MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 21, 2020

The New York University Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at noon on Tuesday, April 21, 2020, via remote connection.

In attendance were Senators Carter, Davis, De Bartolo, Gershman, Illingworth, Jahangiri, Killilea, Kim, Liston, Maynor, McCarty, Mitnick, Patterson, Renzi, Slater, Tourin, Unnikrishnan, Wang, Watkins, White, Williams, and Youngerman; Alternate Senators Barnes, Bridges, Cohen, Ferguson (for Depaola-Cefola), Flamini, Hartsfield, Hersh Kleinert (for Saravanos), Lim, Lin, Owens, Packard, Pietro, Ritter, Rochlen, Sahin, Spivakovsky, Stevens.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the March 12, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: LARRY SLATER

See attached Documents A, B, and C.

Discussion/Questions on Chair’s Report

Chairperson Slater reported since the University Senate meetings are suspended for the remainder of the semester, the Senate Executive Committee shall act in the name of the Senate on urgent matters. This includes approval of the list of University Senate meeting dates for the next academic year. See attached Document C.

Slater noted the importance of Council members collecting information from their constituencies about their specific challenges. He commented that it is the individual, micro-level stories that can have the biggest impact in this current environment to help the Council advocate for c-faculty.

He noted the Steering Committee (SC) is still looking at broad areas such as financial issues, but individual issues or concerns will help shape the conversations within the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the SC's meetings with the President and Provost.

A Senator inquired on the status of continuing contract faculty’s contracts ending this year. Slater noted that student evaluations this semester will not factor into re-hiring decisions. The anticipation is that contract renewal decision will go forward as in previous years.

Senators noted the notification period of contract renewal is still in place.

A Senator asked about restrictions on spending, for instance, if a faculty member needs a printer while teaching remotely. It was noted that there has to be justification for all COVID-related expenses.
Slater reported the memo regarding the School Senator elections was sent to all Deans. For next year, the C-FSC has one less seat in the College of Dentistry and one more seat in NYU Shanghai.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

Addressing Trans+ Health Disparities at the Student Health Center Resolution: Kelly Catherine Ancharski, Leah Amanda Abay, Nicky Nenkov

See attached Document D.

The student presenters provided introductions. Leah Abay is a masters degree student in the Silver School of Social Work. Abay’s field experience is with homeless LGBTQ youth ranging from ages 16 to 24, and at a gay men's health crisis center, providing individual and group psychotherapy to those living with HIV and AIDS.

Kelly Ancharski is also a masters degree student in the Silver School of Social Work. Ancharski's field experience is with African Services’ immigrants with HIV, and AIDS and this year, at the MC Silver Institute for poverty policy research doing data analysis for PTSD intervention.

Nicky Nenkov is with the Student Center for Trans and Gender Expansive Students (SSE) and is sponsoring the resolution from SSE.

Ancharski noted in order to further understand the barriers to health care that trans+ students face, the Silver Trans + Queer Student Collective conducted a survey open to all current NYU students of trans experience. They found continual and pervasive transphobia and harassment occurring at the Student Health Center.

46.7% of respondents endorsed that they had denied or postponed annual exams because of binary gendered language, but an overwhelming majority of students asserted that changes to the language would reduce unnecessary barriers.

The resolution puts forth tools and pathways to understand the extent of this discrimination and improve access to services and reduce barriers.

Abay referred to Appendix III, Terminology, which offers basic definitions and clarifications of some terminology used throughout the resolution to provide and frame insight and perspective of key terms. For instance, misgendering is the act of assuming (purposefully or unintentionally) gender pronouns or gender identity that does not correctly align or reflect someone's lived experiences.

Senators noted concern with the use of the term white supremacy and noted the need to clarify the definition.

Senators noted the term white supremacy has a very specific social justice definition, and people will inevitably bring their own connotations to those terms. They suggested avoiding jargon and instead focusing on the specific examples of the problem and proposed solution.

A Senator asked if they have had conversations with the Student Health Center to discuss complications with medical record-keeping, etc.

Ancharski responded they are meeting with the Student Health Center on April 28. It was noted there will be some barriers such as insurance processes, etc., but the focus is on training providers on how to best have a dialogue with patients. The Senator suggested adding a line about providing resources to support the Student Health Services infrastructure.

A Senator noted their survey only had 15 respondents and suggested an effort to obtain a larger survey size. It was noted the survey is still open.
A Senator asked if the students have looked at resources currently available for the LGBTQ plus community through NYU Langone Medical Center. Abay stated the resolution is less about the resources available to students, but about making the Student Health Center a more approachable and safer place for some of the most marginalized students at NYU.

The Senator responded it might make more sense to use the same team doing the training in the NYU centers to help guide the training at the Student Health Center.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

**Vice Provost for Faculty Engagement and Development Charlton McIlwain**

Vice Provost McIlwain offered information on the mission and a brief history of the Center for Faculty Advancement (CFA). One of the primary initiatives focuses on the need to have more professional development opportunities for faculty across the university. The Center for Faculty Advancement was created to reorganize and consolidate efforts across the university and make them more highly visible to all faculty.

The Center for Faculty Advancement connects and collaborates with the NYU community to recruit, retain, develop, and advance faculty whose research, teaching, and public engagement will positively impact the scholarly community and the world.

They accomplish this by providing knowledge, resources, and engagement opportunities that: prepare faculty to meet key career milestones such as tenure, promotion, contract renewal, and other scholarly/professional aspirations; develop faculty academic leadership capacity; and facilitate faculty members ability to connect to, and positively impact communities throughout the world.

He noted a new Virtual Teaching Community site launched to provide support for remote teaching. It is a way for faculty to access resources, gain knowledge, and experience engagement with other faculty from across the university as remote courses are designed over the summer and into the fall.

The site focuses on three key areas, including 1) instruction: how do we best think about how we provide instruction in a remote environment; 2) engagement: how do we best connect with students and help students engage with each other and course material; and 3) assessment: how and what are the best practices, but thinking about how we evaluate students in this remote environment.

He noted there is also a Virtual Teaching Community Forum, which is a way for faculty to engage with colleagues from across the university.

There will also soon be a communication on a four-week short course that will be available to faculty in a remote environment. This will also become an asynchronous resource.

McIlwain noted the new policy, effective in fall 2019, on Continuing Contract Faculty as Principal Investigators of Sponsored Projects and Programs. Under the new policy, continuing contract faculty are deemed eligible to serve as Principal Investigators (PIs)/Project Directors (PDs) on proposals and awards for sponsored programs supporting training; pedagogical and curriculum development; basic, applied, and experimental research; and public service and evaluation. The CFA, in conjunction with the Office of Research, is working to elevate the support to develop research external funds, receiving grants, etc. This would be open to all of our faculty.

McIlwain noted the CFA’s engagement with a group called Academic Impressions to provide various forms of leadership development to the faculty community. He there is an extensive online professional development library that is free to all faculty and staff at the University. Information on how to access the URL will be emailed.

McIlwain noted the Program Director for the Center for Faculty Advancement is Usheevii King, and you can contact the Center at facultyadvance@nyu.edu.
PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, VOTE

Resolution on NYU Shanghai Faculty Committee’s Affordability Subcommittee Report

See attached Document E.

GNU Committee Chair Ritter presented the resolution and report. The Committee reviewed the NYU Shanghai Faculty Council Affordability Subcommittee Report, which demonstrates that Chinese Language Lecturers currently receive salaries that are roughly 40% below those of their NYU Shanghai international colleagues with similar ranks and teaching hours at NYU Shanghai. In addition, Chinese Language Lecturer housing benefits are pegged to their salaries, while international faculty housing benefits are fixed at a rate and adjusted for number of dependents, making their subsidies three to six times higher than those for Chinese Language Lecturers. The NYU Shanghai Faculty Council Affordability Subcommittee Report also demonstrates that the housing subsidy for Chinese Language Lecturers is considerably lower than that offered by peer institutions to faculty of similar positions in the Shanghai area.

He noted NYU Shanghai Dean of Arts and Science Shanghai Dean Maria Montoya attended the March 26 Committee meeting and offered context on the issue. She noted Chinese language lecturers have recently been shifted from staff positions to faculty positions. Shanghai has not yet responded to the report, but will likely in the fall.

Senators expressed support for the resolution. A Senator noted this issue should also be on the agenda for the C-FSC Housing and Benefits Committee and other Committees as a way to continue to push the University to give the Council and Committees a role in global network governance, finances, benefits, and housing.

The resolution was approved by vote of the Council. The GNU Committee will coordinate with the Steering Committee, Finance Committee, and Benefits Committee to follow up on how to push the resolution forward and to learn more about issues the Committee should focus on next year.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Resolution to Establish a University Holiday on Election Day: Kosar Kosar

See attached Document F.

Kosar presented the resolution. The Student Senators Council (SSC) and the Student Government Assembly (SGA) support the implementation of a university policy mandating that November 5, 2024, and every first Tuesday of November thereafter on which an election should occur. It shall be a University Holiday during which no classes, for courses taken for a grade or for credit, shall be scheduled.

The SSC and the SGA support the implementation of a university policy mandating that no student shall face any academic consequences for missing class for the purpose of participation in election activities on November 3, 2020, November 8, 2022, and on any day on which there is a Federal, New York statewide, or New York citywide primary.

The SSC and the SGA support the implementation of additional targeted programming initiatives that aim to promote and expand voter accessibility, voter registration, and voter turnout on campus. They also support the creation of a university-wide standing committee -- composed of students, faculty, and administrators -- for the evaluation of the NSLVE report and implementation of policies through NYU Votes to improve student voting statistics. The SSC and the SGA support the public release of the biennial NYU NSLVE Report and that it be made accessible on the NYU website.

A Senator inquired on how many students vote by mail. She expressed concern that this is New York-centric and does not focus on the general population of students who vote outside New York. Kosar noted that at this time he does not have information on absentee ballots.
A Senator asked how they intend to handle non-traditional academic obligations such as performances that are curricular or clinical days.

A Senator suggested using the policy already in place that allows for student absences such as for religious reasons.

A Senator noted New York residents can vote early, and non-New York residents vote by mail. Another Senator noted that students voting in New Jersey or nearby might prefer in-person voting and might require a holiday to travel to that location. It was noted this encourages students to engage in civic and political life.

A Senator stated this would not result in less instructional days, a make-up day would be added.

Chairperson Slater noted he will send this feedback to the students.

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, VOTE

PPCi's Recommendations on the School of Professional Studies Continuing Contract Faculty Reappointment and Promotion Policy

See attached Document G.

Personnel Policies and Contract Issues Committee Chair White presented the recommendations.

She noted the Committee’s process in handling these reviews. The Committee carefully reviews the document and offers recommendations. They also meet with generally three or more representatives from the school. The Committee also meets with the T-FSC Personnel Policies and Tenure Modification Committee (PPTM). In this case, they developed joint recommendations. The T-FSC will be voting on these recommendations on May 7.

The recommendations use the Twenty-five Principles regarding School Policies for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion for Full-time Continuing Contract Faculty.

In this set of recommendations, the Committee also included in each recommendation, how that specific recommendation aligns at other schools.

The recommendations were approved by vote of the Council.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

See attached Document H.

No Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:

Faculty Benefits & Housing
Global Network University
Personnel Policies and Contract Issues
Undergraduate Program Committee

Reports at Meeting:

Finance and Policy Planning
Committee member Patterson reported the University estimates the financial impact of COVID to be between 178 and 220 million dollars, which is primarily from housing refunds and loss of revenue in the summer with an anticipated 10% drop in enrollment.

Committee Chair Patterson reported on the Committee’s recommendation for the fiscal 2021 budget, which was submitted prior to the COVID crisis. She stated they recommended the minimum salary for continuing contract faculty be raised to $70,000 from $60,000. In addition, continuing contract faculty who have been employed by the university for more than five years be paid at $5,000 above the minimum salary and that the continuing contract faculty that have been employed for more than 10 years be paid at least $10,000 dollars above the minimum and that minimum salary levels must be reviewed at least every 3 years.

Senators discussed the impact of AMI being suspended. Senators suggested advocating for AMI for those with salaries under $80,000.

The Committee will add a statement noting the C-FSC recognizes that the University is facing budget constraints as a result of COVID-19, and requests that, if the University is unable to adopt all or any part of this recommendation for FY 2021, this request be carried over to FY 2022.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
It seems that it has been much longer than 5 weeks since we last met as a Council. I know that the last 5 weeks for all of us have been extremely busy with our transition to full remote teaching and the added stress of staying at home, teaching our students while teaching your own children, caring for loved ones or worrying about the care of loved ones that you are unable to see in person. It truly has been an unexpected journey, one that leaves us all with mixed feelings – pride at what we have accomplished over the last 5 weeks, but worry about what the next 5 weeks, or 5 months may hold. As we are in uncharted territory, we ask that all Senators and Alternates please let us know how things are going – the good and the bad – and encourage our C-Faculty to do the same. While we are going to keep advocating for ourselves and our students, and have tried to do it on a macrolevel, it is the individual microlevel stories that can have the biggest impact in this current environment. I appreciate those that have been bringing these to the attention of your Steering Committee (SC) hope everyone will continue to do so.

On another quick but very important note, we have many of our constituents that are working on the frontlines during this pandemic, whether as a direct healthcare provider, or as an essential worker. Please know that we think of you daily and have you and your families in our thoughts and prayers. We are so proud of you and want to thank you directly for the hard work you continue to do.

On to the report – as there have been many meetings since our last Council meeting on March 12, I am going to list them here with the major themes/highlights from each, without as much of my typical detail. I will highlight a few key things in my report during the meeting and, as always, welcome questions related to any of the meetings and topics. Some fellow members of the SC may also be able to elaborate for us during the meeting.

1. Meetings Since the Last Council Meeting on March 12, 2020
   a. **March 18, 2020, SC Meeting:** The Steering Committee met to discuss concerns related faculty preparation and potential student issues, including asynchronous vs synchronous teaching, student travel and missing classes during the first week back, course grading for the remainder of the semester, and faculty planning for teaching from home. The Steering Committee then sought input from the full council on a potential request to delay return to classes. The final letter sent to the President and Provost (a copy is attached as Document B), addressed these concerns.
   b. **March 19, 2020, SC Meeting with the President:** Prompted by the letter, the President set up a meeting with the SC for the following day. At this meeting the SC elaborated on the immediate faculty concerns. The President stressed the importance of trying to get back to a sense of normalcy and routine. The SC highlighted the mixed messaging received within individual schools related to asynchronous vs synchronous teaching and grading of students, leaving faculty unclear about how to prepare and proceed. The SC requested further communication with Deans about the administration’s support and trust of faculty and the specific course decisions they must make, as well as communication to the general faculty body about the tremendous work they are doing.
   c. **March 26, 2020, Senate Executive Committee Meeting (chair only):** The main discussion centered around the University Senate, and it was the decision of the SEC that it would meet in lieu of the Senate, making any essential, time-sensitive decisions until the Senate resumes in the fall. The SEC agreed that reports from councils and committees should still be collected and disseminated to the members of the University Senate, including reports from the SEC about any deliberations or actions taken. Also discussed were a resolution on making election day a university holiday (referred to the...
Senate Academic Affairs Committee) and a letter in support of religious accommodations (also refereed to SAAC). President Hamilton also gave an update on COVID-19, including the transition to remote learning and close dorms/buildings.

d. **March 26, 2020, SC and Executive Committee of T-FSC Meeting with Provost:** The Provost held a combined meeting with the SC and the EC of the T-FSC. The Provost expressed her full support and acknowledged the hard work of all faculty during these difficult times. She also stated that she will continue to throw her full support behind faculty in terms of course-based decisions that need to be made. Administration discussed the tenure clock stoppage decision, as well as hiring freezes currently put in place as a budgetary mitigation effort. The committees then had good discussion about teaching concerns as in other meetings - asynchronous/synchronous, P/F grading, adjusting to teaching in diverse home environments (sharing technology with family, homeschooling children, caring for aging parents, etc.). The group also discussed requesting delays for approved sabbaticals.

e. **April 3, 2020, Chair Meeting with Vice Provost and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs:** I asked for a direct meeting with Kris Day and Gigi Dopico to discuss continued faculty concerns related to remote teaching, specifically asynchronous vs synchronous teaching and working with students in different times zones around the world, Zoom meetings and concerns with class recordings, P/F grading, student evaluations of teaching (including school-specific evaluation questions), and the extension of faculty contracts. It was stated that the administration would continue to fully support faculty in course-specific decisions and would reiterate this with individual schools/colleges. They stated they would take the teaching-related concerns under advisement and appreciate our feedback. There was a long conversation about NYU’s specific P/F grading decisions and that there would not be any change to those plans. In terms of evaluations, Administration was still looking at guidance to provide to schools/colleges on use, including the potential for access available on to faculty, who will then make the decision to release/use (for review/promotion if wanted). I also highlighted that while they were discussing general university evaluation questions, we were also concerned about school-level questions and how those will be used. Vice Provost Day explained why the tenure clock was stopped but expressed that this was different than contracts. She stated that while there were currently no plans for extending contracts, there were no expectations of non-renewal related to budgetary shortfalls.

f. **April 7, 2020, SC Meeting:** The meeting was called initially to update the SC on my call with the Vice Provost and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs and to set the agenda for the SC’s next meeting with the President. We also discussed several additional issues: (1) continue the process of elections for senators and alternates. I followed up with an email to Peter Gonzalez and the Secretary of the Senate to get our allocations for the next academic year; (2) continue to advocate for participation in decision-making for financial affairs that related to budget mitigation that impact contract faculty; and (3) greater participation in decision-making for fall 2020 teaching and learning plans. Finally, Leila brought up the importance of messaging to our faculty that are serving as frontline healthcare workers during the pandemic, acknowledging their work and thanking them for their service.

g. **April 14, 2020, Senate Executive Committee Meeting (chair only):** The SEC approved the University Senate Schedule for AY 2020-2021. It is provided as Document C. The SEC then discussed several pending resolutions/documents. The first was the Fall 2021 – Summer 2024 Academic Calendars. It was agreed that this resolution could be postponed until the fall, giving the full University Senate the opportunity to review, discuss, and vote. The second was the SSC resolution on the election day holiday. The
SEC will invite the authors to present at the next SEC meeting. The third was the SSC letter in support of accommodations for religious obligations. The President reported that this letter is still being reviewed and potential revisions made through the Senate Academic Affairs Committee. The fourth was the SSC resolution addressing trans+ health disparities. The SSC will also invite the authors to present at the next SEC meeting. These resolutions are also being presented/reviewed at individual council meetings. The SEC then reviewed incorporation of the Long Island School of Medicine (LISOM) into the Senate. With no action taken, the University Bylaws would call for the LISOM to be integrated into the C-FSC and T-FSC but not other councils. The SEC will propose that the Board of Trustees suspends these provisions in the bylaws. This will keep LISOM in observer status in all councils until final decisions are proposed by the Senate Committee on Organization and Governance and approved by the University Senate in the Fall. I also highlighted the desire (which was reiterated by the Dean’s Council Rep) that the University should message to our full community to thank those essential workers and frontline healthcare workers for everything they are doing during this time (as discussed under item #1f above).

h. April 16, 2020, SC Meeting with the President: The SC wanted to address two main topics: (1) COVID-19 and Budget Implications for NYU, Faculty, and Students Moving Forward; and (2) Contract Faculty’s Role in Continuing NYU’s Academic Mission During and After COVID-19. The President started with a huge thank you to C-Faculty and all that we all have done over the last 5 weeks. From their perspective, teaching in this moment is better than they could have ever expected. In terms of budget impacts, we expressed the desire to be included in discussions related to budget impacts on contract faculty (e.g., AMI, professional development funds, promotions) and also expressed concern for those whose contracts may be ending at the end of this academic year. The President stated that the University is working diligently to keep the community intact, but a lot will depend on continued enrollment. The feel undergraduate enrollment should continue to be robust (and are ahead in terms of deposits for new students than at this point last year). There is more concern for graduate programs that rely more heavily on international students. In terms of priorities during this pandemic, the President reiterated that the first priority was safety, second was teaching and academically completing the semester, and now moving onto mitigation as well as future semesters, with a lot of unknowns. Some of the unknowns relate to how the fall may work, from totally remote to totally live or somewhere in between. We stressed that C-Faculty need to be participating with department chairs to plan course schedules that will work best for students should the fall need to include remote instruction. There was also discussion about flexibility across the global network for students who may not be able to travel in the fall to their select campus, possibly using global sites to have at least some semblance of academic community. There were a few other topics discusses, including: (1) faculty exploring other avenues for final exams then remote proctoring (which has proven difficult in many instances across the university); (2) developing NYU competitive internship programs for students impacted by lack of internships during the pandemic that could address review of procedures across the university for pandemic response, remote teaching modalities, etc.; and (3) the potential for deferred pathways for incoming first-year students (January start) and its impact on teaching for spring and summer 2021.
2. C-FSC Senator Elections

Although we remain remote, schools/colleges should continue with their regular process for election of Senators and Alternates. We are still awaiting information from the Secretary of the University Senate on the breakdown of Senators (to see if there were any changes to numbers by school) for the next academic year. Once we receive that information, we will be sending out communications to schools/colleges on the number of seats as well as any seats that are up for election. It is customary that we invite any newly elected Senators and Alternates to our final Council meeting of the year. They will begin their terms on September 1, 2020. (Note as per item #1g above, LISOM will not be used in determining the upcoming year’s allotments.)

