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A. Introduction:

In the Fall of 2016, Provost Katherine Fleming asked the Committee to study the current state of “coordinated hiring and tenure review,” the process that has been governed by Provost David McLaughlin’s memo (revised July 2015) entitled “BOTH/AND DECISION MAKING IN SEARCHING FOR, HIRING, AND TENURING FACULTY AT NYU ABU DHABI AND NYU SHANGHAI.” (Appendix A)

That document applies to the following members of portal standing faculty: tenure-stream faculty, and Arts and Music Professors. (Note: those last two titles no longer exist at NYUAD and NYUSH, having been replaced with the term “Arts Professors.”)

From October 2016 to March 2017, the committee conducted many interviews, conversations, and listening sessions with a wide range of people, including all three provosts, several portal deans, many NY department chairs, and many portal faculty members, both tenure-stream and contract-stream, both junior and senior.

This progress report is intended to inform all interested colleagues of our findings, and to invite their feedback and advice prior to the issuance of our Final Report and Recommendation on this subject.

We are now at a crossroads. This is a moment when the University could fundamentally redefine the process of Coordinated Hiring and Tenure Review at the portals, with ramifications for connectivity and governance, and we urge you to give this document your careful consideration. Please see further information on Page 10 for ways to send us your feedback.
B. Fundamental Issues:

The major goals of the “Both/And” policy were undoubtedly twofold:

1. To create deep, academically meaningful Global Network connectivity.
2. To ensure academic quality at the new portals, by bringing the disciplinary expertise at the Square to bear on the establishment of a Standing Faculty at the portals.

Whether the mandates of the “Both/And” policy are continuing to serve both these goals is a matter of strong disagreement across the Network.

There is a wide range of responses and attitudes towards the fundamental question “What is the ideal relationship between related disciplines across the University’s Global Network?” At one extreme, there is a model of total and seamless integration; in the words of one Chair: “We are one department in three locations.” At the other extreme are feelings of distance, disconnection, and even resentment between portals and Square. As one person put it, the range of relationships runs the gamut from “a quasi-merger” to “benign neglect.” The variation on this topic is such that it was pointed out to us that not all members of his department would agree with the Chair who said “We are one department in three locations”! The objections to the model range from the pragmatic to the philosophical.
C. Findings

The “Both/And” document covers several areas, which we will believe should be addressed separately. They are: Searches and Recruitment; Appointment; 3rd Year and Tenure Review. An implicit (and extremely important) fourth topic is: Affiliation (with a Department at the Square)

I. SEARCHES AND RECRUITMENT

For many programs, the “center of gravity” of searches is moving from the Square to the portals, a move that seems to be universally welcomed, and one that makes this the least problematic aspect of the Coordination process. For a detailed discussion of the committee’s findings, please see Appendix B.

II. APPOINTMENT (to a Standing Faculty position at a portal)

The “Both/And” memo states: “NYU Abu Dhabi/NYU Shanghai partner with a New York school, department, or program on searches for tenured and tenure track faculty, Arts Professors, and Music Professors; an offer is made to a candidate only if both the leadership of the portal campus and the relevant New York unit agree.”

It goes on to explain what the NY department’s “agreement” means (at a minimum): “The New York school, department, or program must agree to regard the new hire as eligible to participate in scholarly and instructional activities of the unit, including teaching graduate courses and mentoring PhD dissertations and master’s theses. The unit also agrees to participate in the third-year review and tenure process of the tenure-track candidate.”

