



MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 11, 2017

The New York University Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at 9:00 AM on Thursday, May 11, 2017 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Borowiec, Carl, Celik, Elcott, Ferguson, Halpin, Herman, Howard-Spink, Jahangiri, Killilea, Kim, Mooney, Morton, Paiz, Sacks, Steeves, Stehlik, Stewart, White, Ying, and Youngerman; Alternate Senators Cittadino, Lee, Renzi, Ritter, and Smith.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD APRIL 25, 2017

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the April 25, 2017 meeting were approved unanimously.

MESSAGE FROM THE VICE CHAIRPERSON: MARY KILLILEA

Vice Chairperson Killilea announced this is Chairperson Carl's last meeting as Chair and member of the Council. She noted he has moved the goals of the Council forward and elevated the view of continuing contract faculty at the University. C-Faculty may have different roles in the university but they are not lesser roles in the university and that has been Chairperson's Carl stance from the beginning of the planning committee through today. She expressed the Council's thanks and offered a gift from the Council for his service.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: FRED CARL

See attached Document A: C-FSC Chair Update

Discussion/Questions on Chair's Report

School of Professional Studies (SPS)

A Senator asked about the SPS report. Chairperson Carl re-stated that on Monday, May 8, 2017, 10 continuing contract faculty members from the Paul McGee Division of the School for Professional Studies were informed by their Dean and their division head that their contracts would not be renewed. This raises a host of troubling issues, including the timing of the decision, questions regarding meaningful consultation with faculty members and the availability of career development review to assess whether those faculty members who were terminated would be able to function in any new restructuring of the division.

There is concern that the progress made in terms of recognizing the value of continuing contract faculty as faculty who are deeply committed to their students and the University, faculty who are capable of understanding

and actively, and productively, engaging in working with School administrations to solve serious curricular and enrollment issues, has seen uneven acceptance at some Schools, and this is deeply troubling.

A Senator asked on the timeline for informing faculty of contract renewal.

Senators discussed making a statement. It was noted the faculty members are still in the processing of negotiating severance packages and signing non-disclosure agreements and the Council would not want to effect these negotiations with a public statement.

A Senator expressed his concern over the issue that the program closure took place without faculty consultation, notice, communication of budget numbers, or discussion of strategic planning. He suggested the Steering Committee make a statement expressing concern with the way in which this strategic decision was made.

A Senator expressed concern in making a statement without discussion with the 10 faculty members affected.

Steering Committee Letter to C-FSC on Continuing Faculty Participation in University Joint Shared Governance, dated May 5, 2017

Senators discussed the letter from the Steering Committee. A Senator asked for clarification on the statement that if a Union represented full-time continuing contract faculty, the C-FSC would cease to exist and all current direct participation in governance would be replaced by Union representatives, not C-faculty. She noted the by-laws state the C-FSC exists and members belong on committees. It was noted the by-laws change, and changed to include the C-FSC.

It was noted in the discussions prior to the creation of the C-FSC, the conversation focused on the two pathways of unionization and participating in governance at the university. In those discussions it was clear while there is a history of shared governance and unionization at other institutions, it would unlikely be the case at this institution. Reasons included NYU is a private, not public institution and only a fraction of the faculty and not the entire faculty would be unionized. It was noted that the adjuncts, who are part of a union, do not sit on any committees, they do not have a Council, and they are not involved in shared governance at any level.

A Senator commented it seems a negative public statement for the administration to remove more than half of the NYU faculty from a role in governance because some of its members have formed a union.

A Senator noted C-Faculty may not be eligible to join a union under NLRB's set of standards for evaluating whether faculty members are managerial. One of the primary tests is recommendations on fiscal matters are not taken. However, the C-FSC's recent recommendation regarding the new base salary for continuing contract faculty was approved.

A Senator offered some history as a member of the core organizing group for the adjuncts when the union vote took place. She noted after the vote, faculty members were taken off the finance committee and no longer negotiated pay and benefits.

A Senator questioned why the C-faculty would be taken off non-finance related committees.

A Senator expressed her disagreement with the lack of open discussion on this issue. She noted any Senator engaging in these conversations should have brought the issue to the Council.

It was noted some faculty members involved in these discussions fear retaliation.

A Senator noted he would have difficulty going back his constituents to discuss because he does not have concrete facts on what it would mean to unionize.

The Chair's Report was accepted into the minutes.

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE

Presentation, discussion and vote on recommendations to FAS Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion

See attached Documents C: FAS Clinical and D: FAS Language Lecturer

Senator Mooney presented the Committee's recommendations.

The following amendments to the recommendations regarding FAS Policies and Procedures Recruitment of New Faculty Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor NYU Faculty of Arts and Science were discussed:

Amendment 1: Addition of the following recommendation

Page 2, Titles and Qualifications, paragraph 3:

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

Recommendation

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

Amendment 2: Addition of the following recommendation

Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 5

The passage reads, "Candidates are eligible for five-year reappointment contracts at all ranks only if they have been at NYU for at least six years and have had at least one contract renewal at NYU."