3. Upcoming Meetings for the Academic Year

If you have any issues you would like to have discussed at any of the meetings, please forward your requests/comments to the Steering Committee at:

c-fsc-steering-committee-group@nyu.edu

a. C-FSC
   i. C-FSC Council Meetings
      1. May 5, 2020, 12:00 pm – 2:00 pm

b. C-FSC Steering Committee
   i. C-FSC Steering Committee Meetings
      1. Additional TBD
   ii. Meetings with the President
      1. Complete for the Semester. May request additional meetings as necessary.
   iii. Meetings with the Provost
      1. April 30, 2020, 1:00 pm – 2:00 pm

c. University Senate
   i. Senate Meetings
      1. Canceled for the remainder of the academic year.
   ii. Senate Executive Committee Meetings (Chair only)
      1. April 30, 2020, 10:30 am – 11:30 am
      2. May 15, 2020, 11:00 am – 12:00 pm
Dear President Hamilton and Provost Fleming,

We appreciate all you are doing to protect the health and well-being of the NYU community, while maintaining continuity of our academic mission. As faculty, we look forward to the sense of normalcy that we hope our classes will provide when they resume; we imagine many of our students will feel the same way.

However, many of our contract faculty colleagues are overwhelmed, both by academic questions and by practical concerns. These concerns have risen up repeatedly in our conversations with colleagues and amongst the C-FSC itself.

1. There are concerns about the demands of synchronous teaching, on both faculty (many of whom may have children at home with them, who are themselves remote learning) and students (who may be spread across multiple time zones in any given class). Faculty have been receiving inconsistent messaging related to the possibility of asynchronous teaching, as needed. Asynchronous teaching may be necessary to address faculty responsibilities while still meeting student course outcomes.

2. There are concerns about grading students in these new conditions. Many faculty have argued in favor of offering alternative grading opportunities, e.g. High Pass/Pass/Fail. We note that although there are concerns about motivation and graduate school applications, there are also genuine concerns about equity if students are given the option to have grades.

3. Given #1 and #2, faculty need to be empowered to work within their academic units to make decisions that are best for themselves, individual courses, and programs, with the support of university leadership.

4. These, and other concerns, have led some contract faculty to share with us the desire to delay class resumption until March 30th. Faculty are concerned about students traveling and about students in home environments which are not yet set up for learning. And many faculty, realizing now that they must teach from their homes and for the entire semester, are undertaking significant changes to their syllabi. Frankly, the demands (and unknown shape) of teaching in apartment living rooms alongside their children in remote “classes” is weighing heavily on many faculty, who may benefit from additional time to build these new, personal schedules, including having to share technology resources with family members.

We are confident that, as a faculty community, we can provide our students with the high-quality educational experiences they deserve; but we believe that responses to these issues will help.

Respectfully,

The Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council Steering Committee
cc: Richard S. Baum, Chief of Staff to the President
    Ellen Schall, Senior Presidential Fellow
    Kristen Day, Vice Provost

C-FSC Steering Committee Members:
    Beverly Watkins, C-FSC Vice Chairperson
    Ethan Youngerman, C-FSC Secretary
    Lauren Davis
    Leila Jahangiri
    Mary Killilea
    Antonios Saravanos

Nicholas Economides, T-FSC Chairperson
New York University Senate
AY 2020-2021 Schedule of Meetings

Thursday, October 1, 2020
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Thursday, November 5, 2020
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Thursday, December 3, 2020
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Thursday, February 18, 2021
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Thursday, March 25, 2021
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Thursday, April 22, 2021
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

All University Senate meetings will take place in the Colloquium Room on the Fifth Floor of the Global Center for Academic and Spiritual Life located at 238 Thompson Street.
Addressing Trans+ Health Disparities at the Student Health Center Resolution

Preamble

We are aware that white supremacy creates artificial divisions in social structures that minimize, erase, and isolate transness, People of Color, neurodivergence, ability status, and all those who fall outside the purview of white cis heteronormativity as described by pioneers of social justice with an emphasis on intersectionality: Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Paulo Freire, bell hooks, Audre Lorde, and Iris Young; and

That these are foundational academic texts in the field of Social Work and social justice, but beyond academic jargon, activists such as Rachel Cargle, Ericka Hart, and Indya Moore use their digital platforms to speak on intersectionality under a more accessible and decolonized lens; and

That in order to even begin conceptualizing the stress inflicted upon intersecting identities, first we must understand Minority Stress Theory and how it differs from other types of stress. Ilan Meyer’s 2003 article Prejudice, Social Stress, and Mental Health in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations: Conceptual Issues and Research Evidence describes the concept of minority stress as, “excess stress to which individuals from stigmatized social categories are exposed to as a result of their social, often a minority, position” (p. 4). That being said, minority stress differs from other types of stress because not only is it unique to a minority group, it is also excess stress and chronic stress, meaning that it does not refer to stress in reaction to a specific event, rather it comes from an institutionalized source, versus a personal source; and

That minority stress is related to compounded and increased adverse environments at home, work, and school, which may result in increased mental health issues such as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), anxiety, depression, and internalized homophobia (Meyer, 2003); and

That Complex Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder expands upon the DSM-5 definition of PTSD in order “to capture the protean sequelae of prolonged, repeated trauma” (pp. 377). Moreover, complex trauma that occurs in both public and private spheres, may increase the psychological oppression of individuals or groups (Herman, 1992); and

That in the article Barriers to Health Care for Transgender Individuals by Safer, Coleman, Feldman, Garofalo, Hembree, Radix, and Sevelius (2019) outlines the multi-dimensional oppression transgender, nonbinary, and gender noncomforming communities disproportionately face: socioeconomic discrimination, sociocultural stigma, and harassment within the health care system; and

That the intersectional isolation and exclusion of queer transgender People of Color (QTPOC) is caused by anti-Blackness, stigma, and microaggressions inside and outside the healthcare field as documented in Measuring Multiple Minority Stress: The LGBT People of Color Microaggressions Scale (Balsam,
Molina, Beadnell, Simoni, & Walter, 2011) and High Stakes for the Health of Sexual and Gender Minority Patients of Color (Tan, Baig, & Chin, 2017); and

That persistent experiences are connected with feelings of victimization, suicidal ideation, higher rates of substance use and abuse, depression, and other mental/physical health conditions for members of the trans+ community as referred in That's So Gay! Microaggressions and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Community (Nadal, 2013); and

That barriers to health care include misgendering, noncompetent providers, over-medicalization, gender essentialist language, transphobia, and fear/anxiety as illustrated by Romanelli and Hudson in Individual and Systemic Barriers to Health Care: Perspectives of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Adults (2017), Stroumsa, Shires, Ricardson, Jaffee, Woodford in Transphobia Rather than Education Predicts Provider Knowledge of Transgender Health Care (2019), Vincent in Breaking Down Barriers and Binaries in Trans Healthcare: The Validation of Non-binary People (2019), and supported by the trans+ New York University (NYU) student narratives collected by the Silver Trans + Queer Student Collective (STQSC) (see Appendix II); and

That consistently using name and pronoun(s) indicated by client during care, centering the clients knowledge, needs, and wishes, acknowledging of mistakes by providers, and ongoing practitioner research and training for trans+ health excellence on an interpersonal level links to a positive relationship in increasing trans+ retention to care and physical and mental health outcomes (Pryor & Vickroy, 2019); and

That clinicians have an ethical obligation to be transparent with their clients with regards to the use of their government name on insurance forms but with the understanding that a client may use a name and pronouns that do not align with their government-issued identification due to financial and legal barriers (WPATH, 2012); and

That under the Hippocratic Oath and World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH) guidelines, NYU clinicians at the Student Health Center (SHC) are mandated to go above and beyond to affirm the dignity and worth of all persons as defined by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics; and

Furthermore, that systematic changes of establishing a comprehensive trans-affirming health center, mandatory training, broadening transition-related coverage, eliminating male/female designations in medical billing, standardizing training and expectation in trans health for all staff and providers, and including inclusive, accessible, and all-gender bathrooms within facilities creates a cultural dedication to supporting and uplifting the trans+ community (Pryor & Vickroy, 2019).
WHEREAS, in *Summary of Trans+ Discrimination at NYU*, the Silver Trans + Queer Student Collective captured continual and pervasive transphobia and harassment\(^1\) (See Appendix II); and

WHEREAS, 37% of trans+ students at NYU reported that they had “experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, and/or hostile conduct,” campus wide, according to the *Being@NYU Assessment* (2018); and

WHEREAS, the substantial progress New York University Student Health Center has made progress towards a more equitable and inclusive community, especially in terms of mental health care, insurance coverage, and medical transitioning, we need to increase our services for trans+ students and deconstruct gender essentialism that clouds universal care and treatment; and

WHEREAS, this discrimination is a part of a larger institutional oppression of trans+ student in higher education as suggested by the survey published by the Williams Institute, *Transgender in Higher Education* (2018). Out of over 27,000 trans+ respondents, 24% reported being verbally, physically, or sexually harassed at that time of university enrollment—with 16% of those who experienced harassment having left college because of the harassment.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that New York University Student Health Center undertake the following measure in accordance with American College Health Association Guidelines:

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Student Health Center undergo a program evaluation in relation to service delivery for trans+ students with members of the trans+ community with a background of Social Work, Public Health, and/or Law, with a vested interest in anti-oppressive social justice practices; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that all Student Health Center staff and providers attend mandated training around respective trans+ identities and individual service needs, as developed by The Transgender Training Institute; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Student Health Center appoint one or more patient advocates and have a visible procedure for trans+ students to report concerns and instances of suboptimal care and treatment; and

---

\(^1\) The narratives and responses used to formulate the *Summary of Trans+ Discrimination at NYU* was developed as an advocacy tool to fill the information gaps available detailing the trans+ experience on campus. Between September to December 2019, members of the STQSC e-mailed Silver professors of Practice and Diversity, Racism, Oppression, and Privilege (DROP) classes and T-Party at NYU’s LGBTQ+ Center in order to present the project and ask members of the trans+ community to share their experiences at the Student Health Center. The qualitative methodology aimed to deconstruct the idea of a single trans+ narrative and medical care needs, pinpoint problem areas, and organize the trans+ community. For gender identity, participants could select as many pertinent categories to describe themselves. Many collective university data is not clear on their methodology of defining gender/sex, and nonbinary or gender expansive students are only included in the “total” scores. The survey design seeks to minimize this inherent oppression and implement decolonized language to affirm the experiences of students that live and operate beyond the binary and cisheteronormativity. While this survey was not systematic research, it solidifies a need for more anti-oppressive research to uncover service delivery gaps for all trans+ students in all campus branches and global sites. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix IV.
FURTHER RESOLVED that gender binary language around services, e.g. Women’s Health, and Well Women’s Exams, be changed to more inclusive and all-encompassing of the wide variety of gender variation on campus; and

That being said, oppression intersects with multiple areas of student’s lives, therefore changes at the Student Health Center cannot be siloed. In order to address systematic oppression we must address all systems that affect students.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following measures target long-term university wide initiatives as secondary measures once the specific Student Health Center items are addressed; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the New York University at-large, including portal campuses and global sites, designate support and resources to provide assessment, oversight, and anti-transphobia education in all health care services, schools, and departments that goes beyond trans+ competency to humility that recognizes the power of language, gender fluidity, and shifting cultural norms; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that New York University institute yearly evaluations of anti-transphobic practices across all schools, faculty, students, staff, and administrators, as modeled in the narrative collection based on the original survey distributed by the Silver Trans + Queer Student Collective. This ongoing feedback will ensure accountability of aforementioned parties by determining deficits from the perspective of those affected; and

FURTHER RESOLVED that New York University through a working group comprised of members outlined below, produce a 5-year strategic plan that focuses on the trans+ student, faculty, and staff experience, baring in mind the intersections of racism, homophobia, and ableism, in order to evaluate and monitor best practices and effective mechanisms for implementation of trans-centered and anti-oppressive health care. The lifespan of the working group will be two years for each appointed member. After that time-lapse of progress, Program Evaluators, patient advocates, and Student Health Center Leadership will evaluate the necessity of the group. At the summation of the tasks set forth by the working group, due to the ever-present shifting cultural norms, the working group may be reinstated at any time.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the working group will be comprised of:
- Student Health Center Leadership
- Patient advocates
- Program evaluation coordinators
- Members from the NYU LGBTQ+ Center
- Relevant student government bodies
- Select members from various LGBTQ groups on campus
- Triple Aim committee liaison

FURTHER RESOLVED that the tasks of the working group may include but are not limited to:
- Oversee of the hiring and management of patient advocates
- Implement of IT changings to Student Health Portal
- Evaluate service name changes that meet the needs of the student body and are assessable
- Supervise of the program evaluation and collection of student narratives
- Conduct student focus groups with all departments around the trans+ experience
- Coordinate with Deans of all NYU schools to assess individual department needs
- Create and administer yearly evaluations
- Devise a 5-year strategic plan with NYU leadership and Board of Trustees
Appendix I: Resolution Endorsements

This resolution is endorsed by:

Silver Trans + Queer Student Collective

Asian Pacific Islander/American (API/A) Social Work Students for Change

Black Women’s Social Work Coalition

White Students Challenging Racism

Silver Peer Support Network

Silver Graduate Student Associate Council (GSA)

NYU T-Party @ LGBTQ+ Center (members below):

For transgender, non-binary, and gender non-conforming students & their allies.

- Cameron Sopala
- Joshua Arrayales
- Kyu Wild
- Jordan Kolocotronis
- Lachlan Campbell
- Consi Faling
- Noah DeFranceschi
- Suz Fyodorov

144 NYU Students who signed a petition of support

Calla C. Jo, LP, LCSW, Adjunct Lecturer
Libby O’Connor, LCSW, Adjunct Lecturer
Diane Mirabito, Clinical Professor, Chair of Practice Curriculum
Andrée Pilaro, LCSW, Adjunct Associate Professor
Robin Donath, LCSW, Co-director of NIP C&A Program, Associate Editor for the Journal of Family Social Work
Joan Greenberg, LCSW-R, Adjunct Associate Professor
Dina Franchi, LCSW, Adjunct Lecturer
James I. Martin, PhD, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Silver School of Social Work
Courtney O’Mealley, Associate Dean for Student Affairs, Silver School of Social Work
Richeleen Dashield, Director for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, Silver School of Social Work
Dulcinea Pitagora, PhD, LCSW, CST, Adjunct Professor, Silver School of Social Work
Porsche L. Martin, LCSW, Adjunct Lecturer, Silver School of Social Work
Susan M. Pelosi, LCSW, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Silver School of Social Work
Appendix II: Summary of Trans+ Discrimination at NYU

In order to further understand the barriers to health care that trans+ students face, the Silver Trans + Queer Student Collective conducted a survey open to all current NYU students of trans experience. We found continual and pervasive transphobia and harassment occurring at the Student Health Center.

Of the 15 respondents, 60% were undergraduates and 40% were graduate students from Silver, Stern, Gallatin, GSAS, CAS, and Tisch. Students’ gender identity was varied across the spectrum, including agender, genderqueer, nonbinary, gender nonconforming, man, transgender, trans feminine, trans masculine, trans man, trans woman, woman, and gender expansive.

46.6% of students rated their comfort-level with staff and service providers at SHC as neutral, 26.7% uncomfortable, and 26.7% as comfortable.

46.7% of respondents endorsed that they had denied or postponed annual exams because of binary gendered language, but an overwhelming majority of students asserted that changes to the language would reduce unnecessary barriers. 86.7% of students affirmed that changing the “Women’s Health Center” and online appointment options of “Women’s Health Visit” and “Well Woman Visit” to more inclusive language would help reduce barriers to health care.

Barriers to health care include, but are not limited to misgendering, deadname usage, identity/care needs being reduced to genitals or a partner’s genitals, providers connecting all chronic illness or mental health conditions with a person’s trans identity (pathologizing transness), difficulties navigating the SHC center, lack of knowledge around trans competent providers, absence of peer advocates, and delaying/denying care because of noncompetent providers.

One respondent outlined,

As a gender nonbinary student, I have been misgendered so many times by staff, nurses, and doctors/nurse practitioners. Really the only time I am not misgendered is when I am with the counseling department. Bear in mind, all the counseling services I seek are specifically for TGNC students. Language in appointments has been exclusively binary/essentialist. Having a sexual partner with a penis has automatically equaled a male partner or having penetrative sex has always been associated with a penis. My gender identity has been reduced to my uterus, and the enormous assumption that all people with uteruses are woman/female. The structure of health services has placed the duty of retrieving gender expansive care on the gender expansive student. It is not easy to call the student health center, face invalidating and insensitive staff, have to out myself as non-binary, and request vital annual services. This is not the same as the female-born experience of logging-on and clicking an appointment. While I realize NYU has many gender-affirming programs and ability to access health care, language and staff training needs to mirror these policies. My basic identity shouldn’t be eased. Using the correct pronouns, realizing that gender and sex are social constructions, and allowing ease of access to services are simple ways of implementing anti-oppressive health care.
Another student reported, “I have put off medical [appointments] and waited months for trans competent providers. Even then, I have been misgendered at LGBTQA clinics.”

