MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 7, 2019

The New York University Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at 9:00 AM on Thursday, March 7, 2019 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, in the 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Carter, Davis, De Bartolo, Gold-Von Simson, Illingworth, Jahangiri, James, Killilea, Kim, Lee, Leone, Liston, Mitnick, Patterson, Renzi, Saravanan, Slater, Unnikrishnan, Wang, Watkins, White, Williams, and Youngerman; Alternate Senators Funk (for Howard-Spink), Hersh, Kleinert, Ritter, and Tourin.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A senator proposed an amendment to the agenda of moving the Senate representation of the Liberal Studies Dean under New Business.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting agenda was approved as amended.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 7, 2019

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the February 7, 2019 meeting were approved unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: MARY KILLILEA

See attached Document A.

Discussion/Questions on Chair’s Report

Steering Committee (SC) Meeting with the President

Killilea reported on the meeting’s agenda items, including a discussion of the incident at the Silver School of Social Work, and racism at NYU.

They also discussed Principal Investigator (PI) status for continuing contract faculty, specifically the different ways that NYU defines PI status and any variations across the University.

A senator suggested including a discussion on racial bias in teaching evaluations, along with gender bias, ability bias, etc.

In addition, they discussed that the Provost’s Office is developing a document on how schools define course load and course contact hours, size, development time, and the amount of overall effort that goes into a course. While there are differences between departments, the idea is that general guiding principles from the Provost’s Office would be useful. They noted this should apply to courses taught by all faculty, not just continuing contract faculty. The Provost agreed to also bring this idea to the Dean’s Council. It was noted that the Faculty Handbook states that schools have such a document.
They also discussed developing a larger agenda surrounding major issues from across the University. SC members noted that the issues they have been bringing to the Provost affect all schools, including compensation, workload, academic spending accounts, HR issues, grievances, etc.

Killilea reported they also discussed creating a new position of a designated, neutral, confidential third party to listen, provide and receive information, advise, consult, review, conduct internal fact-finding, and serve as an informal mediator in situations that affect full-time faculty at the University. It was noted the Council is often fielding these inquiries and it would be best to have a central person, outside the Deans’ offices, to serve in this role. This would allow the Council more time to focus on the major issues rather than specific cases.

Senators also asked for an update on the union organizers. Senators discussed the protocol inviting guests and for several invitations to the same group. It was noted there is no policy on inviting guests. It was noted some issues are ongoing with more frequent changes, so some groups might be invited back for an update. Senators discussed the Council taking a vote on each guest to meetings. It was determined to not vote on guests to meetings.

Killilea proposed that Senators work with their constituents to determine the major issues to be presented at the March 26 Council meeting in order to frame the major agenda items to be brought to the Provost at the April 2 meeting.

Killilea concluded from the discussion that the union organizers will be invited to present at the next Council meeting. She will send them any specific questions the Council wishes to address.

In addition, the response to the Council’s review and the final FAS C-Faculty Policies were distributed. See attached Document D.

The Chair’s Report was accepted into the minutes.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

See attached Document C.

**Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:**

**Faculty Advisory Committee on NYU's Global Network**

A Senator inquired on the public events related to academic freedom and how faculty are selected to participate. Committee representative Unnikrishnan corrected the wording in the report, stating faculty are selected from the group of elected representatives.

**Global Network University**

A Senator asked if the Committee has looked into how the Global Research Initiative (GRI) Research Institutes support continuing contract faculty while conducting research abroad.

Committee Chair Ritter noted the Committee is identifying issues, including access to grants and resources, and will include the GRI.

Killilea also asked the Committee to develop language for the GRI emails that makes it clear what is applicable to continuing contract faculty.
No Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:

Educational Policies & Faculty/Student Relations
Faculty Benefits & Housing
Graduate Program Committee

Reports at Meeting:

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
Committee Chair Watkins reported Lisa Coleman will be attending the April 23 Committee meeting. They will be co-sponsoring an event with her office and working on ways to support continuing contract faculty on these issues.

Finance & Policy Planning
Committee Chair Lee reported the Committee is nominating two members to serve on the Compensation Analysis Committee.

Killilea noted it was her impression that the University will be doing an analysis of the compensation data, similar to the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) Equity Report.

Lee asked the Council to send any specific criteria they would like analyzed.

Grievance
Committee Chair Watkins noted the Committee will be bringing a resolution to the Council addressing inconsistencies between grievance policies.

Judicial Board
Committee representative Illingworth reported the Committee will be working on revising the student grievance procedure.

Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (SCOG)
A Senator noted the Committee will be examining the issue of representation of the faculty, students, Dean, and administrators of the new Long Island School of Medicine.

It was noted the new school does not have any tenured or tenure track faculty members, only continuing contract faculty members; and they are not new hires, but existing faculty.

Killilea noted the Senate Executive Committee also discussed the need for SCOG to review Senate representation in general as new schools, especially with large numbers of faculty, etc. are created.

The reports were accepted into the minutes.
NEW BUSINESS

Draft Resolution on Senate Representation of Liberal Studies on Deans Council

See attached Document B.

Senator White presented the proposed resolution that the University’s Bylaws be amended to add a seat for the Liberal Studies Dean on the Deans Council of the University Senate. She reported the Deans Council unanimously approved the resolution, SCOG approved by a vote of 16 in favor and 1 abstention, and the T-FSC approved. It is being presented at an upcoming Administrative Management Council (AMC) meeting. White plans to send it to the University Senate to be presented at the next Senate meeting on March 28.

A Senator asked if this is part of a movement to transition Liberal Studies into a separate school. White stated this is not about Liberal Studies becoming its own school, but about representation for the Dean. It was noted this would be the first Dean to sit on the Deans Council who does not directly report to the President.

A Senator commented that he believes this resolution should first be combined with a discussion on regularizing the LS Faculty Senator into the bylaws, and also on how the Long Island School of Medicine will be represented in the University Senate.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Marlon Lynch from Department of Public Safety (DPS)

See attached Document E.

Marlon Lynch, Senior Vice President of Campus Services and Safety presented on his background. He noted he arrived at NYU in the Fall of 2016 from the University of Chicago, where he served as the Associate Vice President for Safety and Security. He noted the University of Chicago has a sworn police department, with 100+ police officers, with an extended patrol radius of 5 square miles, serving the Southside community of Hyde Park and Woodlawn, as well as Kingwood, of about 60,000 residents, plus the hospital and the University. He noted this is his 18th year in higher education, all primarily in major urban cities for research institutions. At NYU he has been charged primarily with creating an enterprise Public Safety solution to the Global Network at NYU. In NYC, there are about 430-450 total people in the department, including supporting roles. In Abu Dhabi, there are about 185 in public safety and in Shanghai, about 75 in public safety.

Lynch stated the department’s mission is a commitment to providing safety and security for the community and property, and enabling the pursuit of academic and professional goals. The core values are professionalism, excellence, and community.

In terms of professionalism, this means proper training on what is needed today and expected in the future. Excellence is how the department performs and identifying when it is not performing at a certain level or meeting expectations. In terms of community, he noted understanding the specific needs of NYU.

DPS Accomplishments

Lynch noted recent accomplishments, which included the opening of the 561 LaGuardia Place location, which provided needed space, including a training room.

He reported the launch of the Women in Public Safety initiative. He commented that the department is now one of the most diverse on campus. This initiative creates pathways for promotion, additional training, and mentoring relationships. He noted at a recent event the guest speaker was NYPD Assistant Kim Royster, the highest-ranking black woman in department history.

DPS has also worked on strengthening public safety support at NYU Abu Dhabi.
Office of the Senior Vice President

Lynch noted the establishment of the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC), which consists of twelve representatives, including faculty, staff, and students. This serves as an advisory committee to the department to help understand the needs of constituents, and to communicate DPS initiatives.

His group also developed a three-year strategic plan that incorporates trends in public safety in higher education.

They also developed standardized contracts, post orders, and protocols at Global Academic Centers (GACs) to create consistency across the centers.

Field Operations

Lynch listed several community outreach events hosted by DPS, including “Dig in with DPS”, which partners with students, “A Taste of Safety @ Tandon Makerspace”, which is a way to engage with the Brooklyn campus, and “Chew with CRU”, which takes place in resident halls and addresses various themes, from registering laptops, to discussing incidents in the resident halls.

He noted an expansion of the victim services and investigations program to assist those who are victims of crimes, stalking, domestic violence, etc.

He also noted that the department is actively involved in several University Committees including Diversity and Inclusion, Accessibility, Sustainability, and Superblock Stewardship.

Emergency Preparedness and Continuity

Lynch reported the Executive Policy Committee, which consists of the President, Provost, and Vice President, participated in table top exercises, playing out various “what if” scenarios. These exercises were also completed by Shanghai’s Executive Committee, and expectedly by Abu Dhabi in the fall.

He noted the Active Threat training exercises, which they hope to expand involvement.

He also reported on enhanced travel support provided by GSOC (NYU Traveler), including an easier way to register trips.

Technical Operations

Lynch reported on the new NYU Madrid academic center and its security technology upgrades. He noted the NYU ID should work across all global sites.

He reported on the acquisition of ID printers for GAC deployment, which will now allow NYU ID cards to be printed locally.

He reported on the security technology Requests for Proposal (RFP). For example, all equipment for the 181 Mercer Street building will be purchased in bulk at a discount.

Planning, Policy and Engagement

Lynch noted the department is preparing for an accreditation assessment. They also launched a Transportation Advisory Committee.

Questions from the Council
Lynch opened the floor to questions. In response to a question on snow days, he responded that NYU follows the decisions of the City of New York on delays and closings.

In response to a question on Tandon’s security, he responded laptops and card readers are now at security posts.

In response to a question on what training is provided to security guards in AD regarding ID review at security desks, he noted guards are trained to ask for IDs from all who enter. He noted, unlike the Square, AD does not have card readers or turn-styles, and there are sometimes multiple access points to buildings. He noted this may lead to inconsistencies if people are known to the security guard, etc. but noted he will address this at the next visit to AD.

In response to a Senator’s question on medical training for security guards, he stated they have an annual basic first responder training, which includes CPR. Some officers may have also have enhanced training from from EMT backgrounds or policing agencies.

A Senator suggested the Active Threat training be available for adjuncts and staff, as it is for full-time faculty. Lynch noted the department’s goal is to create various modules on the DPS website that can be easily accessed by the University community.

A Senator asked if these trainings could be customized. Lynch noted they could work together before the training to identify any variations that may be helpful based on the school, its location, and classroom spaces.

The Council thanked Lynch for his presentation.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 AM.
1. **Steering Committee Meeting with the Provost**
   The steering committee met with Provost Fleming on Tuesday February 5, 2019 and discussed:
   
   - Principles surrounding course load.
   - Guidelines for use of professional development funds.
   - Process for contract faculty PI status.
   - Potential job description for a faculty resource person.

2. **Steering Committee Meeting with the President**
   The steering committee will meet with the President later on Thursday February 7, 2019

3. **Board of Trustees**
   The attached resolution was passed at February 27, 2019 Board of Trustees Meeting approved the renaming of the Department of Information, Operations, and Management Sciences in the Stern School of Business as the Department of Technology, Operations, and Statistics, effective March 1, 2019.
DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

REPRESENTATION OF LIBERAL STUDIES IN THE
DEANS COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

WHEREAS, Liberal Studies ("LS") is an academic unit under the umbrella of the Faculty of Arts and Science ("FAS") comprised of a two-year Core Program and the four-year Bachelor of Arts degree; and

WHEREAS, LS has approximately 2,600 students, 84 full-time faculty, and 73 part-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, FAS designates one of its Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council seats to LS, and the LS Dean has traditionally participated in the Senate as an alternate for the FAS Dean; and

WHEREAS, in recognition of LS’s many important attributes of a college or school within the University, including, among other things, degree-granting status, infrastructure, unique identify, dedicated faculty, alumni, student council, and student life programing, in June 2018, the Board of Trustees, on the recommendation of the Senate, approved the addition of a regular Senate seat for LS students; and

WHEREAS, the Deans Council voted on November 28, 2018 and the Senate Committee on Organization and Governance voted on February 22, 2019 to recommend to the Senate that the LS Dean be granted a seat on the Deans Council of the Senate.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate recommends to the University’s Board of Trustees that the University’s Bylaws be amended to add a seat for the LS Dean on the Deans Council of the Senate and to make such other changes to the Bylaws as are necessary to reflect this addition.
C-FSC Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee

Date: March 04, 2019
Members: Illingworth (Chair), Frangos, Gershman, Lim, Molé Liston

The committee met on March 4, 2019. Members German, Liston, and Illingworth were present. Illingworth also participated in meeting with the office of MJ Knoll-Finn and T-FSC colleagues on February 20, 2019.

REPORT

Spring Admits
The committee is seeking specific data about additional courses added to summer term(s) in service of supporting spring admits as well as finalizing information about any other known workload adjustments for contract faculty to date. Our goal is to present some suggestions for best practices about joint/shared governance strategies and communication if this program might expand (and for future programs under consideration that might include similar impacts to faculty). We’d be grateful for any additional information or connections other council colleagues might have to make sure we gather as much data as possible. We raised the issue of spring admits impacting contract faculty leave etc. (specifically mentioning Expository Writing) in our meeting with MJ Knoll Finn’s office last month. They said they would look into it and asked for other examples of unintended consequences.

Online Course Evaluations
We continue to work with T-FSC colleagues focused on generating a report regarding response rate and other issues with online course evaluations. In our meeting with MJ Knoll Finn’s office, we raised the issue of online evals with Vice Provost Georgina (Gigi) Dopico. She said that the C-FSC report was being taken seriously and they’ve asked Institutional Research to do a study of the data in April. We asked if they are/would consider moving to eliminate them from use for promotion/retention/tenure decisions (like USC did) or reconsider their use for AMI. She replied that certainly if the study demonstrates bias, as they imagine it might given other studies, we would need to discuss how to ensure that could be improved and how to avoid that being a part of HR processes that could influence an outcome.

Discussion with MJ’s Office
MJ’s office provided some update data regarding enrollment. Year 1 retention is up to 94% (This # does not/will not include spring admits). They are adding some working groups that will likely include elected faculty. Flags on students are up 35% and there have been more that 12,000 advising notes (which they see as a sign the tool is working). Finally, the demand from the federal government to track "academic engagement" to comply with Title IV will roll out in the fall. It is likely be a button to be clicked in Albert on class rosters. We will be able to click for the entire class at once or individual students. It will be clear what 'academic engagement' means for these purposes.
Committee on Faculty Benefits and Housing

Representatives from the C-FSC, T-FSC, and AMC have now been invited to the quarterly meetings of the University’s Retirement Plan Investment Committee. Meetings for 2019 will take place: March (TBA), June 4th, September 10th, and December 5th. I will be serving as the C-FSC representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi,
chair
C-FSC GNU Committee

Thursday, February 14, 2019 regular meeting
Members present:  Monika Lin, Emily Goldman, Jon Ritter

At the February meeting Jon Ritter joined the committee as C-FSC chair Mary Killilea’s appointment to replace Sam Howard Spink, who is on sabbatical. The members present elected Ritter to be chair, replacing Spink. We discussed our agenda for Spring 2019, agreeing to focus on concerns for continuing contract faculty at the portal campuses. Monika outlined some of the issues for continuing contract faculty at NYU Shanghai, and Jon and Emily discussed their experience with these issues in their schools and on the C-FSC. These issues include access to grants, education benefits, family support, and guidelines for hiring and promotion at the portal campuses. The committee will document these issues further at our next meeting, and we will work to prepare recommendations for further information gathering and policy changes.

Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 28, 2019

Respectfully submitted, by,

Jon Ritter, chair
Report of Faculty Committee on NYU's Global Network
Submitted by Deepak Unnikrishnan

On Feb 7, 2019, the Faculty Committee on NYU's Global Network met to discuss: 1) public events connected to academic freedom, and 2) contract faculty in the global network.

1. 3 Public Events Related to Academic Freedom

- The proposed model is to host one event at each portal. The event will be live streamed. In New York, select faculty associated with or affiliated with NYU Abu Dhabi will be invited to participate and/or attend the event. The format, as to how to conduct the panel or discussion, is in the process of being finalized.

- It was suggested that these events not be advertised as being only NYU Abu Dhabi-related, or specific, that the debate feel more global, by offering invitations and overtures to faculty from Shanghai and/or elsewhere.

- There was, again, much debate as to why Abu Dhabi seems to be receiving most of the attention, while Shanghai feels less visible.

2. Contract Faculty in the Global Network

- The faculty committee on NYU's Global Network discussed equity, access to global networks and status of contract faculty within the NYU framework. An NYUAD colleague referenced the contract faculty guidelines in Abu Dhabi, an important document in-progress, as well as emphasizing connectivity issues between faculty associated with NYUAD and NYU's global network. And thanks to other comments from individuals who have worked at other portals and sites, a suggestion was put forth to rethink the structure of representation.

- It was also brought to everyone's attention that it would be helpful to have more contract faculty contribute to the conversation (and perhaps the committee) since there was no representation, especially if contract faculty issues, like the aforementioned topic, were being discussed.