This mandate has proved to be extremely challenging, for a variety of reasons:

- The identification of a “partner department” has not always been obvious or easy, largely due to the differences between the disciplinary formations and boundaries that prevail in a department-based system like the Square versus a division-based one like the portals.
- The potential mismatch of candidate to department sometimes emerges fairly late in the process, as searches often yield desirable candidates whose profile differs from the one originally envisioned when the position was proposed. Thus, searches can produce desirable candidates who do not fit comfortably into the “partner” department, leading portal deans to seek alternative partners, which in turn produces confusion and even resentment among faculty at both departments, disappointment among faculty at the portal and on the search committee, and an unfortunate introduction to NYU for the candidate.
- Another alternative that deans have to resort to when they fail to get a “partner department” to agree to a candidate whom the portal strongly desires is to offer him or her a contract faculty position. From a faculty perspective (perhaps more than from an administrative perspective) this is problematic for various reasons:
  - We risk losing candidates who get tenure offers elsewhere.
We reduce the ranks of tenure-stream faculty, and thus of senior tenured faculty for the future. This in turn delays the schedule for achieving the size of the senior faculty cohort needed for Program and Divisional self-governance.

Most importantly, it deprives junior colleagues of the kind of appointment that is still the norm for an ideal academic career, namely: a tenure-stream appointment, with the mentoring, opportunity, expectations, and rigorous review that are part of academic growth.

- The requirement that the faculty (as a whole) of the ‘partner department’ at the Square participate in the search has proved to be too onerous for many departments who are extremely busy with searches and department business of their own. This leads to embarrassingly poor attendance at job-talks, and votes based on little familiarity with the candidates’ work. This problem is likely to worsen as numbers of searches increase. The model, in short, is unsustainable.
- Too much ‘integration’ of junior faculty with the NY department (i.e. too much identification with the vision and disciplinary values of that department) can sometimes be in tension with the more interdisciplinary structure of programs at the portals.
- The asymmetry of the process—the fact that units at the Square approve appointments (and participate in portal reviews, see discussion below) but that units at the portals do not have any mandated role in such processes at the Square—is already a point of displeasure and resentment among some faculty at the portal. We fear that negative feeling will be exacerbated as the numbers of standing faculty at the portals increase.

Not surprisingly, many of the problems listed above emerge with even greater force during the tenure review process:

III. TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

The “Both/And” memo says: “As a part of the process, the docket will be given to the relevant New York school, department or program for review, and its recommendation will be included in the materials considered by the portal’s P&T Committee.”

There is a wide range of practices around how NY departments arrive at the “recommendation” mandated here. Many departments have been doing exactly what they do with in-house tenure or promotion cases, including (in many cases) having the tenured faculty of the department meet to discuss the report and to vote on the case. Some departments have entrusted the discussion and vote to a smaller group of tenured faculty members.

Areas of greatest concern that have emerged include:

- Some departments feel that it is not fair (to anyone) for faculty to vote on a candidate whom they know only slightly, or only on the basis of her tenure dossier (and perhaps a few visits to NY). This problem comes up most in those
departments that have interpreted the mandate to “participate” in Third Year Review differently, limiting participation to service on the Review Committee, and not including a discussion and vote from the full at-rank faculty. Remedying this by mandating these elements is likely to be unpopular on the grounds of adding to the already crushing faculty review schedules (on their own faculty) in many departments at the Square.

- There are significant points of divergence between established practices in NY and procedures mandated by the new portal guidelines. One important difference pertains to eligibility for participation: in NY (at least in FAS), only tenured faculty can have input (in the form of assessments, teaching observations, etc.) into tenure cases. At the portals, however, many contract-stream faculty perform key academic leadership—and hence supervisory—roles. It is problematic to exclude their input from the materials made available to the NY department whose assessment is sought.

- The asymmetry of the process—the fact that units at the Square approve appointments and participate in portal reviews but that units at the portals do not have any mandated role in such processes at the Square—is already a point of displeasure and resentment among some faculty at the portal. We fear that negative feeling will be exacerbated as the numbers of standing faculty at the portals increase.

- Another kind of asymmetry is also increasingly problematic: the fact that “Both/And” applies to only some groups of standing faculty (tenure-stream, as well as Art and Music professors) but not all. As our faculty governance mechanisms (notably the two FSCs) are working hard to equalize the work conditions and status of tenure-stream and contract-stream faculty, this asymmetry is regularly experienced as problematic.
D. Options going forward.