In addition, a respondent “[refuses] to go to the OBGYN because [they are] uncomfortable even going there.”

One student details,

I get birth control, HRT, and psychiatric medications from the SHC. I’m very often deadnamed and misgendered and made uncomfortable because I am trans and transitioning. The receptionists and some of the pharmacists tend to be the worst offenders, and some of the nurses make me uncomfortable as a trans person.

Another student explains,

[I access] primary care and “women’s” health. I listed my pronouns online when I made my appointments, but I was misgendered by everyone I interacted with. Staff seemed knowledgeable about queer/sexual orientations but [lacked understanding] in relation to gender. [Everyone] assumed I was a ciswoman…[and I did not feel comfortable] to clarify.

A respondent elucidates,

I have seen other providers at the SHC and my experience was usually followed by discomfort and sometimes anger by how I was treated due to ignorance related to how hormones impact my body (ex: menses, blood tests, and frequency) and assumptions about my sexuality and level of risk for STDs. In addition, [I am upset] with the medical model; most providers I saw felt like the “expert” of care and wouldn’t listen to me and would negate my previous medical treatment. For example, to get hormones, I have to have regular blood work done, to monitor my health. Once you are stable, providers will lessen the frequency of tests and give more backup refills. Obtaining a prescription in the medical system depends on this process, and it is at the discretion of the provider. While normally I have tests done every 6 months to a year, I had to get tests done every 3 months or less…which resulted in more money and anger.

Other students have mixed experiences; “It’s neither neutral nor negative, but most often the issues I have are with misgendering and deadnaming, despite my chosen name being in the NYU system.”

Furthermore,

It angers me that NYU provides these services but doesn’t assist in accessing them. I’m established in receiving affirming medical care for 7 years and know how to advocate and navigate the healthcare system. With that in mind, I found my experiences to be frustrating at best.

Another student explains the difference between staff and service providers, “staff treats me nicely, but often deadnames me. Providers are very pleasant and never deadname me (except for the neurologist).”

One respondent accesses therapy, nutrition, and sometimes dental/primary care. They report,
The therapy staff and nutrition staff [are] very nice and well-versed in trans issues. The dental staff and primary care staff are not. I had to explain what genitals I have to the gynecology staff, and they were unable to help me because they don’t know how to deal with patients on testosterone.

While this data is not comprehensive, it does call attention to systemic barriers to health care and invalidation of transness. Trans-centered health care is of the utmost urgency because of the oppression outlined above in combination with the lack of visibility, research, program evaluations, and trans+ competent staff/providers at NYU. These themes of invalidation hold profound physical and mental health impacts.
Appendix III: Terminology

These are basic definitions and clarifications of some terminology used throughout the resolution to provide and frame insight and perspective of key terms. This is not exhaustive. The language is complex and evolving, but Appendix III serves to dismantle any academic gatekeeping.

Trans+ (pp. 1) is an umbrella term for the wide variety of gender identity that does not directly align with an individual’s sociocultural and political sex assigned at birth.

White supremacy (pp. 1) is the theory, practice, and moral belief system that Whiteness is superior. This deemed superiority creates artificial hierarchies of oppression that uplift and uphold White power. In turn, the visible and invisible power of someones’ Whiteness, or kinship to Whiteness (White passing, White presenting, and/or non-Black People of Color), grants unearned access, protection, and praise in political, economic, academic, and social systems. White supremacy seeks to divide and pit identities against each other in order to consolidate and maintain control.

Neurodivergence (pp. 1) describes neurological variation that falls outside normative cognitive processing, typically within social, learning, attention, and affect. It is a counter to ableist terminology and was coined by activist Kassiane Asasumasu.

White cisherenormativity (pp. 1) is the theory, practice, and moral belief system that Whiteness, heterosexuality, and cisgenderism are the normal, standard, and ideal way of operationalizing. It is a consolidation of White power and supremacy that seeks to erase Black and Indigenous people and queerness through violence, subversion, and suppression. This can be both subvert and overt, systematic and interpersonal.

Intersectionality (pp. 1) is the theory, practice, and act of resistance outlining the coinciding and interdependency of identity within systems of oppression, especially race, class, gender, and ability status. Oppression does not operate in a vacuum; one infliction of violence and discrimination targeting an identity intersects or overlaps with all the other identities a person holds. Coined by activist and lawyer Kimberle Williams Crenshaw to counteract the Whiteness of liberal feminism and further social understanding of the ways in which white supremacy proliferates.

Internalized homophobia (pp. 1) is the inward learned and unconscious negative belief system about homosexuality occurring within members of LGBTQ+ community.

Transgender (pp. 1) is one of the older and most prominent identity descriptors for gender diversity, and it has various political, medical, and social definitions that hold elements of both liberation and oppression. The etymology of transgender has shifted throughout history by members of and outside the community. In this resolution, transgender holds the same definition as trans+.

Microaggressions (pp. 1) are indirect and subtle discriminatory remarks or actions against individuals or people who fall outside White, weathly, able-bodied, heterosexual, and Christian benchmark of power.
Microaggressions was coined by psychiatrist Chester Pierce in reference to how anti-Blackness is reproduced on a continuous and ongoing basis.

**Misgendering** (pp. 2) is the act of assuming (purposefully or unintentionally) gender pronouns or gender identity that does not correctly align or reflect someone’s lived experiences.

**Gender essentialist language** (pp. 2)/**gender essentialism** (pp. 3) is the concept (gender essentialism) used to examine specific universal, innate, biologically or psychologically driven, and therefore, unchanging and fixed, features of gender, (note: different than sex assigned at birth) rooted in perceived understandings of behaviors of men and women often times through a Eurocentric and Global North-standarization of gender roles, norms, and expression.

**Transphobia** (pp. 2) is the irrational fear of, aversion to, hatred of, violence towards, prejudice or discrimination against transgender individuals.

**Binary gendered language** (pp. 3) is the linguistic classification that has a bias towards a particular sex assigned at birth or gender, specifically in two distinct, opposite forms, feminine and masculine.

**Anti-oppressive social justice practices** (pp. 3) is the interdisciplinary approach, requiring critical examination of the multiplicity of power imbalances, predominantly rooted within the practice of social work, aiming to end systematic and systematic oppression, racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, and a plethora of additional types of discrimination.

**Systematic oppression** (pp. 3) is institutionalized violence and discrimination, where the systems in place (driven by white supremacy) create and profit from unequal treatment of a specific identity or group.

**Gender fluidity** (pp. 4) describes the opportunity to remain flexible about gender identity, rather than committing to a single definition. This may fluctuate over time, or potentially express multiple aspects of gender expression simultaneously.

**Racism** (pp. 4) is the prejudice, antagnoism, discrimination, and violence directed against someone of a different race based on the belief that one’s race is superior. Predominantly inflicted by the race with the most power, ie. White people and Whiteness.

**Homophobia** (pp. 4) is the irrational fear of, aversion to, hatred of, violence towards, prejudice or discrimination against homosexual individuals or those who are members of the LGBTQIAA+ community.

**Ableism** (pp. 4) is the irrational fear of, aversion to, hatred of, violence towards, prejudice or discrimination against people with disabilities or those who are differently abled. Ableism defines those by their ability status, characterizing as inferior or less than.

**Appendix IV: Trans/Nonbinary/Gender Noncomforming/Genderfluid Student Health Care Survey**
Trans/Nonbinary/Gender
Noncomforming/Genderfluid Student
Health Care Survey

We are a group of trans, gender expansive, nonbinary MSW students, collecting
trans/nonbinary/gender noncomforming, genderfluid student narratives of their experiences with
the Student Health Center (SHC), especially if their needs are not being met in a comfortable,
validating, and active way.

These narratives will be used to identify major issues and barriers for trans and gender non-
binary students in regard to health care and eventually shared with administration to enact
change. Narratives will be shared only with permission of individuals and de-identified.

* Required

1. How do you identify? (Check all that pertain to your experience) *

   Check all that apply.
   - [ ] Agender
   - [ ] Genderfluid
   - [ ] Genderqueer
   - [ ] Gender nonbinary
   - [ ] Gender nonconforming
   - [ ] Man
   - [ ] Transgender
   - [ ] Trans feminine
   - [ ] Trans masculine
   - [ ] Trans man
   - [ ] Trans woman
   - [ ] Two-spirit
   - [ ] Woman
   - [ ] Option not listed

2. If option not listed, please write here.

   ___________________________________________________________
3. What are your pronouns? *

4. What school/department are you enrolled in?

5. Are you an undergraduate or graduate student? *
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   □ Undergraduate
   
   □ Graduate

6. Do you access medical services through the NYU Student Health Center? *
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   □ Yes
   
   □ No

7. Please rate your comfort-level with staff and service providers at SHC.
   
   *Mark only one oval.*
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   
   Very Uncomfortable □ □ □ □ □ Very Comfortable
8. If you do not access services at the SHC, please rate your comfort-level with staff and service providers outside NYU.

Mark only one oval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What are your personal experiences with medical care at NYU? (What services do you access, how does staff treat you, satisfaction level, etc.)

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

10. If you do not access services at the SHC, please describe your personal experiences with your medical providers outside NYU.

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

11. Due to binary gendered language (like "Women's Health/OBGYN/Men's Health), have you ever denied or postponed annual exams? *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No
12. If yes, why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

13. Due to ease of access to services, have you ever denied or postponed annual exams? *
   
   *Mark only one oval.
   
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

14. If yes, why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. In what ways has the Student Health Center validated or invalidated your trans+ experience? *

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________


16. Would changing the "Women’s Health Center" and online appointment options of "Women’s Health Visit" and "Well Woman Visit" to more inclusive language help reduce barriers to health care? *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Other: ____________________________

17. Do you have any proposals for these changes?

____________________________________

18. Can I share your responses with administration? *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No
C-FSC Committee on the Global Network University
Draft Resolution supporting recommendations of the NYU Shanghai Faculty Council
Affordability Subcommittee Report
April 19, 2020

Whereas the C-FSC supports Continuing Contract Faculty throughout the NYU Global Network; and;

Whereas the C-FSC has adopted principles outlining minimum salary levels for Continuing Contract Faculty in the University; and;

Whereas the NYU Shanghai Faculty Council Affordability Subcommittee Report demonstrates that Chinese Language Lecturers currently receive salaries that are roughly 40% below those of their NYU Shanghai international colleagues with similar ranks and teaching hours at NYU Shanghai, and;

Whereas Chinese Language Lecturer housing benefits are pegged to their salaries, while international faculty housing benefits are fixed at a rate and adjusted for number of dependents, making their subsidies three to six times higher than those for Chinese Language Lecturers, and;

Whereas the NYU Shanghai Faculty Council Affordability Subcommittee Report demonstrates that the housing subsidy for Chinese Language Lecturers is considerably lower than that offered by peer institutions to faculty of similar positions in the Shanghai area; now therefore be it

Resolved that the C-FSC

1. supports the recommendations of the Shanghai Faculty Council Affordability Subcommittee Report, and;

2. urges NYU Shanghai to provide housing subsidy to all faculty at the same standard, as a flat rate based on family size, adjustable to current market rates, and;

3. urges NYU Shanghai to explore government-subsidized housing for Sino-US university faculty, plus other resources to meet different faculty needs and price limitations, and;

4. urges NYU Shanghai to find corporate housing options with convenient access to the new NYUSH campus and schools, affordable rent, and options for families of all sizes, and;

5. Urges NYU Shanghai to form a more active and managed platform for faculty to access information on reliable agents, housing options, and general policies and guidelines.
NYU Shanghai Faculty Council
Affordability Subcommittee Report
October 2019
Executive Summary

NYU Shanghai opened in 2013 as partnership between a world-renowned U.S. university and one of China’s elite Class A universities. Six years later, aspects of Shanghai’s cost of living threaten our university’s stated mission to develop and support “a faculty of renowned scholars, innovators, and educators...recruited from the world’s best research universities” — a mission that requires a solid foundation of both teaching and research-oriented faculty. Furthermore, significant variations in NYU Shanghai’s salary and benefits structure for certain faculty groups raise questions about how we define the values of our globally-minded community.

This subcommittee conducted a survey of NYU Shanghai faculty this spring and collected 114 detailed responses representing over 60 percent of the faculty body (50% FTCC, 22% tenure-track, 10% visiting, 8% tenured, 8% postdoc). The results, along with additional reporting by this subcommittee, reveal emerging challenges in the area of local–international pay disparities.

We submit this report to present the lived economic realities confronting NYU Shanghai faculty, to share the results of our findings to date, and to open a productive and collegial conversation about the future of our university. We seek long-term solutions that will help us maintain a solid foundation for our growing community and pursue our common goal of making NYU Shanghai a world-class university and a model for international higher education.

Immediately below, we present a summary of our main findings regarding the Chinese Language Lecturer position and Housing Affordability and recommendations; the following report provides more detail about these issues. We would like to thank the administration for already beginning to work with us on some of our recommendations.
Challenges to Faculty Hiring

- The Chinese Language Program has seen its pool of applicants drop 68% in three years, from 95 applicants in 2016 to just 29 in 2019 for the same number of postings. The CLP has recently lost several top candidates to other universities.
- Chinese Language Lecturers’ salaries and housing benefits are significantly below their colleagues’ at other Sino-U.S./U.K. institutions in cities that have even lower costs of living.

Concerns Over Local–International Compensation Disparities

- Chinese Language Lecturers currently receive salaries at roughly 40% of their NYU Shanghai international colleagues with similar ranks and teaching hours.
- Chinese Language Lecturer housing benefits are pegged to their salaries (amounting to around RMB¥3,000/US$425 per month), while international faculty housing benefits are fixed at a rate and adjusted for number of dependents, making their subsidies three to six times higher.

Summary of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcommittee Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Housing  | ● Provide housing subsidy to all faculty at the same standard, as a flat rate based on family size, adjustable to current market rates.  
  ● Explore government-subsidized housing for Sino-US university faculty, plus other resources to meet different faculty needs and price limitations.  
  ● Find corporate housing options with convenient access to the new NYUSH campus and schools, affordable rent, and options for families of all sizes.  
  ● Form a more active and managed platform for faculty to access information on reliable agents, housing options, and general policies and guidelines. |
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Introduction
This NYU Shanghai Faculty Council Subcommittee’s aim is to gather information about affordability issues that we believe affect NYU Shanghai’s ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty. Our committee was started to explore faculty’s lived realities of housing prices and differences in salary for faculty of the same or similar rank and seniority.

We see this report as a first step toward collaborating with other Faculty Council committees, our colleagues, and university leadership to build sustainable initiatives which contribute to the long-term health of the university. We outline the results of the Subcommittee’s information-gathering and initiative-building activities below.

Key Subcommittee Activities
● Undertaking an affordability survey for faculty, with an aim to surface structural issues which may negatively impact recruitment and retention
● Collecting faculty narratives on affordability challenges related to housing and tuition
● Proposing recommendations regarding benefits and affordability issues

Members
Amy Becker, Writing and English for Academic Purposes programs
Jing Chai, Chinese Language Program
Rodolfo Cossovich, Interactive Media Arts
Anna Greenspan, Interactive Media Arts
David Hunsaker, Business
Steve Iams, English for Academic Purposes
John Jordan, English for Academic Purposes
Dan Keane, Writing Program
Monika Lin, Visual Arts
Qian Liu, Chinese Language Program
David Perry, Writing Program
Meng Zhou, Chinese Language Program
Jiani Lian, Chinese Language Program
Jinghong Bi, Chinese Language Program
Xiaobo Shui, Chinese Language Program
Part 1: Affordable Housing

Background
In our survey, 68% of respondents rank housing affordability among their top three affordability concerns, and across ranks, nationalities, and disciplines, respondents report spending from 14.41% to 35.88% of monthly take-home income, in addition to what the housing benefit covers (see Appendix A-1). Among respondents, 25% rent within an NYUSH corporate housing complex, while 57% of the respondents rent their own apartments independently, 13% own their own property, and another 3% are co-renting due to affordability issues (See Appendix A-2).

Affordability Issues
The housing issues surfaced in the Affordability Survey focus on the following four aspects: 1) NYUSH Housing Subsidy Type & Rate; 2) NYUSH Corporate Housing; and 3) Additional Housing Issues.

1. NYUSH Housing Subsidy Type & Rate

1.1. NYUSH provides most faculty with a fixed flat housing subsidy ranging from ¥10,333–¥15,500+ per month, depending on their number of dependents. However, Chinese Language Lecturers receive a much lower housing subsidy ranging from only ¥2,800–¥3,950, pegged to their monthly salaries, with no adjustment for dependents and subject to a significant government tax. Their subsidies are calculated as follows, using Writing/EAP Lecturer subsidies as a comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Writing/EAP Lecturer Housing Subsidy (fixed)</th>
<th>Chinese Language Lecturer Housing Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>approx ¥30,000</td>
<td>¥10,000–¥13,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Housing Subsidy (40% of salary)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>¥4,000–¥5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Provident Fund Withholding (12% of salary)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(¥1,200–¥1,650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Housing Subsidy</td>
<td>Single: ¥10,333</td>
<td>¥2,600–¥3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+1 dependent: ¥12,917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+2 or more: ¥15,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different types of housing subsidies available for faculty of different national origins and ranks is a clear case of unequal access to housing benefit support from the university to these certain group(s) of faculty, although all faculty face the same challenging housing market in
Shanghai. We are concerned these disparities undermine NYU Shanghai’s cosmopolitan values at a time when our community is working to address rising nationalism both on campus and around the world.

The current rates for Chinese Language Lecturers are also not competitive with the current market. Other joint-venture institutions offer better housing subsidies, in cities where the cost of living is lower than Shanghai’s. NYUSH’s salary and working hours do not make up the difference, either (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Language Lecturer Benefits</th>
<th>Xi’an Jiaotong Liverpool</th>
<th>Duke Kunshan</th>
<th>NYU Shanghai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly housing subsidy</td>
<td>￥4,000 (take-home)</td>
<td>￥6,000+ (reimbursement)</td>
<td>￥2,600 – 3,300 (take-home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample monthly rent (one-room apartment)</td>
<td>￥2,000</td>
<td>￥3,000</td>
<td>￥5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly salary - Newly hired CLL (take home)</td>
<td>￥16,000</td>
<td>US rate est. ￥26,250</td>
<td>￥8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly salary – Senior CLL (take-home)</td>
<td>￥30,000</td>
<td>US rate est. ￥28,875</td>
<td>￥11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly teaching hours</td>
<td>15 hours</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>10 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Since NYU Shanghai’s founding in 2013, faculty housing subsidies have not kept pace with the city’s significant rise in residential rents. The Nikkei Asian Review notes in a 2019 report that “Shanghai's property rent index jumped 60% over a 10-year period” ending in 2017. Though rents have stabilized in the last two years, they “do not seem headed down from their current nosebleed levels.” Finally, it is common in the Shanghai market for landlords to raise the rent with the signing of each rental contract renewal. Of the 76 faculty surveyed who receive a flat
rate as housing subsidy, 70 of them (92%) report not having their rates adjusted to keep up with rising market prices (See Appendix A-3 and Appendix A-6).