- Finally, it was proposed contract faculty be asked the following question: Do you have the access to the Global Network that you wish you had? Whether this be done through a survey, or other means, wasn't agreed upon. However, it was suggested both approaches be administered.
**Graduate Program Committee**  
Iskender Sahin

The Graduate Program Committee met on February 13 and discussed the MOI of a Stern Program "MS in Quantitative Economics (MQE)". It differs from the existing MA in Economics by FAS as it is a 1-year program with day classes.

It is not an on-line program.
February 8, 2019

Memorandum To: Thomas Carew, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
    Wen Ling, Chair, T-FSC
    Mary Killilea, Chair, C-FSC

From: Katherine E. Fleming, Provost

Subject: Faculty of Arts and Science Policies and Procedures for the Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Continuing Contract Faculty

I write to formally conclude the iterative process to establish FAS Continuing Contract Faculty policies.

The final steps of this process involved a review of the recommendations of the T-FSC and the C-FSC on earlier drafts of the policies. In considering these recommendations, FAS undertook an extended consultative process that is described in the attached memo from Dean Carew. My office also reviewed these recommendations with reference to University policies and the Faculty Handbook, keeping in mind that the Handbook provides general principles while leaving schools the flexibility to develop policies that are consistent with their culture, history, and organization. That process has now been completed and FSC recommendations have been incorporated into the final documents.

I am attaching the two sets of guidelines titled FAS Policies and Procedures – Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointments, and FAS Policies and Procedures – Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor. These policies are effective as of February 15, 2019 and FAS will post the policies on its website.

I am also attaching the FAS responses to the FSC recommendations. I thank the T-FSC and the C-FSC for your thoughtful review of the FAS policies, which your recommendations have helped to strengthen.

Attachments

Copy to: Jonathan Lipman, Associate Dean for Faculty Advancement and Associate Dean for the Humanities
        Carol Morrow, Vice Provost
        Peter Gonzalez, Associate Provost, Faculty Appointments
        Karyn Ridder, Manager of Faculty Governance
To:        Provost Katherine Fleming  
        Vice Provost Carol Morrow

From: Thomas Carew

Re:    Continuing Contract Faculty Guidelines

Date:    February 7, 2019

I am pleased to notify you that the FAS faculty have voted to approve the revised FAS Guidelines for the appointment, reappointment and promotion of Continuing Contract Faculty.

The two sets of guidelines titled *FAS Policies and Procedures – Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointments*, and *FAS Policies and Procedures – Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor* were presented at a meeting of the full FAS Faculty on December 5, 2018 and were unanimously approved by an open vote of the Continuing Contract Faculty and Tenured/Tenure Track faculty in attendance.

Both sets of guidelines take into consideration the recommendations of the Tenured-Faculty Senators Counsel (submitted to the Provost on May 4, and October 18, 2017) and the Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Counsel (submitted to the Provost on May 22, 2017). These recommendations were incorporated as appropriate.

The guidelines also reflect two independent reviews undertaken by CCF ad-hoc committees in Fall 2015 and again in 2018. The latter was convened by Dean Carew in January 2018 and concluded its work in November 2018. That committee, consisting of 4 CCF faculty, including one member of the CCF Faculty Senators Counsel and three members of the FAS Faculty Assembly, formally submitted the guidelines to the full FAS faculty on December 5, 2018.

With approval we will formally adopt the revised policies and procedures for both classifications of Continuing Contract Faculty

I am attaching the following documents:

1) Clean copies of the revised guidelines

   *FAS Policies and Procedures – Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointments*
FAS Policies and Procedures – Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor

2) FAS Responses to the recommendations of the Faculty Senators Counsels

FAS response to the recommendations of the Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Counsel in regard to Faculty of Arts and Sciences Proposed: Policies and procedures for Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Grievance Procedures, and Voting Rights for Clinical Faculty.

FAS response to the recommendations of the T-Faculty Senators Counsel
Recommendations for Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointments.

FAS Response to Recommendations of the C-FSC in regard to FAS Policies and Procedures Recruitment of New Faculty Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointment NYU Faculty of Arts and Science.

FAS Response to Recommendations of the C-FSC in regard to FAS Policies and Procedures Recruitment of New Faculty Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor NYU Faculty of Arts and Science.

Please let me, or Jonathan Lipman know if you need any additional information or clarification.

cc: Jonathan Lipman
FAS Policies and Procedures

Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor

This document supplements NYU policies applicable to full-time continuing contract faculty. If any part of this document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies then in effect will control. As with all NYU and FAS policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

Introduction

Clinical faculty are full-time Continuing Contract Faculty positions that provide coordination, continuity, and consistency in instruction and/or administration. Appointees must be experienced or highly knowledgeable in their particular fields and, where relevant, have had experience in curriculum development and supervision of laboratory facilities and teaching assistants. Appointees should possess relevant advanced degree or scholarly or professional credentials, which may vary by discipline and department, as developed in consultation with the Divisional Dean.

Clinical appointments are primarily teaching positions, and often include some administrative and/or supervisory responsibilities. Research is not part of the clinical faculty’s formal obligations; however, research activities may be considered when being reviewed for reappointment, promotion, or annual reviews. Although clinical appointments are without tenure, they are typically multi-year appointments. Clinical faculty members are protected by academic freedom. They receive the same health, retirement and tuition remission benefits as tenured and tenure track faculty. Clinical faculty are ineligible for sabbaticals and generally ineligible for NYU faculty housing.

The appointment processes for Continuing Contract Faculty, including clinical faculty, shall reflect the University’s overriding commitment to enhance academic excellence and to provide students with the best available educational experience. Thus, each Continuing Contract Faculty appointment and reappointment shall be evaluated in the light of the contribution it makes to the distinct excellence of the school, including its educational and training programs, and shall exemplify the University’s commitment to appoint and retain the best faculty in all disciplines.

Titles and Qualifications

- **Clinical Assistant Professor** - Teaching experience, minimum of a master's degree in the field of expertise, or other appropriate advanced degree.
- **Clinical Associate Professor** – At least six years of relevant teaching and professional experience at NYU or elsewhere; evidence of supervisory experience (where relevant); superior contributions to the teaching program; as well as recognition for excellence in the professional field and innovation in the area of instruction. Minimum of a master's degree in the field of expertise or other appropriate advanced degree.
- **Clinical Professor** - A minimum of 12 years of teaching and related professional experience at NYU or elsewhere, evidence of extraordinary contribution to the NYU teaching program, and evidence of recognition for leadership and innovation in the professional field (e.g. leadership in a relevant national organization or recognition for excellence and innovation in teaching). Minimum of master's
degree in the field of expertise or other appropriate advanced degree.
As per University Bylaw 81(c), “Degree Programs” a degree candidate who accepts appointment as a full-time Continuing Contract Faculty member must there upon relinquish candidacy for a degree at NYU. As appropriate, the FAS Dean can request an exception from the NYU Board of Trustees.

Continuing Contract Faculty also include Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, who are addressed separately under {LINK}

**Areas of Responsibilities** – Responsibilities include some, but not necessarily all of the following, and need not be restricted to them:

- **Teaching** - The normal course load for clinical faculty is three courses per term. This load may be reduced depending on other assigned duties or responsibilities. With the approval of the relevant Divisional and School Deans, administrative and professional duties and other professional activities that serve FAS may, if comparable in time demands to one or more courses, substitute for such courses.
- **Service** - Participation on departmental, FAS and/or University-wide committees is expected. Individual departments and programs will determine the appropriate opportunities for service. Clinical faculty are also expected to be available to provide advice to the department chair or director of undergraduate studies or director of graduate studies regarding curriculum, teaching assignments, and any other matters related to their area of instruction.
- **Research** – Although there is no obligation to conduct research, clinical faculty may be eligible to be principal investigators on curriculum grants, training and teaching grants and other non-research grants in accordance with University policy. Approval to serve as principal investigator on research-related grants will be considered on a case by case basis in accordance with University policy.
- **Administration** – In some cases, clinical faculty will have program-related administrative duties, including but not limited to: curriculum development, selection of textbooks and instructional methodologies, implementation of technologies, class schedules, student advisement, supervision of laboratories (if applicable), supervision and training of clinical faculty and adjuncts, and program management.

**Terms of Appointment**

- Unless stipulated otherwise in an appointment letter, clinical faculty are appointed for the academic year (September to May) and paid over twelve months (starting October 1). If appointed mid-year, the term of the appointment should be aligned to include the partial year and subsequent full academic year (i.e., the initial appointment would be for at least 1.5 years).
- Summer teaching appointments are optional and are made, subject to curricular needs and the faculty member’s desire to teach, with additional compensation. Administrative duties that carry over beyond the nine-month academic year and require service during the summer may carry additional summer compensation.
- For Clinical Assistant Professors, the initial appointment can be made for one to three years. Subsequent reappointment can be made for one to three years. For Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors, the initial appointment is also for one to three years. In no case will a series of one year contracts exceed 3 years.
- Candidates are eligible for five-year reappointment contracts at all ranks only if they have been at NYU for at least six years and have had at least one prior contract renewal at NYU.
- The length of reappointment is determined by performance as well as curricular needs of the department or program.
- One-year appointments are exceptional and typically reserved to address temporary programmatic needs (e.g., a leave or resignation), though appointments may be renewed on an annual
basis for up to 3 years on the recommendation of the chair or director.
• There is no limit to the number of terms that a clinical faculty member at any rank can be reappointed.
• Appointments automatically terminate at the close of the period of time stipulated in the contract, unless there is an official notice of renewal.

Annual Review

Clinical faculty are subject to the annual merit increase (AMI) review, conducted for all full-time faculty members by the department chair or program director, with input from the appropriate faculty committee, as per department or program procedure. Clinical Faculty will submit an Annual Faculty Personnel Record Supplement, usually in January of each academic year, to report on their teaching and service. This report will be used in the annual merit review, which typically considers the faculty member’s teaching performance, contribution to the effectiveness of the program or department, and relevant administrative performance. Note that additional weight will be given to the performance of administrative duties for faculty whose duties are primarily administrative. Scholarly and research activities (e.g. publications) are not required, but may be considered.

Governance

Full Faculty meeting attendance and voting rights can be found under University Bylaw 82 (c). FAS practice is to hold joint full faculty meetings inclusive of continuing contract faculty, including clinical faculty, and tenure/tenure track faculty. Clinical faculty are also eligible to participate and vote in the FAS Faculty Assembly.

At the department level, continuing contract faculty, including clinical faculty, may participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion and tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure-track faculty¹, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty of NYU (e.g. curricular changes that impact their contract renewal or relate to their personal degree program (if an exception to Bylaw 81(c) has been approved).

Procedures for Recruitment and Appointment

As part of the Annual Planning Report, each chair/director forwards to the Divisional Dean a Faculty Staffing Plan outlining requests for new faculty hiring. In particular, the request should include a justification that there is an important teaching need, and that this need can best be met with a continuing contract faculty appointment, including a clinical faculty appointment, rather than a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. Detailed procedures for recruitment of new full time faculty, including clinical faculty, are available online at http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.

Contracts specifying the terms and length of employment are issued by the Divisional Dean.

¹ Note that continuing contract faculty may be invited by the department chair to participate in the hiring of tenured/tenure track faculty.
Procedures for Reappointment General Considerations

Reappointment is based on departmental criteria of overall performance as a teacher and, if applicable, as an administrator. Research activities are not required for reappointment, but may be considered. In addition, reappointment is subject to the academic and curricular needs of FAS and the University; thus, review for reappointment and promotion shall consider curricular or structural changes and improvements in academic programs. Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvement in academic programs. In this case, the basis for non-reappointment will be clearly stated in the notice given to the faculty member. The review will also comment on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and or new academic structure, and in what capacity.

Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion

University guidelines require Continuing Contract Faculty, including clinical faculty, to be reviewed in the penultimate year of a multi-year contract. Penultimate year reviews must be submitted by the department or program to the appropriate Divisional Dean by March 15. If the department has any concerns that a clinical faculty member is not fulfilling the requirements of the position or that the position may not be needed to fulfill the teaching mission of the department or program, these should be clearly outlined in the report submitted to the Divisional Dean. Any reservations must be shared in writing and in person with the faculty member, who is obliged to acknowledge receipt of this information by countersigning the report on a summary of the report, so that he or she is under no misunderstanding regarding the expectations for him or her. The chair or director must submit a written report to the Divisional Dean that includes the substance of the review and a recommendation for reappointment, promotion or termination. In the event of a decision to reappoint the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally for another multi-year term.

Following a review, if the decision is not to offer a reappointment, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than August 31st of the penultimate year, and shall continue to be under contract for the final year.

Upon request, the timing of a review may be delayed by stopping the contract clock for reasonable cause that has been approved by the Divisional Dean, e.g., medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, same sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation.

When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there is no reappointment process and the faculty member will be notified in the penultimate year; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development.

For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance of these duties in both multi-year appointments and recommendations for promotion.

Reappointment for One-Year or Two-Year Contracts

In addition to contracts of three years or more, clinical faculty may be recommended by the department chair or director to a series of one-year or two-year full time contracts. Notification of reappointment decisions should be made to the Divisional Dean by March 15th. In the third year of
continuous one-year appointments, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review comparable to those to which faculty members on longer multiyear contacts are subject.

Clinical faculty members will be limited to no more than three consecutive one-year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multi-year contract or not reappointed at all. In the case of continuing two-year contracts, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review comparable to those which faculty members on longer multi-year contracts are subject to in the first semester of the third year of continuous service.

**Formal Review Processes**

The review, whether for renewal and/or promotion is undertaken by a committee appointed by the department chair or director or elected by the department or faculty as per the custom of the department or program. The committee must consist of three to five full-time faculty, with a minimum of one tenured or tenure-track faculty and at least one Continuing Contract Faculty member. Any deviation from this configuration of the committee must be approved by the appropriate Divisional Dean. If a department or program does not have sufficient tenured or tenure track faculty to participate in the review process, the department or program committee may consist entirely of Continuing Contract Faculty from the program, or at the discretion of the Divisional Dean, an ad hoc committee of Continuing Contract Faculty from other FAS departments or programs may be formed.

In the case of promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professors are not eligible to serve. In the case of promotion to Clinical Professor, Clinical Assistant Professors and Clinical Associate Professors are not eligible to serve.

In the case of reappointment, the committee shall not include clinical faculty under review for reappointment that year.

**I. PROMOTION: General Procedures**

If the review packet is for promotion, it also must describe how the candidate meets the qualifications for Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor as prescribed by the “Titles and Qualifications” section of this document. Furthermore, the candidate must have been in his or her current rank for a minimum of three years and had at least one prior reappointment at the current rank to be eligible for promotion in rank. Recommendation for promotion should be made to the Divisional Dean by March 15th.

In addition to the consideration of teaching, administration, and service activities, recommendations regarding promotion also may be based on a prognosis of the clinical faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of FAS. Research activities are not required for promotion, but may be considered.

Candidates may request promotion during their second review in rank and any year after.

**II. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES**

The candidate should submit a personal statement, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations to the chair or director of the department; for candidates on multi-year appointments, this should be submitted on or before February 1 of the penultimate year of their current appointment. These materials are to be made available to the review committee for their evaluation. The review committee
should prepare a report of their evaluation and recommendation, which has been read, approved, and
signed by all committee members before it is submitted to the department. The review may be written
by the committee chair or a member of the committee. The committee report should represent a
collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If
there is a division, the dissenting opinion should be appended to the majority review. The committee
report may be supplemented by input from other members of the department. Depending on the norms
of the department, the committee report and supporting materials may be made available to all eligible
faculty for a vote. Eligible faculty include all full-time members of the faculty that are of equal or higher
rank than the faculty member being reviewed or promoted as determined by the department.

The review packet to be presented to the department chair/director and/or the full faculty should normally
include:

- An up-to-date curriculum vitae of the candidate
- A description of the candidate's teaching and administrative responsibilities
- A list of all courses taught since the last review
- Committee service
- An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:
  - Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
  - Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
  - Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)
- An evaluation by the committee of the candidate’s other contributions to the instructional
  program, for example, curriculum development
- If applicable, an evaluation of the candidate’s administrative performance, including any role in
  the training and supervising of other faculty. Note that additional weight will be given to the
  performance of administrative duties for faculty whose duties are primarily administrative
- A personal statement from the candidate assessing his or her contributions
- If applicable, scholarship including, but not limited to, research and publications related to their
  specific discipline or field, to the pedagogy of their field, or to the work of the
  department/program/university may be included.
- Candidates may include additional documents to support their renewal and or promotion.

The committee will consider all work activity, as listed above, since the last review, including materials
from the ultimate year of the previous contract.

The recommendation of the chair/director should be forwarded to the Divisional Dean along with a draft
of the candidate’s summary letter, the review packet, the committee’s recommendation and, in the case of
a full faculty vote, the vote of the faculty by March 15th.

Following approval of the Divisional Dean a summary of the review, prepared by the chair or director in
the form of a letter, must be given to the candidate and discussed with him or her by the chair or director.
The candidate must sign the letter to indicate that he or she has read it and discussed it with the chair or
director. This summary must cover both strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance.