There is no explanation as to what "eligibility" means, how "eligibility" is decided, or who decides "eligibility."

Recommendation

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

Amendment 3: Addition of the following recommendation

Page 6. Formal Review Process, Promotion, section I, following paragraph 2

There is no mention of an increase in contract length upon promotion.

Recommendation

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

Amendment 4: Addition of the following recommendation

Page 6. Formal Review Process, Promotion, section I, following paragraph 2

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

Recommendation

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

The following amendments to the recommendations regarding the FAS Policies and Procedures Recruitment of New Faculty Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointments NYU Faculty of Arts and Science were discussed.

Amendment 1: Addition of the following recommendation

Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 4, first bulletpoint: Senior Language Lecturers

The passage reads, "Senior Language Lecturers: the initial appointment is for one to three years. The subsequent reappointment(s) can be made for one to five years. There is no limit to the number of terms that a Senior Language Lecturer can be reappointed."

Recommendation

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

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

Amendment 2: Addition of the following recommendation

Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 4, first bulletpoint, Senior Language Lecturers

The passage reads, "The subsequent reappointment(s) can be made for one to five years." This passage may allow shorter subsequent contracts after promotion. Subsequent reappointment contracts should be no shorter than the previous appointment contract.

Recommendation

We recommend the following, "Subsequent contracts will be for at least 5 years."

Amendment 3: Addition of the following recommendation

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

Recommendation

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

Amendment 4: Addition of the following recommendation

Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 3, sentence 1:

Language Lecturers: the initial appointment can be made for one to three years.

Recommendation

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

The amendments were approved by vote of the Council. The recommendations of the C-FSC in regard to: FAS Policies and Procedures Recruitment of New Faculty Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor NYU Faculty of Arts and Science and the recommendations of the C-FSC in regard to: FAS Policies and Procedures Recruitment of New Faculty Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer Appointments NYU Faculty of Arts and Science were approved by vote of the Council.

Discussion and vote on Recommendations on Student Evaluations prepared by the Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee

See attached Document E: Educational Policies recommendations.

Senator Stewart presented the Committee recommendations.

A Senator commented on the low response rate since switching to electronic evaluations and suggested adding criteria on a minimum response rate to be considered valid. It was noted that schools have varying practice on incentives for completing evaluations, such as grade release, monetary gift certificates, or no incentives.

Senators questioned if the evaluations are determined by schools independently. A Senator stated the evaluations for undergraduate students would be consistent across the University.

It was noted that evaluations are used in accreditation. Senators discussed that evaluations are needed to avoid an unregulated system of evaluations, offering the example of Rate My Professor.

A Senator asked for a closer look into the value of student satisfaction rating in the evaluation of teaching.

A Senator also asked for the addition of student evaluation questions within the course evaluation and suggested questions such as "how would you rank your effort in this course?" and "what grade do you expect to receive?" She also recommended that faculty see individual responses, and not just the average result.

It was noted these recommendations would be sent to the Provost Office to then get involvement from institutional research. The report would also be posted on the C-FSC website in order for faculty to continue the conversation with their Dean.

A Senator noted while the push is to have a universal seven question form, the practices of incentives and other employment of the evaluations is not universal across schools.

A Senator noted the literature shows that there is no relationship to student satisfaction to teaching effectiveness. The real teaching effectiveness is looking at grades as well as course composition as well as peer evaluation and self-evaluation. She suggested the Council ask the Office of the Provost, not to redefine how to interpret these, but for an institutional group to define what NYU considers teaching effectiveness.

The recommendations were approved by vote of the Council.

STEERING COMMITTEE ELECTION

Chairperson Carl read the list of nominations for the seven members of the Steering Committee for academic year 2017-2018:

Name	School	Term end
John Gershman	Wagner Graduate School of Public Service	2018
Leila Jahangiri	College of Dentistry	2019
Mary Killilea	Faculty of Arts and Science	2018
Larry Slater	Rory Meyers College of Nursing	2017
Susan Stehlik	Stern School of Business	2018
Beverly Watkins	College of Global Public Health	2019
Patrick Ying	School of Medicine	2017

All nominees agreed to run. Carl asked for any additional nominations from the floor. No additional nominations were made.

It was noted the terms of two of the nominees end in spring 2017. Carl stated if these nominees are elected to serve on the Steering Committee, but are not re-elected by their School, they will step down from the Steering Committee and the election for the open positions will be conducted at the first meeting of fall 2017.

Chairperson Carl asked the Council if there was any objection to voting by unanimous consent. The motion to allow for vote by acclamation was approved by unanimous vote of the Council.

The election took place by acclamation. In academic year 2017-2018, the above Senators will serve as the Steering Committee members.

NEW BUSINESS

Provost Responses to Recommendations

A Senator inquired on the status of posting the Provost's responses to C-FSC recommendations or resolutions on the C-FSC website. Chairperson Carl noted some of the responses are in the form of red-lined draft documents, which will not be posted online. The Steering Committee discussed with the Provost the possibility of providing clear responses that could be posted online.

