professional schools are keen on exploring the possibility of Master’s, Certificate, and other non-doctoral graduate programs in the Global Network. One such program that is already being developed is the Silver School of Social Work’s Master’s program in Shanghai. This topic must be given careful consideration by the proposed Global Network Steering Committee in the coming (2014-2015) academic year.
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G. Leadership of the Global Network

Recent changes in the leadership structure of Global have included the appointment of Professor Linda Mills as Vice Chancellor for Global Programs and University Life, working closely with Matthew Santirocco, Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs. The new leadership has been responsive to our committee and subcommittees, supplying us with data, information, and discussion on a huge range of topics, and taking great pains to supply that material in forms we could use and engage with readily. We appreciate this, as we do the respectful and collaborative approach the Office of Global Programs has taken in all their current activities and initiatives.

The committee held several discussions about the new leadership structure, with special focus on the question of whether that leadership should be doubled, or bifurcated, so as to allow a distinct academic leadership for the Office of Global Programs.

The notion of an explicitly academic leader for the Sites appeals to many members of the committee, and was part of the committee’s conversation with Provost McLaughlin. The Provost expressed reservations about this idea, saying that it conflicted with the effort currently underway to move academic authority for global initiatives into schools and other
academic units, to spread engagement with and responsibility for NYU’s international initiatives throughout the University. Vice Chancellor Mills has also repeatedly affirmed this goal, and the Site-Specific Advisory Committees she has established this year are envisioned as a major mechanism for furthering an academic agenda and academic coordination at the Sites. As mentioned above, we welcome these committees. We believe they are long overdue, and hope they will offer strong institutional support for curricular collaboration and oversight.

The Committee is, however, divided on the issue of whether global leadership should include an explicitly academic leader, something like a “dean for global.” Some of us are strongly in favor of the idea. These members of the Committee acknowledge Vice Chancellor Mills’s statements that she serves a largely administrative role, and agree with her view that academic matters should be pushed to the SSACs. But they also worry that as the Sites and Office of Global Programs mature, academic coordination of the curricula at the many Sites will become more and more important. These members of the Committee see the establishment of a purely administrative leadership for an academic unit as a challenge to a core academic value: that academic units should be led by academic deans rather than by administrative vice chancellors. While Vice Chancellor Mills is well able to represent both an academic and administrative point of view in this regard, these members of the committee worry about future vice chancellors. They expressed the view that both the principle of academic leadership for academic units and the need for academic coordination of the SSACs calls for a change in the existing leadership structure for the Office of Global Programs. Other members of the committee, however, would rather wait and see how effective the new mechanisms (such as the SSACs as well as the Global Officers in Deans’ offices and Global Coordinators in some departments) are in supplying the academic coordination needed.

However, the Committee unanimously recommends that from now on, all positions of academic leadership (such as the Vice Provost for Global Programs, as well as the Provosts and Deans at the Portals (as here in New York)) should be filled on the basis of full and formal searches conducted by members of the faculty, including Portal faculty, rather than through discretionary appointment by the University administration.

H. Recommendation for a New Standing Committee: The Global Network Steering Committee

In the year and a half of its operation, the Faculty Advisory Committee on the University’s Global Network has identified several areas of ongoing faculty interest and concern. Most importantly, we have confirmed an urgent and widespread need for representative (elected) faculty involvement in the academic planning and governance of the Global Network. We therefore recommend that a new standing committee replace our committee: a Global Network Steering Committee. We propose that this committee be an addition to—and work
in close collaboration with—existing standing committees of the Provost’s Office, most importantly: the Graduate Commission, the Undergraduate Curriculum Advisory Committee, and the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee.

While the Faculty Senate is the chief body of faculty governance at NYU, we believe that the scale of the Global Network and the volume of work it entails are not compatible with the numerous other obligations of Faculty Senators. We believe that the new Global Network Steering Committee that we are proposing must coordinate its work with the Faculty Senate to ensure that the principles of shared governance and faculty oversight over academics be observed. To ensure that the Steering Committee work in close collaboration with the Faculty Senators Council’s Global Network University Initiatives Committee, we propose that there be two representatives of that committee on the Steering Committee. 

III. Conclusion

The Committee uncovered a large number of issues and concerns pertaining to the University’s global initiatives, and gathered information that began to clarify and address these issues and concerns. While a great many problems remain to be solved, this process had the effect, we believe, of expanding an extremely important conversation—about the academic quality and educational value of international programs—into many more sections of the faculty than had previously been the case. As such, we believe the committee has contributed to a timely and productive reframing of the kinds of values that should guide the Global Network, and the energies that should fuel it. The former are academic and educational values; the latter are student, faculty, departmental, and school energies. The University’s Global Network will develop and thrive as it creates mechanisms for the systematic, organic, transparent, and voluntary involvement with it of academic units in New York, Abu Dhabi, and Shanghai.