The summary letter to the candidate must include the recommendations of the evaluation committee as
well as the chair/director’s recommendation to the Divisional Dean, including promotion, the length of
reappointment (if that is the decision), and a signature block for the candidate. It must also include the
following sentences:
1. Regardless of the merits for reappointment/promotion at this time, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of future reappointment.

2. Candidates will be judged for reappointment/promotion in the future according to the conditions and standards in effect at the time of their next review.

3. I have read this letter and understand its content.

III. FAS DEAN’S OFFICE PROCEDURE

The departmental review and all relevant supporting materials will be reviewed by the relevant Divisional Dean. Additional input from the Dean of the College of Arts and Science, and the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Science may also be sought, as appropriate. In the event of a split vote or other reasons deemed necessary to insure a thorough review the Deans may consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate's home department. If there are questions in any particular case, the chair of the department review committee may be asked to provide additional information to the Divisional Dean.

The Divisional Dean makes his or her recommendation to the Dean of Arts and Science. If the recommendation of the Divisional Dean is contrary to the recommendation of the chair/director or if the case produces a negative or split committee vote, the Divisional Dean will also forward the review packet to the Dean of Arts and Science. After receiving the Divisional Deans advice and relevant materials, the Dean of Arts and Science will inform the department chair of the advice provided by the Divisional Dean as well as his or her own decision. If the decision of the Arts and Science Dean is contrary to that of the departmental evaluation committee, the Dean will provide the department chair with the reasons. The chair or director has an opportunity to respond to the Dean’s decision in writing and provide additional information within ten days.

Notice of intention not to reappoint shall be sent to the faculty member not later than August 31st of the penultimate year of the contract.

Faculty Grievances

Faculty Grievances are classified into two main types: 1) those connected with reappointment or promotion and 2) those concerned with other matters, such as duties, salaries, perquisites, and working conditions.

As per university guidelines, with respect to grievances related to reappointment and promotion, outcomes of the review process or decisions reached through the review process can be grieved only to the extent that they involve violation of University-protected rights of faculty members. Thus, a grievance of either type must allege that 1) the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration; or 2) that the decisions violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question, in which case the burden of proof falls to the grievant.

- The decision not to undertake the reappointment process where a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term, and where no similar position is open, is not the basis for a grievance.
- A clinical faculty member whose contract is non-renewable or who is not eligible for reappointment cannot grieve a decision not to reappoint.
• Individuals on multi-year contracts of three years or more who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be reappointed do have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision with respect to reappointment or promotion, under the same criteria as cited in the preceding paragraph.

• Faculty on continuous one-year or two-year appointments are similarly entitled to grieve the process in the event the third year review process leads to a negative decision.

If a faculty member’s grievance is not settled informally at a level below the Dean, or by the Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean to convoke the FAS Grievance Committee, to hear grievances in order to advise the Dean.

The FAS Grievance Committee is composed of nine tenured full professors elected by the FAS, with three members from each academic division, and six at large continuing contract faculty (senior language lecturer, clinical associate and full professors), two from the Expository Writing Program and four from other units in FAS. Sitting department chairs and program heads may not serve on the Committee on Grievance. The Dean shall convoke the committee within fifteen working days of receiving the faculty member’s appeal.

Appeal

Following the review of the FAS Grievance Committee, in the event the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is not to reappoint or promote, an appeal can be made to the Provost, following the procedures enumerated in the Faculty Handbook.

General Disciplinary Regulations

All faculty members have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments. These rules protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. In particular, the faculty member is obligated to comply with the standards of academic freedom as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Disciplinary action may follow when the faculty member engages in other conduct unbecoming a member of the faculty, such as violation of the New York University Rules for the Maintenance of Public Order, any action which interferes with the regular operations of the University or the rights of others, any serious violation of the law, or any other conduct prejudicial to the teaching, research, or welfare of the University as set forth in the Faculty Handbook.
FAS Policies and Procedures

Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointments

This document supplements NYU policies applicable to full-time continuing contract faculty. If any part of this document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies then in effect will control. As with all NYU and FAS policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

Introduction

Language Lecturers (LL) and Senior Language Lecturers (SLL) are full-time continuing contract faculty positions that provide coordination, continuity, and consistency in instruction and/or administration. Appointees must be experienced or highly knowledgeable in their particular fields and, where relevant, have had experience in language acquisition and curriculum development. Appointees should possess relevant advanced degree or scholarly or professional credentials, which may vary by discipline and department, as developed in consultation with the Divisional Dean.

Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer appointments are primarily teaching positions, but may include some administrative and/or supervisory responsibilities. Research is not part of the LL or SLL faculty’s formal obligations; however, research activities may be considered when being reviewed for reappointment, promotion, or annual reviews. Although LL and SLL appointments are without tenure, they are typically multi-year appointments. LL and SLL faculty members are protected by academic freedom. They receive the same health, retirement and tuition remission benefits as tenured and tenure track faculty. LLs and SLLs are ineligible for sabbaticals and generally ineligible for NYU faculty housing.

The appointment processes for Continuing Contract Faculty, including Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, shall reflect the University’s overriding commitment to enhance academic excellence and to provide students with the best available educational experience. Thus, each continuing contract faculty appointment and reappointment shall be evaluated in the light of the contribution it makes to the distinct excellence of the school, including its educational and training programs, and shall exemplify the University’s commitment to appoint and retain the best faculty in all disciplines.

Titles and Qualifications

Language Lecturer – Teaching experience, minimum of a master’s degree in foreign language teaching or other appropriate advanced degree and professional attainment in relevant teaching.

Senior Language Lecturer – minimum of a master’s degree in foreign language teaching; or other appropriate advanced degree; demonstrated excellence in teaching and instruction; and at least six years of teaching and related professional experience at NYU or elsewhere: evidence of supervisory experience (where relevant); superior contributions to the teaching program, as well as recognition for excellence in the professional field (e.g. leadership in a relevant national organization or recognition for excellence and innovation in teaching).
As per University Bylaw 81(c), “Degree Programs” a degree candidate who accepts appointment as a full-time Continuing Contract Faculty member must there upon relinquish candidacy for a degree at NYU. As appropriate, the FAS Dean can request an exception from the NYU Board of Trustees.

Continuing Contract Faculty also include Clinical Assistant Professors, Clinical Associate Professors, and Clinical Professors, who are addressed separately under {LINK}

**Areas of Responsibilities**– Responsibilities include some, but not necessarily all of the following, and need not be restricted to them:

- **Teaching** - the normal course load for Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers is three courses per term. This load may be reduced depending on other assigned duties or responsibilities. With the approval of the relevant Divisional and School Deans, administrative and professional duties and other professional activities that serve FAS may, if comparable in time demands to one or more courses, substitute for such courses.
- **Service** - participation on departmental, FAS and/or University-wide committees. Individual departments and programs will determine the appropriate opportunities for service. Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers are also expected to be available to provide advice to the department chair or director of undergraduate studies or director of graduate studies regarding curriculum, teaching assignments, and any other matters related to their area of instruction.
- **Research** - Although there is no obligation to conduct research, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers may be eligible to be principal investigators on curriculum grants, training and teaching grants and other non-research grants in accordance with University policy. Approval to serve as principal investigator on research-related grants will be considered on a case by case basis in accordance with University policy.
- **Administrative** - In some cases, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers will have program-related administrative duties, including but not limited to: curriculum development, selection of textbooks and instructional methodologies, implementation of technologies, class schedules, student advisement, supervision of laboratories (if applicable), supervision and training of full time language faculty and adjuncts, and program management.

**Terms of Appointment**

- Unless stipulated otherwise in an appointment letter, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers are appointed for the academic year (September to May) and paid over twelve months (starting October 1). If appointed mid-year, the term of the appointment should be aligned to include the partial year and subsequent full academic year (i.e., the initial appointment would be for at least 1.5 years).
- Summer teaching appointments are optional and are made, subject to curricular needs and the faculty member’s desire to teach, with additional compensation. Administrative duties that carry over beyond the nine-month academic year and require service during the summer may carry additional summer compensation.
- **Language Lecturers**: the initial appointment can be made for one to three years. Subsequent reappointment can be made for one to three years. Appointments in this rank cannot be made for more than a total of six years. However, in no case will a series of one year appointments exceed three years. After three one year contracts, Language Lecturers will either be provided with a multi-year contract or not be reappointed at all. A Language Lecturer who is not promoted to Senior Language Lecturer at the expiration of six years shall be ineligible for reappointment as a Language Lecturer in FAS.
- **Senior Language Lecturers**: the initial appointment is for one to three years. The subsequent reappointment(s) can be made for one to five years. Senior Language Lecturers are eligible for a five year reappointment contract if they have been at NYU at least six years and have at least one prior contract renewal at NYU. There is no limit to the number of terms that a Senior Language Lecturer can be reappointed.
• The length of reappointment is determined by performance as well as curricular needs of the department or program.
• One-year appointments are considered exceptions and are typically reserved to address temporary programmatic needs (e.g., a leave or resignation), though one year appointments may be renewed on an annual basis for up to three years on the recommendation of the chair or director.
• Appointments automatically terminate at the close of the period of time stipulated in the contract, unless there is an official notice of renewal.

Annual Review

Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers are subject to the annual merit increase (AMI) review, conducted for all full-time faculty members by the department chair or program director, with input from the appropriate faculty committee, as per department or program procedure. Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers will submit an Annual Faculty Personnel Record Supplement, usually in January of each academic year, to report on their teaching and service. This report will be used in the annual merit review, which typically considers the faculty member’s teaching performance, contribution to the effectiveness of the program or department, and relevant administrative performance. Note that additional weight will be given to the performance of administrative duties for faculty whose duties are primarily administrative. Scholarly and research activities (e.g. publications) are not required, but may be considered.

Governance

Full Faculty meeting attendance and voting rights can be found under University Bylaw 82 (c). FAS practice is to hold joint full faculty meetings inclusive of continuing contract faculty, including Language Lecturers, Senior Language Lecturers, and tenure/tenure track faculty. Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers are also eligible to participate and vote in the FAS Faculty Assembly.

At the department level, Continuing Contract Faculty, including Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, may participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion and tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure-track faculty¹, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty of NYU (e.g. curricular changes that impact their contract renewal or relate to their personal degree program (if an exception to Bylaw 81(c) has been approved).

Procedures for Recruitment and Appointment

As part of the Annual Planning Report, the chair/director forwards to the Divisional Dean a Faculty Staffing Plan outlining requests for new faculty hiring. In particular, the request should include a justification that there is an important teaching need, and that this need can best be met with a Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer. Detailed procedures for recruitment of new full-time faculty, including Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, are available online at [http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment). Contracts specifying the terms and length of employment are issued by the Divisional Dean.

¹ Note that continuing contract faculty may be invited by the department chair to participate on search committees in the hiring of tenured/tenure track faculty.
Procedures for Reappointment General Considerations

Reappointment is based on departmental criteria of overall performance as a teacher and, if applicable, as an administrator. Research activities are not required for reappointment, but may be considered. In addition, reappointment is subject to the academic and curricular needs of FAS and the University; thus, review for reappointment and promotion shall consider curricular or structural changes and improvements in academic programs. Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvement in academic programs. In this case, the basis for non-reappointment will be clearly stated in the notice given to the faculty member. The review will also comment on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and or new academic structure, and in what capacity.

Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion

University guidelines require continuing contract faculty, including Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, to be reviewed in the penultimate year of a multi-year contract. Penultimate year reviews must be submitted by the chair/director to the appropriate Divisional Dean by March 15th. If the department has any concerns that a Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer is not fulfilling the requirements of the position or that the position may not be needed to fulfill the teaching mission of the department or program, these should be clearly outlined in the report submitted to the Divisional Dean. Any reservations must be shared in writing and in person with the faculty member, who is obliged to acknowledge receipt of this information by countersigning the report on a summary of the report, so that he or she is under no misunderstanding regarding the expectations for him or her. The Chair or Director must submit a written report to the Divisional Dean that includes the substance of the review and a recommendation for reappointment, promotion or termination. In the event of a decision to reappoint the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally for another multi-year term.

Following a review, if the decision is not to offer a reappointment, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than August 31st of the penultimate year, and shall continue to be under contract for the final year.

Upon request, the timing of a review may be delayed by stopping the contract clock for reasonable cause that has been approved by the Divisional Dean, e.g., medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, same sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation.

When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there is no reappointment process and the faculty member will be notified in the penultimate year; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development.

For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative (e.g. lab manager, director of a program, etc.), greater weight will be given to performance of these duties in both multi-year appointments and recommendations for promotion.

Reappointment for Service on One-Year or Two-Year Contracts

In addition to contracts of three years or more, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers may be recommended by the department chair or director to a series of one-year or two-year full time
contracts. Notification of reappointment decisions should be made to the Divisional Dean by March 15th. In the third year of continuous one-year appointments, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review comparable to those to which faculty members on longer multi-year contacts are subject.

Language Lecturers will be limited to no more than three consecutive one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all. In the case of continuing two year contracts, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review comparable to those which faculty members on longer multi-year contracts are subject to in the first semester of the third year of continuous service.

**Formal Review Processes**

The review, whether for renewal and/or promotion, is undertaken by a committee appointed by the department chair or director or elected by the department or faculty as per the custom of the department or program. The committee must consist of three to five full-time faculty, with a minimum of one tenured or tenure-track faculty and at least one Continuing Contract Faculty member. Any deviation from this configuration of the committee must be approved by the appropriate Divisional Dean. If a department or program does not have sufficient tenured or tenure track faculty to participate in the review process, the department or program committee may consist entirely of Continuing Contract Faculty from the program, or at the discretion of the Divisional Dean, an ad hoc committee of Continuing Contract Faculty from other FAS departments or programs may be formed.

In the case of promotion to Senior Language Lecturer, Language Lecturers are not eligible to serve.

In the case of reappointment, the committee shall not include lecturers under review for reappointment that year.

I. **PROMOTION: General Procedures**

If the review packet is for promotion, it also must describe how the candidate meets the qualifications for Senior Language Lecturer as prescribed by the “Titles and Qualifications” section of this document. A review for promotion to Senior Language Lecturer is mandatory in the fifth year of the initial six years of service.

In addition to the consideration of teaching, administration, and service activities, recommendations regarding promotion also may be based on a prognosis of the faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of FAS. Research activities are not required for promotion, but may be considered.

II. **DEPARTMENT: Procedures**

The candidate should submit a personal statement, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations to the chair or director of the department; for candidates on multi-year appointments, this should be submitted on or before February 1 of the penultimate year of their current appointment. These materials are to be made available to the review committee for their evaluation. The review committee should prepare a report of their evaluation and recommendation, which has been read, approved and signed by all committee members before it is submitted to the chair/director. The review may be written by the committee chair or a member of the committee. The committee report should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division, the dissenting opinion should be appended to the majority review. The committee report may be supplemented by input from other members of the department. Depending on the norms of the department, the committee report and supporting materials may be made available to all eligible
faculty for a vote. Eligible faculty include all full-time members of the faculty that are of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed or promoted as determined by the department.

The review packet to be presented to the department chair/director and/or the full faculty should normally include:

- An up-to-date curriculum vitae of the candidate
- A description of the candidate's teaching and administrative responsibilities
- A list of all courses taught since the last review
- Committee service
- An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:
  - Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
  - Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
  - Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)
- An evaluation by the committee of the candidate's other contributions to the instructional program, for example, curriculum development
- If applicable, an evaluation of the candidate's administrative performance, including any role in the training and supervising of adjunct instructors or other Language Lecturers.
- A personal statement from the candidate assessing his or her contributions
- If applicable, scholarship including, but not limited to, research and publications related to their specific discipline or field, to the pedagogy of their field, or to the work of the department/program/university may be included.
- Candidates may include additional documents to support their renewal and or promotion.

The committee will consider all work activity, as listed above, since the last review, including materials from the ultimate year of the previous contract.

The recommendation of the chair/director should be forwarded to the Divisional Dean along with a draft of the candidate’s summary letter, the review packet, the committee’s recommendation and if applicable the vote of the faculty by March 15th.

Following approval of the Divisional Dean a summary of the review, prepared by the chair or director in the form of a letter, must be given to the candidate and discussed with him or her by the chair or director. The candidate must sign the letter to indicate that he or she has read it and discussed it with the chair or director. This summary must cover both strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance.

The summary letter to the candidate must include the recommendations of the evaluation committee and the recommendation that the chair/director is making to the Divisional Dean, including promotion, the length of reappointment (if that is the decision), and a signature block for the candidate. It must also include the following sentences:

1. Regardless of the merits for reappointment/promotion at this time, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of future reappointment.

2. Candidates will be judged for reappointment/promotion in the future according to the conditions and standards in effect at the time of their next review.

3. I have read this letter and understand its contents.
III. FAS DEAN’S OFFICE PROCEDURE

The departmental review and all relevant supporting materials will be reviewed by the relevant Divisional Dean. Additional input from the Dean of the College of Arts and Science, and the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Science may also be sought, as appropriate. In the event of a split committee vote or other reasons deemed necessary to insure a thorough review process, the Deans may consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate's home department. If there are questions in any particular case, the chair/director may be asked to provide additional information to the Divisional Dean.