Ideascale

A Senator asked if the Council had interest in setting up the online idea forum, Ideascale, to gather ideas and suggestions from faculty constituents with the ability to discuss and vote. The Council did not express interest.

Retreat

A Senator suggested a member from the University administration be invited to offer a presentation at the retreat on what a union would mean for faculty governance. It was noted this might be a better opportunity for the Steering Committee, rather than dedicating the retreat to this topic. The Retreat Committee will discuss.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.

**C-FSC—Chair's Report
Chairperson Fred Carl**

Report as of May 8, 2017

1. Action Items

We will have a number of items up for discussion and voting at the meeting on Tuesday, May 11, 2017:

- 1) FAS policy;
- 2) Report on Student Evaluations (Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee—Ben Stewart)
- 3) Voting and selection of Steering Committee for AY 2017-2018.

2. SPS

On Monday, May 8, 2017, 10 continuing contract faculty members from the Paul McGee Division of the School for Professional Studies were informed by their Dean and their division head that their contracts would not be renewed. This raises a host of troubling issues, including the timing of the decision, questions regarding meaningful consultation with faculty members and the availability of career development review to assess whether those faculty members who were terminated would be able to function in any new restructuring of the division.

There is concern that the progress made in terms of recognizing the value of continuing contract faculty as faculty who are deeply committed to their students and the University, faculty who are capable of understanding and actively, and productively, engaging in working with School administrations to solve serious curricular and enrollment issues, has seen uneven acceptance at some Schools, and this is deeply troubling.

3. Steering Committee Letter to C-FSC on Continuing Faculty Participation in University Joint Shared Governance, dated May 5, 2017

You will all have received the letter from the Steering Committee recommending that senators and alternate senators have discussions and conversations concerning the possible benefits of unionization versus the danger of losing direct faculty voice and participation if faculty votes to unionize.

4. C-FSC Retreat

Our 2017 C-FSC Retreat will be on Wednesday, May 24, 2017, from 10:00am-4:00pm in Kimmel 405/406.

5. C-FSC Meeting Participation

The Steering Committee strongly urges all C-FSC members, Senators and Alternate Senators, to attend and participate in C-FSC meetings and committees. Our Rules of Procedure stipulate that only Senators may vote on any action items (Alternate Senators vote when their corresponding Senator is unable to attend). It should be kept in mind that votes on Action Items comprise a relatively small part of our meetings. The bulk of our meetings consist of in-depth discussions of items of importance to continuing contract faculty by all members of the C-FSC, Senators and Alternate Senators included, and all committees and discussions rely on participation by the full Council.

6. Publications, Performances, Awards and Distinctions

Please mention any awards, publications, performances and distinctions at the meeting.

7. Thank you!

It has been a great privilege to serve as Chair of the C-FSC for these past 2 years. I think that we have begun the very important work of changing the culture of NYU, particularly the recognition that continuing contract faculty are not lesser faculty. We provide the backbone of the excellent teaching faculty at NYU, we are deeply involved in research, whether that is understood in the traditional sense of research in the hard and social sciences and the humanities, or in the more correctly expansive sense of research as the discovery of new knowledge, including the knowledge of how to live and feel as a human being in relation to other human beings. Through our work on committees and in less formal situations with tenured faculty, students, administrators, deans and the senior leadership, we have and will continue make change, even understanding that deep change is a long game. What I see as the uneven acceptance of us as vital, full collaborators in the excellence of the University remains very troubling and will remain one of the challenges of moving forward. My hope is that everyone across the University will see us as the students see us, without distinction between rank and contract type. To them we aren't tenured and continuing contract; we are simply THE faculty who create and disseminate new knowledge and ways of understanding the world through our work in classrooms, labs, studios, and libraries.

I would like to also thank everyone who participated in the Planning Committee and all the senators and alternate senators who have served, and who continue to serve, and a special thanks to the members of the Steering Committee: Vice Chair Mary Killilea, Susan Stehlik, Patrick Ying, John Halpin, Larry Slater and Joe Borowiec for their commitment and hard work. And, always, a MASSIVE thank you to Karyn Ridder for everything that you do for us!

Thank You!

C-FSC Communications Committee

May 11, 2017

Since the last C-FSC meeting, we have hired a newsletter designer, Jason Lin, who will be responsible for design and layout but not content. We are also currently involved in planning the retreat.

Respectfully submitted,
Vicky Steeves

Report of the C-FSC Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee

Committee members:

Spiros Frangos, Neal Herman, Brian Mooney, Deborah Smith, Ben Stewart (chair).

The committee has revised its “Recommendations on Student Evaluations” to incorporate feedback from the April 25th C-FSC meeting. Additions include: a request to revise or delete the global questions on the NYU evaluation; a call for evaluations to be used primarily to evaluate courses rather than instructors; a caution against comparisons among programs, departments, or schools; a call to ensure the confidentiality of qualitative questions.

Those additions also required some structural changes: whereas the previous report was divided in two (one half of which was slated to go to the Provost’s office and one for the website) it’s now framed as a single report.