We urge the University leadership to provide adequate financial and logistical support to these mechanisms. In all cases, the mechanisms involve great expenditures of time and energy of the University’s faculty; if that time and energy is to continue to flow at the pace and levels necessary for excellence, it must be properly acknowledged and compensated.

NYU’s Global Network has grown exponentially in recent years, especially since the establishment of the two Portals. The remarkable early success of NYUAD, along with the Office of Global Programs’ energetic work on rationalizing the interface between NYU and the Sites, are grounds for optimism about the future of the Global Network. Many of the colleagues from whom we heard share this optimism, and many see the Global Network as an opportunity to diffuse tensions that have existed between and within schools in New York, and to nurture new synergies here. Some regard it as a testing ground for new configurations of disciplines and new educational pathways. Others emphasize the importance of making the best possible use of the many new faculty lines that the new funding by our Chinese and U.A.E. partners has made and will make available. Still others see this as our University’s opportunity to play a historic leadership role in the development of global higher education innovation. The committee affirms all these goals and ideals, but always with the reminder that they must all be pursued in service of the academic excellence of the University as a whole.

The committee is grateful to Vice Chancellor Richard Foley, our liaison to the University Administration, for his knowledgeable and principled guidance, and to all the members of University and Global Network leadership for their generous responses to our requests for information and discussion. In particular we thank Vice Chancellor Linda Mills for all the data she made available to us, and for her collaborative spirit. Finally, we thank the staff members who have assisted us so ably: Marley Bauce, Kelly Long, Marie Ostby, and Mikhala Stein.
IV. Comments and Feedback to this Report

- To post your comments and feedback publicly on the Committee’s website, please click here.
- To provide anonymous feedback to the Committee, please email global-network-committee-group@nyu.edu.
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APPENDIX A: Proposal for a New Standing Committee: The Global Network Steering Committee

The overarching responsibility of the Committee would be to ensure timely involvement of—and oversight by—the full-time faculty of NYU (both at the Square and at the Portals, both tenure stream and contract stream) in all academic issues related to the Global Network.

The Committee must endeavor to ensure that policies and practices of the Global Network do not jeopardize the integrity of NYU’s academic programs, wherever they may be, by protecting faculty control of curricula, programs of study, and recruitment and advancement of new faculty.

Since the quality of academic programs depends largely on the quality and working conditions of their faculties, the Committee must work to ensure that, as the Global Network develops, all our faculty colleagues, wherever in the Global Network they work, receive the fair treatment and appropriate protection that is necessary to achieve academic excellence.

Finally, a Global Network Steering Committee could provide valuable continuity during the forthcoming period of leadership transition, and safeguard the University’s considerable successes and achievements in the area of global initiatives, including the establishment of our two new Portals.

Major Responsibilities of the Proposed Committee:

1) Work to ensure educational quality of Study Away programs.
2) Work to promote the educational value and administrative ease of student circulation throughout the Global Network.
3) Work to promote collaboration among units in New York and at the Portals on curricular and research issues and faculty recruitment.
4) Work on optimizing faculty circulation in the University’s Global Network, including to Portals and Sites.
5) Ensure timely involvement of faculty and academic units in decisions about opening any new Site or Portal, or closing an existing Site or Portal.
6) Regularly review, re-evaluate, and refine all policies, procedures, practices, etc. of the Global Network, especially as the Portals mature.
7) Assess and help to refine tools and mechanisms to evaluate undergraduate academic and student life experiences before, during, and after Study Away.
8) Facilitate inquiries and assessment of areas of concern to faculty, students, or academic units that may emerge as the Global Network matures and evolves.

Composition and Transition:

We propose that the Committee consist of elected members from all schools and both Portals and members from the FSC’s Global Network University Initiatives Committee.
The elected representatives should be selected according to the procedures that exist in (or will need to be developed/established in) each of the relevant academic units, and every effort should be made to make these elections as broad and democratic as possible.

Elected representatives will be expected to seek input from their constituents and report back to them on a regular basis.

Because of time pressures, it will not be possible to constitute the proposed standing Committee by fall 2014. Therefore, we propose a two-stage process:

1. Extension of the current Committee through AY 2014-2015. We propose that the current Committee continue its work, and all current members be asked to stay on. If a current member cannot continue (or chooses not to), then the dean of that member’s school will consult with the co-chairs and the Provost’s Office to appoint his or her replacement.

2. To help ensure continuity between AY 2014-2015 and AY 2015-2016, it might be advisable to replace only half the 2014-2015 committee in 2015-2016 (and then the other half in the following year).

We propose that the Provost’s Office work with the successor committee next fall to (1) determine the exact number of representatives from each school; (2) determine whether it would be useful for other Provostial committees to have ex officio members on the Committee, and if so, how many; and (3) decide how many student representatives should be on the Committee, and how they are to be chosen.