The issue of coordinated hiring and tenure review is deeply entangled with two major concerns: concern about portal autonomy and self-determination—both in curricular matters as well as in establishing an institutional identity—and concern that the growth of the global network not come at the cost of vastly increased workloads and bureaucracy. There is also the concern that Global Network units (portals and sites) will somehow “dilute” the standards and hence the reputation of the University. All these concerns are sub-texts in all conversations about coordinated hiring and promotion review, and revisions that are made in those areas should explicitly address these concerns.

Among the main options before us at this moment are:

OPTION 1:
**Strengthen and clarify** the “Both/And” model by spelling out in much greater detail what the mandated administrative roles of units at the Square will be in portal reviews, and to lay out **a clear schedule and modalities for academic interactions between a junior faculty person at the portal and his or her NYU NY unit**, such that by the time tenure review rolls around, there is substantial mutual familiarity. Such a document would have to address such topics as mentorship, the “integration year,” and 3rd year Review.

The committee’s attempt to draft such a document (as an exercise) highlighted two features of this model that make it deeply problematic going forward: its asymmetry, and its unsustainability (in terms of workload and bureaucracy).

OPTION 2:
Replace **mandated, administrative** departmental involvement with **voluntary intellectual/academic** modes of connectivity. In effect, this would mean decoupling “Affiliation” from “Appointment” (and Tenure Review), and make Affiliation something that **follows** appointment rather than **is a condition of it**.

This second, much more radical option, comes with some obvious risks, especially in the areas that the “Both/And” policy was designed to enable: connectivity and quality.
E. Risks of Option 2

1. Faculty connectivity.
There is wide agreement that faculty connectivity is crucial to realizing the enormous potential of our university’s Global Network, in the areas of educational quality, student experience, and new knowledge production.

However, there is increasing support for the idea that faculty connectivity should be voluntary, faculty-driven, and based on intellectual/scholarly interests. A large number of people we talked to expressed the desire to emphasize intellectual/academic modalities for faculty connectivity across the Global Network, and to gradually minimize administrative and mandatory mechanisms for connectivity. In other words: more collaborative research and teaching, more circulation, more sharing of students, and less reliance/insistence on mandatory mechanisms of coordinated hiring and review. Specific ideas that came up are:

- Faculty exchange and circulation and collaboration should occur on a “two-way” model rather than just from Square to Portals. In addition to the “integration year” model (which is not equally doable by everyone), establish mechanisms for shorter visits to New York.
- Deans at the portals and Department Chairs in New York be encouraged to actively foster voluntary faculty connectivity (even that this be an element of their assessments by their supervisors).
- The “Global Network Faculty” titles be developed into a robust (well-understood, respected) mechanism for faculty connectivity. (NOTE: Our committee is working on a revision of the policies on that initiative that we hope will serve this goal).
- Each new portal faculty member be assigned a “New York faculty liaison,” a senior faculty person who works in or close to the new person’s field, and who will be available to orient the new colleague to the University at large, to assist them with inquiries and information, and to introduce them to other colleagues in their field.

2. “Quality”
Note: the scare quotes here are intended to acknowledge that this whole idea can feel offensive at the portals. Perhaps “senior expertise” is a better alternative.

If the mandatory NY-Department full tenure and 3rd year review were no longer required, appropriate and valuable kinds of input from the Square could be achieved by such things as (these are ideas, not, at this point, recommendations):

- Every search committee include at least one member either from the Square or from the other portal.
- Every 3rd Year Review Committee and every Tenure committee include at least two (of its five) members either from the Square or from the other portal.
• These members be explicitly charged with reporting back to their departments about the outcomes of the searches or cases they served on (post-completion).

• Every tenure review include, in addition to the “external letters,” an “internal letter” from a member of the senior faculty at the Square who works in the tenure candidate’s field, and to whom the candidate’s materials are made available in the same form and on the same schedule as they are to external reviewers.