Finally, the current draft adds to the prior draft’s discussion of the complex relations between grade inflation and student evaluations. To further this discussion, the report includes data that compare EWP’s grading practices with those of CAS more generally.

We’d like to discuss this report and bring it to a vote: to both post the recommendations on the C-FSC website and send them to the Provost’s office.

Respectfully submitted, Ben Stewart

Report of the Personnel Policies and Contract Issues Committee

Brian Mooney (Chair), John Halpin, Heidi White, Lu Zhang

May 7, 2017

1. We have completed our review of the final two policies on contract faculty appointment, reappointment and promotion presented to us this year. We are submitting our recommendations on the FAS Clinical Faculty Policy and the FAS Language Lecturer Policy to the C-FSC for approval at our May 11, 2017 meeting. Given time constraints, we have not been able to coordinate review of these policies with the T-FSC and, as such, we will be submitting independent recommendations to the Provost.
2. As we discuss these two sets of recommendations, we would like to discuss in particular a difference of opinion that has taken place in the committee over a particular issue. The issue concerns the length of contract a faculty member will receive upon promotion to either Associate Clinical Professor or Senior Lecturer. One point of view is that the initial term could be either three years or five years. The other point of view is that the initial appointment shall be five years in both cases. We would like to debate this issue in the C-FSC and approve the final set of recommendations with an appropriate amendment (if necessary) following a discussion of this issue. The issue is one that we believe deserves more inclusive discussion and it was raised in a different context at our last C-FSC meeting in April.
3. Finally, I would like briefly to mention the status of the policy in the School of Professional Studies (which I represent as Senator representing the contract faculty) where the faculty has recently voted to reject the policy presented to them for a vote.

Senate Academic Affairs Committee (SAAC) Report
May 11th, 2017

Committee Members: Peggy Morton, Ezra Sacks, Ben Stewart (Chair)

On Thursday, May 4th, Ben Stewart participated in a call with the Registrar and the Provost's office: the Registrar wanted clarification on how to implement the committee's redesign of the Founders' Day Award. The question related to the Founders' Day guidelines that, instead of a GPA cutoff, now stipulate that a percentage of the class will receive the award. Given that class percentages are a moving target, the Registrar needed some way to establish a baseline. We decided to follow the procedure used in calculating Latin honors, which use the GPA percentages of the previous year's class as the baseline.

Respectfully submitted by Ben Stewart

SCOG presented its final report on Senate Function to the University Senate at its meeting on April 27, 2017. In addition, SCOG proposed amendments to the University Senate Bylaws Sections 65 through 69 (including Section 66 - The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council). The amendments were approved by the Senate.

John Gershman
Brian Mooney
Vincent Renzi
Larry Slater

Report of Representatives to the Ad Hoc Committee on Tuition Remission and Portable Tuition Benefits

The committee made a report to the Senate on April 27, 2017, on its work during 2016-2017. The committee's charge will be extended through 2017-2018, in order to develop recommendations based on this year's study and survey results.

The committee met later in the day on April 27, 2017. Present for the C-FSC was Vincent Renzi. It was agreed that the group would work over the summer to develop preliminary recommendations to bring to the AMC, C-FSC, and T-FSC for discussion in the fall.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi

NYU GRADUATE PROGRAM COMMITTEE

NYU GPC met Wednesday, May 3rd, 2017. It should be noted a new procedure of introducing Memos of Intent before formal voting is very effective and allows deeper discussion before the final voting.

Following New Program Proposals were presented and approved:

- Master of Science in Dental Sciences – College of Dentistry
- Master of Science in Computer Science and Entrepreneurship - Graduate School of Arts and Science
- Master of Science in Global Security, Conflict and Cybercrime - SPS
- Master of Science in Applied Fashion Merchandising - SPS
- Master of Science in Organization Management and Strategy – Stern and NYU Shanghai

I can provide details if requested.

Respectfully submitted.

Iskender Sahin

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

Background

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

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

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

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

Major Substantive Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

Given the letter from President Andrew Hamilton of April 18, 2017, which promotes professional development for continuing contract faculty, we recommend the

removal of a complete ban on sabbaticals and the consideration of semester long developmental or research leaves, similar to those granted in Gallatin, LS, and SPS.

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

13. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 7, sentence 2:
In rare instances, a one-semester appointment as a Clinical Assistant Professor may be made to ...

Recommendation

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

14. Page 4. Procedures for Reappointment, General Considerations, paragraph 2, sentence:

Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvement in academic programs.

Recommendation

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

15. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 4:

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

Recommendation

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

16. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 4:

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

Recommendation

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

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

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

Recommendation

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

19. Page 5. Formal Review Process, sentence 1:

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

Recommendation

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

20. Page 5. Formal Review Process, sentence 4:

In any event, the committee shall not include a clinical faculty member under review for reappointment that year.

Recommendation

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

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

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

Recommendation

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

22. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, paragraph 3, sentence 1:

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

Recommendation

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

23. Page 7. Formal Review Process, section II, paragraph 3, item 5:

An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:

- A. Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
- B. Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
- C. Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

["http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html"](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html)as.nyu.edu

HYPERSLINK "http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html"/object/HYPERSLINK

"http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html"aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html), as adapted below:

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

26. Page 8. Formal Review Process, section III, paragraph 1, sentence 3:

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

28. The policy does not specify the process according to which the divisional dean communicates with the Dean about the reappointment to ensure that the school Dean

receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendations of the divisional dean.