The Divisional Dean makes his or her recommendation to the Dean of Arts and Science. If the recommendation of the Divisional Dean is contrary to the recommendation of the chair/director or if the case produces a negative or split department vote, the Divisional Dean will also forward the review packet to the Dean of Arts and Science.

After receiving the Divisional Dean's advice and relevant materials, the Dean of Arts and Science will inform the department chair/director of the advice provided by the Divisional Dean as well as his or her own decision. If the decision of the Arts and Science Dean is contrary to that of the departmental evaluation committee, the Dean will provide the department chair/director with the reasons. The chair or director has an opportunity to respond to the Dean’s decision in writing and provide additional information within ten days.

Notice of intention not to reappoint shall be sent to the faculty member not later than August 31st of the penultimate year of the contract.

Faculty Grievances

Faculty Grievances are classified into two main types: 1) those connected with reappointment or promotion and 2) those concerned with other matters, such as duties, salaries, prerequisites, and working conditions.

As per university guidelines, with respect to grievances related to reappointment and promotion, outcomes of the review process or decisions reached through the review process can be grieved only to the extent that they involve violation of University-protected rights of faculty members. Thus, a grievance of either type must allege that 1) the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration; or 2) that the decisions violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question, in which case the burden of proof falls to the grievant.

- The decision not to undertake the reappointment process where a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term, and where no similar position is open, is not the basis for a grievance.
- A Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer whose contract is non-renewable or who is not eligible for reappointment cannot grieve a decision not to reappoint.
- Individuals on multi-year contracts of three years or more who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be reappointed do have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision with respect to reappointment or promotion, under the same criteria as cited in the preceding paragraph.
- Faculty on continuous one-year or two-year appointments are similarly entitled to grieve the process in the
event the third year review process leads to a negative decision.

If a faculty member’s grievance is not settled informally at a level below the Dean, or by the Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean to convoke the FAS Faculty Grievance Committee, to hear grievances in order to advise the Dean.

The FAS Grievance Committee is composed of nine tenured full professors elected by the FAS, with three members from each academic division, and six at large continuing contract faculty (senior language lecturer, clinical associate and full professors), two from the Expository Writing Program and four from other units in FAS. Sitting department chairs and program heads may not serve on the Committee on Grievance. The Dean shall convoke the committee within fifteen working days of receiving the faculty member’s appeal.

**Appeal**

Following the review of the FAS Grievance Committee, in the event the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is not to reappoint or promote, an appeal can be made to the Provost, following the procedures enumerated in the Faculty Handbook.

**General Disciplinary Regulations**

All faculty members have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments. These rules protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. In particular, the faculty member is obligated to comply with the standards of academic freedom as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Disciplinary action may follow when the faculty member engages in other conduct unbecoming a member of the faculty, such as violation of the New York University Rules for the Maintenance of Public Order, any action which interferes with the regular operations of the University or the rights of others, any serious violation of the law, or any other conduct prejudicial to the teaching, research, or welfare of the University as set forth in the Faculty Handbook.
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1.6 Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointments

This document supplements NYU policies applicable to full-time continuing contract faculty. If any part of this document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies then in effect will control. As with all NYU and FAS policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

Introduction

Language Lecturers (LL) and Senior Language Lecturers (SLL) are full-time continuing contract faculty positions that provide coordination, continuity, and consistency in instruction and/or administration. Appointees must be experienced in their particular fields and, where relevant, have had experience in language acquisition and curriculum development. Appointees should possess relevant advanced degree or scholarly or professional credentials, which may vary by discipline and department, as developed in consultation with the Divisional Dean.

Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer appointments are primarily teaching positions, but may include some administrative and/or supervisory responsibilities. Research is not part of the LL or SLL faculty’s formal obligations. Although LL and SLL appointments are without tenure, they are typically multi-year appointments. LL and SLL faculty members are protected by academic freedom. They receive the same health, retirement and tuition remission benefits as tenured and tenure track faculty. LLs and SLLs are ineligible for sabbaticals and generally ineligible for NYU faculty housing.

Titles and Qualifications

Language Lecturer – Teaching experience, minimum of M.A. in foreign language teaching or other appropriate advanced degree and professional attainment in relevant teaching.

Senior Language Lecturer – minimum of M.A. in foreign language teaching; or other appropriate advanced degree; demonstrated excellence in teaching and instruction; and at least six years of teaching and related professional experience at NYU or elsewhere, evidence of supervisory experience (where relevant); superior contributions to the teaching program, as well as recognition for excellence in the professional field.

1. RECOMMENDATION: Define “recognition for excellence in the professional field”.

C-FSC Meeting 3/7/19, Document D, Page 20
This could include leadership in a national organization, or recognition by professional organizations for excellence and innovation in teaching. We will note this in the guidelines.

“All but degree” doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU are not eligible to be considered for Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer positions.

Continuing contract faculty also include Clinical Assistant Professors, Clinical Associate Professors, and Clinical Professors, who are addressed separately under [Link to Clinical Faculty Guidelines]

2. RECOMMENDATION: Describe the differences between Clinical Faculty and Language Lecturers responsibilities.

A link to Clinical Faculty Guidelines will be referenced (see above)

Areas of Responsibilities– Responsibilities include some, but not necessarily all of the following, and need not be restricted to them:

- **Teaching** - the normal course load for Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers is three courses per term. This load may be reduced depending on other assigned duties or responsibilities. With the approval of the relevant Divisional and School deans, administrative and professional duties and other professional activities that serve FAS may, if comparable in time demands to one or more courses, substitute for such courses.

3. RECOMMENDATION: Add “course load may not exceed three per semester without negotiated additional compensation.”

Individual teaching loads are determined by departments and are specified in the offer letter made to all Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers.

- **Service** - participation on departmental committees involving language instruction is expected. Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers are also expected to be available to provide advice to the department Chair or Director of Undergraduate Studies or Director of Graduate Studies regarding curriculum, teaching assignments, and any other matters related to their area of instruction.
- **Research** - Although there is no obligation to conduct research, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers may be eligible to be principal investigators on curriculum grants, training and teaching grants and other non-research grants in accordance with University policy. Approval to serve as principal investigator on research-related grants will be considered on a case by case basis in accordance with University policy.
- **Administrative** - In some cases, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers will have program-related administrative duties, including but not limited to: curriculum development, selection of textbooks and instructional methodologies, implementation of technologies, class schedules, student advisement, supervision of laboratories (if applicable), supervision and training of language faculty and adjuncts, and program management.
Terms of Appointment

- Unless stipulated otherwise in an appointment letter, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers are appointed for the academic year (September to May) and paid over twelve months (starting October 1). If appointed mid-year, the term of the appointment should be aligned to include the partial year and subsequent full academic year (i.e., the initial appointment would be for at least 1.5 years).
- Summer teaching appointments are optional and are made, subject to curricular needs and the faculty member’s desire to teach, with additional compensation. Administrative duties that carry over beyond the nine-month academic year and require service during the summer may carry additional summer compensation.

**Length of Appointment** – Language Lecturers: the initial appointment can be made for one to three years. Subsequent reappointment can be made for one to three years. Appointments in this rank cannot be made for more than a total of six years. A Language Lecturer who is not promoted to Senior Language Lecturer at the expiration of six years shall be ineligible for reappointment as a Language Lecturer in FAS.

4. **RECOMMENDATION: NYU Guidelines for clinical faculty state “wherever possible schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one year contracts.” Suggest including this language above and below.**

- Senior Language Lecturers: the initial appointment is for one to three years. The subsequent reappointment(s) can be made for one to five years. There is no limit to the number of terms that a Senior Language Lecturer can be reappointed.
- One-year appointments are typically reserved to address temporary programmatic needs (e.g., a leave or resignation). There is no expectation of renewal, though appointments may be renewed on an annual basis on the recommendation of the Chair or Director.
- In rare instances, a one-semester appointment as a Language Lecturer may be made to meet an immediate short-term gap in teaching coverage. In these instances there is no expectation of renewal.
- Appointments automatically terminate at the close of the period of time stipulated in the contract, unless there is an official notice of renewal.

It is typical that if a Continuing Contract Faculty member on an initial one-year appointment is renewed, reappointment will be for a multiyear contract of three years. However, to be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of a one-year option for both initial appointments and contract renewals. To avoid the establishment of a permanent group of CCF on one year appointments we will revise the text to include the statement that “In no case will a series of one year appointments exceed three years”.

Annual Review

Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers are subject to the annual merit increase (AMI) review, conducted for all full-time faculty members by the department chair or program director, with input from the appropriate faculty committee, as per department or program procedure. Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers will submit an Annual Faculty Personnel Record Supplement, usually in January of each academic year, to report on their teaching and
service. This report will be used in the annual merit review, which typically considers the faculty member’s teaching performance, contribution to the effectiveness of the program or department, and relevant administrative performance. Note that additional weight will be given to the performance of administrative duties for faculty whose duties are primarily administrative.

5. RECOMMENDATION There is no mention above of consideration of research as there is in the reviews for reappointment and promotion. Suggest adding the same language above for consistency.

_While there is some moderate flexibility in departmental AMI procedures to allow for review of research, the bulk of the review is teaching and then service. However, we will include the statement: “Scholarly and research activities (e.g. publications) are not required, but may be considered when being reviewed for reappointment, promotion, or annual reviews”._

Governance

Full Faculty meeting attendance and voting rights can be found under University Bylaw 82 (c). FAS practice is to hold joint full faculty meetings inclusive of continuing contract faculty, including Language Lecturers, Senior Language Lecturers, and tenure/tenure track faculty. Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers are also eligible to participate and vote in the FAS Faculty Assembly.

At the department level, continuing contract faculty, including Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, may participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion and tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure-track faculty, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty of NYU.

Procedures for Recruitment and Appointment

As part of the Annual Planning Report, the Chair/Director forwards to the Divisional Dean a Faculty Staffing Plan outlining requests for new faculty hiring. In particular, the request should include a justification that there is an important teaching need, and that this need can best be met with a Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer. Detailed procedures for recruitment of new full time faculty, including Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, are available online at [http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment).

Appointment letters specifying the terms and length of employment are issued by the Divisional Dean.

Procedures for Reappointment General Considerations:

Appointment processes for continuing contract faculty, including Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, shall reflect the University’s overriding commitment to enhance academic excellence and to provide students with the best available educational experience. Thus, each continuing contract faculty appointment and reappointment shall be evaluated in the light of the contribution it makes to the distinct excellence of the school, including its educational and training programs, and shall exemplify the University’s commitment to appoint and retain the best faculty in all disciplines.
Reappointment is based on departmental criteria of overall performance as a teacher and, if applicable, as an administrator. In addition, reappointment is subject to the academic and curricular needs of FAS and the University; thus, review for reappointment and promotion shall consider curricular or structural changes and improvements in academic programs. Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvement in academic programs. In this case, the basis for non-reappointment will be clearly stated in the notice given to the faculty member.

**Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion**

University guidelines require continuing contract faculty, including Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, to be reviewed in the penultimate year of a multi-year contract. Penultimate year reviews must be submitted by the department or program to the appropriate Divisional Dean by March 15. If the department has any concerns that a Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer is not fulfilling the requirements of the position or that the position may not be needed to fulfill the teaching mission of the department or program, these should be clearly outlined in the report submitted to the Divisional Dean. Any reservations must be shared in writing and in person with the faculty member, who is obliged to acknowledge receipt of this information by countersigning the report on a summary of the report, so that he or she is under no misunderstanding regarding the expectations for him or her. The Chair or Director must submit a written report to the Divisional Dean that includes the substance of the review and a recommendation for reappointment, promotion or termination. In the event of a decision to reappoint the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another multi-year term.

Following a review, if the decision is not to offer a reappointment, the faculty member shall be notified of the decision no later than August 31st of the penultimate year, and shall continue to be under contract for the final year.

Upon request, the timing of a review may be delayed by stopping the contract clock for reasonable cause that has been approved by the Divisional Dean, e.g., medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, same sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation.

When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there is no reappointment process; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development.

**For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in both multi-year appointments and recommendations for promotion.**

6. **RECOMMENDATION:** Clarify this statement. To what aspect of performance will be given additional weight be given.

*We will specify that “for faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative (e.g. lab manager or Director of a Masters’ Program) greater weight will be given to performance of these duties.***
Reappointment for Continuous Service on One-Year or Two-Year Contracts

In addition to contracts of three years or more, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers may be recommended by the Department Chair or Director to a series of one-year or two-year full time contracts. Notification of reappointment decisions should be made to the Divisional Dean by March 15th. In the third year of continuous appointments, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review comparable to those to which faculty members on longer multi-year contacts are subject.

7. RECOMMENDATION: A “series of one-year or two year contracts” described above is inconsistent with NYU guidelines for Contract faculty. See Recommendation 3 above.

To be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of reappointing to contracts of varying lengths, including one year appointments. however, we will stipulate that Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers will be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all.

Formal Review Processes

The review, whether for renewal and/or promotion is undertaken by a committee appointed by the department Chair or Director, consisting of three to five full-time faculty, with a minimum of two tenured or tenure-track faculty and at least one contract faculty member. In the case of promotion to Senior Language Lecturer, Language Lecturers are not eligible to serve. In any event, the committee shall not include a Language Lecturer or Senior Language under review for reappointment that year. Any deviation from this configuration of the committee must be approved by the Divisional Dean.

8. RECOMMENDATION: Suggest revision of this language to account for the following:
Feedback from FAS- TFSC faculty suggests that the Expository Writing Program, which employs one third of the 300 LL and SLL in FAS, does not have the requisite number of T/TT faculty to meet this requirement, nor is it feasible to have the only T/TT faculty member (the Director) participate in all 20-30 reviews per year.

We will revise the guidelines to include the following statement: If a department or program does not have sufficient tenured or tenure track faculty to participate in the review process, the department or program committee may consist entirely of Continuing Contract Faculty from the program, or at the discretion of the Divisional Dean, an ad hoc committee of Continuing Contract Faculty from other FAS departments or programs may be formed.

I. PROMOTION

If the review packet is for promotion, it also must describe how the candidate meets the qualifications for Senior Language Lecturer as prescribed by the “Titles and Qualifications” section of this document. A review for promotion to Senior Language Lecturer is mandatory in the sixth year of service.
In addition to the consideration of teaching, administration, and service activities, recommendations regarding promotion also may be based on a prognosis of the faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of FAS.

II. DEPARTMENT

The candidate should submit a personal statement, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations to the Chair or Director of the Department; for candidates on multi-year appointments, this should be submitted on or before February 1 of the penultimate year of their current appointment. These materials are to be made available to the review committee for their evaluation. The review committee should prepare a report of their evaluation and recommendation, which has been read, approved and signed by all committee members. The committee report should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division, the dissenting opinion should be appended to the majority review. The committee report may be supplemented by input from other members of the department. The committee report and supporting materials must be made available to and discussed by the eligible faculty. Faculty members in the department may propose amendments to the report.

The departmental committee must present its final recommendations to the faculty for a vote. The recommendation must take the form of a written report. In the case of reappointment of a Language Lecturer, all tenure-track and tenured faculty members and Senior Language Lecturers are eligible to vote. For promotion to, or reappointment as Senior Language Lecturer, only tenure-track and tenured faculty members and Senior Language Lecturers are eligible to vote. There should be an open discussion among the eligible faculty members in advance of a vote, which must be conducted by secret ballot. Faculty not present at the discussion should be invited to submit a vote and opinion in writing; these votes and opinions must be recorded separately from those who attended the discussion.

The review packet to be presented to the faculty should normally include:

- An up-to-date curriculum vitae of the candidate
- A description of the candidate's teaching and administrative responsibilities
- A list of all courses taught since the last review
- Committee service
- An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:
  - Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
  - Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
  - Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)
- An evaluation by the committee of the candidate's other contributions to the instructional program, for example, curriculum development.
- If applicable, an evaluation of the candidate's administrative performance, including any role in the training and supervising of adjunct instructors or other Language Lecturers.
- A personal statement from the candidate assessing his or her contributions
- If applicable, scholarship including, but not limited to, research and publications related to their specific discipline or field, to the pedagogy of their field, or to the work of the
The committee will consider all work activity, as listed above, since the last review, including materials from the ultimate year of the previous contract.

A summary of the review, prepared by the Chair or Director in the form of a letter, must be given to the candidate and discussed with him or her by the Chair or Director. The candidate must sign the letter to indicate that he or she has read it and discussed it with the Chair or Director. This summary must cover both strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance.

The summary letter to the candidate must include the recommendation that the evaluation committee is making to the Divisional Dean, including promotion, the length of reappointment (if that is the decision), and a signature block for the candidate. It must also include the following sentences: “Regardless of the merits for reappointment/promotion at this time, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of future reappointment.” “Candidates will be judged for reappointment/promotion in the future according to the conditions and standards in effect at the time of their next review.” “I have read this letter and understand its contents.”