1.3. There are other issues raised in the survey pertaining to the housing benefit and market prices, including additional fees required to obtain a fapiao, and various issues pertaining to families and married faculty (who often have children), who receive almost half the housing benefit they would receive if they were two single individuals and who require space adequate for a family. (See Appendix A-7)

2. **NYUSH Corporate Housing**

2.1. Distance between NYUSH corporate housing and affordable schools for children of faculty is a major concern for some faculty given that the options for affordable schools are extremely limited, requiring faculty to have to choose to either greatly compromise with regard to the commute time for children to get to school by choosing NYUSH corporate housing or to compromise living standards (choosing to rent on their own) near affordable schools. (See Appendix A-8)

2.2. Options for families with more than one child are limited, and in some cases they need to win a lottery to get to corporate housing. Corporate housing options often do not provide (and will not exchange) the correct furniture set up for families with children. (See Appendix A-9)

2.3. The lack of adequate kitchen facilities in some of the corporate housing units makes it difficult to cook regularly and to therefore eat out more than would be preferred and more easily budgetable, but this kind of apartment is the only option within the housing subsidy affordable range for those faculty. (See Appendix A-12)

3. **Additional Housing Issues** (see Appendix A-8 through A-17)

In the survey, faculty also reported the following issues:

- Language barriers with rental agents
- Rental agents manipulating market information or access to properties
- Lack of contextual information for housing decisions that must be made rapidly and/or from long distance
- Delays in rental reimbursement
A-4: Survey responses on the challenges of a housing subsidy based on a percentage of salary rather than a flat rate

1. Too little housing support from the university and the differences in the form of housing support are my major problems now. The 40% of the salary makes no sense when the salary is only 10,000 RMB a month, and as Chinese citizen also need to hold 12% to the national Provident Fund, that makes the housing support for Chinese language faculty only around 3,000 RMB per month, but we’re facing the same housing market like everyone living in Shanghai. I’d like a flat rate that is comparable to the market price and to faculty from other departments here at NYUSH.

2. Our housing allowance is based on our salary but not a specific amount of money. As the basic salary of a language lecturer is not much, the housing allowance can only cover nearly half of the renting fee, which means I also need to spare a lot of money on accommodation. In addition, compared to the workload and payment of language lecturers in other international schools, such as Duke Kunshan University, the financial support from NYU Shanghai needs improving.

3. The housing allowance difference, nearly 45%, generated by different nationalities, especially for Chinese passport holders after tax and housing allowance deduction affected by 住房公积金 even though it's not in use.

4. For me, the main problem is housing in Shanghai. There are two possible solutions: 1) Receiving a flat rate housing benefit which can help me afford a decent place to live 2) the university can provide apartments for faculty with reasonable rent around our new campus.

Appendix B: Affordability Narratives and Case Studies for CLL Housing in Shanghai

These narratives are from Chinese faculty who live in rented apartments in Shanghai.

Person 1 Title: Chinese Lecturer

Living conditions

1. What is your current living condition? (such as apartment location, rent, facility, age of building, apartment size, other cost)
   I currently live at the community nearby Weifang Road and Laoshan Road. The building in that complex was built in 1992. It takes me 15-20 minutes walk to school. The size of the apartment is 38 ㎡, one bedroom, a small kitchen and a small bathroom with necessary furniture and facility. The rents is ¥ 5000/month. I need to pay utilities, Internet fee by myself, which is around 250 rmb, 300 rmb in winter.

2. How do you think of your current living condition?
   My current apt is better than my previous 2 apartments in commute time and in house condition. Even so, it still has many problems happened unexpectedly. I only live there for 10 month.
   a) During the 10 month, it had 2 times water leaking problem in the kitchen.
   b) One time that the pipe blocked at my bathroom so that I can not use the bathroom at all for 3 days. I called the professional to fix it and they told me that the problem might happen again in the future because the pipe was not installed properly at first.
   c) Multiple times that the upstairs resident’s air conditioner leaked the water and dropped heavily on my balcony roof. It kept me from sleeping for almost one month. The problem didn’t solve at all, but just because the weather is getting warmer, the upstairs resident stopped using heater. The house agency couldn’t solve the problem for me. They said, “we cannot require other resident not doing anything”, which made
me frustrated a lot.

d) My furniture LOOKS okay, but it already had some crackles and broken pieces, even though I am really cared about using them.

Overall, I appreciated that I could find this apartment considered its location, but it still keeps having troubles for me that I would never think of, which makes me feel upset all the time. I don’t know what problems will happen and who I can turn for help.

3. What is your ideal living condition?
   a) At least I don’t need to keep worried about what part of the house will goes wrong and who I need to ask to help me fix it.
   b) The location is nearby campus with 15-30 minutes walk. My previous apartment is only 10 minutes driving, but in rush hour it took me 1 hour and 30 minutes to take the public transportation to school. Therefore I moved to the current apartment.
   c) 3) The rent is affordable. My current rents costs almost half of my monthly pay. Considered the fact that living in Shanghai is expensive, it would get more difficult for me to live in Shanghai.

Housing searching process

1. What are the available resources you have?
   House agency such as Lianjia
2. **What are the barriers that you would like to share during your search of a housing option?**  
The rent. The rent of the house nearby the campus is really high. Most of them are beyond my affordability. So I have to limit my search among the old complex. I also have to accept the fact that most of the house’s condition is far less satisfying.

**Decision making**

1. **What made you decide to rent the current apartment?**  
The location helped me make the decision. Compared to spend 90 minutes one way to school everyday, it only takes me 20 minutes now. But the cost is that I have to pay a high rent and the house condition is not very satisfying too.

2. **What are your concerns?**  
   a) Bad house condition and poor maintenance  
   b) The high rent that keeps going every year  
   c) With my affordability in rents, I don’t have much choices if I would like to rent a house nearby school.

**Document involved**

1. **What are the document involved in your experience of renting apartments in Shanghai?**  
I have a Shanghai hukou, so regarding this part, I don’t have much trouble.

**Potential influence**

2. **What are the potential risk of keeping living in the current apartment?**  
The house maintenance man doesn’t work after 6:00pm or at weekends, which means I have to deal with all the house condition issues in my working hour. I definitely don’t want to cause any influence to my work, but sometimes I just don’t know how to solve the problem.

**Person 2 Title: Chinese Lecturer**

**Living condition**

1. **What is your current living condition? (such as apartment location, rent, facility, age of building, apartment size, other cost)**  
My current apartment, located in a 6-floor residential complex, was built in 1982 and is about 25-minute walk from campus. It is a 2-bedroom apartment, with one shared bathroom, one shared kitchen and most necessary furniture. The total monthly rent for the whole apartment (around 45 m²) is 5500 RMB and I pay 3000 RMB in rent for my own room, which is around 12 m². In addition to that, the utility fee per month per person is about 250 RMB. So in total, the apartment costs me 3250 RMB per month.

2. **How do you think of your current living condition?**  
It’s livable but definitely not a satisfactory living condition. I have been living in this apartment for 2 years and before this one, I lived in two similar apartments near Century Avenue and for all the time, I have to co-rent with strangers since it will take up almost half of my salary to rent a decent apartment on my own. I spend most of my time in the university and my home is just a place where I can take shower and get some sleep. It’s not meant to have a life in my apartment, considering the congested common space and little privacy. I have never invited my family or friends to come over. Also, since the building is very old and
lacks maintenance, the sewer pipes are often clogged and the wall of the apartment is too thin to be effectively soundproof. The air conditioner in my bedroom is not functioning and I couldn’t use it for the past winter. What’s even worse, my landlord seldom responds to our requests and we basically did or asked professionals to do repairs at our own expenses.

3. What is your ideal living condition?
   Ideally, I want to live by myself, in a safe, clean, livable apartment where I can comfortably have a normal adult life.

Housing searching process

1. What are the available resources you have?
   Real estate agencies, and several Chinese websites.

2. What are the barriers that you would like to share during your search of a housing option?
   The biggest barrier is my limited budget and the high rent.

Decision making

1. What made you decide to rent the current apartment?
   It’s close to the campus and the rent is affordable.

2. What are your concerns?

Document involved

1. What are the document involved in your experience of renting apartments in Shanghai?
   网签租房合同: Online House Lease contract
   租赁备案: House Lease Record

2. How difficult to get those documents?
   It’s not very difficult to get the Online House Lease contract as long as you have set a deal with the landlord. The problem is with the House Lease Record because many landlords refuse to provide the House Lease Record. They are afraid that once the renting process is documented by the government, they might be charged with tax in the future.

Potential influence

1. What are the potential risk of keeping living in the current apartment?
   a. Roommate. Because I cannot afford the apartment on my own, I have spent a lot of time and efforts to find a roommate. However these days people move frequently, and over the past four years, I’ve had five roommates and you just never know what kind of people you will be living with next.
   b. Landlord. Honestly speaking, I don’t like most of the landlords. They are very difficult to speak to and barely show respect to tenants. In China, tenants usually are at an inferior position and the landlord can raise the rent whenever he/she feels to. Actually my landlord just raised the rent by 100 RMB per month for the next year and there is no room for me to negotiate.
   c. Hukou. I am not a native Shanghainese but I settled my Hukou in Shanghai after I came back from the United States. Since my Hukou, which is called ‘public household registration in the community 社区公共户’, belongs to the community where I am living now, if I move to other communities, I will need to make a transfer, which can be a very time consuming process. So basically I am stuck to my current
living area. However on the other hand, my landlord can terminate the lease contract whenever he wants to.

Person 3 Title: Chinese lecturer

Living condition

1. **What is your current living condition? (such as apartment location, rent, facility, age of building, apartment size, other cost)**
   My current apartment is in an old residential complex which is about three blocks from the university. The building was built in 1989. It’s a 2 bedroom apartment which is 59㎡. The rent per month is 5800 RMB. I have a roommate to share the apartment and the rent. So I pay 2900 RMB for the rent every month. The utility fee per month per person is about 200 RMB. In total, the apartment costs me 3000 RMB per month. The apartment comes with most necessary furnishings but no electrical equipment, so I bought those devices when I moved in.

2. **How do you think of your current living condition?**
   One thing bothers me is the age of the building. It is very old and lack of maintenance. I live on the 6th floor which is the top of the building. The ceiling leaks when there is heavy rain (which is very often in Shanghai). The wall of old building is pretty thin so it is very cold inside in winter. Another concern is that I have to live with a roommate because I can’t afford a decent one-bedroom apartment. It usually takes me a lot of efforts to find a roommate. People tend to move a lot so it is my third roommate right now. I don’t have enough private space because I need to share the small living room, bathroom and kitchen with my roommate.

3. **What is your ideal living condition?**
   I would like to have a one-bedroom apartment near campus. I don’t expect it very big or luxury. I want my apartment clean, safe, have enough space and in good condition. I would like to walk about 10-20 minutes to school from my apartment.
Housing searching process

1. What are the available resources you have?
   a) Real estate agency
   b) Two or three websites which provide apartment renting information

2. What are the barriers that you would like to share during your search of a housing option?
   a) There are a lot of fake information and advertisement online and even from the real estate agencies. It took me time and efforts to find useful and real information. At the same time, resources that I can trust are very limited.
   b) It’s difficult for me to find an apartment in acceptable condition and with acceptable price. Actually there are not plenty options considering the rent. The rent of most one-bedroom apartment near campus is around 4000-6000 RMB/month, which is half of my monthly salary.
   c) Although I have Shanghai Hukou, I still need to provide many document to rent an apartment legally in Shanghai. It’s difficult to find landlords who are willing to help with those document and paperwork.
   d) The commission of real estate agency is 50% of the rent now.
   e) As the tenant, I need to pay all the extra cost in the renting process.
   f) The government policies regarding apartment renting keep changing. I don’t have access to get to know the policies.

Decision making

1. What made you decide to rent the current apartment?
   Mainly the price made my decision.

Financial Support

1. What kind of financial support you are getting from the university? (a certain percentage of the salary, Housing Provident Fund, Supplementary Housing Provident Fund, etc.)
   I received 2941 RMB, a 28% of my basic salary from the university as my housing subsidies, which can’t afford a decent place to live. While other faculty who are not from Chinese Language Program receive a flat rate which is around 10,000 RMB each month. The university counts the other 12% of the employer contribution to the Housing Provident Fund and Supplementary Fund into the housing subsidies. However, this part of money can only be taken out from my account when I am going to purchase an apartment.

2. What kind of expenses do you have when renting an apartment?
   The rent, utility fee, apartment maintenance fee

Document involved

1. What are the document involved in your experience of renting apartments in Shanghai?
   网签租房合同：Online House Lease contract
   租赁备案：House Lease Record

2. How difficult to get those document?
   To get the Online House Lease contract, first I need to get approval from the landlord. That is the prerequisite for everything. Then I have to be at the government office with the landlord and his/her Property Ownership Certificate and ID card. It usually takes half a day to get the
process done and wait for another week to get the contract. After having the contract, I need to get “Certificate for permanent residence” which usually takes one week to get. Then I need to go to another government office to get House Lease Record. With all the document, I will have my “Hukou Card” to prove I live in Shanghai legally. The whole process is very time consuming and frustrating.

Potential influence

1. What are the potential risk of keeping living in the current apartment?
   a) I am not Shanghainese and I haven’t bought any house property in Shanghai. Therefore, the Hukou I possess is: “pubic household registration in the community (社区公共户)”. In this case, I need a “Hukou card” to get my health insurance card, renew my passport, get visa for traveling, basically everything in my life. However, the “Hukou card” need to be updated every three year. To update my “Hukou card”, I need to provide a House Lease Record (租 赁 备 案) and “Online House Lease Contract（网签合同）” which I cannot get without cooperation with landlords. Many landlords refused to help with these document because they may be charged more tax in the future. Landlords who agree with the document usually increase the rent. For me, the potential risk is either continuously being charged more money or being kicked out of the apartment because the landlord doesn’t want to help with the document anymore.
   b) Since I can’t afford a one-bedroom apartment, I need to keep looking for roommates to share a two-bedroom apartment, which takes me great efforts and a lot of time. I also feel my life does not have privacy because I have to live with someone else. It is not safe neither.

Person 4 Title: Chinese Language Lecturer

Living condition

1. What is your current living condition? (such as apartment location, rent, facility, age of building, apartment size, other cost)
   My current living apartment is located at Weifang 2 cun which is near NYU SH campus. Weifang community was built around the year of 1979 which called 老公 (old public room or the old governmental housing. My apartment is 32.25 sq.m, one bedroom, one bathroom and an open kitchen. The original facilities contain one old bed, one old refrigerator, one air conditioner, and one closet. The rent is ¥3500 monthly. The other utilities fee including water, electricity, gas supplies and internet are additional payment paid by myself. The other cost contains one month deposit and agency fee(35% of the monthly rent).

2. How do you think of your current living condition?
The community is near our campus and the surrounding reaches the basic livelihood needs. Since it is an old community, yet it is not quiet and not very safe. The percentage of the rent is around 36.8% of the my monthly total income( including the 40% housing subsidy from school). So the rent pressure for me is high.

3. What is your ideal living condition?
My ideal living condition would be near our campus, safe and quiet, leave more space for personal privacy.
The rent could not influence my basic necessities of life so much.

**Housing searching process**

1. **What are the available resources you have?**
   a) Online Websites such as Lianjia wang, Taipingyang, Anjuke;
   b) Housing agency around the living communities.
2. **What are the barriers that you would like to share during your search of a housing option?**
   a. The online websites mostly shared fake information which wasted me a lot of time to figure out what’s true;
   b. My budget is not enough to pay the rent which are valued at the average housing prices (¥4000-6000/month), so I have to choose an apartment with poor conditions but lower rent
   c. I didn’t receive any governmental documents about housing so I could not have any information about Public Rental Housing (公共租赁房) or Low-rent Housing (廉租房) which should provided by my employer (NYU SH);

**Decision making**

1. **What made you decide to rent the current apartment?**
   My budget limitation, location (near campus).
2. **What are your concerns?**
   The rent is my first consideration because the housing pay is the largest percentage of my income.

**Document involved**

1. **What are the document involved in your experience of renting apartments in Shanghai?**
   - 网签租房合同: Online House Lease contract
   - 租赁备案: House Lease Record
2. **How difficult to get those document?**
   The landlord didn’t want to help because s/he wanted to avoid any troublesome and the extra costs arising in the process. My landlord accepted to go through the documents with me but, as a condition, I had to cover all the expense and tax fee involved even in the future.

**Potential influence**

1. **What are the potential risk of keeping living in the current apartment?**
   a) The old house repair cost;
   b) 网签租房合同(Online House Lease contract) and 租赁备案(House Lease Record) only cover one year, so I need to renew them every year which give the landlord an excuse to raise my monthly rent.
   c) The housing rent documents are related to my Hukou(户口, registered permanent residence) and I have to renew my Hukou every three years. The current housing situation could not guarantee to keep my Hukou.

**Person 5 Title: Chinese Language Lecturer**

**Living condition**
1. What is your current living condition? (such as apartment location, rent, facility, age of building, apartment size, other cost)
   My current apartment is in an old residential complex which is about 20-minute walk from the university. The building was built in 1999. It’s a 5-floor building with 4 apartments in one floor. I live in a 2-bedroom apartment, with one small cooking space (can’t even call it a kitchen), and one shared bathroom. I have one roommate to share the apartment and the rent, so I pay 3360 RMB for the rent every month, and the space of my own room is 11.5 ㎡. The utility fee per month per person is about 200 RMB. In total, the apartment costs me 3500 RMB per month. The apartment comes with most necessary furnitures.

2. How do you think of your current living condition?
   One thing bothers me the most is the privacy and low life quality because I have to live with a roommate and share the bathroom and kitchen, otherwise I can’t afford the rent for one-bedroom apartment. The house-renting agency finds my roommate, so I don’t have to find the roommate by myself, but the problem is the agency won’t take gender or other factors into consideration; whoever can pay the rent, who can rent it. Therefore, my first roommate was a male, and I didn’t have any choice and right for choosing my roommate. People tend to move a lot so now I have my third roommate, and I don’t know what kind of person will live with me next time. Moreover, I have to rent an apartment from the agency because only agency will give me Fapiao for reimbursement. So I have to stick to finding the apartment through the agency. Secondly, it’s a very old building, so I can hear baby crying from downstairs, people doing laundry next door; it really influence my sleeping quality. Also, I live on the 5th floor which is the top of the building, so it’s super hot during summer. The only good thing is the apartment is near our campus.

3. What is your ideal living condition?
   I would like to have a one-bedroom apartment near campus. As long as it’s clean, safe, have enough space and in good condition.

Housing searching process
1. What are the available resources you have?
   Only Real estate agency because I need Fapiao

2. What are the barriers that you would like to share during your search of a housing option?
   The benefit that the school provides is not enough to rent a one-bedroom near campus.

Decision making
1. What made you decide to rent the current apartment?
   The PRICE! Had no choice.