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

Add language detailing the process to be followed if the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the divisional dean and/or the review committee, similar to that found on the FAS website: "PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion" for clinical faculty:

([http://HYPERLINK](#)

["http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html"](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html)as.nyu.edu

HYPERLINK ["http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html"](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html)/object/
HYPERLINK

["http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html"](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html)aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html), as adapted below:

"If the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the departmental evaluation committee or the divisional dean, the Dean will provide the committee with the reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's decision is finalized."

31. Page 9. Faculty Grievances, paragraph 2, item 4:

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

Recommendation

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

Minor Substantive Recommendations

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

34. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 5:

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

Editorial Recommendations

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

Recommendation

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

37. Page 3. Annual Review:
24. Clinical faculty are subject to ...

Recommendation

Since there is only one paragraph in this section, a bullet is unnecessary, and should be deleted.

38. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 1, sentence 6:

In the event of a decision to reappoint the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another multi-year term.

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

**Recommendations of the C-FSC in regard to:
FAS Policies and Procedures
Recruitment of New Faculty
Language Lecturer and Senior Language Lecturer
Appointments
NYU Faculty of Arts and Science**

Background

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

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

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

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

Major Substantive Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

Given the letter from President Andrew Hamilton of April 18, 2017, which promotes professional development for continuing contract faculty, we recommend the

removal of a complete ban on sabbaticals and the consideration of semester long developmental or research leaves, similar to those granted in Gallatin, LS, and SPS.

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

9. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 4, sentence 1:
Senior Language Lecturers: the initial appointment is for one to three years.

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

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

Recommendation

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

13. Page 3. Terms of Appointment, item 6, sentence 2:

In rare instances, a one-semester appointment as a Language Lecturer may be made to ...

Recommendation

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

14. Page 4. Procedures for Reappointment, General Considerations, paragraph 2, sentence:

Even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular and structural changes and improvement in academic programs.

Recommendation

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

15. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 4:

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

Recommendation

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

16. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 4:

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

Recommendation

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

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

19. Page 5. Formal Review Process, sentence 1:

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

Recommendation

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

20. Page 5. Formal Review Process, sentence 4:

In any event, the committee shall not include a Language Lecturer or Senior Language Lecturer under review for reappointment that year.

Recommendation

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

21. Page 5. Formal Review Process, section I, sentence 2:

A review for promotion to Senior Language Lecturer is mandatory in the sixth year of service.

Recommendation

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

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

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

Recommendation

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

23. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, paragraph 3, item 5:

An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:

- A. Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
- B. Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
- C. Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

Specify that a majority vote of the departmental review committee shall be required for a successful review for a recommendation for reappointment and that all votes

shall be by secret ballot. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

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

Recommendation

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

["http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html"](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html)as.nyu.edu

HYPERLINK

["http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html"/object/](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html)

HYPERLINK

["http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html"](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html)aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html), as adapted below:

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

26. Page 7. Formal Review Process, section III, paragraph 1, sentence 3:
The Deans may consult with faculty from academic departments other than the candidate's home department.

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

should include the length of reappointment/appointment, and a signature block for the faculty member.”

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation

Add language detailing the process to be followed if the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the divisional dean and/or the review committee, similar to that found on the FAS website: "PROCEDURES for Reappointment and/or Promotion" for language lecturers:

([http:// HYPERLINK](#)

["http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html"](http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html)as.nyu.edu

HYPERLINK

"<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html>"/object/

HYPERLINK

"<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html>"aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html), as adapted below:

"If the decision of the Dean of Arts and Science is contrary to that of the departmental evaluation committee or the divisional dean, the Dean will provide the committee with the reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's decision is finalized."

31. Page 9. Faculty Grievances, paragraph 2, item 4:

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

Recommendation

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

Minor Substantive Recommendations

32. Page 1. I Introduction, paragraph 1, sentence 2:

"Appointees must be experienced in their particular fields ..."

Recommendation

Since initial appointment Language Lecturers might not have significant work experience in their field, we recommend the replacement of "experienced" by "highly knowledgeable".

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

Recommendation

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

34. Page 5. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 5:

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

Recommendation

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

35. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, paragraph 3, sentence 1:

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

Recommendation

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

Editorial Recommendations

36. Page 2. Terms of Appointment, item 3:

"**Length of Appointment** - Language Lecturers: the initial appointment ..."

Recommendation

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

37. Page 4. Reappointment for Multi-Year Contracts of Three Years or More, and/or Promotion, paragraph 1, sentence 6:

In the event of a decision to reappoint the faculty member shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another multi-year term.