3. Other serious concerns with Option 2:

• With the removal of a departmental vote in New York, the only votes in tenure cases will come from the Faculty Review Committee and the portal’s Promotion and Review Committee. There will have been no moment at which the candidate’s senior colleagues will have voted and discussed the case as a disciplinary cohort. This is partly due to the divisional (as opposed to Departmental) structure at the portals, but mainly due to the lack of senior faculty there.

At the Square, as at other universities, departmental self-governance has traditionally been an important hedge against administrative and decanal overreach. The tenure discussion and vote is a key instance of this self-governance, and as such also a key protection of junior colleagues, linking their assessment to the judgment of their disciplinary colleagues (if only in an advisory capacity, but nevertheless on the record). How might this current deficit at the portals be remedied?

• NY Departments and portal colleagues who have worked hard to make the “Both/And” model work might feel disappointed if it is changed. It might help if any change to the model included a “grandfathering” mechanism and be required only for future hires.
F. Conclusion and Request for Feedback

In closing, we wish to list the two key principles that emerged from all our conversations on these topics and that should be used to shape whatever revisions are made to the policies. They are:

1. **The importance of supporting, protecting, and assisting junior faculty members as they proceed through “academic life cycle” issues at NYU, wherever in the Global Network their appointment may be.** In addition to such basic issues as clarity about work expectations and the criteria that will be used in their evaluation, portal junior faculty should also be assured (1) of reliable mentoring by senior faculty in their disciplines, and (2) that they will not be evaluated by units that have not come to know them and their work.

2. **The importance of Faculty Connectivity across the Global Network in all academic areas, including research, curriculum development, and pedagogical innovation.** This is an essential feature of the value and promise of NYU’s Global Network, and everything must be done to promote this kind of connectivity without unduly increasing administrative burdens on any unit.

THE COMMITTEE WOULD BE GRATEFUL FOR COMMENTS, ADVICE, SUGGESTIONS, INFORMATION, CORRECTIONS, ETC.


PLEASE E-MAIL EITHER OR BOTH THE CO-CHAIRS (eliot.borenstein@nyu.edu; una.chaudhuri@nyu.edu), or use the anonymous form available [here](#).
“BOTH/AND” DECISION MAKING IN SEARCHING FOR, HIRING, AND TENURING FACULTY AT NYU ABU DHABI AND NYU SHANGHAI

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

These principles apply only to appointments of tenured/tenure-track faculty, Arts Professors and Music Professors at the portals. Other full-time non-tenure track/contract faculty appointments do not require “both/and” decision-making.

1. Search plans

In addition to being approved by the Provost of NYU Abu Dhabi/NYU Shanghai, the annual search plans for the portal campuses must be approved by the Provost of NYU.

It is intended that these search plans be developed by the faculty and academic leadership of the portal campus, with early input from the relevant school or department in New York. The approval process is an extension of the process governing schools in New York; New York deans construct search plans for their schools from departmental/unit search plans, and then submit their proposals for final approval to the Provost of NYU.

2. Searches and Offers

NYU Abu Dhabi/NYU Shanghai partner with a New York school, department, or program on searches for tenured and tenure track faculty, Arts Professors, and Music Professors; an offer is made to a candidate only if both the leadership of the portal campus and the relevant New York unit agree.

The New York school, department, or program must agree to regard the new hire as eligible to participate in scholarly and instructional activities of the unit, including teaching graduate courses and mentoring PhD dissertations and master’s theses. The unit also agrees to participate in the third-year review and tenure process of the tenure-track candidate.

Granting “Global Network Faculty” status is the way for New York units to express their approval of the candidate. This is a title that Faculty Advisory Committee on the University’s
Global Network has recommended that New York schools use.\textsuperscript{1} In the words of the Committee:

“The title would be awarded to an NYU Abu Dhabi/NYU Shanghai colleague by an NYU New York 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.”