The distribution of representatives on the Committee ought to be re-evaluated every two years, especially as the Portals grow in size and the involvement of NY’s professional schools in the Global Network increases.

**Term:**

We propose that the standard term of service on this committee be three years. In the first year or two of the Committee’s existence, however, it would be advisable to elect or appoint some members for shorter terms, in order to avoid complete turnover every three years.

**Leadership:**

We propose that the Committee elect co-chairs from its membership. Co-chairs will serve for two years, in staggered terms. Once the Committee is up and running, a new co-chair would be elected at the end of each academic year (for a term to begin the following academic year).

**Logistical Support:**

We propose that a liaison from the Office of the Provost work with the Committee as a non-voting member. We also propose that the Provost’s Office provide logistical support to the
new committee, including assistance with scheduling, communications technology, and meeting locations.

**Proposed Initial Agenda Items for the Committee Next Year:**

1. Set the schedule for annual Faculty Forum and bi-annual meetings with Portal leadership.
2. Invite a focus group of department chairs from across the schools, to meet with the Committee next fall. (This year’s committee sought feedback and input from all chairs and program heads, and met with a number of them, but not as many as we would have liked to. This dialogue should continue, and perhaps become a regular part of the Committee’s annual calendar. It is especially important to assemble groups of chairs whose departments are already heavily involved with the Global Network.)
3. Set up the electoral system for the Committee to use from AY 2015-2016 onwards, including the membership allocations of all schools and Portals.
4. Seek detailed information about the first-year experience of the SSACs.
5. Select the Committee’s Liaisons to Financial and to the Portals (see above, pages 14 and 20).
APPENDIX B: Proposal for a New Faculty Title: Global Network Faculty

- We propose that a new title, “Global Network Faculty,” be created and used to designate members of the full-time faculties of NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai as participants in the research and teaching activities of appropriate\(^3\) units in NYUNY.
- The title would be awarded to an NYUAD/NYUSH colleague by an NYUNY unit, to signify that the granting unit regards that colleague as a professionally active and accomplished academic who would be an asset to the unit’s research, training, and teaching agendas, and, as such, is qualified to teach and mentor its students, including graduate students.
- Although Global Network Faculty status would entail eligibility to teach and mentor students in the program, it would not carry automatic guarantees with regard to specific teaching, advising or mentoring assignments, since teaching assignments (undergraduate and graduate) must be driven by the curricular needs of the program and assignments to thesis committees by the intellectual needs of students; thus programs must retain the right to make these assignments internally.
- Likewise, Global Network Faculty status would not confer any rights or obligations, either upon the faculty member or the awarding unit, with regard to departmental governance or salary. It will also have no implications for tenure in the awarding unit.
- By awarding this designation, the awarding units would signify their willingness to host these colleagues when they are visiting New York, welcoming them into the educational and scholarly activities of the unit. Global Network Faculty would be listed on the unit’s catalog and website. While it is hoped that this hosting would often entail offering Global Network Faculty office space, central administration will need to insure that departments and units on the square have the resources to make this possible without disrupting local operations.
- When NYUNY units confer Global Network Faculty status they would also be agreeing to participate in the individual’s third-year, tenure, and promotion review processes. A template for this process should be agreed upon by the Provosts of NYU, NYUAD, and NYUSH, working in consultation with School and Divisional Deans.

---

\(^3\) In cases when there is no single or obvious match between units at the Portals and units at NYUNY (for example, the Literature Program at NYUAD has counterparts in several departments in FAS and Gallatin, including the Departments of English, Comparative Literature, French, German, etc.) the decision about which NYUNY unit or units are the right ones for an individual to be affiliated with will need to be agreed upon by the units and deans involved, and facilitated by the Provost of NYU.
• The title of “Global Network Faculty” would refer exclusively to the person’s relationship to the relevant academic unit in New York; it would not affect or alter the person’s title at their primary Portal campus.

• The Global Network Faculty status would not include any implications about the kind of contract (tenure-stream or contract-stream) the individual holds.

• The title of “Global Network Faculty” would not preclude a faculty member from also having other titles and other modes of affiliation with the NYU academic units, which would be proposed and decided in whatever ways the unit normally decides upon affiliated, associated, or joint appointments.

• Units would have the right to revoke Global Network Faculty status at any time, although it is expected that this would be an extremely rare occurrence.

• The process leading to Global Network Faculty status would normally begin in the recruitment phase, when relevant NY units would be invited (by Portal deans) to participate in the formulation of search plans. Ideally, the unit that would eventually affiliate the new Portal colleague would have representatives of its faculty on the search committee, and participate in the search itself in a variety of ways (attending job talks and candidate meals, for instance, and providing feedback to the Committee through the departmental representative).