Recommendation

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

38. Page 5. Formal Review Process, section I, title:

PROMOTION

Recommendation

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

39. Page 6. Formal Review Process, section II, title:

DEPARTMENT

Recommendation

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

40. Page 7. Formal Review Process, section III, title:

FAS DEAN'S OFFICE

Recommendation

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

*Continuing/ Contract Faculty Senate Recommendations
On Student Evaluations:*

Report Prepared by the C-FSC Educational Policies and Faculty/Student Relations Committee

Committee Members:

Ben Stewart, Chair, Faculty of Arts and Science
Spiros Frangos, School of Medicine
Neal Herman, College of Dentistry
Brian Mooney, School of Professional Studies
Deborah Smith, School of Professional Studies

Date: 5/11/2017

Introduction

The evaluation of teaching poses a range of problems, not least of which is that the precise assessment of a teacher's classroom performance entails high costs. Moreover, when assessing the performance of full-time, non-tenured faculty, this problem becomes especially visible. Whereas tenured faculty assessments tend to rely on scholarship as a measure of performance, there is no equivalent avenue for the assessment of continuing/contract faculty. For the latter group, the obvious, easily available measure for the assessment of teaching has been student evaluations.

Given this situation, we seek to ensure that student evaluations of teaching (SET) are used primarily in the interests of identifying and cultivating good teaching. We are especially concerned with this issue given that a number of studies have raised concerns about various kinds of bias within teaching evaluations. Moreover, within the scholarship on SETs, there is an ongoing debate about problems with global measures of teaching (i.e., general questions about the instructor or the class).

Due to these concerns, we propose four sets of recommendations, two of which request collaboration with the Provost's office and two of which make more general recommendations. The recommendations addressed to the Provost's office focus on the revision and assessment of NYU SETs. Our other recommendations address issues related to the use of SETs for assessment.

Requests for Collaboration with the Provost's office:

I. Recommendations for the Revision and Assessment of NYU's SET system

1. We recommend that NYU's Office of Institutional Research examine the extent to which the gender, age, and race of teachers and students affects student evaluations.
2. We recommend the revision or deletion of the evaluation's global measures (See Appendix A, questions 1 and 2: "Overall evaluation of the instructor(s)," and

“Overall evaluation of the course”). If questions 1 and 2 are revised, we recommend that they be replaced with more specific questions.

3. While those global measures remain in place, we recommend that NYU’s Office of Institutional Research examine the extent to which students’ responses to those questions correlate with or diverge from the their answers to the evaluaton’s more specific questions.

II. Recommendations for the Customization of Evaluation Questions at the School Level:

1. Continuing/contract faculty should be represented on the School-level committees that develop and revise evaluation questions for the customizable portion of the NYU evaluation. These faculty members should be elected faculty representatives (either from School- or University-level bodies).
2. Quantitative questions should err on the side of asking about specific rather than general aspects of the class and the teaching (see footnote 1).
3. Qualitative (short answer) questions should be framed so as to encourage specificity in students’ answers. Consider the qualitative question on the customized portion of CAS evaluation: “Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.” We see that question as a good model in that it encourages students to focus on a concrete skill that they took from the class.

Recommendations for Using SETs as Assessment Tools

III. Recommendations for Teachers Who Are Up for Reappointment and/or Promotion.

1. Faculty members should carefully review the evaluations and consider whether the responses suggest worthy changes in pedagogy.
2. We recommend that faculty consider evaluations in the context of longer-term patterns of response. While we know that the responses in any one class or for any one semester are not necessarily indicative of much, patterns that persist over time and across different courses are stronger indicators of areas for improvement.
3. Departments and programs should establish peer mentoring or other forms of peer support to cultivate faculty reflection on their evaluations, particularly in relation to reappointment. We recommend that these peer interactions include discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of including reflections on evaluations in reappointment and promotion documents (how much or how little to include, how best to frame those reflections, etc.).

IV. Recommendations Related to Administrative Assessment.

1. SETs (despite their name) should primarily be used to assess aspects of the curriculum rather than to evaluate the performance of individual teachers.
2. Comparison of SETs among programs, departments, or schools should be avoided.
3. Evaluations of faculty should avoid the use of quantitative data from student evaluations. School-based Reappointment and Promotion (R&P) recommendations should be re-examined to address this recommendation. At most, such numbers should be used to sensitize the reading of qualitative data.
4. To the extent that quantitative data are considered, they should only be examined longitudinally. A given class or semester may be an outlier. At best, quantitative may suggest a trend in teaching quality over a period of time.
5. For a given class, R&P recommendations should attend carefully to the statistical validity of the sample (both in terms of the size of the class and the response rate).
6. Student evaluations are best examined holistically. The faculty member familiar with the course and with the students enrolled in it can often put student responses in context. Deans and administrators should be discouraged from looking at the student responses without discussing them with the faculty member; faculty should have an opportunity to explain the context for students' responses. The faculty member is likely to have valuable insight into which of the student narrative responses are worthy of consideration and which ones are either incorrect or false claims, or are possibly motivated by some other personal reason.
7. Beyond administrators, R&P committees, and those involved in program assessment, qualitative data should remain confidential.