2. What are your concerns?
   I cannot choose my roommate.

Document involved
1. What are the document involved in your experience of renting apartments in Shanghai?
   台胞证，and I have to bring my contract to 居委会 & 派出所 to register because I am not from China.

2. How difficult to get those document?
Getting the documents are not difficult. The difficulty was doing the registration. I had to go 居委會 & 派出所 to get everything done because it’s either they needed something that I didn’t get informed I needed to provide or the time constraints.

Potential influence

1. What are the potential risk of keeping living in the current apartment?

Low life quality because sharing a room with a stranger. I prefer to stay on campus until very late or come to school on weekends because I don’t get much privacy in my apartment. In other words, I can’t really take a rest in my apartment.

Person 6 Title: Chinese Lecturer

I used to rent an apartment because my own apartment can’t fit my needs: my kid does not have her own bedroom. So I rent out my own apartment so that I can afford the rent of a bigger apartment. But now I have moved back to my own apartment. Because the apartment I rented is too old and not safe for kid. It is also far away from NYU SH and my kid’s kindergarten. Now I am still worried about not having enough space at home. This is already a big problem in our family.

Person 7 Title: Chinese Lecturer

Living condition

1. What is your current living condition? (such as apartment location, rent, facility, age of building, apartment size, other cost)

I am renting a one-bedroom apartment near the campus on Weifang Road. I choose to rent this house as the rent fee is comparatively reasonable and safer. This apartment was built up around 1980s. I spend 5500 RMB per month for this forty-square meter house. The heating system did not work when I just moved in and I tried hard to get my landlord to pay the repairing fee, which was very time-consuming and required a lot energy. As the house was decorated six years ago, all the furniture and domestic appliances are old so that they are comparatively power-consuming. I need to almost 200 RMB per month for the water and electricity fee. My friends have told me that their rented house are of similar housing appliances but it only takes them about 100 RMB per month, as most of the appliances are energy efficient. However, my landlord refused to change anything in my house now.

2. How do you think of your current living condition?

I am trying to get a better living condition as the current apartment is not big enough for me now. I just got married this March. My husband and I now are paying down the house with our salary. Additionally, it takes time to decorate.
Appendix F: Sample NYU Shanghai Faculty Budgets

These are estimated budgets that members of the committee submitted just for reference. The data come from both lived experience and outside cost-of-living calculators, specifically numbeo.com and transferwise.com. For international faculty budgets, we calculated with the assumption that non-NYU travelling partners would not be working, which we thought was a fair assumption, considering their visa status. For equivalence, the Chinese faculty budget also does not include a partner’s salary.

Note: Although not recorded here, Many Chinese families face schooling costs and issues as well.
### Estimated Spending for International Family of Four

Two NYU Incomes - Schooling budgeted for one child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Monthly)</th>
<th>Amount (RMB)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>¥54,000.00</td>
<td>1 sr. lecturer; 1 lecturer;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numbo.com; Transformwise.com;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(fica, transportation, utilities, entertainment, clothing, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Living</td>
<td>¥15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>¥30.00</td>
<td>Our rent is below our housing stipend; FYI: NYU sponsored housing options for 2 bedrooms are ¥13-17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>¥3,700.00</td>
<td>Asthma price for 1 single employee and 1 employee + children (MSH is free, but might have some additional travel insurance, or medical expenses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>¥15,400.00</td>
<td>Estimate. Our tax burden may actually be higher than this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>¥10,840.00</td>
<td>monthly (¥130,000/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>¥9,300.00</td>
<td>Full-time ayi for bacy; very part-time cooking ayi; includes the cost of the 13th month bonus, given to both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>¥3,500.00</td>
<td>Two full contributions for the full match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td>¥5,560.00</td>
<td>75% of ¥15,000; 65% of ¥15,000; 50% of ¥15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(USD)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$918.40</td>
<td>$1,463.40</td>
<td>$1,853.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,968.40</td>
<td>$1,968.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Estimated Spending for a Chinese Family of Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One NYU income</th>
<th>Amount (RMB)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary</strong></td>
<td>¥11,958.00</td>
<td>Typical salary for faculty who worked for 3-8 years at NYU Shanghai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing stipend</strong></td>
<td>¥3,200.00</td>
<td>Housing stipend = 40% of salary, 12% statutory provident &amp; supplementary provident = 25% of the salary (Mandatory for Chinese citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Living</strong></td>
<td>¥41,800.00</td>
<td>Estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House monthly Loan Payments</strong></td>
<td>¥2,500.00</td>
<td>2550+ 9500(monthly loan payment) - provident &amp; supplementary provident fund from my husband and me, so 2550 is the money I pay from my salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Provident &amp; Supplementary Provident</strong></td>
<td>¥1,500.00</td>
<td>(Mandatory for Chinese citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory Social Security</strong></td>
<td>¥1,680.00</td>
<td>Statutory social security (Mandatory for Chinese citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes</strong></td>
<td>¥457.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leftover</strong></td>
<td><strong>¥2,779.00</strong></td>
<td>(USD) -5396.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution to Establish a University Holiday on Election Day

WHEREAS, the right to vote is fundamental in a free and democratic society; and

WHEREAS, there will be a federal election on November 3, 2020 for all 435 voting members of the United States House of Representatives, 35 United States Senators, and for the office of the President of the United States; and

WHEREAS, student voter turnout in the 2018 midterm federal elections was estimated to be twice as high as the turnout in the 2014 elections; and

WHEREAS, efforts to suppress the college student vote are on the rise across the United States; and

WHEREAS, New York University (NYU) has students from nearly every state within the United States; and

WHEREAS, NYU has a standard academic day scheduled on November 3, 2020; and

---


2 There will also be elections for five non-voting delegates to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives on behalf of the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as well as one resident-commissioner to serve on behalf of Puerto Rico.


WHEREAS, NYU is committed to “ensur[ing] that all eligible voters in the NYU community have the necessary voter registration tools to be ready to cast ballots at the voting booth;” and

WHEREAS, NYU students, staff, and faculty, both United States citizens and non-citizens, engage in the electoral process not only by voting in elections, but also by volunteering for and working on political campaigns and political action groups; and

WHEREAS, civic engagement provides an invaluable benefit to the educational experience of students by offering an opportunity to engage with important local and national issues, to develop skills applicable in professional environments, and to build community awareness; and

WHEREAS, “campus climate - the norms, structures, behaviors, and attitudes of people on campuses - can influence student decisions whether or not to vote or to be otherwise politically engaged;” and

WHEREAS, NYU is a participating campus in the National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement (NSLVE); and

WHEREAS, according to the NYU 2012 and 2016 NSLVE Report, 19,016 NYU students, approximately 35.8% of the enrolled NYU population, voted in the 2016 general election; and

---


8 See also N.Y. Election Law § 3-110 (mandating that all employers in the state of New York give up to three paid hours off of the work day to vote.)


11 NYU National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement 2012 and 2016 Report, N.Y. Univ., (Inst. for Democracy and Higher Edu. at Tufts University, 2017), 7, https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B88tg95mV7tvc3M5ZktoWWJ0bm5ZeTFwazRhUmkk1TlQxYUQ0
WHEREAS, the 2016 voting rate of registered NYU students was 47.8%, 2.6 percentage points lower than the national voting rate for all institutions (50.4%); and

WHEREAS, the rate of voting at private research institutions in 2016 was 53.1% which is 5.3 percentage points higher than NYU’s rate; and

WHEREAS, the rate of NYU students voting in-person on Election Day has increased from 1,540 students in 2012 to 9,952 students in 2016; and

WHEREAS, according to the NYU 2014 and 2018 NSLVE Report on midterm elections, 37.1% of the NYU student voting population voted in the 2018 midterm elections, a net positive of 27.5 percentage points from 2014 and 2 percentage points lower than the national voting rate for all institutions (39.1%); and

WHEREAS, the number of students that voted in-person in the 2018 midterms increased from 577 students in the 2014 midterm elections to 1,697 students; and

WHEREAS, the pressure and stress of needing to attend class can discourage or restrict students’ abilities to vote and participate in the electoral process; and,

WHEREAS, there is precedent for institutions of higher education establishing University Holidays on election day;  

12 Id. at 3.
13 Id. at 4.
14 Id. at 5. This 42.0% change in voting rate demonstrates that a significant portion of the NYU population votes on General Election Day.
15 NYU National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement 2014 and 2018 Report, N.Y. Univ. 3 (Inst. for Democracy and Higher Edu. at Tufts University, 2019), https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B88tg95mV7tvc3M5ZktoWWl0bm5ZeTFwazRhUmk1TIQxYUQ0.
16 Id. at 5. These trends in in-person voting in general elections and midterm elections demonstrate that more NYU students are voting in-person.
17 Both Columbia University and Fordham University recognize Election Day as a University Holiday. See Academic Calendar, Office of the Univ. Registrar, Columbia Univ., https://registrar.columbia.edu/calendar (last visited Nov. 24, 2019); Academic Calendar, Fordham Univ., https://go.activecalendar.com/FordhamUniversity/site/academic/?&gl=y&search=y (last visited Nov. 24, 2019); see also 2020-2021 Academic Calendar, N.Y. Univ. School of Law, https://www.law.nyu.edu/academicservices/academiccalendar/2020-2021-academic-calendar (last visited
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the SSC and the SGA support the implementation of a university policy mandating that November 5, 2024, and every first Tuesday of November thereafter on which an election should occur, shall be a University Holiday during which no classes, for courses taken for a grade or for credit, shall be scheduled; and

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the SSC and the SGA support the implementation of a university policy mandating that no student shall face any academic consequences for missing class for the purpose of participation in election activities on November 3, 2020, November 8, 2022, and on any day on which there is a Federal, New York statewide, or New York citywide primary; and

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the SSC and the SGA support the implementation of additional targeted programming initiatives that aim to promote and expand voter accessibility, voter registration, and voter turnout on campus; and

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the SSC and the SGA support the creation of a university-wide standing committee -- composed of students, faculty, and administrators -- for the evaluation of the NSLVE report and implementation of policies through NYU Votes to improve student voting statistics; and

Nov. 24, 2019)(showing that NYU School of Law has no classes scheduled on November 3, 2020). Similar proposals have been made at the University of California - Berkeley, and Harvard University.

18 The term “election” means - a general, special, or runoff election for federal, statewide or citywide office.

19 The term “election activities” means - voting, assisting in voter registration drives, attending political rallies and meetings, signing and circulating petitions, and campaigning for or against candidates or ballot initiatives, or other political activities.

20 The term “primary” means - a primary election held for the expression of a preference for the nomination of individuals for election to federal, statewide and citywide office. It is assumed that such a policy would not apply if a primary would happen to fall on a day during which a final examination is scheduled, with the additional assumption that faculty and administration would do their best to avoid such scheduling conflicts.

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the SSC and the SGA support the public release of the biennial NYU NSLVE Report and that it be made accessible on the NYU website.

As Proposed by Senator for the College of Arts & Science and the Student Senators Council Vice-Chair, Kosar Kosar; Senator for NYU School of Law, Samuel Ison; and Generation Vote at NYU co-founders, Sam Reinker and Robi Lopez-Irizarry

APPENDIX A: Supporting Groups

1. Generation Vote at NYU
2. Politics Society
3. Roosevelt@NYU
4. Best Buddies at NYU
5. NYU College Democrats
6. Steinhardt Undergraduate Student Government
7. College of Arts & Science Student Council
8. School of Global Public Health Governing Council
9. Undergraduate Nursing Student Organization
10. Stern Student Council
11. Graduate School of Arts & Science Student Council
12. Silver Graduate Student Association
13. Liberal Studies/Global Liberal Studies Student Council
14. Gallatin Student Council
15. Silver Undergrad Student Government
16. Wagner Student Association
17. NYU School of Law Student Bar Association
18. SPS Graduate Student Council

APPENDIX B: Faculty Support

1. Joshua Tucker, Professor
2. Patrick Egan, Associate Professor
3. Julia Payson, Assistant Professor
4. Bertell Ollman, Professor
5. Michael Gilligan, Professor
6. Cyrus Samil, Associate Professor

22 See also this GenVote-led petition urging NYU to designate Election Day as a university holiday.
7. Suraj Patel, Professor
8. Neil Theise, Professor
APPENDIX C: Frequently Asked Questions/Responses

1. Why should we have the election day off?
   a. We are asking for a university holiday because we believe that students are engaged and would want to be even more engaged in our political process. Underestimating their potential level of engagement or dismissing it can be seen as very paternalistic.
   b. Students would have opportunities to volunteer on election day whether as poll workers or vouch for their candidates in any way possible, and it is important that we provide that opportunity. Election day isn’t just primarily about voting. Furthermore, barriers to participation should be eliminated where possible, and knowing that 9,952 NYU students voted in-person in the last general election and that according to the 2018 Factsheet, there are 8,692 students from New York and 2,631 from New Jersey, we should be doing more to increase voter accessibility.
   c. As the largest private university in the country, we have students from all walks of life. We have students that have various schedules, families to take care of, bills that need to be paid, classes that can range from 7am to 10pm, and generalizing the different needs and simply saying that "people don’t need the whole day off" is counterintuitive to the ideals of NYU. It all comes down to how much importance the university and this Senate puts on voting. In addition, there are many initiatives that NYU Votes is doing, but based on the midterm/general election NSLVE reports, we are still very much behind the national averages on voter turnout, and it would be important to start thinking about why turnout is low and whether we need more robust changes (i.e., election day off).

2. The polls are open late, so there’s no need for a day off.
   a. With regards to the point about polls being open late and that being accommodating for students, there are students, especially grad students (i.e., SPS), that work during the day and have classes at night, and having the election day off would alleviate that issue. Furthermore, there are students with visible/invisible disabilities that need more time to vote. Not taking into account the time for commuting, but some of the lines for polls can take a while especially in states like NY and NJ, and the allotted time given by state/federal laws to request time off of work is not inclusive of those factors.

3. NYU has to take a non-partisan stance (we are a private university and there might be funding that makes us stay non-partisan)
   a. On the issue of partisanship, the ask for a university holiday is part of a larger national conversation about having a federal holiday on election day, and according to an American Barometer survey, a majority of Americans support a
day off on election day, so these asks of ours are in line with where most Americans stand at the moment. In addition, other private universities that receive federal funding have made election day a university holiday (i.e., Columbia and Fordham).

4. **NYU could have a liability issue if students groups use the day of student groups using that day being released from classes and protest.**
   a. On the issue of liability, we don’t think that having classes or not having classes would have an effect on students protesting. I was a first-year during the 2016 General Election, and there were protests either held by NYU students or protests where NYU students participated in almost every single day after the election despite there being classes. In addition, the only time I would assume a protest related to election day happening would be the day after if students/citizens are unsatisfied with the outcome, as was present the day after the 2016 election day.

5. **NYU already has polling sites (one that is near the faculty housing - not sure if students can go there).**
   a. On the issue of polling sites, we are all assigned to polls within our specific communities, and students that are commuters would have to commute to their assigned polling sites.

6. **Will other people ask for the school to be closed for religious holidays?**
   a. The ask for religious holidays accommodations is something that the SSC has been addressing the past two years, and we have come under the conclusion that having a day off for each and every religious holiday is not practical. We support accommodations but not for school to be closed.

7. **How can we encourage voting in some way other than shutting down the university?**
   a. With regards to the point on encouraging voter turnout, that is something the university is already doing and there are many Get Out to Vote programs/initiatives that happen at the university level, residential hall level, and club/council level. Despite all of those initiatives, our voter turnout rate is still lower than the national average of college students which is already a low turnout. We are hoping that with a university holiday, we would see a rise in student turnout.

8. **We can’t use the argument that public schools have this day off doesn’t work as they have different funding to worry about.**
   a. We are approaching the argument by comparing ourselves to other private universities and not public schools. Our very own law school has election day off.

9. **Generally speaking, non-profits cannot be politically engaged (shutting down the university for a political reason would implicate us).**
   a. My understanding of these asks and this resolution is that voting/having election day off is not politically charged. The national conversation is moving toward a
federal holiday on election day. We are approaching this resolution more so from a "rights" perspective than from a political perspective. We believe that there shouldn't be any barriers to voting since it is the most crucial aspect of our democracy, and we hope that NYU gets ahead on this issue.

10. **What would the university do with the information obtained from the newly formed university-wide committee?**
   a. The aim of the committee with regards to the evaluation of the NSLVE report is so that it can see whether we have made progress in increasing turnout at the university level and task NYU votes with initiatives that can help increase voter turnout. The committee hopes to give tips/strategies on how to improve our statistics and make voting more accessible.

11. **We have a large international student population here at NYU that do not benefit from the day off.**
   a. We acknowledge that this resolution is very U.S. centric, but it is important to also not write off international students from the electoral process. Non-citizens have a stake in our elections, albeit not to the same extent, and have volunteered for campaigns/Get Out the Vote movements. Furthermore, we had 9,900+ NYU students vote on election day in 2016. That is still a very significant population that shouldn't be ignored.
Continuing-Contract Faculty Council’s Recommendations

Submitted April, XX 2020

Joint Recommendations of the T-FSC & the C-FSC in regard to:

NYU School of Professional Studies
Policies and Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty

BACKGROUND

Dean Greenbaum initiated a review of the “School of Professional Studies Policies and Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty.” On 11/4/19, the Faculty Council met and voted to advance the document to the entire Continuing Contract Faculty for review and comments. It was sent to our Continuing Contract Faculty on 11/11/19 followed by a faculty-only discussion at the full-time faculty retreat on 11/15/19. At the time of the retreat, faculty were invited to submit comments to the Faculty Council, which conveyed suggestions and concerns to Dean Greenbaum and the SPS Associate Dean on Monday 11/18/19. Dean Greenbaum and the SPS Associate Dean (name not given) addressed these concerns, incorporated suggestions, and finalized the document for a second Faculty Council vote. The Faculty Council voted on and endorsed the version attached here on 12/9/19 (9 yes, 2 no, and 2 abstentions). On 12/10/19 it was sent to the entire SPS full-time faculty for a vote. The full faculty vote concluded on 12/18/19 and the policy was endorsed. Of our 77 eligible faculty voters, 58 participated (75.3%), 51 (88%) voted yes, 6 (10.3%) voted no, and 1 (1.7%) abstained.

As part of the process of finalizing the SPS policy for its Clinical Faculty, NYU Provost Katherine E. Fleming invited the C-FSC to comment on the document called: “Policy for the Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty at the School of Professional Studies:

At NYU, our strong tradition is for schools to develop policies that are ‘consistent with school culture and history.’ Within that tradition, the NYU Faculty Handbook (hereafter 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” (December 19, 2019).
NOTES FROM THE C-FSC COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS & POLICY ISSUES

1. The Grievance Process (provisionally approved by the Provost, 12/12/2018) was provided as a link. We have pasted this Grievance Process at the end of this document, so that we may present our recommendations. That being said, the committee recommends that the Grievance Process be returned to the faculty for discussion, possible amendment, and for a confidential vote.