• To propose Global Network Faculty status for one of its prospective or already hired standing faculty, the unit (through the appropriate chair and/or dean) would provide the granting unit with the individual’s full professional dossier. The granting unit would then conduct a discussion of this material and take a vote on conferring the status of “Global Network Faculty” to the individual. The results of this vote would be forwarded to the divisional dean of that unit for final approval.

• We recommend that the status of “Global Network Faculty” first be introduced in New York and then later be extended to the Abu Dhabi and Shanghai campuses to designate members of the faculty of NYU New York (or faculty of the other portal) who have an especially significant and continuing relationship with the campus. As with the status in New York, the campus would retain the right to revoke Global Network Faculty status at any time, although it is expected that this would be an extremely rare. There would be no expectation, however, that the status would confer upon the individual any rights or obligations with regard to departmental governance on the campus, and there would be no expectation that the campus would be involved in the individual’s third-year, tenure, and promotion review processes in New York.
APPENDIX C: List of Recommendations

1. Establish a well publicized, regularly updated, and comprehensive Global Network information hub in the form of a website designed for the needs of academic units and the faculty who work in them.

2. Make all new and existing policies, even provisional ones, as explicit, clear, and widely known as possible. Provisional policies should have clear timetables for review and renewal attached to them.

3. Carefully monitor financial disparities among units that result from uneven participation in the Global Network, and work to counter such disparities, when they are inappropriately affecting the school’s priorities, whether through revenue sharing or some other scheme.

4. Create a standing Provostial-level faculty committee on the Global Network.

5. Appoint two members of the proposed Global Network Steering Committee as the Committee’s Finance Liaisons, to be confidentially briefed by the university’s Executive Vice President for Finance on any financial issues that are of concern to faculty.

6. Provide annual budgetary updates on the Global Network to the proposed Global Network Steering Committee.

7. Develop explicit Academic and Creative Freedom guidelines to inform and protect students and faculty at the Portals and Sites.

8. Create a new academic title, “Global Network Faculty,” to recognize a new kind of cross-unit affiliation between individual faculty members from NYUAD and NYUSH and units in NYUNY.

9. Create a mechanism to produce meaningful consultation and dialogue, on a regular basis, between the faculties of all units representing the same discipline at various NYU locations.

10. Create a mechanism to assist faculty and units in proposing new programs—such as a major, minor, concentration, certificate, or new degree—at the Portals and Sites.

11. Implement the framework for faculty circulation through the Global Network described on pages 25-7 of this report.

12. Positions of academic leadership, such as the Vice Provost for Global Programs, as well as the Provosts and Deans at the Portals, should be filled on the basis of full and
formal searches conducted by members of the faculty, including Portal faculty, rather than through discretionary appointment by the University administration.

13. Implement additional tools to assess the student Study Away experience.

14. Strengthen the advisement and communication system for students moving through the Global Network.

15. Make evaluative metrics and future planning accessible to all units and faculty.

16. Gather and analyze data on the academic experience of students returning to their home campuses.

17. Create strong, reliable, and transparent mechanisms for improving and monitoring compliance with the Statement of Labor Values throughout the university and its Global Network.
LINKED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS OR WEBSITES

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE GLOBAL NETWORK:
- Membership
- Potential agenda items to guide our work
- Subcommittees
- Individuals and groups consulted or interviewed (methodology)
- “Principles and Tensions”
- Departmental responses to Committee inquiries
- Proposal for a new standing committee: The Global Network Steering Committee
- Proposal for a new faculty title: Global Network Faculty

Subcommittee on Questionnaire about Square-Portal collaboration
- Questionnaire about Square-Portal collaboration

Subcommittee on Student Enrollment and Experience in the Global Network:
- Basic Issues and Questions
- Reports, summaries and recommendations
- Statistics and information gathered by and provided to the Subcommittee by the Office of Global Programs
- Areas for further study

Subcommittee on Departmental Involvement
- Discussions with Chairs and Program Heads

NYUAD:
- NYUAD Faculty Governance
- NYUAD Statement on Academic Freedom
- NYUAD Statement of Labor Values
- Recent events and talks on labor issues
- Special issue on labor of The Gazelle, NYUAD student paper
- Statement on labor monitoring and compliance by the Steering Committee of the NYUAD Faculty Council
- Statement by NYUAD faculty members on the recent reports of labor violations in Abu Dhabi
- NYUAD Institute

SITES:
- The Global Sites: fact sheet
- Global Academic Partnerships and Affiliations
- Site-Specific Advisory Committees (SSACs)

OTHER INFORMATION ON THE GLOBAL NETWORK:
- Faculty Senators Council Global Network University Initiatives Committee
- Financial overview of the Global Network (provided by Martin Dorph, Executive Vice President, Finance and Informational Technology)
• **Departmental Global Coordinator**: new, compensated officer offered to CAS departments
• **Global Research Initiatives**