Background for C-FSC Recommendations on Evaluations

We are concerned that SETs may not always work in the interests of the evaluated faculty members or to the institutions to which they belong. A number of recent studies (Anderson and Miller 1997; Basow 1995; Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016; Cramer and Alexitch 2000; Stark and Freishtat 2014) have questioned the validity of SETs. These studies suggest that SETs exhibit a range of student biases with respect to gender, ethnicity, and age. Some of these distortions are complexly layered. For instance, Basow (1995) finds evidence that the gender of the student is significant, as is the academic division in which evaluations take place:

male faculty are perceived and evaluated similarly by their male and female students, whereas female faculty tend to be evaluated differently, depending on the divisional affiliation of the course. Female faculty tend to be rated highly by their female students,

especially in the humanities, but less positively by their male students, especially in the social sciences (664).

Such evidence led us to our first recommendation, that NYU’s Office of Institutional Research should “examine the extent to which the gender, age, and race of teachers and students has effects on student evaluations.”

Additionally, we are concerned with the general character of the first two questions on NYU’s evaluation, which led us to our second recommendation, namely, the “revision or deletion of the evaluation’s global measures” (See Appendix A, questions 1 and 2). During the period in which those questions remain on the evaluation, we also hope that the Office of Institutional Research will “examine whether students’ responses to the global questions correlate with or diverge from the their answers to the evaluation’s more specific questions.”

On the issue of “global measures,” Gravestock and Gregor-Greenleaf (2008) argue that “Most attempts to identify particular characteristics of effective teaching stem from a belief that teaching should be measured according to multiple aspects or categories of teaching activity” (31). However, they also note lingering questions about how to present overall measures of teaching—should measures of multiple dimensions be averaged, or is there value to questions that call for overall, global evaluations of teaching?

While there is no consensus on the value or dangers of global questions, Gravestock and Gregor-Greenleaf end their discussion of that issue with a caution about questions such as those “that ask students if they would recommend the course to others” (32) and they also describe a change that the University of Minnesota made to their student evaluation. In 2007 (109),

the University of Minnesota decided to eliminate its global question, “How would you rate the instructor’s overall teaching ability?” The committee charged with revising the instrument argued that this item was too often the only score evaluated in summative teaching assessment, that students have difficulty responding to the question, that the item is not diagnostic and that global questions such as these do not correlate with ratings on questions that review specific teaching characteristics. (32)

Issues with the evaluation instrument may be further complicated as a result of biases that emerge out of the relations between teachers and students. For example, Wolfgang Stroebe (2016) outlines a possible cause of such bias. Stroebe theorizes that, because student evaluations are such important “determinants of academic personnel decisions” (801), teachers may exchange leniency (in the form of inflated grades) for higher student evaluations. In support of his claim, he primarily cites a number of psychological studies that suggest students’ inclination to give teachers lower evaluation scores when they receive lower-than-expected grades. To the extent that teachers make their classes

more lenient as a result of their concerns about evaluation scores, high evaluation scores “reflect[] a bias rather than teaching effectiveness” (800).

Although it’s clear that the linkage between teaching evaluations and reappointment creates incentives for teachers to give higher grades, we are not so certain that grade inflation is a problem among NYU continuing faculty members. In fact, we are concerned that NYU’s continuing faculty may be giving grades that are *lower* than NYU students’ average grades. Consider, for instance, the percentage of A-range grades (A and A-) that the Expository Writing Program (EWP) gives relative to CAS Humanities classes (including EWP) and to CAS in general:

Percentages of A-range grades:

	EWP	CAS Humanities	All of CAS
F 2014	29%	52%	48%
S 2015	45%	60%	52%
F 2015	36%	56%	49%
S 2016	44%	61%	52%

EWP’s faculty includes one tenured faculty member and approximately 105 continuing faculty. Note that, whereas the Fall numbers include the grades of all of the students EWP teaches, the Spring percentages do not include the grades of EWP students in Tisch and Steinhardt (whose Spring classes run under those schools’ course codes). The higher number of A-range grades that EWP faculty give in the Spring may be due to those students having had the experience of a semester of college before they take the course. To the extent that this is so, it points to a structural factor that contributes to EWP giving a lower number of A-range grades—i.e., it makes sense that students would receive lower grades when they are new to college as compared to the grades they receive later; indeed, those lower grades may well play a role in students’ intellectual development. Nonetheless, this structural factor also highlights the difficulty of the teaching role that continuing faculty are often required to embody—that of introducing students to the conventions and expectations of the university in situations where the students often lack a clear sense of why they need to understand those conventions or why they should attend to those expectations.

For the teachers in that position, evaluation numbers may not always provide a clear signal of teaching quality: in some cases, low evaluations may signal rigorous teaching; in other cases high evaluations may signal an avoidance of the difficulties of helping students to take on scholarly conventions, especially when it comes to gaining the knowledge learning practices that will benefit them over the long term. For instance, the results of Carrell and West’s (2010) seven-year-long study, which looked at multiple years of evaluations from 10,534 students, suggest “that evaluations reward professors who increase achievement in the contemporaneous course being taught, not those who increase deep learning” (430). As *continuing* faculty, we want to encourage the kinds of teaching that have larger payoffs down the road, not only for our students, but also for the teachers who will interact and engage with those students in the future. We are concerned that an overvaluing of

SETs—and, separately, a *perception* among faculty that the SETs are overvalued—could disincentivize precisely the kind of teaching and learning that rigorous evaluation of faculty is meant to ensure.