A draft of the candidate’s summary letter should be forwarded to the Divisional Dean along with the review packet and the committee’s recommendation by March 15. Once approved by the Divisional Dean, the candidate’s summary letter must be signed by both the Chair and the candidate.

III FAS DEAN’S OFFICE

The Departmental Review and all relevant supporting materials will be reviewed by the relevant Divisional Dean. Additional input from the Dean of the College of Arts and Science, and the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Science may also be sought, as appropriate. The Deans may consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate’s home department. If there are questions in any particular case, the chair of the department review committee may be asked to provide additional information to the Divisional Dean.

The Divisional Dean makes his or her recommendation to the Dean of Arts and Science. After receiving the Divisional Dean's advice, the Dean of Arts and Science will inform the Department Chair of the advice provided by the Divisional Dean as well as his or her own decision. If the decision of the Arts and Science Dean is contrary to that of the departmental evaluation committee, the Dean will provide the department chair with the reasons. The Chair or Director has an opportunity to respond to the Dean’s decision in writing and provide additional information within ten days.

Notice of intention not to reappoint shall be sent to the faculty member not later than August 31st of the penultimate year of the contract.

Faculty Grievances

Faculty Grievances are classified into two main types: 1) those connected with reappointment or promotion and 2) those concerned with other matters, such as duties, salaries, perquisites, and
working conditions.

As per university guidelines, with respect to grievances related to reappointment and promotion, outcomes of the review process or decisions reached through the review process can be grieved only to the extent that they involve violation of University-protected rights of faculty members. Thus, a grievance of either type must allege that 1) the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration; or 2) that the decisions violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question, in which case the burden of proof falls to the grievant.

- The decision not to undertake the reappointment process where a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term, and where no similar position is open, is not the basis for a grievance.

- A Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer whose contract is non-renewable or who is not eligible for reappointment cannot grieve a decision not to reappoint.

- Individuals on multi-year contracts of three years or more who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be reappointed do have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision with respect to reappointment or promotion, under the same criteria as cited in the preceding paragraph.

- Faculty on continuous one-year or two-year appointments are similarly entitled to grieve the process in the event the third year review process leads to a negative decision.

If a faculty member’s grievance is not settled informally at a level below the Dean, or by the Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean to invoke the FAS Grievance Committee, to hear grievances in order to advise the Dean.

N.B FAS has updated the structure of its Grievance Committee.

The FAS Grievance Committee is composed of nine tenured full professors elected by the FAS, with three members from each academic division, and six at large continuing contract faculty (senior language lecturer, clinical associate and full professors), two from the Expository Writing Program and four from other units in FAS. Sitting department chairs and program heads may not serve on the Committee on Grievance.

The Dean shall convoke the committee within fifteen working days of receiving the faculty member’s appeal.

Appeal

Following the review of the FAS Grievance Committee, in the event the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is not to reappoint or promote, an appeal can be made to the Provost, following the procedures enumerated in the Faculty Handbook.
General Disciplinary Regulations

All faculty members have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments. These rules protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. In particular, the faculty member is obligated to comply with the standards of academic freedom as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Disciplinary action may follow when the faculty member engages in other conduct unbecoming a member of the faculty, such as violation of the New York University Rules for the Maintenance of Public Order, any action which interferes with the regular operations of the University or the rights of others, any serious violation of the law, or any other conduct prejudicial to the teaching, research, or welfare of the University as set forth in the Faculty Handbook.
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1.7 Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor

This document supplements NYU policies applicable to full-time continuing contract faculty. If any part of this document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies then in effect will control. As with all NYU and FAS policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

Introduction

Clinical faculty are full-time continuing contract faculty positions that provide coordination, continuity, and consistency in instruction and/or administration. Appointees must be experienced in their particular fields and, where relevant, have had experience in curriculum development and supervision of laboratory facilities and teaching assistants. Appointees should possess relevant advanced degree or scholarly or professional credentials, which may vary by discipline and department, as developed in consultation with the Divisional Dean.

Clinical appointments are primarily teaching positions, and often include some administrative and/or supervisory responsibilities. Research is not part of the clinical faculty’s formal obligations.

1. Recommendation: Suggest adding “though each contract is individually negotiated and in some cases research may be an expectation.”

FAS does not require research in any continuing contract faculty appointment, however, we will add that research activities may be considered when being reviewed for reappointment, promotion, or annual reviews.

Although clinicals are without tenure, they are typically multi-year appointments. Clinical faculty members are protected by academic freedom. They receive the same health, retirement and tuition remission benefits as tenured and tenure track faculty. Clinical faculty are ineligible for NYU faculty housing and sabbaticals.

Titles and Qualifications

- Clinical Assistant Professor - Teaching experience, minimum of M.A. in the field of expertise, or other appropriate advanced degree.
- Clinical Associate Professor – At least six years of relevant teaching and professional experience at NYU or elsewhere; evidence of supervisory experience
superior contributions to the teaching program; as well as recognition for excellence in the professional field and innovation in the area of instruction. Minimum of M.A. in the field of expertise or other appropriate advanced degree.

- **Clinical Professor** - A minimum of 12 years of teaching and related professional experience at NYU or elsewhere, evidence of extraordinary contribution to the NYU teaching program, and evidence of recognition for leadership and innovation in the field or in teaching in the field. Minimum of M.A. in the field of expertise or other appropriate advanced degree.

2. **Recommendation: Change M.A. to Masters’ Degree.**

*We approve of this requested change.*

“All but degree” doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU are not eligible to be considered for clinical positions.

Continuing Contract Faculty also include Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers, who are addressed separately under [link]

3. **Recommendation: Suggest deleting this sentence as it seems to violate NYU Bylaws and practices.**

*FAS will amend this text to cite University Bylaw 81(c), Degree Programs. A degree candidate who accepts appointment as a full time Continuing Contract Faculty member in FAS must thereupon relinquish candidacy for a degree at NYU. As appropriate the FAS Dean can request an exception from the NYU Board of Trustees.*

**Areas of Responsibilities** – Responsibilities include some, but not necessarily all of the following, and need not be restricted to them:

- **Teaching** - The normal course load for clinical faculty is three courses per term. This load may be reduced depending on other assigned duties or responsibilities. With the approval of the relevant Divisional and School deans, administrative and professional duties and other professional activities that serve FAS may, if comparable in time demands to one or more courses, substitute for such courses.
- **Service** - Participation on departmental committees is expected. Clinical faculty are also expected to be available to provide advice to the department Chair or Director of Undergraduate Studies or Director of Graduate Studies regarding curriculum, teaching assignments, and any other matters related to their area of instruction.
- **Research** – Although there is no obligation to conduct research, clinical faculty may be eligible to be principal investigators on curriculum grants, training and teaching grants and other non-research grants in accordance with University policy. Approval to serve as principal investigator on research-related grants will be considered on a case by case basis in accordance with University policy.

4. **Recommendation: Suggest clinical faculty be allowed to be PIs as there are in other schools at NYU.**

*We believe our language adequately conveys how Continuing Contract Faculty can be principal investigators.*

- **Administration** – In some cases, clinical faculty will have program-related administrative duties, including but not limited to: curriculum development, selection of textbooks and instructional methodologies, implementation of technologies, class schedules, student advisement, supervision of laboratories (if applicable), supervision and training of clinical faculty and adjuncts, and program management.
Terms of Appointment

- Unless stipulated otherwise in an appointment letter, clinical faculty are appointed for the academic year (September to May) and paid over twelve months (starting October 1). If appointed mid-year, the term of the appointment should be aligned to include the partial year and subsequent full academic year (i.e., the initial appointment would be for at least 1.5 years).
- Summer teaching appointments are optional and are made, subject to curricular needs and the faculty member’s desire to teach, with additional compensation. Administrative duties that carry over beyond the nine-month academic year and require service during the summer may carry additional summer compensation.
- For Clinical Assistant Professors, the initial appointment can be made for one to three years. Subsequent reappointment can be made for one to three years.

5. Recommendation: FAS uses the term one year visiting professor for 1 year appointments and otherwise uses 2-3 year contracts. Suggest changing the statement above to “two to three years”

To be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of appointing clinical faculty to contracts of varying length. We will, however, remove the reference to visiting clinical faculty and stipulate that Clinical faculty members will be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all.

For Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors, the initial appointment is also for one to three years.
- Candidates are eligible for five-year reappointment contracts at all ranks only if they have been at NYU for at least six years and have had at least one prior contract renewal at NYU.
- One-year appointments are typically reserved to address temporary programmatic needs (e.g., a leave or resignation). There is no expectation of renewal, though appointments may be renewed on an annual basis on the recommendation of the Chair or Director.
- In rare instances, a one-semester appointment as a Clinical Assistant Professor may be made to meet an immediate short-term gap in teaching coverage. In these instances there is no expectation of renewal.

6. Recommendation: Delete as FAS one year appointments are not used for clinical faculty.

It is typical that if a Continuing Contract Faculty member on an initial one-year contract is renewed, reappointment will be for a multiyear contract of three years. However, to be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of a one-year option. To avoid the establishment of a permanent group of CCF on one year appointments we will revise the text to include the statement that “In no case will a series of one year appointments exceed three years.”

There is no limit to the number of terms that a clinical faculty member at any rank can be reappointed.
- Appointments automatically terminate at the close of the period of time stipulated in the contract, unless there is an official notice of renewal.

Annual Review

- Clinical faculty are subject to the annual merit increase (AMI) review, conducted for all full-time faculty members by the department chair or program director, with input from the appropriate faculty committee, as per department or program procedure. Clinical Faculty will submit an Annual Faculty Personnel Record Supplement, usually in January of each academic year, to report on their teaching and service. This report will be used in the annual merit review, which typically considers the faculty member’s teaching performance, contribution to the effectiveness of the program or department, and relevant administrative performance. Note that additional weight will be given to the performance of administrative duties for faculty whose duties are primarily administrative.
7. **Recommendation: Add evaluation of research to the Annual Faculty Evaluation.**

*While there is some moderate flexibility in departmental AMI procedures to allow for review of research, the bulk of the review is teaching and then service. However, we will include the statement: Scholarly and research activities (e.g. publications) are not required, but may be considered.*

**Governance**

Full Faculty meeting attendance and voting rights can be found under University Bylaw 82 (c). FAS practice is to hold joint full faculty meetings inclusive of continuing contract faculty, including clinical faculty, and tenure/tenure track faculty. Clinical faculty are also eligible to participate and vote in the FAS Faculty Assembly.

At the department level, continuing contract faculty, including clinical faculty, may participate as members of the department faculty in department governance, with the exclusion of matters related to promotion, tenure, and hiring of tenured and tenure-track faculty, and matters directly or indirectly affecting the individual’s candidacy for a degree, or matters affecting his or her status on the faculty of NYU.

8. **Recommendation: Please clarify this statement.**

*Examples would include curriculum changes that impact their contract renewal or relate to their personal degree program (if an exception to Bylaw 81(c) has been approved).*

**Procedures for Recruitment and Appointment**

As part of the Annual Planning Report, each Chair/Director forwards to the Divisional Dean a Faculty Staffing Plan outlining requests for new faculty hiring. In particular, the request should include a justification that there is an important teaching need, and that this need can best be met with a continuing contract faculty appointment, including a clinical faculty appointment, rather than a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. Detailed procedures for recruitment of new full time faculty, including clinical faculty, are available online at [http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment).

9. **Recommendation: Suggest deleting as it is not directly relevant to personnel policy for clinical faculty.**

*We believe this information is relevant to hiring procedures and should remain a part of the guidelines for the continuing contract faculty.*

**Appointment letters** specifying the terms and length of employment are issued by the Divisional Dean.

10. **Recommendation: Change appointment letter to contract.**

*We accept this recommendation.*

**Procedures for Reappointment General Considerations:**

Appointment processes for Continuing Contract Faculty, including clinical faculty, shall reflect the University’s overriding commitment to enhance academic excellence and to provide students with the best available educational experience. Thus, each Continuing Contract Faculty appointment and reappointment shall be evaluated in the light of the contribution it makes to the distinct excellence of the school, including its educational and training programs, and shall exemplify the University’s commitment to appoint and retain the best faculty in all disciplines.
Reappointment is based on departmental criteria of overall performance as a teacher and if applicable, as an
administrator or researcher. In addition, reappointment is subject to the academic and curricular needs of
FAS and the University; thus, review for reappointment and promotion shall consider curricular or structural
changes and improvements in academic programs. Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the
appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular
and structural changes and improvement in academic programs. In this case, the basis for non-reappointment
will be clearly stated in the notice given to the faculty member.

Research is not a stated criterion for reappointment, however, we will add to the guidelines that: research
activities are not required for reappointment, but may be considered.

11. Recommendation: Suggest adding specific time frames for evaluation and notification of
continuation per Provost guidelines either here or below.

We do include timeline information under the heading below.

Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion

University guidelines require Continuing Contract Faculty, including clinical faculty, to be reviewed in the
penultimate year of a multi-year contract. Penultimate year reviews must be submitted by the department or
program to the appropriate Divisional Dean by March 15. If the department has any concerns that a clinical
faculty member is not fulfilling the requirements of the position or that the position may not be needed to fulfill
the teaching mission of the department or program, these should be clearly outlined in the report
submitted to the Divisional Dean. Any reservations must be shared in writing and in person with the faculty
member, who is obliged to acknowledge receipt of this information by countersigning the report on a
summary of the report, so that he or she is under no misunderstanding regarding the expectations for him or her. The Chair or Director must submit a written report to the Divisional Dean that includes the substance of the review and a recommendation for reappointment, promotion or termination. In the event of a decision to reappoint the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another multi-year term.

Following a review, if the decision is not to offer a reappointment, the faculty member shall be notified of the
decision no later than August 31st of the penultimate year, and shall continue to be under contract for the
final year.

Upon request, the timing of a review may be delayed by stopping the contract clock for reasonable cause that
has been approved by the Divisional Dean, e.g., medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse,
parent, same sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation.

When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there
is no reappointment process; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career
development.

For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in both multi-year appointments and recommendations for promotion.

12. Recommendation: Clarify rationale for this statement or delete

If part of a faculty members course load has been reduced and replaced with administrative duties (e.g.
lab manager or Director of a Program) those duties should be taken into consideration in the review process.
Reappointment for Continuous Service on One-Year or Two-Year Contracts

13. **Recommendation: Suggest delete one year**

*To be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of reappointing to contracts of varying lengths, including one year appointments.*

In addition to contracts of three years or more, clinical faculty may be recommended by the Department Chair or Director to a series of one-year or two-year full time contracts. Notification of reappointment decisions should be made to the Divisional Dean by March 15th. In the third year of continuous appointments, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review comparable to those to which faculty members on longer multi-year contacts are subject.

14. **Recommendation: Provost guidelines suggest continuous single year contracts should be discouraged.**

*To be responsive to programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility to use one year contracts; however, to avoid the establishment of a permanent group of CCF on one year appointments we will stipulate that Clinical faculty members will be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all.*

**Formal Review Processes**

The review, whether for renewal and/or promotion is undertaken by a committee appointed by the department Chair or Director, consisting of three to five full-time faculty, with a minimum of two tenured or tenure-track faculty and at least one clinical faculty member. In the case of promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professors are not eligible to serve. In the case of promotion to Clinical Professor, Clinical Assistant Professors and Clinical Associate Professors are not eligible to serve. In any event, the committee shall not include a clinical faculty member under review for reappointment that year. Any deviation from this configuration of the committee must be approved by the Divisional Dean.

15. **Recommendation: Consider election of committee members in larger department**

*This is a matter of departmental governance; however, we will add the option of appointing or electing a committee as per the custom of the department or program.*

16. **Recommendation: For last sentence in the above paragraph clarify circumstances in which this might occur.**

*For example, this happens when there is an insufficient number of eligible faculty due to department or program size or as a result of faculty on leave. In addition, we will add the following statement: If a department or program does not have sufficient tenured or tenure track faculty to participate in the review process, the department or program committee may consist entirely of Continuing Contract Faculty from the program, or at the discretion of the Divisional Dean, an ad hoc committee of Continuing Contract Faculty from other FAS departments or programs may be formed.*

I. **PROMOTION**

If the review packet is for promotion, it also must describe how the candidate meets the qualifications for Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor as prescribed by the “Titles and Qualifications” section of
this document. Furthermore, the candidate must have been in his or her current rank for a minimum of three years and had at least one prior reappointment at the current rank to be eligible for promotion in rank.

In addition to the consideration of teaching, administration, service, and research (if appropriate), recommendations regarding promotion also may be based on a prognosis of the clinical faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of FAS.

Candidates may request promotion during their second review in rank and any year after.

II. DEPARTMENT

The candidate should submit a personal statement, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations to the Chair or Director of the Department; for candidates on multi-year appointments, this should be submitted on or before February 1 of the penultimate year of their current appointment. These materials are to be made available to the review committee for their evaluation. The review committee should prepare a report of their evaluation and recommendation, which has been read, approved, and signed by all committee members. The committee report should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division, the dissenting opinion should be appended to the majority review. The committee report may be supplemented by input from other members of the department. The committee report and supporting materials must be made available to and discussed by the eligible faculty. Faculty members in the department may propose amendments to the report.