2. We note that Dean Greenbaum writes that the “collective goal was to produce a document that supports the unique mission of SPS while also being in alignment with the NYU Faculty Handbook and the Continuing Contract Faculty policies in place at other NYU schools.” For this reason, we have indicated when our recommendations align with the Continuing Contract polices in place at other NYU schools.

3. The following document will enumerate various comments and recommendations to the submitted policy. The recommendations are made within the body of the document for ease of review and discussion.

Our committee respectfully asks that responses to our recommendations be made within the body of this document for ease of review.

Policy for the Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty at the School of Professional Studies

Minor Recommendation: Add date of approval of this policy.
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I. Preamble
This Policy Document is being implemented by the School of Professional Studies (SPS) to supplement NYU policies applicable to Continuing Contract Faculty as set forth in the Faculty Handbook and in the University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Appointments, Grievance Procedures, and Disciplinary Regulations. The governing expectation in all the policies that follow is that the faculty will be routinely consulted in keeping with the principles of shared governance and the policies and guidelines of The Faculty Handbook. If any part of this policy document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies in effect will supersede. As with all NYU policies, this policy is subject to change. The policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action. This policy will be reviewed every five years or sooner as necessary.

II. Introduction
The NYU School of Professional Studies is committed to an education that prepares students to apply and advance knowledge, creativity and innovation in real-world settings. SPS offers a professionally oriented curriculum that inspires the next generation of leaders to innovate, communicate, and succeed in evolving global environments and economies.

Singularly dedicated to this pedagogical mission, CCF members are essential to its fulfillment and vital to SPS. CCF support SPS through their commitment to teaching and pedagogy, their dedication to academic service and administration, and their scholarly, professional and/or creative
achievements. Composed of scholars in traditional academic fields, experts in the teaching of languages, practitioners in the arts, and professionals in business, management, and other areas, the CCF form the entire body of the full-time faculty at SPS, with the exception of a small number of tenured and visiting faculty.

III. Rights and Responsibilities of SPS CCF

CCF at all ranks are protected by academic freedom. CCF may serve as Principal Investigators for sponsored research with the support of the leader of their academic unit and the SPS Dean.¹

All CCF are expected to provide service to the academic unit, the School, and/or the University in order to strengthen shared governance and advance SPS’s mission. CCF are expected to meet their professional and institutional commitments at the University on a regular basis throughout the academic year. These commitments include time spent on teaching, research, student advising, and various kinds of University or outside professional service on committees and in administrative or advisory roles.² They should be active participants as committee members, student advisers, or in whatever other capacity they can render the best service in the affairs of their academic unit, SPS and the University.³

A. Teaching

CCF in the Center for Applied Liberal Arts, the Center for Global Affairs, the Division of Applied Undergraduate Studies, the Jonathan M. Tisch Center of Hospitality, the Preston Robert Tisch Institute for Global Sport, the Division of Programs in Business, the Center for Publishing, and the Schack Institute of Real Estate primarily teach in degree programs and hold the titles of clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor. It is common for these faculty to have multi-year contracts on a nine-month year and to teach three credit-bearing courses each fall and spring semester.⁴

CCF in the English Language Institute (ELI) primarily teach in non-credit programs and normally have multi-year contracts on an eleven-month year. ELI faculty typically teach 90 contact hours in the summer semester and 180 contact hours in each of the spring and fall semesters. ELI faculty commonly hold the titles of lecturer or senior lecturer. ELI faculty hired prior to 2018 may hold clinical faculty titles if converted to clinical status before September 1, 2020.

No additional compensation by reason of teaching overload may be paid to any CCF member during the period of a regular teaching assignment, except in emergency circumstances duly approved in

---

¹ Academic unit leader in this document refers to the highest-ranking member of the administration in each division and in the Center for Publishing. For revised policy on CCF serving as PIs, see: https://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/continuing-contract-faculty-as-principal-investigators-of-sponso.html

² The parameters of research include self-directed research expected of engaged disciplinary experts as well as PI status for approved research projects consistent with the Provost’s policy.

³ https://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/other-faculty-policies/responsibilities-of-the-faculty-member.html

⁴ Faculty in programs offering three-credit courses will teach a total of 9 credits and faculty in programs offering four-credit courses will teach a total 12 credits.
With the approval of the academic unit leader and SPS Dean, CCF may teach executive education courses (non-credit and/or outside of SPS degree programs). The rate of compensation will be consistent with the terms authorized for executive education. Teaching responsibilities may also include, but are not limited to:

- Developing, creating, and teaching new courses and developing new curricula
- Engaging in program review and revision, accreditation compliance, and assessment
- Advising and mentoring students
- Supervising independent studies and internships

Major Recommendation

The current language is unclear with respect to teaching overload and compensation: “No additional compensation by reason of teaching overload may be paid to any CCF member during the period of a regular teaching assignment, except in emergency circumstances duly approved in advance by the Office of the Provost.”

We strongly recommend replacing the above sentence with the following language:

“In exceptional circumstances authorized in advance by the Office of the Provost, additional compensation shall be paid to any CCF member for teaching overload while maintaining a regular teaching assignment.”

Major Recommendation

The bullets identified as teaching responsibilities are in fact service. Remove the items below and insert under “Service”:

- Developing, creating, and teaching new courses and developing new curricula
- Engaging in program review and revision, accreditation compliance, and assessment
- Advising and mentoring students

Major Recommendation

At certain times faculty may be required to instruct a new course for the first time, and faculty should be given time to sufficiently prepare.

We strongly suggest the following language:

---

5 https://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/other-faculty-policies/responsibilities-of-the-faculty-member.html
“At certain times, faculty may be required to instruct a new course for the first time, and should normally be given at least a semester’s lead time to prepare, or when necessary, release time from other duties or additional compensation.”

Major Recommendation

The supervising of independent studies requires the faculty invest additional time in teaching over their three/three course load and should be recognized.

We strongly recommend the following language:

“Faculty supervision of independent studies and internships shall be recognized either at the time through stipend or when the number of supervisions at the time or over time is equivalent to a taught course through course release.”

With the approval of the academic unit leader and the SPS Dean, CCF taking on additional teaching responsibilities may qualify for a reduced course load and/or stipend. Academic Director responsibilities, for example, would qualify.

B. Service and Administration

Service and administration are key components of faculty engagement and all CCF are expected to contribute in these areas. For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in both reappointment and promotion reviews. In providing service to SPS and/or the University, CCF may:

- Participate in administrative components of academic programs (admissions, committees, events)
- Serve on program, curricular, student affairs, or other SPS or University committees including task forces and working groups
- Participate in student recruitment, orientation, retention, and/or alumni activities
- Provide outreach to the community at large as a representative of SPS
- Contribute to policy-making, especially with regard to policies concerning to the mission of the School, program, and/or academic unit

With the approval of the academic unit leader and the SPS Dean, CCF participating in administrative duties on behalf of the program, academic unit, School, or University may qualify for a reduced course load and/or stipend. Academic Coordinator duties, for example, may qualify.

C. Scholarly Work, Creative Production, and Professional Activity

CCF expertise is crucial to teaching excellence in SPS and to the overall profile of its programs. SPS faculty are encouraged to be actively engaged in professional, scholarly, and/or creative work in their fields. Professional engagement includes a range of activities that may strengthen a faculty member’s professional profile, further fields of knowledge, enhance teaching excellence, and/or advance the mission of SPS.
Scholarly, Creative, and Professional activities may include, but are not limited to:

- Providing expert information about practice realities and new developments in the profession
- Producing scholarly and/or creative work in print, film, performance, or digital forms related to particular disciplines or fields of practice
- Contributing to policy-making locally, nationally, and/or globally in one’s field of expertise
- Acting as a bridge to practice and academic communities by attending conferences; participating in professional associations; giving lectures, readings, performances, or presentations; serving on advisory boards or councils; and otherwise informing and/or shaping debates in relevant fields and/or disciplines
- Success in applying for and receiving funding for authorized grant activity
- Engaging in public intellectual activities, such as service to professional, non-profit, or community-based organizations on a local, national, or international level

With the approval of the academic unit leader and the SPS Dean, CCF pursuing scholarly, creative and/or professional activities that serve the program, academic unit, School, or University may qualify for a reduced course load and/or stipend. CCF participating in externally funded research programs, for example, may qualify.

D. Annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR)

All faculty are required to submit an annual report of activities and accomplishments to the leader of the academic unit following the form and process approved by the SPS Dean. Faculty must receive written feedback from their academic unit leader and/or SPS Dean about the report including a statement of whether or not the faculty member has met performance expectations required for reappointment. This statement will identify required areas of improvement as needed.

Faculty Activity Report Timetable:

Submissions for FAR follow a calendar rather than academic year and should include student evaluations and other materials from the previous January, Spring, Summer, and Fall terms.

| Written notification and distribution of the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) template to faculty | By November 1 |
| Academic unit leader arranges one-on-one meetings and returns FAR with written comments that note whether expectations have been met or not | By March 31 |
| Faculty return the signed Faculty Evaluation Form to their academic unit leader | By April 14 |
| The academic unit leader submits all FARs and Faculty Evaluation Forms to OAFA | By April 28 |

Note: Minor Recommendation
IV. Appointment of SPS CCF

A. Search and Hiring

The SPS Dean solicits authorization from the Provost for faculty searches as set forth in annual academic planning documents. The rank(s) of the faculty member(s) to be sought is proposed by the leader of the academic unit, ideally following input from a unit-wide faculty meeting, and approved by the SPS Dean. Unless granted an exemption in the manner set forth in the University’s Recruiting and Hiring Policy, the leader of the academic unit must conduct a search to fill every approved full-time faculty position, whether a newly created or vacant line. 6 SPS hiring practices for CCF shall be transparent and fair and should include CCF in the hiring process. 7 In CCF recruitment processes, the name and title of all members serving on any search committee will be shared electronically with all SPS full-time faculty at the start of every search.

The search for all CCF positions should be managed by posting open positions using NYU’s online hiring system. All searches must include outreach to diverse candidate pools and must be publicized for a minimum of six weeks on the SPS website and in at least one external academic or industry-specific professional publication or website.

For each search process, the leader of the academic unit forms and charges an ad hoc search committee, which should include at least three CCF of whom the majority (if possible) must be from the affected academic unit, plus one ex-officio CCF member from outside of the academic unit. Every effort must be made to ensure that the search committee is diverse and inclusive. 8 Each search committee will establish the desired qualifications and selection criteria appropriate to the position for which the search is being conducted, and the search committee will draw up a shortlist of candidates who meet these requirements. Efforts must be made to ensure diversity of candidates under consideration. Shortlisted candidates will be interviewed, and other means of assessing qualifications may be used, as appropriate, including review of applicants’ publications and teaching performance and a call for references. Shortlisted candidates should also be required to deliver a presentation that is open to the entire CCF of the academic unit. At the conclusion of the search process, the committee shall present a list of preferred candidates to the leader of the academic unit, who then submits their recommendation to the SPS Dean for approval. Candidates who accept offers of appointment may, with their academic unit leader’s support, seek elevated rank through the SPS

8 Academic units with enough CCF should use a rotation system for search committee membership.
Rank, Title, and Privilege (RTP) Committee process (See section V). The RTP Committee submits its recommendation to the SPS Dean for a final decision.

All contracts must include the following terms:

- Start and end dates of the appointment
- Academic responsibilities, including teaching load, benefits, and compensation
- Acknowledgement of release from part of the teaching load due to significant administrative responsibilities or due to receipt of grants
- Agreement to be bound by applicable University policies

**Major Recommendation**

We strongly recommend that contracts should indicate whether appointment is subject to renewal.

Add the following bullet-point to the list above:

“Contracts should indicate whether appointment is subject to renewal.”

**Major Recommendation**

We strongly recommend that contracts or letters of reappointment indicate an explicit list of responsibilities.

Add the following bullet-point to the list above:

“Contracts will list explicit academic responsibilities and administrative responsibilities (if applicable).”

**B. Terms of Appointments**

Newly hired SPS CCF typically receive multiple-year contracts of two to three years. Initial appointments at the level of Language Lecturer, Senior Language Lecturer, and Assistant Professor (Clinical) are for two years; initial appointments for Associate Professor (Clinical) and Professor (Clinical) are for three years. These contract lengths allow SPS to recruit and retain high-caliber faculty while also supporting the School’s unique mission to provide innovative programs that not only recognize but also anticipate industry trends and emerging opportunities.

**C. Ranks and Titles of Faculty**

The definitions of ranks and titles below are intended as a framework for CCF appointments.

It is expected that CCF members are experienced and accomplished instructors, scholars, professionals, and/or artists in their disciplines or fields of practice, holding the highest degree appropriate to their field. Faculty at higher ranks are expected to demonstrate outstanding capabilities in their field and have nationally or internationally recognized achievements.
Visiting Appointments
Visiting appointments are given to individuals, including outstanding practitioners, who are teaching temporarily at SPS. These appointments are made by the SPS Dean and used primarily to address short-term programmatic needs. These appointments are usually for one single academic year but can be renewed for a second year, or, in rare circumstances, for a third year for a maximum of three academic years in total. Visiting appointments cannot be converted to regular CCF appointments, but visiting faculty may apply to any position in an open competitive search.  

Language Lecturer
Faculty appointed at this rank should hold a relevant advanced degree, demonstrate evidence of initiative in curricular development and language pedagogy, demonstrate an ability to engage in meaningful service or administrative work, and ideally have at least three years of language teaching experience and evidence of teaching excellence and effectiveness. Faculty at this rank should also demonstrate evidence of, or potential for, achievements in professional activities and research in their disciplines and/or areas of practice.

Senior Language Lecturer
Faculty promoted to the rank of Senior Language Lecturer should hold a relevant advanced degree and have at least six years of experience in and evidence of teaching excellence in higher education. Faculty at this rank shall have demonstrated strong contributions in curriculum revision or development, service and/or administrative work, and, where relevant, publications or other forms of scholarly, creative, and professional outputs in their disciplines and/or areas of practice.

Assistant Professor (Clinical)
Faculty appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor (Clinical) should hold an advanced degree (terminal in their field or discipline), have a significant industry or academic track record, and have at least three years of teaching experience and evidence of teaching excellence and effectiveness in higher education. Faculty at this rank should provide evidence of initiative in curricular development, demonstrate an ability or potential ability to engage in meaningful service or administrative work, and supply evidence of promise in scholarly or artistic work, and, where relevant, publications.

Associate Professor (Clinical)
Faculty appointed or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor (Clinical) should hold an advanced degree (terminal in their field or discipline), have a significant industry or academic track record, and should have at least six years of experience in and evidence of teaching excellence and effectiveness in higher education. Faculty at this rank shall have demonstrated strong contributions in curriculum revision or development, service and/or administration, and in their field of study or practice.

Professor (Clinical)
Faculty appointed or promoted to the rank of Professor (Clinical) should hold an advanced degree (terminal in their field or discipline), have a significant industry or academic track record, have at least six years of experience at the rank of Associate Professor (Clinical), and should provide evidence of teaching excellence and effectiveness in higher education. Faculty at this rank shall have demonstrated extraordinary contributions in curriculum revision or development, service and

---

9 The hiring, reappointment and promotion policies and procedures covered in this document do not pertain to visiting faculty.
administration, in industry-relevant or artistic production, in academic and/or applied research, and in professional leadership. Clinical professors maintain national and international reputations in relevant areas.

D. Voluntary Termination and Contract Stoppage
As required by the NYU Faculty Handbook, there are grounds for stopping or pausing the contract clock. Reasonable causes can include medical; personal; role as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, same-sex domestic partner; or by contractual stipulation or negotiation.

CCF members in the middle of a contract of two or more years may opt out of their contract provided they complete the current academic semester.

E. Special Academic Leave for Full-time Faculty, Professional Development Funds and Summer Session Teaching
Faculty may apply for Special Academic Leave in accordance with SPS Special Academic Leave policies for CCF. The School encourages faculty professional development and provides a modest annual support fund as well as opportunities to compete for small grants for research and to support continued growth in teaching, instructional design and curriculum development, scholarly activity, leadership, administration, and organizational development.

Summer (and January term) teaching appointments for faculty on nine-month contracts are optional and are made, subject to curricular needs and the faculty member’s desire to teach, for additional compensation provided that the faculty member has met their teaching load as agreed.11

V. Reappointment of SPS CCF
Faculty peer reviews form an essential component of professional development and are intended to enable faculty to gain feedback, enhance their skills, and find new ways to contribute to the mission of the School. They also support the highest quality of teaching and performance. The process for review of full-time multi-year contracts shall include a peer review committee, which is advisory to the head of the academic unit in question and the SPS Dean.12

A. Terms for Reappointment
Term eligibility: Language Lecturers are eligible for reappointment contracts of two years. Senior Language Lecturers and Assistant Professors (Clinical) are eligible in their first reappointment for a contract of two years. After the completion of two two-year contracts, Senior Language Lecturers and Clinical Assistant Professors are eligible for reappointment contracts of three years. Associate Professors (Clinical) are eligible for reappointment contracts of three years. Professors (Clinical) are eligible for reappointment contracts of five years. Shorter contracts may be used in situations where

10 The policy may be found here: https://www.sps.nyu.edu/homepage/academics/office-of-academic-and-faculty-affairs/policies-and-documents/special-academic-leave.html
11 CCF on nine-month contracts who have not met their teaching load during the fall and/or spring semesters due to course cancellations will be given the option of teaching during the January and/or summer terms. CCF will only receive additional compensation for Summer or January teaching if they have met their regular semester teaching load.
(a) there are questions or concerns about performance, (b) there is uncertainty about future needs and student demand for the program in which the clinical faculty member teaches, or (c) at the faculty member’s request.

**Major Recommendation**

With respect to the contract length of Language Lecturers, “Language Lecturer are eligible for reappointment contracts of two years.” This is in contrast to other schools’ terms of appointment at that level. It is also unclear as to the length of subsequent contracts. Subsequent appointments should be of at least the same length as the previous contract.

We strongly recommend the following language:

“Language Lecturer, Senior Language Lecturers and Assistant Professors (Clinical) are eligible in their first reappointment for a contract of two years. After the completion of two two-year contracts, Language Lecturer, Senior Language Lecturers and Assistant Professors (Clinical) are eligible for reappointment contracts of three years, subsequent appointments shall be for at least three years.”

**Major Recommendation**

The length of contract for subsequent contracts is unclear. Moreover, the length of contract for Associate Professors (Clinical) is not equitable to what is offered by the other schools:

Liberal Studies – “Five-year appointments: Five-year contracts are awarded upon promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.”

Tisch School of the Arts – “Associate Arts Professor: Six Year Term.”

Gallatin School of Individualized Study – “Clinical Associate Professors: First appointments are for five years; after the first appointment, reappointments are for six years.”

Institute for the Study of the Ancient World – “Five-year appointments: Normally, five-year contracts are awarded only upon promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.”

NYU Abu Dhabi – “Rank of Associate Professor: 4 years.”

We strongly recommend the following language:
“Associate Professors (Clinical) are eligible for reappointment contracts of five years, subsequent appointments shall be of at least same length.”

Major Recommendation

The length of contract for subsequent contracts is unclear. Moreover, the length of contract for Professors (Clinical) is not equitable to what is offered by the other schools:

Liberal Studies – “Five-year appointments: Five-year contracts are awarded upon promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.”