Given that NYU is currently in the process of transitioning to a University-wide evaluation system, it's an especially important time to establish procedures around that system's revision, assessment, and use for purposes other than providing feedback to individual teachers. This situation motivates those of our recommendations that extend beyond the evaluation instrument itself: those that call for continuing faculty involvement in the development and revision of questions; those that suggest strategies for teachers to engage with their evaluations; and finally, those that offer protocols for the use of evaluations in assessment, especially in reappointment and promotion decisions.

Works Cited

- Anderson, K., & Miller, E.D. "Gender and Student Evaluations of Teaching." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 30.2 (1997): 216-219.
- Basow, S.A. "Student evaluations of college professors: When Gender Matters." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87.4 (1995): 656-665.
- Boring, Anne, Kellie Ottoboni, and Philip B. Stark. "Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness." *ScienceOpen Research* (2016): 1-11.
- Carrell, Scott E., and James E. West. "Does Professor Quality Matter? Evidence from Random Assignment of Students to Professors." *Journal of Political Economy* 118.3 (2010): 409-432.
- Cramer, K.M. & Alexitch, L.R. "Student Evaluations of College Professors: Identifying Sources of Bias." *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 30.2 (2000): 143-64.
- Gravestock, Pamela, and Emily Gregor-Greenleaf. *Student Course Evaluations: Research, Models and Trends*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, 2008.
- Stark, Philip B., and Richard Freishtat. "An evaluation of course evaluations." *ScienceOpen Research* 9 (2014): 1-26.
- Stroebe, Wolfgang. "Why Good Teaching Evaluations May Reward Bad Teaching: On Grade Inflation and Other Unintended Consequences of Student Evaluations." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11, no. 6 (2016): 800-816.

Appendix A: Evaluations from Shanghai, CAS, and SPS

NYU Shanghai – Albert Course Evaluation

For the following questions (1) means “poor” and (5) means “excellent.”

CORE	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Overall evaluation of the instructor.					
2. Overall evaluation of the course.					

For the following questions, (1) means “strongly disagree” and (5) means “strongly agree.”

CORE	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3. The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.					
4. The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).					
5. The course objectives were clearly stated.					
6. The course was well organized.					
7. The course was intellectually stimulating.					
COURSE					
1. My primary reason for taking this course	Drop Down Menu = Major Requirement, Other specific degree requirement, General interest, in subject matter, Non-degree requirement, Elective credits required for a degree, Minor requirement, Teacher reputation, Advisor recommendation, Peer recommendation				
2. How many hours a week did you work on this course?	(open text response, answering is optional)				
3. What grade do you expect to earn in this course?	(open text response, answering is optional)				
4. What would you suggest to improve about this course?	(open text response, answering is optional)				
INSTRUCTOR					
1. What about the course or the instructor was effective in helping you learn.	(open text response, answering is optional)				

CAS Evaluation Questions

Standard University Questions (all on a 5-point, Likert scale)

1	Overall evaluation of the instructor(s)
2	Overall evaluation of the course.
3	The instructor(s) provided an environment that was conducive to learning.
4	The instructor(s) provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).
5	The course objectives were clearly stated.
6	The course was well organized.
7	The course was intellectually stimulating.

CAS Custom Questions (8-17 on a 5-point, Likert scale; 18 is a qualitative question)

Questions about the Course

8	The course was effective at helping me learn.
9	The classes were informative.
10	The course was challenging.
11	The course increased my knowledge of the subject.

Questions about the Instructor

12	The instructor was effective at helping me learn.
13	The instructor encouraged student participation.
14	The instructor was effective at facilitating class discussion.
15	The instructor was open to students' questions and multiple points of view.
16	The instructor was accessible to students (e.g., via e-mail and office hours).
17	The instructor created an environment that promoted the success of students with diverse backgrounds.

Qualitative Question:

18	Describe the best thing about the course/instructor that was effective in helping you learn.
----	--

School of Professional Studies

Standard University Questions

For the following questions (1) means “poor” and (5) means “excellent.”

<i>CORE</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Overall evaluation of the instructor.					
2. Overall evaluation of the course.					

For the following questions, (1) means “strongly disagree” and (5) means “strongly agree.”

<i>CORE</i>	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3. The instructor provided an environment that was conducive to learning.					
4. The instructor provided helpful feedback on assessed class components (e.g., exams, papers).					
5. The course objectives were clearly stated.					
6. The course was well organized.					
7. The course was intellectually stimulating.					

Additional SPS Questions

1. On average how many hours a week (other than scheduled class time) did you devote to this course?
2. What did the faculty member do to encourage your engagement in the course?
3. Comment on positive aspects that should be continued.
4. Suggest specific changes that the faculty member could make to improve the course.