17. Recommendation: Provide more details on the process described. Is an actual vote count included? Is the vote by secret ballot?

A vote of the full faculty is optimal, and is determined at the department/program level. If a vote is taken, the guidelines specify the Chair/Director include the vote of the faculty in their recommendation to the department.

The review packet to be presented to the faculty should normally include:

- An up-to-date curriculum vitae of the candidate
- A description of the candidate's teaching and administrative responsibilities
- A list of all courses taught since the last review
- Committee service
- An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:
  - Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
  - Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
  - Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)
- An evaluation by the committee of the candidate’s other contributions to the instructional program, for example, curriculum development
- If applicable, an evaluation of the candidate’s administrative performance, including any role in the training and supervising of adjunct instructors or other clinical faculty. Note that additional weight will be given to the performance of administrative duties for faculty whose duties are primarily administrative

See Recommendation 17 above.

This pertains to reappointment reviews and promotions. If part of a faculty members position includes administrative duties (e.g. lab manager or Director of a Program) those duties will be taken into consideration in the review process.

- A personal statement from the candidate assessing his or her contributions
• If applicable, scholarship including, but not limited to, research and publications related to their specific discipline or field, to the pedagogy of their field, or to the work of the department/program/university.

The committee will consider all work activity, as listed above, since the last review, including materials from the ultimate year of the previous contract.

A summary of the review, prepared by the Chair or Director in the form of a letter, must be given to the candidate and discussed with him or her by the Chair or Director. The candidate must sign the letter to indicate that he or she has read it and discussed it with the Chair or Director. This summary must cover both strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's performance.

The summary letter to the candidate must include the recommendation that the evaluation committee is making to the Divisional Dean, including promotion, the length of reappointment (if that is the decision), and a signature block for the candidate. It must also include the following sentences: “Regardless of the merits for reappointment/promotion at this time, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of future reappointment.” “Candidates will be judged for reappointment/promotion in the future according to the conditions and standards in effect at the time of their next review.” “I have read this letter and understand its contents.”

A draft of the candidate’s summary letter should be forwarded to the Divisional Dean along with the review packet and the committee’s recommendation by March 15. Once approved by the Divisional Dean, the candidate’s summary letter must be signed by both the Chair and the candidate.

**III. FAS DEAN’S OFFICE**

The Departmental Review and all relevant supporting materials will be reviewed by the relevant Divisional Dean. Additional input from the Dean of the College of Arts and Science, and the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Science may also be sought, as appropriate. The Deans may consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate's home department. If there are questions in any particular case, the chair of the department review committee may be asked to provide additional information to the Divisional Dean.

The Divisional Dean makes his or her recommendation to the Dean of Arts and Science. After receiving the Divisional Deans advice, the Dean of Arts and Science will inform the Department Chair of the advice provided by the Divisional Dean as well as his or her own decision. If the decision of the Arts and Science Dean is contrary to that of the departmental evaluation committee, the Dean will provide the department chair with the reasons. The Chair or Director has an opportunity to respond to the Dean’s decision in writing and provide additional information within ten days.

Notice of intention not to reappoint shall be sent to the faculty member not later than August 31st of the penultimate year of the contract.

**Faculty Grievances**

Faculty Grievances are classified into two main types: 1) those connected with reappointment or promotion and 2) those concerned with other matters, such as duties, salaries, perquisites, and working conditions.

As per university guidelines, with respect to grievances related to reappointment and promotion, outcomes of the review process or decisions reached through the review process can be grieved only to the extent that they involve violation of University-protected rights of faculty members. Thus, a grievance of either type must allege that 1) the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration; or 2) that the decisions violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question, in which case the burden of proof falls to the grievant.
The decision not to undertake the reappointment process where a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term, and where no similar position is open, is not the basis for a grievance.

A clinical faculty member whose contract is non-renewable or who is not eligible for reappointment cannot grieve a decision not to reappoint.

Individuals on multi-year contracts of three years or more who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be reappointed do have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision with respect to reappointment or promotion, under the same criteria as cited in the preceding paragraph.

Faculty on continuous one-year or two-year appointments are similarly entitled to grieve the process in the event the third year review process leads to a negative decision.

If a faculty member’s grievance is not settled informally at a level below the Dean, or by the Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean to convoke the FAS Grievance Committee, to hear grievances in order to advise the Dean.

N.B FAS has updated the structure of its Grievance Committee.

The FAS Grievance Committee is composed of nine tenured full professors elected by the FAS, with three members from each academic division, and six at large continuing contract faculty (senior language lecturer, clinical associate and full professors), two from the Expository Writing Program and four from other units in FAS. Sitting department chairs and program heads may not serve on the Committee on Grievance.

The Dean shall convoke the committee within fifteen working days of receiving the faculty member’s appeal.

Appeal

Following the review of the FAS Grievance Committee, in the event the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is not to reappoint or promote, an appeal can be made to the Provost, following the procedures enumerated in the Faculty Handbook.

General Disciplinary Regulations

All faculty members have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments. These rules protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. In particular, the faculty member is obligated to comply with the standards of academic freedom as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Disciplinary action may follow when the faculty member engages in other conduct unbecoming a member of the faculty, such as violation of the New York University Rules for the Maintenance of Public Order, any action which interferes with the regular operations of the University or the rights of others, any serious violation of the law, or any other conduct prejudicial to the teaching, research, or welfare of the University as set forth in the Faculty Handbook.
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Background

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Thomas Carew, submitted to the NYU Provost, Katherine E. Fleming, the school's policies pertaining to the appointment, reappointment and promotion of Continuing Contract Faculty. These policies were produced with input from an FAS CCF Guidelines Review Committee that was convened by Dean Carew in November 2015; and that following the re-issuing of the University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty in July 2016, earlier drafts of the policies were modified to insure that they conform to the University Guidelines. In Spring 2017 the Dean's office also transmitted the policy to the FAS CCF Guidelines Review Committee, which in turn shared the documents with the FAS Continuing Contract Faculty Senate Council. The changes were discussed in a meeting between Dean Carew and the FAS C-FSC. In January 2018 Dean Carew formed an ad-hoc committee to finalize the guidelines for a faculty vote. On December 5, 2018 at an FAS full faculty meeting, the guidelines were unanimously accepted.

At NYU, our strong tradition is for schools to develop policies that are "consistent with school culture and history." Within that tradition, the Handbook provides that school policies will be reviewed by the Provost to determine 'whether the substance of the policy: (i) is consistent with general University policy; (ii) is compatible with the University's commitment to excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, or artistic achievement and service within a community of respectful and respected academic professionals; and (iii) has no adverse implications for the University." As part of the process of finalizing FAS policy for its Clinical Professors and Language Lecturers, Provost Fleming has invited the T-FSC and the C-FSC to comment on the document, adopting the same perspective.
(per the letter of February 21, 2017 from Katherine E. Fleming to C-FSC and T-FSC Chairs)

The following document will enumerate various questions, comments and recommendations to the submitted Policy.

Major Substantive Recommendations
Add a description of the faculty voting process for the approval of this document. If such a vote did not take place, we recommend the return of this document to FAS for such a vote, with the possibility of making amendments. This is in keeping with The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, page 1, *Formulation of School Policies*, paragraph 2, sentence 1, which states that:

“In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate or amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the expectation that Continuing Contract Faculty shall participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.”

Clarify specifically and explicitly the process of consultation with the Continuing Contract faculty.

We strongly recommend that any development of this policy follow the letter and the spirit contained in the above quote from the University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, allowing the Continuing Contract faculty, acting, according to the school’s governance structure (e.g., its Faculty Assembly or similar body, faculty meeting, etc.) an active, essential and meaningful role in forming and approving any new policy, which policy must necessarily include the grievance/appeal process.

*The revised guidelines have been reviewed by the Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council; a CCF Ad-hoc Committee; a CCF Town Hall meeting; and submitted and approved by vote of the FAS Full Faculty.*

1. The policy does not include any process for future amendments and revisions to it. The University Guidelines provide: “In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate or amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the expectation that Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty shall participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.”

**Recommendation**

Include the following: “Mechanisms for timely distribution of any amendments to the Policy to the faculty, faculty discussion, as well as the ability for faculty to present amendments, make recommendations to and vote on the Policy in a regularly scheduled faculty meeting following procedures outlined in the school’s governance structure, should be included and stated explicitly.”

As with all school policies and committees, FAS policies are subject to review and amendments as necessary and follow school governance and are in accord with University guidelines. There are a variety of pathways for consultation and we would be hesitant to restrict this by including a proscribed method. However, for further clarification the following preface has been added to the guidelines to address future
amendments and revisions to the guidelines:

This document supplements NYU policies applicable to full-time continuing contract faculty. If any part of this document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies then in effect will control. As with all NYU and FAS policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

2. Page 1. Introduction, paragraph 2, sentence 6:
   “LLs and SLLs are ineligible for NYU faculty housing and sabbaticals.”

   **Recommendation**
   Exceptional circumstances may exist for which a total ban on faculty housing will be an impediment to reasonable response. We recommend replacing the word "ineligible" with the phrase "generally ineligible".

   *We accept the phrase “generally ineligible for NYU housing” and will add it to the guidelines.*

3. Page 1. Introduction, paragraph 2, sentence 6:
   “LLs and SLLs are ineligible for NYU faculty housing and sabbaticals.”

   **Recommendation**
   Given the letter from President Andrew Hamilton of April 18, 2017, which promotes professional development for continuing contract faculty, we recommend the removal of a complete ban on sabbaticals and the consideration of semester long developmental or research leaves, similar to those granted in Gallatin, LS, and SPS.

   *FAS does provide opportunities for professional development including annual allocations of professional development funds. Faculty who exhaust their professional development funds may request additional support from their Divisional Dean.*

4. Page 1. Titles and Qualifications, paragraph 3:
   "All but degree" doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU are not eligible to be considered for Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer positions.

   **Recommendation**
   Given that both ranks of the language lecturer faculty list an M.A. in the field of expertise as the minimum degree requirement, an "All but degree" doctoral candidate who possesses an M.A. should not be excluded. We recommend that this statement be deleted.

   *FAS will amend this text to site University Bylaw 81(c), Degree Programs. A degree candidate who accepts appointment as a full time Continuing Contract Faculty member in FAS must thereupon relinquish candidacy for a degree at NYU. As appropriate the*
FAS Dean can request an exception from the NYU Board of Trustees.

5. Page 1. Titles and Qualifications, paragraph 3:
"All but degree" doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU are not eligible to be considered for Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer positions.

**Recommendation**
Given that there currently may be Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers who are "All but degree" doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU, if the statement is not deleted as recommended in item 5, we recommend that the statement be modified to allow those individuals to retain their positions. Language such as, ”"All but degree" doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU will not be considered for initial appointments to Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer positions." would protect those current faculty members.

FAS will amend this text to site University Bylaw 81(c), Degree Programs. A degree candidate who accepts appointment as a full time Continuing Contract Faculty member in FAS must thereupon relinquish candidacy for a degree at NYU. As appropriate the FAS Dean can request an exception from the NYU Board of Trustees.

6. Page 2. Areas of Responsibilities, item 2, "Service", sentence 1:
*Service* - participation on departmental committees involving language instruction is expected.

**Recommendation**
We recommend that this sentence be extended to, "*Service* - participation on departmental committees involving language instruction is expected, and opportunity should be equitable." If participation is expected, every LL and SLL must have the opportunity to meet that requirement.

This is a matter of departmental governance. We will amend the text to indicate that individual departments and programs will determine the appropriate opportunities for service.

7. Page 2. Terms of Appointment, item 3, sentence 1:
Language Lecturers: the initial appointment can be made for one to three years.

**Recommendation**
As per the University Guidelines, Page 4, Duration of Contracts, sentence 2, "Thus, Wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts.", we recommend that if a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification. We recommend adding language to the document similar to the following: "If a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification, similar to the hiring plan submitted to the Provost, based upon programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty through the FAS Faculty Assembly."
All components of the FAS hiring plan including for Continuing Contract Faculty are discussed and worked out with department chairs and program directors. We will continue to use the option of one year contracts in order to meet the curricular needs of departments and programs. Note that justification for creating any full time faculty position in FAS, regardless of duration, follows standard faculty recruitment guidelines used for all faculty hires, including tenured and tenure track faculty.

8. Page 2. Terms of Appointment, item 3, sentence 1:
   Language Lecturers: the initial appointment can be made for one to three years.

   **Recommendation**
   To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year contracts, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as, "Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment."

   It is typical that faculty with an initial one-year appointment are renewed for a multiyear contract of three years. However, to be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of a one-year option. To avoid the establishment of a permanent group of CCF on one year appointments we will revise the text to limit the number of one year contracts to a total of three one-year contracts.

9. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 4, first bulletpoint: Senior Language Lecturers
   The passage reads, “Senior Language Lecturers: the initial appointment is for one to three years. The subsequent reappointment(s) can be made for one to five years. There is no limit to the number of terms that a Senior Language Lecturer can be reappointed.”

   **Recommendation**
   There is no mention if, and when, a Senior Language Lecturer will receive a five-year contract. It is our understanding that in the past, Language Lecturers were given a five-year contract after twelve years of service.

   We recommend adding the following: “Senior Language Lecturers will move to five-year appointment after nine years of service.”

   To be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of reappointing to contracts of varying lengths. To avoid the establishment of a permanent group of CCF on one year appointments we will limit the number of one-year contracts to a total of three one-year contracts. We will also stipulate that Senior
Language Lecturers are eligible for a five-year reappointment contract if they have been at NYU at least six years and had at least one prior contract renewal at NYU.

10. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 4, first bulletpoint, Senior Language Lecturers The passage reads, “The subsequent reappointment(s) can be made for one to five years.” This passage may allow shorter subsequent contracts after promotion. Subsequent reappointment contracts should be no shorter that the previous appointment contract.

Recommendation
We recommend the following, “Subsequent contracts will be for at least 5 years.”

To be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of reappointing to contracts of varying lengths.

11. Senior Language Lecturers: the initial appointment is for one to three years.

Recommendation
As per the University Guidelines, Page 4, Duration of Contracts, sentence 2, "Thus, Wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts."

We need to maintain the flexibility of using contracts of varying lengths and will continue to use the option of one to three year contracts. Justification for creating any full time faculty position in FAS, regardless of duration, follows standard faculty recruitment guidelines.

12. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 3, sentence 1: Language Lecturers: the initial appointment can be made for one to three years.

Recommendation
To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year contracts, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as, “Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment.”
We need to maintain the flexibility of using contracts of varying lengths to meet programmatic needs and will continue to use the option of one to three year contracts; however, we will stipulate that one-year Language Lecturer contracts will be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all.

13. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 4, sentence 2:
The subsequent reappointment(s) can be made for one to five years.

**Recommendation**
To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year contracts, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as, "Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment."

Further, the subsequent reappointment should be no shorter than the initial appointment.

We need to maintain the flexibility of reappointing to contracts of varying lengths and will continue to use the option of one to five year contracts. However, we will stipulate that one-year Language Lecturer contracts will be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all.

14. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 5, sentence 2: There is no expectation of renewal, ...

**Recommendation**
This item concerning visiting faculty does not pertain to continuing contract faculty, and should be deleted from the document.

We agree that short term appointments in the case where there is no expectation of renewal should not fall under the heading of “Contract Faculty”. We will remove the reference to Visiting Language Lecturers.

15. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 6, sentence 2:
In rare instances, a one-semester appointment as a Language Lecturer may be made to ...

**Recommendation**
This item concerning visiting faculty does not pertain to continuing contract faculty, and should be deleted from the document. Further, the use of the title "Language
Lecturer is inappropriate for such a position.

These types of appointments come up under exigent circumstances and are quite rare. We agree that short term appointments in the case where there is no expectation of renewal should not fall under the heading of “Contract Faculty”. We will remove the reference to Visiting Language Lecturers.

16. Page 4. Procedures for Reappointment, General Considerations, paragraph 2, sentence:
Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvement in academic programs.

Recommendation
We recommend adding the language that, "In such an event, a review should be conducted which will focus on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and/or new academic structure and, if so, in what capacity."

We will add the following statement to the guidelines; “The review will also comment on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and or new academic structure, and in what capacity.”

17. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 4:
When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there is no reappointment process; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development.

Recommendation
We recommend that a date be provided prior to which the faculty member will be notified of the intention not to reappoint.

The Dean’s Office will notify the department or program in early spring of any contract that is scheduled to be renewed or is terminal. The department or program will then communicate this information to the faculty members.

18. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 4:
When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there is no reappointment process; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development.

Recommendation
We recommend adding the language that, "In such an event, the review should focus on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and/or new academic structure and, if so, in what capacity."
We will add the following statement to the guidelines: “The review will also include comment on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and or new academic structure, and in what capacity.”

19. Page 5. Reappointment for Continuous Service on One-Year or Two-Year Contracts, sentence 1:

In addition to contracts of three years or more, Language Lecturers and Senior Language Lecturers may be recommended by the Department Chair or Director to a series of one-year or two-year full time contracts.