3. Tenure is granted only if both the Vice Chancellor of NYU Abu Dhabi/NYU Shanghai and the Provost of NYU approve.

At each portal, the process begins with a “local” faculty review committee that prepares the docket and makes a recommendation to the portal’s P&T committee. Tenured faculty from the New York partner school, department, or program will have membership in the faculty review committee, and very likely a majority membership during this initial period until the portal campus has a sufficient number of tenured faculty in the discipline. As a part of the process, the docket will be given to the relevant New York school, department or program for review, and its recommendation will be included in the materials considered by the portal’s P&T Committee. The portal’s P&T Committee makes its recommendation to the Provost of NYU Abu Dhabi/NYU Shanghai. If the NYU Abu Dhabi/NYU Shanghai Provost recommends tenure, that recommendation goes to the Vice-Chancellor of NYU Abu Dhabi / NYU Shanghai and the Provost of NYU for final approval through a both/and decision.

The provisions above represent the “core and essence” of the processes involved in searching for, hiring, reviewing, and granting tenure at the portal campuses. There are, of course, a number of other important elements of these processes.

\textsuperscript{1} See Report of the Global Faculty Advisory Committee on the University’s Global Network, Proposal for a New Faculty Title: Global Network Faculty, Appendix B.
SEARCHES AND RECRUITMENT

For many programs, the “center of gravity” of searches is moving from the Square to the portals, a move that seems to be universally welcomed, and one that makes this the least problematic aspect of the Coordination process. For a detailed discussion of the committee’s findings, please see Appendix B. This is due to the growth of standing faculty at the portals, as well as to the efforts of some programs to actively involve junior portal faculty in searches. Weighing the benefits of coordinated searches against the

- **Benefits** of coordinated searches:
  - Helps us attract a better candidate pool; people are keen on being connected to established departments as well as to our new programs at the portals.
  - Colleagues at the Square have been helpful in “wooing” candidates we want at the portals.
  - Colleagues at the Square have given valuable guidance.
  - Provides opportunities for substantive interactions between individuals and groups from different parts of the Global Network; in other words, is itself an important mode of intellectual connectivity.
  - Provides occasions for faculty at the Square to gain understanding of the different curricular and pedagogical needs and goals of their counterpart programs at the Portals, and vice versa.

- **Problems** that persist because of the need (either mandated or otherwise) for coordinated hiring:
  - Running searches involving two campuses slows down the schedule for making offers, which in many fields leads to a loss of the top candidates.
  - This in turn necessitates bringing in more candidates than one would usually do, because of the likelihood of the aforementioned loss. This adds to workload, for both units (portal and Square).
  - Increases workload of faculty at the Square (some programs compensate NY-based colleagues for participating in searches).
  - Raises anxieties about potential “double standards,” especially in highly competitive disciplines. This point related to the importance of resisting any implication that portal colleagues are not as qualified as their counterparts at the Square. At the same time, we must acknowledge that junior faculty at the portals have a range of unique, time- and energy-consuming duties associated with being part of a new project. The portals’
needs and expectations that junior faculty contribute to institution building must be recognized and included both in hiring and in review.

- Produces tensions between varying intra-disciplinary perspectives and commitments. In other words, certain portal programs wish to develop strengths in sub-fields that are not of interest to the counterpart departments at the Square.

- Among the different perspectives is one pertaining to the definition of “diversity,” a key concern for hiring committees. The understanding of “diversity” varies between the U.S. (where it is often aligned with markers like gender, race, and ethnicity) and the cultures where the portals are located (where it can be aligned with under-represented regions of the world, including those that send us significant numbers of students). The candidates from the groups we seek to hire in the portals may have had very different career trajectories than those we seek to hire at the Square.

- NOTE: all these points, while certainly indicating areas of difficulty, are also areas to foster mutual understanding and discovery, and even—potentially—a way that the Global Network contributes to disciplines’ ongoing self-analysis and development. It is important that NYU leadership find ways to facilitate these conversations in ways that are creative and rewarding rather than divisive and tedious.