Tisch School of the Arts – “Arts Professor: Six Year Term. Unlimited reappointments; eligible for sabbatical and Emeritus status.”

Gallatin School of Individualized Study – “Clinical Full Professors: Appointments are for six years.

We strongly recommend the following language:

“Professors (Clinical) are eligible for reappointment contracts of six years, subsequent appointments shall be of at least the same length.”

Major Recommendation

We strongly recommend the following language:

“Faculty members on continuous two-year appointments who successfully complete two two-year contracts will undergo a formal review and shall move to at least a three-year appointment. Subsequent appointments shall be of at least the same length.”

Regular committee reviews of all CCF on contracts of three or more years take place in the penultimate year of their contracts. Regular committee reviews of all CCF on contracts of two years take place in the second year of their contracts. All faculty are reviewed annually by their academic unit leader. CCF contracts can be renewed a limitless number of times.

B. Process for Reappointment
All reviews of CCF are conducted by academic unit-specific Reappointment Committees (RCs). It is the responsibility of each academic unit leader to ensure that a RC is formed, that membership is regularly reviewed, and that it meets the standards and follows the procedures set out below. Annually in September, the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs (OAFA) must supply each academic unit leader and each academic unit-level RC with a list of faculty eligible to be considered for reappointment.
The academic unit-level Reappointment Committee must:

1. Contain an odd number of full-time faculty (ideally, and at a minimum, three), each serving for two years
2. Include at least one alternate member in the event one member must be recused.
3. Exclude lecturers and clinical assistant professors with fewer than four years of full-time teaching experience at SPS.
4. Exclude individual faculty members that are applying for reappointment or promotion during the two-year RC cycle in question

The Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs will work with academic unit leaders to hold an election and form a Reappointment Committee each year. Composition of committee and selection process must be on file with OAFA and updated annually. Members shall serve on the RC for two academic years and may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

**Major Recommendation**

*It should be clear that the election process is managed by the faculty.*

*Add the following language:*

“The process to elect members to the Reappointment Committee should be managed by a respective elected committee of the faculty.”

Where the academic unit is too small to generate a committee that meets requirements 1 through 4 above, academic units may identify a cognate academic unit with which to form a joint RC.

At least one member of the RC should be of equivalent or higher rank than any given candidate for reappointment. In cases where a clinical professor is reviewed for reappointment and there is no CCF of equivalent rank in the unit, the academic unit leader will make a request to OAFA to identify a clinical professor from another unit for the specific review. OAFA will maintain a list of all clinical professors and will randomly select an individual to serve on the RC. In such cases, a lower ranking member will not review this one case. The candidate in question must be informed of this in advance.

The RC in each academic unit chooses its own chair who serves as chair for two years and may not serve as chair more than two consecutive two-year terms.

A simple majority vote of the RC shall be required for a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment. The RC’s report should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, the majority of the committee.

**Major Recommendation**

13 In the event there are two lower ranking members, they will alternate reviewing cases such as these.
Add at the end of the paragraph language highlighting that all votes shall be confidential,

“All votes shall be by secret ballot.”

This is in line with other parts of the University, e.g., Center for Urban Science and Progress, Gallatin, Liberal Studies, Stern, Shanghai, and the Law School.

The RC report includes the outcome of the vote and a brief statement of the basic arguments for or against reappointment. The report will be provided to the leader of the relevant academic unit, according to the timetable in Section IV F.

Major 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.recuirement.html), adapted as follows:

“The review may be written by one or more member of the Review and Reappointment Committee, but all members of the committee should read the review before it is submitted to the Dean. The review should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division of opinion, the minority opinion should be appended to the majority review.”

This paragraph is in line with other parts of the University, e.g., Center for Urban Science and Progress, FAS Clinical Policies, FAS Language Lecturers, Gallatin, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, Liberal Studies, Stern, Abu Dhabi, Shanghai, Law, and Tandon.

The RC is advisory to the leader of the academic unit. The academic unit leader must state in writing his, her, or their reasons for accepting or rejecting the RC’s recommendation to reappoint or not reappoint. The unit leader’s statement, along with the RC’s recommendation, must be submitted to the SPS Dean, who informs the candidate in writing of the Dean’s final decision, including a written rationale for the length of the new appointment. At their discretion, the SPS Dean may request additional information from the RC or academic unit leader. CCF on contracts of three or more years must be notified by August 31st or one year prior to the conclusion of the contract. However, all efforts will be made to notify faculty by May 31st, fifteen months prior to the conclusion of the contract. Faculty with two-year contracts must be notified by March 1st or 180 days prior to the conclusion of the contract. In the event of a decision for non-renewal, the SPS Dean will notify the faculty member in writing that the contract will be terminated at the conclusion of the contract.
Major Recommendation

Add detailed information that in line with other parts of the University, e.g., CUSP, FAS Clinical, FAS Lecturer, Liberal; Studies, and Stern:

“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 the 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.”

Major Recommendation

In the case of schools where a division dean or an academic unit leader receives the committee report and passes that with a recommendation to reappoint or to promote to a school Dean (as at Liberal Studies and Tandon), add language to ensure that the school Dean receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendation of the divisional dean or academic unit leader, (similar to Liberal Studies and to the following language from Liberal Studies and Tandon):

“The Chair or the academic unit leader will forward the report of the promotion committee and closed vote to the Dean along with his or her own recommendation. The recommendations of the review committee, the voting faculty and the Department Chair are all advisory to the Dean. The Dean will make a decision on the promotion case and notify the Department Chair.”

Major Recommendation

We strongly recommend the following language:

“The academic unit leader must forward the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendation of the academic unit leader to the school Dean along with the committee’s recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”

Major Recommendation

16 – 12.04.19
Add the following as a new paragraph (adapted from the FAS website, “PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion” for clinical faculty, http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html):

“If the school Dean's decision is contrary on appointment, title, or length of contract to that of the Review and Reappointment Committee or the Promotion 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.”

This is in line with other parts of the University, e.g., Center for Urban Science and Progress, Gallatin, and Abu Dhabi.

In the event a faculty member is not reappointed, the faculty member may pursue a grievance according to the Grievance Policy described in Section VII. Faculty members may not pursue a grievance for failure to meet the specific dates listed in the timeline in Section E as these dates are indicative. However, all parties (the candidate for reappointment, the RC, the academic unit leader, OAFA and the SPS Dean) should ensure that no part of the process deviates significantly (more than ten business days) from the suggested dates.

Major Recommendation

Clarify that on appeal of a negative decision regarding reappointment or promotion by the dean that the candidate will have access to the Review/Promotion Committee’s full report, including its recommendation and any comments from the faculty by adding language similar to the Center for Urban Science and Liberal Studies:

“In all cases of an appeal to a negative decision related to reappointment or promotion by the Dean, the candidate will have access to the Review/ Promotion Committee’s full report, including its recommendation, with the expectation that the Committee will protect information provided in confidence.”

C. Materials for Reappointment

The reappointment process consists of a thorough review of a portfolio of evidence of accomplishment in teaching, service, and professional activity submitted by the faculty member in question. This portfolio must include:

1. Current CV
2. Annual Faculty Activity Reports (with attachments, faculty evaluation summary, and any faculty response) for the current contract term and up to one year preceding the start of that term (see Section IV. F.)
3. Additional syllabi, sample assignments, student course evaluations, peer evaluations, observation reports, statement of teaching philosophy, etc. that are available but not included in recent faculty activity reports.

4. Personal statement

The portfolio may also include, if relevant, and at the discretion of the faculty member:

5. A professional file indicating publications, creative production, industry-relevant work, etc.
6. If applicable, indicators of accomplishment and contribution such as peer reviews of publications, citations and other ratings, recognition in conventional and social media, etc.

Due to variations in the nature of CCF contributions across the School, more specific evidence of excellence and achievement will differ by academic unit. Units are encouraged to develop their own written examples of activities relevant to the review process. These examples should be shared with and maintained by the OAFA to ensure high and comparable standards are upheld throughout the School.

D. Criteria for Reappointment

The Reappointment Committee shall consider evidence of teaching excellence, performance in areas of SPS and University service, and a faculty member’s professional activities in the context of teaching expertise and/or professional profile. In assessing these areas, the Reappointment Committee shall consider the candidate’s overall contributions to the mission of SPS.

In assessing teaching, the committee shall consider a broad range of evidence and activities. These include, but are not limited to, statement of teaching philosophy; course and/or curriculum development in SPS and/or in other parts of the university; innovations in pedagogy; participation in teaching workshops and consultations within NYU or elsewhere; data from student evaluations; peer observations; evidence of student advising and mentoring; and evidence of faculty mentoring.

In assessing service and/or administration to the program or the University, the committee shall consider a range of activities. These include, but are not limited to, service on committees; participation in SPS student affairs such as advising student activities; planning and offering events or programs; participating in student recruitment, orientation, retention, or alumni activities; and providing outreach to the community at large as a representative of SPS. For faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to accomplishments in this area.

The committee shall assess accomplishments in a candidate’s field of practice and/or other relevant scholarly, creative and professional activities with a focus on the candidate’s professional profile, enhancements to a particular field or industry, and contributions to the overall mission of SPS. In assessing scholarly, creative and professional accomplishments, the committee shall consider a range of materials, including but not limited to: published books; articles; conference/workshop events and presentations; and creative exhibits, projects, productions, and products in any format.

The committee’s written review shall indicate the strengths and/or weaknesses of the faculty member under consideration in relation to SPS criteria.

Major Recommendation
For clarity, we suggest that following phrase “For those faculty whose responsibilities include scholarship, creative work, and related activities,” be added to the first sentence of the previous paragraph, so that it reads, “For those faculty whose responsibilities include scholarship, creative work, and related activities, the committee shall assess accomplishments ....”

Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvements in academic programs. When appropriate, the Procedures for Termination or Reorganization of Academic Programs as found in the Faculty Handbook should be followed as well as any school policies and by-laws. The review in such cases would focus, in addition to the assessment of quality and excellence described below, on whether the faculty member could teach in the revised curriculum and/or new academic structure. If non-reappointment takes place due to curricular or structural changes then that reason must be stated clearly in the written performance review of the faculty member. Efforts should be made to redeploy the faculty member in another area in which the faculty member has expertise.

E. Timeline for Reappointment

Review for reappointment occurs in the penultimate year of the contract for CCF on contracts of three or more years and shall be completed by the end of that penultimate year.

In the semester prior to the review, OAFA notifies the faculty member that they are scheduled for their committee review via letter with a copy going to the leader of the academic unit. In the event of a decision not to reappoint, the CCF member shall be notified of the intention not to reappoint no later than August 31st of the penultimate year (but preferably by May 1st) for those faculty on a contract of three or more years that commenced on September 1st. The faculty member may grieve according to the SPS CCF Grievance Policy referred to in Section VII. Any CCF member whose multi-year appointment is due to terminate on a date other than August 31st must be notified of the intention not to be reappointed no later than twelve months prior to the termination date.

In the case of a faculty member on a one-year or two-year contract the faculty member must be notified of the intention not to reappoint at least 180 days before termination of the contract, but for those on two-year contracts preferably one year prior to termination of the contract. Review date may need to be adjusted according to appointment dates. (These timetables represent guidelines and faculty may not grieve a failure to meet a School deadline set forth here.)

The Reappointment Process Timetable:
The guideline timetable for review of a faculty member with a multi-year appointment of three or more years that terminates on August 31 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OAFA notifies faculty members who are scheduled for a penultimate year review</td>
<td>By November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty submit their materials to the leader of the relevant academic unit and the Reappointment Committee</td>
<td>By February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reappointment Committee sends its written recommendation to the academic unit leader</td>
<td>By March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The academic unit leader submits recommendation to the SPS Dean.</td>
<td>By April 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 – 12.04.19
The SPS Dean provides written notification to the faculty member and the academic unit leader of the Dean’s final decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The guideline timetable for review of a faculty member with an appointment of two years that terminates on August 31 is as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OAFA notifies faculty who are scheduled for a review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty submit their materials to the relevant academic unit leader and the relevant Reappointment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reappointment Committee sends its written recommendation to the academic unit leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The academic unit leader submits a written recommendation to the SPS Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SPS Dean provides written notification to the faculty member and the academic unit leader of the Dean’s final decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Promotion of SPS CCF
Promotion recognizes achievements in teaching excellence, contributions in service and administration in SPS and/or the University, and accomplishments in professional activities within a candidate’s disciplinary areas and/or fields of practice. The SPS Rank, Title, and Privilege (RTP) Committee reviews all candidates seeking promotion and considers the overall impact of the candidate’s accomplishments and contributions in furthering the mission of SPS.

A. Process for Promotion
All proposed promotions of CCF are conducted by the RTP Committee. Candidates seeking promotion submit a complete portfolio to their academic unit leader as outlined in section V. C. The academic unit leader reviews the portfolio and writes a report detailing their assessment of the promotion request. The portfolio and the academic unit leader’s assessment are then shared with the School’s RTP Committee. The committee’s written review should indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member under consideration in relation to School criteria, and will recommend that the candidate be promoted or not promoted. A majority vote will be required to generate a recommendation. A dissenting opinion can be appended to the written majority recommendation.

The RTP Committee will vote on each case by closed ballot. The committee’s decision to recommend promotion or not, as well as the report detailing the recommendation, will be forwarded to the leader of the academic unit and the SPS Dean. The SPS Dean will review all material and recommendations. At their discretion, the SPS Dean may request additional information from the RTP Committee and/or the academic unit leader. The SPS Dean will make a final decision and will communicate the decision to the faculty member with a copy to the academic unit leader.

Major 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.recruitment.html). This is in line with other parts of the University, e.g., Gallatin, Liberal Studies, Shanghai, and Tandon:

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

Major Recommendation

We strongly recommend the addition of detailed information in line with other parts of the university, e.g., CUSP, FAS Clinical, FAS Lecturer, Liberal Studies, and Stern:

“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 the 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.”

Major Recommendation

In the case of schools where a division dean receives the committee report and passes that with a recommendation to reappoint or to promote to a school Dean, add language to ensure that the school Dean receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendation of the divisional dean, similar to the following:

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

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

“If the school Dean's decision is contrary on appointment, title, or length of contract to that of the Review and Reappointment Committee or the Promotion 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.”

Major Recommendation

Add language similar to the following (paraphrased from CUSP and Liberal Studies):

“In all cases of an appeal to a negative decision related to reappointment or promotion by the Dean, the candidate will have access to the Review/Promotion Committee’s full report, including its recommendation with the expectation that the Committee will protect information provided in confidence.”

The schedule of deadlines for promotions provided in Section VI. E. should be followed so that the Dean’s decision reaches the faculty member by May 21st. Following this deadline, the faculty candidate may respond in writing.

B. Criteria for Promotion
While some variation between academic units is to be expected in demonstrating how faculty meet the criteria for promotion, any faculty member seeking to apply for promotion must satisfy the following basic criteria:

Promotion to Associate Professor (Clinical)
A clinical faculty member ordinarily should hold an advanced degree (terminal in their field or discipline), where applicable have a significant industry or academic track record, and should have spent at least six years at the rank of Assistant Professor (Clinical) to be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor (Clinical). Promotion requires evidence of excellence and effectiveness in teaching. Faculty seeking this rank should demonstrate significant contributions to curricular revision and development, service and administration, scholarly and/or artistic work, and/or professional industry-relevant fields. Any faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor (Clinical) has the option to request review for promotion to Associate Professor (Clinical) earlier if the individual can demonstrate exceptional achievements.

Promotion to Professor (Clinical)
A clinical faculty member ordinarily should hold an advanced degree (terminal in their field or discipline), where applicable have a significant industry or academic track record, and should have spent at least six years at the rank of Associate Professor (Clinical) to be eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor (Clinical). Promotion requires evidence of exceptional performance in teaching,
curricular revision and development, service and administration, industry-relevant or artistic production, professional leadership, and academic and/or applied research. Faculty seeking this rank should demonstrate that they hold and maintain national or international reputations in relevant areas. Any faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor (Clinical) may also request promotion to Professor (Clinical) earlier if the individual can demonstrate exceptional achievements.

**Promotion to Senior Language Lecturer**

A faculty member ordinarily should hold a relevant advanced degree and have spent at least six years at the rank of Language Lecturer to be eligible for promotion to Senior Language Lecturer. Promotion requires evidence of excellence and effectiveness in teaching, service and administration, and industry-relevant activity. Faculty at this rank shall have demonstrated strong contributions in curriculum revision or development, service and/or administrative work, and, where relevant, publications or other forms of scholarly, creative, and professional outputs in their disciplines and/or areas of practice. Any faculty member at the rank of Language Lecturer has the option to request review for promotion to Senior Language Lecturer earlier if the individual can demonstrate exceptional achievements.

At all ranks above, for faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in promotion reviews.

**C. Materials for Promotion**

Candidates for promotion may apply according to the deadlines for application published by OAFA as long as they have met the criteria of mentioned in Sections V. A and V. B. Candidates will submit a portfolio to the leader of their academic unit. The portfolio must include:

1. Current CV
2. Annual Faculty Activity Reports (with attachments, faculty evaluation summary, and any faculty response) available for the current contract term, and up to five years prior to applying for promotion
3. Evidence of teaching excellence including additional syllabi, sample assignments, student course evaluations, peer evaluations, observation reports, etc.
4. A personal statement in support of promotion, including a brief essay describing and reflecting upon their contributions to their division, to SPS, and to the wider University, including teaching, student advisement, service, and/or scholarly or creative work
5. Three professional letters of reference, of which one must be external to SPS (the letters of reference are solicited by the candidate and uploaded into Interfolio; OAFA then includes them in the portfolio)
6. All previous review and promotion committee recommendations; all previous academic unit leader recommendations

The portfolio may also include, if relevant, and at the discretion of the faculty member:

1. Documentation of all scholarly and/or creative work and/or industry-specific practice, including publications, creative output, or commissioned work.
2. Indicators of accomplishment and contribution such as peer reviews for publications, citations and other ratings, industry or policy-relevant projects, recognition in conventional and social media, etc.
E. Timeline for Promotion
An annual schedule of deadlines for promotion review is published online by OAFA and a notice is sent to all faculty. (These timetables represent guidelines and faculty may not grieve a failure to meet a School deadline set forth here.)

The Promotion Process Timetable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member notifies the academic unit leader and OAFA of intent to apply for promotion</td>
<td>By December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty member submits the portfolio to relevant academic unit leader for review.</td>
<td>By February 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader of the academic unit assesses candidate’s portfolio, and submits their review and candidate’s portfolio to the RTP Committee</td>
<td>By March 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RTP committee makes a written recommendation to promote or not to promote to the SPS Dean</td>
<td>By April 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SPS Dean considers all material, including the academic unit leader’s assessment, makes a decision, and communicates it to the academic unit leader.</td>
<td>By May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SPS Dean communicates the final decision to the faculty member in writing, with copy to academic unit leader, and provides the opportunity for the candidate to respond in writing.</td>
<td>By May 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Grievance Procedure
In accordance with the SPS Grievance Policy, CCF faculty may appeal the decision of the SPS Dean (or their proxy) regarding reappointment or promotion. 14

VIII. Amendments
The SPS Dean, or SPS Faculty Council, or SPS CCF may suggest changes or amendments to this policy as outlined in the Faculty Council Charter. Any proposed changes are subject to a vote by the SPS CCF and review and approval by the SPS Dean and NYU Provost.

[PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT PAGE: GRIEVANCE POLICY]

14 The policy may be found here: https://www.sps.nyu.edu/homepage/academics/office-of-academic-and-faculty-affairs/policies-and-documents/full-time-continuing-contract-faculty-grievance-policy.html
FULL-TIME CONTINUING CONTRACT FACULTY
GRIEVANCE POLICY

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The purpose of this document is to establish the NYU School of Professional Studies (SPS) policy and procedures by means of which a Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty member can seek redress for her or his grievance(s).

This policy is responsive to the University’s commitment to academic excellence and its responsibility to provide students with access to an excellent education, and cognizant of its responsibility to faculty to afford them due process and a fair hearing of their complaints.

1.2 This SPS policy aligns with and incorporates University policy set forth in the Faculty Handbook under Faculty Policies Applicable to Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Procedures and specifies the process for SPS.

1.3 Grievances connected with reappointment and promotion are addressed in a manner that conforms to the general appointment procedures. The initial protection for the faculty member is documented in the New York University Faculty Handbook under Academic Freedom, which cites Title I ‘Statement in Regard to Academic Freedom and Tenure’ Section II. The Case for Academic Freedom, and Section IV. Academic Freedom; and the NYUSPS Faculty Handbook under ‘Terms and Conditions of Appointment and Reappointment.’

Major Recommendation

The grievance/appeal process, of crucial importance to the faculty, should be developed by the faculty and needs to be added to the Policy document.

The process should be identified and explicitly described at the beginning of this document. The development of this grievance process should be undertaken with full participation by the Continuing Contract Faculty and submitted to the faculty for discussion and a confidential vote by the faculty. The process of consideration must include the right to offer amendments, and the confidential vote may occur during a regular faculty meeting or by electronic ballot, as the faculty governance body may determine.

Major Recommendation

We recommend that the grievance/appeal process closely follow the principles elaborated in the University Guidelines that specify that all members of the committee, including the senior continuing contract faculty member, be elected:
“Unless otherwise authorized in the school’s policy and approved by the Provost, each school shall either establish a new standing faculty committee for Continuing Contract Faculty grievances, which will include senior Continuing Contract Faculty and T/TTF elected by the voting members of the faculty; or shall expand its existing standing grievance committee for T/TTF to include (elected) senior Continuing Contract Faculty who shall participate in hearing and evaluating only those grievances that are filed by Continuing Contract Faculty.”

Additionally, The New York University Guidelines for Full—Time Continuing Contract Faculty note numerous requirements and procedures for the school grievance process, including specifying who may grieve, the grounds for grievances based on non—reappointment, as well as grievances related to other issues, the process of requesting the convening by the dean of the grievance committee, and the accessibility of that grievance policy to the faculty.

1.4 It is expected that most grievance cases, particularly those concerned with matters such as duties, salaries, perquisites, working conditions, and other matters will be settled within SPS.

1.5 SPS has established a Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee to hear grievance cases in order to advise the Dean. This grievance committee is elected by the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty and shall be a standing committee of SPS. The committee shall not include academic directors, associate deans, or any faculty member whose primary assignment is administrative within an academic unit or within the SPS Office of the Dean.

SECTION 2. APPLICABILITY

2.1 A grievant must be a faculty member of New York University when he or she initiates the appellate grievance procedure, described below “Appeals from a Dean’s Decision on Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion” (Section 6).

2.2 Faculty members covered by this policy are Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty as defined in the Faculty Handbook under Faculty Titles and who are covered by the NYUSPS Standards and Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty (“FTCCF”) policies.

2.3 Faculty members whose primary assignment is administrative are covered by this policy insofar as the grievance concerns their faculty appointment. These faculty members serve in an administrative capacity at the Dean’s discretion; in accordance with the Faculty Handbook under Term of Administrative Appointments and they are not entitled to grieve the decision of the School to terminate their administrative or staff appointment.

2.4 This policy does not cover conflicts between faculty members, unless the faculty member against whom the grievance is lodged was in that case acting administratively. Resolution of questions concerning which capacity gave rise to the grievance shall be a jurisdictional matter for the SPS Dean.
2.5 A copy of the SPS grievance procedure should be made widely available and easily accessible to all Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty members.

SECTION 3. CONFIDENTIALITY

3.1 Members of the Grievance Committee and participants in all proceedings of this policy are expected to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings to the greatest extent possible, consistent with the Committee’s goal of conducting a thorough and complete review, and to the extent permitted by law. This expectation extends to any communications during the grievance process between the Committee and the SPS Dean.

SECTION 4. GRIEVABLE MATTERS

4.1 Types of Faculty Grievances

Following the Faculty Handbook, grievances can be made regarding matters in two general areas:

1. Reappointment and promotion
2. Other matters, such as duties, salaries, perquisites, and working conditions

4.2 Grievances relating to Reappointment and Promotion

4.2.1 Basis for Grievance

With respect to grievances related to reappointment and promotion, outcomes of the review process can be grieved only to the extent that they involve violation of University-protected rights of faculty members. Thus, a grievant must allege that the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case was not given adequate consideration; or that the decision(s) violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question, as documented in the Faculty Handbook, in which case the burden of proof falls to the grievant.

4.2.2 Who Can Grieve:

Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty on multi-year contracts of three years or more who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be reappointed, have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision with respect to reappointment or promotion or the terms of reappointment or promotion. He or she is entitled to grieve in that he or she is denied reappointment without review for reasons other than elimination of the position.

---

1 This policy has been provisionally approved by the Office of the Provost as of fall 2018, pending the final approval of the Standards and Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty.

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. They are entitled to grieve the process in the event they are not reappointed after a third-year review when a review had been explicitly promised in connection with the possibility of reappointment subject to it, but was not undertaken for reasons other than elimination of the position.

Continuing Contract Faculty who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be promoted have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision.

### 4.2.3 What Cannot Be Grieved:

Grievances cannot be made when SPS does not undertake a reappointment process for a position because the position will be eliminated at the end of a contract, and no similar position is open. Such cases will not be the basis for a grievance.

### 4.3 Allegations that discrimination on the basis of race, gender and/or gender identity or expression, color, creed, religion, age, national origin, ethnicity, disability, unemployment status, veteran or military status, sex, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, citizenship status, or any other legally protected basis, affected decisions on reappointment and promotion should be brought to the attention of NYU’s Office of Equal Opportunity.

### 4.4 Issues related to duties, salaries, perquisites, and working conditions

All Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, including faculty on one-year appointments, may grieve matters other than promotion and reappointment, such as duties, salaries, perquisites, and working conditions.

---


[2] The Faculty Handbook Faculty Policies Applicable to All or Most Members of The Faculty Including Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty, Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, and Other Faculty, Academic Freedom are available at: [http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/other-faculty-policies/academic-freedom.html](http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/other-faculty-policies/academic-freedom.html).
SECTION 5. PROCESS AND PROCEDURE: GENERAL OVERVIEW

5.1. In the case of all grievances, attempts shall be made to settle the dispute by informal discussions between the concerned parties. If a faculty member’s grievance is not settled informally at the level of the Associate Dean, Associate Dean of Academic and Faculty Affairs, or the SPS Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the SPS Dean to convoke the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee.

A grievant wishing to bring a matter before the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Committee must submit a Notice of Grievance to the Dean’s Office. The Notice of Grievance shall contain a concise statement of the substance of the complaint, and a summary of the faculty information in support of the complaint, together with documentation, if any.

The SPS Dean shall review the request to ensure it is considered a grievable matter as outlined in Section 4 and shall inform the faculty member accordingly. If the matter is grievable, the SPS Dean shall convene the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee within 15 working days of the receipt of the written request from the grievant. In any instance in which the Dean has not convened the School’s grievance committee within the mandated 15 working days, the faculty member has the right to bring it to the attention of the Office of the Provost. An exception to this may be made only with the consent of the grievant, the SPS Dean, and the Provost.

* Major Recommendation

The requirement that “The SPS Dean shall review the request to ensure it is considered a grievable matter” is not in line with other policies, of which none has such a requirement; moreover, it creates a conflict of interest when the grievant is grieving against the SPS Dean.

Delete the above phrase and insert the following language:

“The SPS Dean shall convene the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee within 15 working days of the receipt of the written request from the grievant.”

Major Recommendation

We strongly recommend the addition of the following language (paraphrased from Liberal Studies and Tandon):

“The SPS Dean shall convene the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee within 15 working days of the receipt of the written request from the grievant.”

Having decided to consider the case, the grievance committee will then hear evidence and report to the Dean in writing on its findings of fact and its opinion on a fair disposition of the case. After considering the advice of the committee, the Dean will inform the grievant in writing of his or her decision, and include a copy of the
committee’s report provided by the committee.”

52. The SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee does not judge the professional merits of the case, but considers the grounds as specified above (Section 4.2.1).

53. The SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall proceed to assemble the relevant facts and may seek additional information or evidence pertinent to the case from appropriate, informed, and relevant sources. The Grievance Advisory Committee shall assess the accuracy, credibility, and relevance of any information it collects. In soliciting information from any third party, rights of privacy and confidentiality shall be protected.

54. After considering the evidence, the Committee should reach a conclusion as to what it deems are the relevant facts, set these forth in writing, and then make a recommendation to the Dean for specific action.

55. After obtaining the recommendation of the grievance committee, the Dean shall decide the case and in writing shall notify the concerned parties and the grievance committee of his or her decision, together with reasons therefore, and information on the procedure for appeal.

Major Recommendation

We strongly recommend the addition of the following (paraphrased from the Liberal Studies and Tandon):

“If the committee’s report is accepted by both the grievant and the Dean, the matter shall be considered settled. However, if the Dean shall deny any findings of fact, or refuse to implement suggestions by the committee made as a part of the committee's recommendations on the disposition of a case, the Dean is required to reply in writing giving in detail his or her reasons. This memorandum must be sent both to the grievant and to the committee.”

56. The parties may reach a mutually agreed upon resolution to the grievance at any time. If they reach such agreement after the Grievance Advisory Committee has begun its work, the parties shall notify in writing the Chair of the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee. The specific terms of the mutually agreed upon resolution need not be shared. The Chair of the Grievance Advisory Committee shall inform the committee of the resolution. The Grievance Advisory Committee shall then cease work upon receipt of such notification and shall have no obligation to enforce the parties’ mutually agreed resolution.

Major Recommendation

Add the following language (quoted from the Liberal Studies and Tandon):
“As a standing committee of the faculty, it must regularly report to the faculty on the number of cases heard or under study and the ultimate disposition of such cases, (for example, amicably settled, on appeal to the Provost or President, or committee report rejected by the Dean).”

SECTION 6. APPEALS

6.1. Appeals from a Dean’s Decision on Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion

6.1.1. Appeals from such decisions can be made only on the following grounds:

• That the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration;
• That the decision violated the academic freedom of the person in question, in which case the burden of proof is on that person.

6.1.2. A faculty member intending to make such an appeal shall indicate such intention in writing to the Provost, specifying all grounds for and materials in support of the appeal within 15 days after receiving written notification of the Dean’s decision. An exception to this may be made only with the consent of the grievant, the Dean, and the Provost.

6.1.3. Where such an appeal is made, the Dean shall transmit to the Provost a report of the proceedings in the case at its earlier stages. The Provost shall in each case obtain the advice of an advisory committee – the Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Committee – drawn from a standing committee that shall consist of the members of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) Grievance Committee and the Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) Grievance Committee; in each case committee members shall be selected by the relevant faculty senators council but need not necessarily be members of the particular council. The Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall consist of three members, none of whom are from the grievant’s school: one from the C-FSC standing committee, one from the T-FSC standing committee, and one senior administrator selected by the Steering Committee of the C-FSC.

6.1.4. The Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall hold a hearing and shall complete its deliberations and notify the Provost of its recommendations preferably within 30 days of the close of the hearing, but in any case, within sixty days. The Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall at all times follow the requisites of fair and equitable hearing, but it is not to be restricted by the technical rules of evidence or the formality of the adversary proceeding as in a court trial. In each case, the Committee shall determine its own procedure, adapting the requirements of the particular case to the equity of the situation. This shall include, for example, the question of a record of the hearing, the examination of witnesses, the schedule and public nature of meetings, etc. The grievant, however, may determine whether he or she shall have the aid of an advisor or counsel.

6.1.5. The Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall not judge professional merits, but only ascertain whether procedural safeguards have been
observed. Evidence that a decision appealed is so arbitrary that it has no rational foundation may be considered on the issue of “inadequate consideration.”

6.1.6. After receiving the advice of the Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee, the Provost shall decide the case and notify the grievant, the Dean and the Chairperson of the Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee. If the advice of the latter is not followed, the reasons shall be reported with the decision. The Provost’s decision is final and subject to no further review.

6.2. Appeals from a Dean’s Decision on Other Matters Such as Duties, Salaries, Perquisites, and Working Conditions

6.2.1. Appeals from such decisions can be made only on the following grounds:
• That the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration;
• That the decision violated the academic freedom of the person in question, in which case the burden of proof is on that person.

6.2.2. Where such an appeal is desired by a Continuing Contract faculty member, the faculty member must inform the Provost in writing within 15 days after he or she is notified of the Dean’s decision. The Provost shall then make informal procedures available.

SECTION 7. GRIEVANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

7.1 In order to adjudicate formal faculty grievances there shall be established a Full-Time Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee to the SPS Dean in the following manner:

7.1.1. The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee will consist of full-time faculty from across the SPS, with no more than one (1) member from each academic unit.

7.1.2. Members of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall be elected by the faculty at-large for a two-year term.

7.1.3. The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall not include deans, department chairpersons or academic directors, or any faculty member whose primary assignment is administrative in an academic unit or in the SPS Office of the Dean and who are not covered by the *NYUSPS Standards and Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty (“FTCCF”) policies.*

7.1.4. The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall elect a Chairperson at the beginning of each academic year.

7.1.5. A member of the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee may not take part in a review when the grievant is from her or his academic unit.

7.1.6. Any member of the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance
Advisory Committee who has a conflict of interest regarding a particular faculty grievance shall recuse himself or herself from serving on that grievance review. Any member of the grievance committee who has a conflict of interest regarding a particular faculty grievance shall inform the Chairperson of the issue as immediately as awareness permits and a determination should be made accordingly.

7.2 The SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall consist of three standing members and two alternates of and elected by the SPS Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, as documented in the SPS Faculty Council Charter and who are covered by NYUSPS Standards and Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment of Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty (“FTCCF”) policies.

The Faculty Handbook provides that Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty are to serve on the committee for FTCCF grievances; however, as the SPS Faculty is primarily Continuing Contract Faculty, it is not always possible to include Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty. When possible, a Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty member from SPS, if such person exists on the faculty and is elected by the voting members of the faculty to serve on the committee, shall also serve on the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee.

All elected committee members will serve two-year terms (standing and alternate). To ensure continuity and overlap, a one-time exception will be made to initiate the committee. The first committee will have one standing and one alternate member who will serve a three-year term each. Annual elections will be conducted thereafter to elect new members. The sequence will be to elect two then three new members in alternate years (see Appendix 1).
8. **APPENDIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NYUSPS Full-time Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Committee Terms of Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Elect 3  
3) Elect 2  
4) Elect 3  
5) Elect 3  
6) Elect 2  
7) Elect 2  
8) Elect 3  
9) Elect 2
Committee on Faculty Benefits and Housing
Report for the C-FSC meeting of April 21, 2020

We have received word from the Benefits Office that implementation of the streamlined retirement plan investment options has been deferred in view of the novel corona virus pandemic. If not later this year, we can likely expect it to be rolled-out early in 2021.

Because of the state stay-at-home order, the May 4th meeting with the finalists who responded to the medical benefits provider request for proposals will likely now take place via videoconference.

It is too early to know what the costs of COVID-19 related medical benefits will be, though early estimates show them to be manageable. For now they are also being countered by savings due, e.g., to elective surgeries being postponed. We will have a better sense of projected costs for the current year and the impact on premiums for 2021 at our regular summer meeting with Willis Towers Watson, the University’s benefits consultants.

The University is working with NYU Langone on a plan to waive copays for primary care and obstetrics/gynecology, which they are hopeful can be ready to announce in the coming months.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi,
chair
At our March meeting, the committee met with Dean Maria Montoya from NYU Shanghai. The main topic of discussion was the NYU Shanghai Faculty Committee’s Affordability Subcommittee Report. Dean Montoya provided further background about employment and housing issues for Chinese Language Lecturers at NYU Shanghai.

After deferring our discussion about this issue at the March C-FSC meeting, we expect to present the report and a committee resolution to the C-FSC meeting on April 21.

Over the winter break, our committee received two Continuing-Contract Faculty Reappointment & Promotion policies from the Provost: the School for Professional Studies (SPS) and the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences.

Our SPS Recommendations are attached. Our committee met with the T-FSC PPTM (Personnel Polices and Tenure Modifications Committee), and we are pleased to report that the two committees have agreed upon a joint set of recommendations. We are awaiting the decision of the T-FSC; a vote will be taken at their next meeting on May 7th.

We have met with several contract faculty members from Courant, and we are about 80% finished. Once approved by our committee, we will meet with the T-FSC PPTM Committee. Our goal is to submit our recommendations to the C-FSC before our last council meeting, so that this policy may be in place for next year.

Respectfully submitted,

Heidi White, Chair

Members: David Barnes, Fidelindo Lim, Pamela Pietro, Antonios Saravanos, Geoff Shullenberg, Gioia Stevens – and Edward Kleinert (volunteer)
The Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) last met on April 8, 2020. The committee reviewed two new minors:

a) Minor in Robotics (Tandon): The minor was recommended for approval, contingent on clarifying non-Tandon equivalents for electives within the minor. The 16-credit minor includes the following courses: ROB-UY 2004 - Robotic Manipulation and Locomotion; ROB-UY 3203 - Robotic Vision; ROB-UY 3303 - Robot Motion and Planning; ROB-UY 3404 - Haptics and TeleRobotics in Medicine. The minor requires prerequisites in computer science, mathematics, and physics.

b) Minor in Feminism and STEM (Tandon): The minor was recommended for approval with no conditions. The 16-credit minor, which addresses the role of gender in shaping STEM and the social effects of STEM fields on gender, has one required course (STS-UY 3904 – Special Topics in STS: Introduction to FSTEM) and three electives that can be selected from a comprehensive list of courses throughout the University.

c) The committee reviewed a Memo of Intent, also from Tandon, for a new minor in Technology, Management, and Design. The 16-credit minor is designed to incorporate design thinking into the technology and management STEM sphere. The core course for the minor is MG-UY 2704 Design Thinking for Creative Problem Solving. Students will then choose 3 electives looking at design strategies, human-centered product design, service design innovation, entrepreneurship, and special topics in management.