**Recommendation**

As per the University Guidelines, Page 4, Duration of Contracts, sentence 2, "Thus, Wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts.", we recommend that if a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification. We recommend adding language to the document similar to the following: "If a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification, similar to the hiring plan submitted to the Provost, based upon programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty through the FAS Faculty Assembly.

We will continue to use one and two year contracts; however, we will stipulate that Language Lecturers be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all. We will also stipulate that in the case of two year appointments, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review in the first semester of the third year of continuous service, comparable to those which faculty members on longer multiyear contracts are subject.

20. Page 5. Reappointment for Continuous Service on One-Year or Two-Year Contracts, sentence 1:

**Recommendation**

To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year or two-year contracts, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year or two-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as, "Faculty members on continuous one-year or two-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment."

We will continue to use one and two year contracts; however, we will stipulate that Language Lecturers be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all. We will also stipulate that in the case of two year appointments, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review comparable to those which faculty members on longer multiyear contracts are subject.
faculty members on longer multiyear contracts are subject.

The review, whether for renewal and/or promotion is undertaken by a committee appointed by the department Chair or Director, consisting of three to five full-time faculty, with a minimum of two tenured or tenure-track faculty and at least one contract faculty member.

Recommendation
The committee should be made up of elected members, not appointed; additionally, the majority of the committee should be made up of Continuing Contract faculty members.

This is a matter of departmental governance; however, we will revise to allow for a majority of Continuing Contract Faculty and provide the option at an appointed or elected committee.

22. Page 5. Formal Review Process, sentence 4:
In any event, the committee shall not include a Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer under review for reappointment that year.

Recommendation
For small departments, or for departments with few Continuing Contract faculty, this constraint may be onerous and severely restrict the makeup of the review committee. We recommend that a Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer under review for reappointment and/or promotion simply recuse herself or himself from consideration of her/his case.

As with tenured and tenure track promotion and tenure reviews, we work with small departments to find a pathway for committee formation, including allowing for Ad-hoc committee members from other units.

23. Page 5. Formal Review Process, section I, sentence 2:
A review for promotion to Senior Language Lecturer is mandatory in the sixth year of service.

Recommendation
Since reviews are now performed during the penultimate year of a contract, we recommend replacing this sentence with, "A review for promotion to Senior Language Lecturer is mandatory in the fifth year of the initial six years of service."

We will make this edit.

24. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, paragraph 1, sentence 1:
The candidate should submit a personal statement, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations to the Chair or Director of the Department; for
candidates on multi-year appointments, this should be submitted on or before February 1 of the penultimate year of their current appointment.

**Recommendation**
We recommend replacing this sentence with, “The candidate should submit a review packet (see below for content) to the Chair or Director of the Department; for candidates on multi-year appointments, this should be submitted on or before February 1 of the penultimate year of their current appointment.

*The packet is not solely prepared by the candidate, so we decline this request.*

An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:
   - Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
   - Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
   - Reports of classroom observation (provided by department or committee)

**Recommendation**
Many other criteria might be used in order to assist the committee in assessing the teaching performance of the candidate. We recommend expanding the content of the review packet to include optional items that the candidate believes will support the assessment. Other items for consideration might include lecture notes, assignments, course development and innovation, instructor development, collegial observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing, evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.

*To assist the committee in making its assessment, we will include the statement: Candidates may include additional documents to support their renewal and or promotion.*

26. The policy does not specify how the departmental review committee will make its determinations.

**Recommendation**
Specify that a majority vote of the departmental review committee shall be required for a successful review for a recommendation for reappointment and that all votes shall be by secret ballot. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

*A vote of the full faculty is optional, and is determined at the department/program level. The guidelines specify that in the case of a split opinion, that a minority report will be appended to the majority report.*

27. The policy does not specify the process governing the creation of the departmental review committee’s report.
**Recommendation**
Add language detailing the process governing the creation of the review committee's report, similar to that found on the FAS website: "PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion" for language lecturers (http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.ppassocdean.recruitment.html), as adapted below:

“The review may be written by the department Chair or a member of the committee, but all members of the committee should read the review before it is submitted to the department. The review should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division, the dissenting opinion should be appended to the majority review.”

While much of this language is already included in the policy, we will add “The review may be written by the committee Chair or a member of the committee.”


The Deans may consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate’s home department.

**Recommendation**
Please include within this document examples of reasons for the Dean to consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate’s home department, and any constraints upon such consultations. Further, if such consultations do occur, a written record of their nature and outcome should be added to the review packet.

This occurs in the interest of a thorough review although it is very rare; the dean has the option to seek additional consultation. This might come up when there is a very small unit or in the case of a highly split vote. These conversations and/or written documents are not part of the departmental docket.

29. The policy does not specify procedures for the Dean’s review of and decision on the recommendations of the departmental review committee and the divisional dean.

**Recommendation**
Include the following language: “The Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to
discuss the committee’s evaluation, as well as his or her own assessment and continuing programmatic need for appointment. In the event that the Dean follows the recommendation of the committee to reappoint and/or for promotion, the summary letter to the faculty member with notification of intent to reappoint or for promotion should include the length of reappointment/appointment, and a signature block for the faculty member.”

The letter of advice to the candidates is approved in advance by the Divisional Dean. It is the chair/director that provides the feedback directly to the candidate. All other points are addressed in the guidelines.

30. The policy does not specify the process according to which the divisional dean communicates with the Dean about the reappointment to ensure that the school Dean receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendations of the divisional dean.

**Recommendation**
Add the following language: “The divisional dean must forward the review packet to the school Dean along with the committee’s recommendations and any comments from the faculty.”

*We will adopt similar clarifying language.*

31. The policy does not specify a candidate's access to written review materials in the event of a negative decision on reappointment

**Recommendation**
“In all cases of an appeal of a negative decision related to reappointment or promotion by the Dean, the candidate will have access to the Review/Promotion Committee’s full report, with redactions of any confidential material such as names of evaluators, and including its recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”

*As is the case with tenured and tenure track faculty reviews (e.g. 3rd year review and promotion and tenure reviews) the candidate is provided with a letter of advice from the department chair or program director, and a summary of the report, not the complete report. This allows for a frank confidential review, and discussion of the candidate.*

32. The policy does not specify the procedure to be followed if the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the divisional dean and/or the review committee.

**Recommendation**
Add language detailing the process to be followed if the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the divisional dean and/or the review committee, similar to that found on the FAS website: "PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion" for language lecturers: 
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"If the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the departmental evaluation committee or the divisional dean, the Dean will provide the committee with the reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean’s decision is finalized."

As is the case of the review of tenure track faculty, the committee report and recommendation of the Chair and Divisional Dean are advisory to the FAS Dean. The Dean communicates his or her decision to the Divisional Dean and Department Chair, not the department or program faculty committee.

33. Page 9. Faculty Grievances, paragraph 2, item 4:
Faculty on continuous one-year or two-year appointments are similarly entitled to grieve the process in the event the third year review process leads to a negative decision.

Recommendation
This statement removes all rights of grievance for faculty on one-year or two-year appointments, prior to their third year review. We recommend that this statement be deleted from the document.

The FAS language conforms with University policy related to reappointments on continuous one or two year contracts.

Minor Substantive Recommendations

34. Page 1. I Introduction, paragraph 1, sentence 2:
"Appointees must be experienced in their particular fields"

Recommendation
Since initial appointment Language Lecturers might not have significant work experience in their field, we recommend the replacement of "experienced" by "highly knowledgeable".
We will change the language to “experienced or highly knowledgeable”.

35. Page 4. Procedures for Reappointment, General Considerations, title:

**Recommendation**
The title of this section should be changed to, "Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment, General Considerations"

Paragraph one of this section regarding appointments will be relocated to page 1, and become paragraph 3 under the section titled “Introduction”

36. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 5:
For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in both multi-year appointments and recommendations for promotion.

**Recommendation**
We recommend changing, "greater weight will be given to performance in both ...", to " greater weight will be given to performance of those duties in both ..."

We will make this suggested change.

37. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, paragraph 3, sentence 1:
The review packet to be presented to the faculty should normally include:

**Recommendation**
We recommend replacing this statement with, "The review packet prepared by the candidate to be presented to the faculty should normally include:"

We need to retain this as the review packet is not prepared solely by the candidate.

**Editorial Recommendations**

38. Page 2. Terms of Appointment, item 3:
“Length of Appointment - Language Lecturers: the initial appointment ...”

**Recommendation**
This is not a subsection heading, but rather a description of length of appointment for the language lecturer rank, much like item 4 is a description of length of appointment for the senior language lecturer rank. To maintain consistency with other items in this list, the first component of this item, "Length of Appointment -", should be deleted.

We will make this suggested change.
39. Page 4. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 1, sentence 6:
In the event of a decision to reappoint the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another multi-year term.

**Recommendation**
Two commas are incorrectly placed in the sentence. We recommend, "In the event of a decision to reappoint, the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally for another multi-year term."

*We will make this change.*

40. Page 5. Formal Review Process, section I, title:
PROMOTION

**Recommendation**
We recommend that the section title be changed to "PROMOTION: GENERAL PROCEDURE", to maintain consistency with the following two section titles.

*We will make this change.*

41. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, title:
DEPARTMENT

**Recommendation**
We recommend that the section title be changed to "PROMOTION: DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURE"

*We will change the section title to “DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES”*

42. Page 7. Formal Review Process, section III, title:
FAS DEAN'S OFFICE

**Recommendation**
We recommend that the section title be changed to "PROMOTION: FAS DEAN'S OFFICE PROCEDURE"

*We will change the section title to “FAS DEAN'S OFFICE PROCEDURE”*

N.B. FAS has updated the structure of its Grievance Committee on the occasion of updating the CCF Guidelines.
The FAS Grievance Committee is composed of nine tenured full professors elected by the FAS, with three members from each academic division, and six at large continuing contract faculty (senior language lecturer, clinical associate and full professors), two from the Expository Writing Program and four from other units in FAS. Sitting department chairs and program heads may not serve on the Committee on Grievance.
CONFIDENTIAL
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NYU Faculty of Arts and Science

December 10, 2018

Background

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Thomas Carew, submitted to the NYU Provost, Katherine E. Fleming, the school's policies pertaining to the appointment, reappointment and promotion of Continuing Contract Faculty. These policies were produced with input from an FAS CCF Guidelines Review Committee that was convened by Dean Carew in November 2015; and that following the re-issuing of the University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty in July 2016, earlier drafts of the policies were modified to insure that they conform to the University Guidelines. In Spring 2017 the Dean's office also transmitted the policy to the FAS CCF Guidelines Review Committee, which in turn shared the documents with the FAS Continuing Contract Faculty Senate Council. The changes were discussed in a meeting between Dean Carew and the FAS C-FSC. In January 2018 Dean Carew formed an ad-hoc committee to finalize the guidelines for a faculty vote. On December 5, 2018 at an FAS full faculty meeting, the guidelines were unanimously accepted.

At NYU, our strong tradition is for schools to develop policies that are "consistent with school culture and history." Within that tradition, the Handbook provides that school policies will be reviewed by the Provost to determine 'whether the substance of the policy: (i) is consistent with general University policy; (ii) is compatible with the University's commitment to excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, or artistic achievement and service within a community of respectful and respected academic professionals; and (iii) has no adverse implications for the University." As part of the process of finalizing FAS policy for its Clinical Professors and Language Lecturers, Provost Fleming has invited the T-FSC and the C-FSC to comment on the document, adopting the same perspective.

(per the letter of February 21, 2017 from Katherine E. Fleming to C-FSC and T-FSC Chairs)

The following document will enumerate various questions, comments and recommendations to the submitted Policy.

Major Substantive Recommendations

1. Add a description of the faculty voting process for the approval of this document. If such a vote did not take place, we recommend the return of this document to FAS for such a vote, with the possibility of making amendments. This is in keeping with University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, page 1, Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1, which states that
“In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate or amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the expectation that Continuing Contract Faculty shall participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.”

Clarify specifically and explicitly the process of consultation with the Continuing Contract faculty.

We strongly recommend that any development of this policy follow the letter and the spirit contained in the above quote from the University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, allowing the Continuing Contract faculty, acting according to the school’s governance structure (e.g., its Faculty Assembly or similar body, faculty meeting, etc.) an active, essential and meaningful role in forming and approving any new policy, which policy must necessarily include the grievance/appeal process.

The revised guidelines have been reviewed by the Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council; a CCF Ad-hoc Committee; a CCF Town Hall meeting; and submitted and approved by vote of the FAS Full Faculty Meeting.

2. The policy does not include any process for future amendments and revisions to it. The University Guidelines provide: “In response to these guidelines and as appropriate thereafter, schools shall formulate or amend their policies in accordance with existing school governance processes and with the expectation that Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty shall participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.”

Recommendation
Include the following: “Mechanisms for timely distribution of any amendments to the Policy to the faculty, faculty discussion, as well as the ability for faculty to present amendments, make recommendations to and vote on the Policy in a regularly scheduled faculty meeting following procedures outlined in the school’s governance structure, should be included and stated explicitly.”

As with all school policies and committees, FAS policies are subject to review and amendments as necessary and follow school governance and are in accord with University guidelines. There are a variety of pathways for consultation and we would be hesitant to restrict this by including a proscribed method. However, for further clarification the following preface has been added to the guidelines to address future amendments and revisions to the guidelines:

This document supplements NYU policies applicable to full-time continuing contract faculty. If any part of this document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies
then in effect will control. As with all NYU and FAS policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

3. Page 1. Introduction, paragraph 2, sentence 6:
   “Clinical faculty are ineligible for NYU faculty housing and sabbaticals.”

   **Recommendation**
   Exceptional circumstances may exist for which a total ban on faculty housing will be an impediment to reasonable response. We recommend replacing the word "ineligible" with the phrase "generally ineligible".

   We accept the phrase “generally ineligible for NYU housing” and will add it to the guidelines.

4. Page 1. Introduction, paragraph 2, sentence 6:
   “Clinical faculty are ineligible for NYU faculty housing and sabbaticals.”

   **Recommendation**
   Given the letter from President Andrew Hamilton of April 18, 2017, which promotes professional development for continuing contract faculty, we recommend the removal of a complete ban on sabbaticals and the consideration of semester long developmental or research leaves, similar to those granted in Gallatin, LS, and SPS.

   FAS does provide opportunities for professional development including annual allocations of professional development funds. Faculty who exhaust their professional development funds may request additional support from their Divisional Dean.

5. Page 2, Titles and Qualifications, paragraph 3:
   "All but degree" doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU are not eligible to be considered for clinical positions.

   **Recommendation**
   Given that all ranks of the continuing contract faculty list an M.A. in the field of expertise as the minimum degree requirement, an "All but degree" doctoral candidate who possesses an M.A. should not be excluded. We recommend that this statement be deleted.

   FAS will amend this text to site University Bylaw 81(c), Degree Programs. A degree candidate who accepts appointment as a full time Continuing Contract Faculty member in FAS must thereupon relinquish candidacy for a degree at NYU. As appropriate, the FAS Dean can request an exception from the NYU Board of Trustees.

6. Page 2, Titles and Qualifications, paragraph 3:
   "All but degree" doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU are not eligible to be
considered for clinical positions.

**Recommendation**
Given that there currently may be Clinical Faculty who are "All but degree" doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU, if the statement is not deleted as recommended in item 5, we recommend that the statement be modified to allow those individuals to retain their positions. Language such as, "'All but degree' doctoral candidates currently enrolled at NYU will not be considered for initial appointments to clinical positions." would protect those current faculty members.

_FAS will amend this text to site University Bylaw 81(c), Degree Programs. A degree candidate who accepts appointment as a full time Continuing Contract Faculty member in FAS must thereupon relinquish candidacy for a degree at NYU. As appropriate the FAS Dean can request an exception from the NYU Board of Trustees._

7. Page 2. Areas of Responsibilities, item 2, "Service" sentence 1: Participation on departmental committees is expected.

**Recommendation**
We recommend that this sentence be extended to, "Participation on departmental committees is expected, and opportunity should be equitable." If participation is expected, every continuing contract faculty member must have the opportunity to meet that requirement.

_This is a matter of departmental governance. We will amend the text to indicate that individual departments and programs will determine the appropriate opportunities for service._

8. Page 2. Terms of Appointment, item 3, sentence 1:
For Clinical Assistant Professors, the initial appointment can be made for one to three years.

**Recommendation**
As per the University Guidelines, Page 4, Duration of Contracts, sentence 2, "Thus, Wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts.", we recommend that if a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification. We recommend adding language to the document similar the following: "If a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification, similar to the hiring plan submitted to the Provost, based upon programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty through the FAS Faculty Assembly.

_All components of the FAS hiring plan including for Continuing Contract Faculty are discussed and worked out with department chairs and program directors. As is the case for all hiring, it is not our practice to bring FAS hiring plans to faculty governance committees._
9. Page 2. Terms of Appointment, item 3, sentence 2: Subsequent reappointment can be made for one to three years.

**Recommendation**
To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year contracts, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as, "Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment."

*It is typical that if a Continuing Contract Faculty member on a one-year appointment is renewed, reappointment will be for a multiyear contract of three years. However, to be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of a one-year option. To avoid the establishment of a permanent group of CCF on one year appointments we will revise the text to limit the number of one-year contracts to a total of three one-year contracts.*

10. Page 2. Terms of Appointment, item 3, sentence 2: Subsequent reappointment can be made for one to three years.

**Recommendation**
Subsequent reappointment should be no shorter than the initial appointment. When promoted to a three-year contract, subsequent appointment shall be for at least three years. When promoted to a five-year contract, subsequent appointments shall be for at least five years.

*To be responsive to specific programmatic needs we need to maintain the flexibility of reappointing to contracts of varying lengths.*

11. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 4: For Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors, the initial appointment is also for one to three years.

**Recommendation**
As per the University Guidelines, Page 4, Duration of Contracts, sentence 2, "Thus, Wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts.", we recommend that if a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification. We recommend adding language to the document similar to the following: "If a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification, similar to the hiring plan submitted to the Provost, based upon programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty through the FAS Faculty Assembly."
All components of the FAS hiring plan including for Continuing Contract Faculty are discussed and worked out with department chairs and program directors. We will continue to use the option of one year contracts in order to meet the curricular needs of departments and programs. Note that justification for creating any full time faculty position in FAS, regardless of duration, follows standard faculty recruitment guidelines used for all faculty hires, including tenured and tenure track faculty.

12. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 4:
   For Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors, the initial appointment is also for one to three years.

   **Recommendation**
   To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year contracts, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as, “Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their third year formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment.”

   We will continue to use one year contracts; however, we will stipulate that Clinical faculty members will be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all.

13. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 5
   The passage reads, “Candidates are eligible for five-year reappointment contracts at all ranks only if they have been at NYU for at least six years and have had at least one contract renewal at NYU.” There is no explanation as to what “eligibility” means, how “eligibility” is decided, or who decides “eligibility.”

   **Recommendation**
   The word “eligible” needs to be replaced so that it reads, “Candidates are expected to receive five-year reappointment contracts at all ranks only if they have been at NYU for at least six years and have had at least one contract renewal at NYU. Written justification will be given if a reappointment contract is for less than five years.”

   The length of reappointment is determined by performance as well as curricular needs of the department or program. We do not mandate an expected length of contract.

14. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 6, sentence 2: There is no expectation of renewal, ...

   **Recommendation**
   This item concerning visiting faculty does not pertain to continuing contract faculty,
and should be deleted from the document.

_We agree that short term appointments in the case where there is no expectation of renewal should not fall under the heading of “continuing contract faculty”. Reference to Visiting Continuing Contract Faculty will be removed from the guidelines._

15. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 7, sentence 2:
   In rare instances, a one-semester appointment as a Clinical Assistant Professor may be made to ...
   
   **Recommendation**
   This item concerning visiting faculty does not pertain to continuing contract faculty, and should be deleted from the document. Further, the use of the title "Clinical Assistant Professor" is inappropriate for such a position.

_These types of appointments come up under exigent circumstances and are quite rare. We agree that short term appointments in the case where there is no expectation of renewal should not fall under the heading of “continuing contract faculty”. We will remove the reference to Visiting Clinical faculty._

16. Page 4. Procedures for Reappointment, General Considerations, paragraph 2, sentence:
   Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvement in academic programs.

   **Recommendation**
   We recommend adding the language that, "In such an event, a review should be conducted which will focus on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and/or new academic structure and, if so, in what capacity."

_We will add the following statement to the guidelines; “The review will also comment on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and or new academic structure, and in what capacity.”_

17. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 4:
   When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there is no reappointment process; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development.

   **Recommendation**
   We recommend that a date be provided prior to which the faculty member will be notified of the intention not to reappoint.

_The Dean’s Office will notify the department or program by August 31 of the penultimate_
year of any contract that is scheduled to be renewed or is terminal. The department or program will then communicate this information to the faculty members.

18. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 4:
When a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there is no reappointment process; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development.

**Recommendation**
We recommend adding the language that, "In such an event, the review should focus on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and/or new academic structure and, if so, in what capacity."

We will add the following statement to the guidelines; “Such a review will include comment on whether the faculty member would be able to teach in the revised curriculum and or new academic structure, and in what capacity.”

19. Page 5. Reappointment for Continuous Service on One-Year or Two-Year Contracts, sentence 1:
In addition to contracts of three years or more, clinical faculty may be recommended by the Department Chair or Director to a series of one-year or two-year full time contracts.

**Recommendation**
As per the University Guidelines, Page 4, Duration of Contracts, sentence 2, "Thus, Wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts.", we recommend that if a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification. We recommend adding language to the document similar to the following: "If a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification, similar to the hiring plan submitted to the Provost, based upon programmatic and academic considerations, to the faculty through the FAS Faculty Assembly."

All components of the FAS hiring plan including for Continuing Contract Faculty are discussed and worked out with department chairs and program directors. As is the case for all hiring, it is not our practice to bring FAS hiring plans to the governance committees. We will continue to use the option of one year contracts in order to meet the curricular needs of departments and programs. Note that justification for creating any full time faculty position in FAS, regardless of duration, follows standard faculty recruitment guidelines used for all faculty hires, including tenured and tenure track faculty.

20. Page 5. Reappointment for Continuous Service on One-Year or Two-Year Contracts, sentence 1:
In addition to contracts of three years or more, clinical faculty may be
recommended by the Department Chair or Director to a series of one-year or two-year full time contracts.

**Recommendation**
To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year or two-year contracts, add language allowing for a transition to a appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year or two-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as, "Faculty members on continuous one-year or two-year appointments who successfully complete their formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment."

*We will continue to use one and two year contracts; however, we will stipulate that Clinical Faculty will be limited to no more than three one year contracts. After three such contracts they will either be provided with a multiyear contract or not reappointed at all. We will also stipulate that in the case of two year appointments, the faculty member shall be subject to formal review in the first semester of the third year of continuous service, comparable to those which faculty members on longer multiyear contracts are subject.*

The review, whether for renewal and/or promotion is undertaken by a committee appointed by the department Chair or Director, consisting of three to five full-time faculty, with a minimum of two tenured or tenure-track faculty and at least one clinical faculty member.

**Recommendation**
The committee should be made up of elected members, not appointed; additionally, the majority of the committee should be made up of Continuing Contract faculty members.

*This is a matter of departmental governance; however, we will revise to allow for a majority of Clinical Contract Faculty and provide the option of an appointed or elected committee.*

22. Page 5. Formal Review Process, sentence 4:
In any event, the committee shall not include a clinical faculty member under review for reappointment that year.

**Recommendation**
For small departments, or for departments with few Continuing Contract faculty, this constraint may be onerous and severely restrict the makeup of the review committee. We recommend that a clinical faculty member under review for reappointment and/or promotion simply recuse herself or himself from consideration of her/his case.

*As with tenured and tenure track promotion and tenure reviews, we work with small*
departments to find a pathway for committee formation that avoids apparent or potential conflict of interest, including allowing for ad-hoc committee members from other units.

23. Page 6. Formal Review Process, Promotion, section I, following paragraph
2 There is no mention of an increase in contract length upon promotion.

**Recommendation**
Add the following, “When promoted to Clinical Associate Professor, the candidate will receive a 5-yr contract. Subsequent appointments shall be for at least five years.”

*Promotion is not the determining factor in the length of a contract. The length of contract is determined by performance and curricular and programmatic needs.*

2 As an appointment of at least five years is the norm for Clinical Associate Professor, provide an increase in term of appointment for Clinical Professor. This is the case at certain schools (e.g., The Gallatin School).

**Recommendation**
Add the following, “When promoted to Clinical Professor, the candidate will receive a 6-yr contract. Subsequent appointments shall be for at least six years.”

*This is not the case in FAS; five years is the maximum length of a contract.*

25. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, paragraph 1, sentence 1:

The candidate should submit a personal statement, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations to the Chair or Director of the Department; for candidates on multi-year appointments, this should be submitted on or before February 1 of the penultimate year of their current appointment.

**Recommendation**
We recommend replacing this sentence with, “The candidate should submit a review packet (see below for content) to the Chair or Director of the Department; for candidates on multi-year appointments, this should be submitted on or before February 1 of the penultimate year of their current appointment.

*We decline this request as the packet is not solely prepared by the candidate.*


The review packet to be presented to the faculty should normally include:
**Recommendation**

We recommend replacing this statement with, "The review packet prepared by the candidate to be presented to the faculty should normally include:"

*The packet is not solely prepared by the candidate, so we decline this request.*

27. Page 7. Formal Review Process, section II, paragraph 3, item 5:
An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:
   A. Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
   B. Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
   C. Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)

**Recommendation**

Many other criteria might be used in order to assist the committee in assessing the teaching performance of the candidate. We recommend expanding the content of the review packet to include optional items that the candidate believes will support the assessment. Other items for consideration might include lecture notes, assignments, course development and innovation, instructor development, collegial observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing, evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.

*To allow for the inclusion of other items that the candidate believes will support the assessment, we will include the statement: “Candidates may include additional documents to support their renewal and or promotion.”*

28. The policy does not specify how the departmental review committee will make its determinations.

**Recommendation**

Specify that a majority vote of the departmental review committee shall be required for a successful review for a recommendation for reappointment and that all votes shall be by secret ballot. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

*A vote of the full faculty is optional, and is determined at the department/program level. The guidelines specify that in the case of a split opinion, that a minority report will be appended to the majority report.*

29. The policy does not specify the process governing the creation of the departmental review committee’s report.

**Recommendation**

Add language detailing the process governing the creation of the review
committee’s report, similar to that found on the FAS website: "PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion" for clinical faculty (http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html), as adapted below:

“The review may be written by the department Chair or a member of the committee, but all members of the committee should read the review before it is submitted to the department. The review should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division, the dissenting opinion should be appended to the majority review.”

While much of this language is already included in the policy, we will add “The review may be written by the committee Chair or a member of the committee.”

The Deans may consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate’s home department.

**Recommendation**
Please include within this document examples of reasons for the Dean to consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate’s home department, and any constraints upon such consultations. Further, if such consultations do occur, a written record of their nature and outcome should be added to the review packet.

This occurs in the interest of a thorough review although it is very rare; the dean has the option to seek additional consultation. This might come up when there is a very small unit or in the case of a highly split vote. These conversations are not part of the departmental document.

31. The policy does not specify procedures for the Dean’s review of and decision on the recommendations of the departmental review committee and the divisional dean.

**Recommendation**
Include the following language: “The Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee’s evaluation, as well as his or her own assessment and continuing programmatic need for appointment. In the event that the Dean follows the recommendation of the committee to reappoint and/or for promotion, the summary letter to the faculty member with notification of intent to reappoint or for promotion should include the length of reappointment/appointment, and a
signature block for the faculty member."

The letter of advice to the candidate is approved by the Divisional Dean. It is the chair/director that provides feedback directly to the candidate. All other points are addressed in the guidelines.

32. The policy does not specify the process according to which the divisional dean communicates with the Dean about the reappointment to ensure that the school Dean receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendations of the divisional dean.

Recommendation
Add the following language: “The divisional dean must forward the review packet to the school Dean along with the committee’s recommendations and any comments from the faculty.”

We will adopt similar clarifying language.

33. The policy does not specify a candidate’s access to written review materials in the event of a negative decision on reappointment.

Recommendation
“In all cases of an appeal of a negative decision related to reappointment or promotion by the Dean, the candidate will have access to the Review/Promotion Committee’s full report, with redactions of any confidential material such as names of evaluators, and including its recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”

As is the case with tenured and tenure track faculty reviews (e.g. 3rd year review and promotion and tenure reviews) the candidate is provided with a letter of advice from the department chair or program director, and a summary of the report, not the complete report. This allows for a frank confidential review, and discussion of the candidate.

34. The policy does not specify the procedure to be followed if the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the divisional dean and/or the review committee.

Recommendation
Add language detailing the process to be followed if the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the divisional dean and/or the review committee, similar to that found on the FAS website: "PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion" for clinical faculty: [http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html)
"If the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the departmental evaluation committee or the divisional dean, the Dean will provide the committee with the reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's decision is finalized."

As is the case of the review for tenure track faculty, the committee report and recommendation of the Chair and Divisional Dean are advisory to the FAS Dean. The Dean communicates his or her decision to the Divisional Dean and Department Chair, not the department or program faculty committee.

35. Page 9. Faculty Grievances, paragraph 2, item 4:
Faculty on continuous one-year or two-year appointments are similarly entitled to grieve the process in the event the third year review process leads to a negative decision.

**Recommendation**
This statement removes all rights of grievance for faculty on one-year or two-year appointments, prior to their third year review. We recommend that this statement be deleted from the document.

*The FAS language conforms with University policy related to reappointments on continuous one or two year contracts.*

**Minor Substantive Recommendations**

36. Page 1. I Introduction, paragraph 1, sentence 2:
"Appointees must be experienced in their particular fields ..."

**Recommendation**
Since initial appointment Clinical Assistant Professors might not have significant work experience in their field, we recommend the replacement of "experienced" by "highly knowledgeable".

*We will change the language to experienced or highly knowledgeable.*

37. Page 4. Procedures for Reappointment, General Considerations, title:

**Recommendation**
The title of this section should be changed to, "Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment, General Considerations"
Paragraph one of this section will be relocated to page one, and become paragraph #3 under the section titled “Introduction”

38. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 5:
   For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in both multi-year appointments and recommendations for promotion.

   **Recommendation**
   We recommend changing, "greater weight will be given to performance in both ...", to "greater weight will be given to performance of those duties in both ..."

   *We will make this suggested change.*

39. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section I, paragraph 1, sentence 2:
   Furthermore, the candidate must have been in his or her current rank for a minimum of three years and had at least one prior reappointment at the current rank to be eligible for promotion in rank.

   **Recommendation**
   This sentence is unnecessarily complex, and is redundant, given the statement in paragraph 3, "Candidates may request promotion during their second review in rank and any year after." We recommend deleting sentence 2 in paragraph 1 and keeping paragraph 3.

   *Paragraph 1 describes the minimum amount of service required for promotion, as such, it is not redundant.*

**Editorial Recommendations**

40. Page 1. Titles and Qualifications, item 3: "Clinical Professor - A minimum ..."

   **Recommendation**
   This item requires a bullet point in order to remain consistent with the formatting of the two preceding items.

   *We will make this change.*

41. Page 3. Annual Review:
   28. Clinical faculty are subject to ...
Since there is only one paragraph in this section, a bullet is unnecessary, and should be deleted.

We will make this change.

42. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 1, sentence 6:
In the event of a decision to reappoint the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another multi-year term.

Recommendation
Two commas are incorrectly placed in the sentence. We recommend, "In the event of a decision to reappoint, the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally for another multi-year term."

We will make this change.

43. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section I, title:
PROMOTION

Recommendation
We recommend that the section title be changed to "PROMOTION: GENERAL PROCEDURE", to maintain consistency with the following two section titles.

We will make this change.

44. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, title:
DEPARTMENT

Recommendation
We recommend that the section title be changed to "PROMOTION: DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURE"

We will change the section title to “DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES”

45. Page 7. Formal Review Process, section III, title:
FAS DEAN’S OFFICE

Recommendation
We recommend that the section title be changed to "PROMOTION: FAS DEAN’S OFFICE PROCEDURE"

We will change the section title to “FAS DEAN’S OFFICE PROCEDURE”

N.B. FAS has updated the structure of its Grievance Committee on the occasion of
updating the CCF Guidelines.

The FAS Grievance Committee is composed of nine tenured full professors elected by the FAS, with three members from each academic division, and six at large continuing contract faculty (senior language lecturer, clinical associate and full professors), two from the Expository Writing Program and four from other units in FAS. Sitting department chairs and program heads may not serve on the Committee on Grievance.
Our Mission
We are committed to providing safety and security for our community and property, enabling the pursuit of academic and professional goals

Our Core Values
• Professionalism
• Excellence
• Community
Highlights

• DPS
• Office of the Senior Vice President
• Field Operations
• Emergency Preparedness and Continuity
• Technical Operations
• Planning, Policy and Engagement
• Opened 561 LaGuardia Place location
• Launched Women in Public Safety initiative
• Strengthening public safety support at NYU Abu Dhabi
• Established the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC)
• Developed three-year strategic plan
• Standardized contracts, post orders and protocols at GACs
• Community Outreach Events
  • Dig In with DPS
  • A Taste of Safety @ Tandon Makerspace
  • Chew with CRU

• Expansion of Victim Services and Investigations programs

• Actively involved in several University committees
  • Diversity and Inclusion
  • Accessibility
  • Sustainability
  • Superblock Stewardship

3/22/2019
• Executive Policy Committee table top exercises
• Active Threat training exercises
• Enhanced Travel Support provided by GSOC (NYU Traveler)
• NYU Madrid academic center security technology

• Acquisition of ID printers for GAC deployment

• Security Technology RFP
• Preparations for accreditation assessment
• Conducted Clery and Campus Security Authority training at portal campuses
• Launched Transportation Advisory Committee