MINUTES OF THE C-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 2, 2019

The New York University Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, May 2, 2019 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room.

In attendance were Senators Davis, De Bartolo, Ferguson, Gershman, Gold-Von Simson, Illingworth, Jahangiri, Killilea, Lee, Leone, Liston, Mitnick, Renzi, Saravanos, Slater, Unnikrishnan, Watkins, White, Williams, and Youngerman; Alternate Senators Chernoff (for Patterson), Funk (for Howard-Spink), Hersh, Kleinert, Maynor, Pietro, Ritter, Spivakovsky, Talib, and Tourin.

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 MARCH 26, 2019

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the March 26, 2019 meeting were approved unanimously.

STEERING COMMITTEE ELECTION

Call for Nominations and Vote

Chairperson Killilea called for nominations for Steering Committee members. All current Steering Committee members were nominated: Lauren Davis of Tisch, Leila Jahangiri of the College of Dentistry, Mary Killilea of the Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS), Tommy Lee of Tandon, Larry Slater from the Rory Meyers College of Nursing, Beverly Watkins from the College of Global Public Health, and Ethan Youngerman of Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS).

Antonius Saravanos from the School of Professional Studies and John Gershman from Wagner were nominated. They accepted the nominations.

The election of the seven members of the Steering Committee took place by secret ballot.

Senator Gold Von-Simson and Karyn Ridder, Manager of Faculty Governance, supervised the counting of the ballots.

Killilea reported the results of the election: Lauren Davis, Leila Jahangiri, Mary Killilea, Antonius Saravanos, Larry Slater, Beverly Watkins, and Ethan Youngerman will serve as Steering Committee members for academic year 2019-2020.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: MARY KILLILEA

See attached Document A.

Discussion/Questions on Chair’s Report
Thank you
Killilea thanked the Council for their dedication and stated she looks forward to the Council continuing its work next academic year.

Meeting with President Hamilton

The Steering Committee met with President Hamilton on April 25. They discussed the importance of undergraduate research at NYU and the role of contract faculty in mentoring undergraduates. The discussion included highlighting the opportunities for continuing contract faculty to serve as mentors. They also examined some of the limitations c-faculty face in terms of incentives and resources.

They discussed the need to increase the diversity of the continuing contract faculty. It was noted that Steinhardt and Tisch have been successful at increasing faculty diversity. They considered that despite the resources provided by the University and the largely good intentions of search committees and administration, more needs to be done and tools are needed to evaluate the outcomes of faculty searches.

Luncheon with the Board of Trustees

On April 20, 2019, Bill Berkley, Chairman of NYU’s Board of Trustees, invited several faculty leaders to a luncheon. The discussion focused on the Universities need to increase faculty diversity.

Save the Date for the C-FSC End of the Year Retreat and Celebration

Killilea reported the tentative date for the annual retreat and celebration is Tuesday May 28, 2019. Some Senators indicated they would be traveling on this date. New dates and spaces in June will be explored.

The Chair’s Report was accepted into the minutes.

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE

Joint recommendations on AD Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty

See attached Document B.

The Committee presented their recommendations to the policy. The Senator from AD described the process of creating the policy, noting there were listening sessions with AD faculty.

Senators discussed the language regarding titles, noting there is a Provost of Abu Dhabi, not a Dean. It was recommended to change the title of the committee to the Provostial Grievance Committee.

The recommendations were passed by vote of the Council.

Resolution regarding Grievance Procedures in Faculty Handbook

See attached Document C.

The C-FSC Grievance Committee presented their proposed resolution to amend, replace, and clarify the Grievance Procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Committee Chair Watkins read the following proposed language:

“In the case of all grievances, within 15 working days of the faculty member notifying the Dean of an intent to file a grievance, an attempt shall be made to settle the dispute by an informal discussion between the concerned parties, possibly with the assistance of mediators.”
“If the faculty member decides that the grievance cannot be settled informally, at a level below the Dean, or by the Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean who shall convolve the grievance committee of the school or faculty within 15 days of the faculty’s written notification. Each school or faculty shall designate a faculty committee to hear grievances in order to advise the Dean. Unless otherwise authorized in the school’s policy and approved by the Provost, each school shall either establish a new standing faculty committee for Continuing Contract Faculty grievances, which will include senior Continuing Contract Faculty and Tenured Faculty elected by the voting members of the faculty; or shall expand its existing standing grievance committee for Tenured Faculty to include (elected) senior Continuing Contract Faculty who shall participate in hearing and evaluating only those grievances that are filed by Continuing Contract Faculty. The faculty grievance committee(s) shall not include departmental chairpersons or department heads or any faculty member whose primary assignment is administrative. The Grievance Committee Chair shall provide the grievant with status updates every two (2) months for the duration of the process.”

A Senator suggested clarifying if the 15 days are calendar days or working days. He also suggested re-wording “two months” to “60 days”. Watkins stated the 15 days are considered calendar days.

A Senator inquired if there are provisions that state the beginning to the end of the grievance process will not exceed a certain amount. Watkins stated they want to allow for more time if needed.

The Committee noted they are also working on establishing a guide to clarify the grievance process. It was noted often that grievants come to the Council for clarification and a written policy would help direct them to the appropriate process.

A Senator inquired on how to protect the anonymity of the grievant. It was noted information on grievances is only given to the Chair of the Council. It was noted this document asks that schools report on the number of grievances and how they were resolved to their school grievance committee, while maintaining confidentiality.

A Senator asked if the status on grievances goes to the Chair of the Council or the Chair of the Grievance Committee. Senators expressed concern with the ambiguity on language regarding which Chairs and Committees are involved in the process, and how.

The Committee will clarify language in the document on calendar days and also on the involvement of Committee Chairs. They will then bring the draft document to the T-FSC for their review and will bring back to the Council in the fall.

**Revised Shared Governance Survey Report**

The Governance Committee presented the Shared Governance Survey report, revised by the T-FSC following the C-FSC’s concerns that the original did not protect the anonymity of survey respondents. In this version, the comments from School of Professional Studies faculty were removed.

Senators expressed concerns that the report still does not protect confidentiality. For instance, a Senator noted he could personally identify faculty members in his school from the comments in the document.

The Council drafted and approved by unanimous vote, the following statement to be sent to the Chair of the T-FSC:

The C-FSC vehemently opposed the publication and release of the Shared Governance Survey report because it challenges the anonymity of the survey respondents. The vote against the release of the report was unanimous. Our concerns are based on extensive use of direct quotes from the survey which undermine the expectation of anonymity of participants.
COMMITTEE REPORTS

See attached Document E.

Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:

Educational Policies & Faculty/Student Relations

Committee Chair Illingworth noted the Committee worked with the T-FSC on the topic of course evaluations. The T-FSC report focused on improving response rate. The C-FSC Committee instead focused on creating a summary of the number of direct and indirect references to the use of course evaluations in the review, promotion, and retention of continuing contract faculty across NYU. The committee believes that this presents significant potential problems for contract faculty given the growing understanding nationally and at NYU regarding bias in these instruments.

Senators discussed the best way to communicate this report. The Committee’s "Report on the Use of Language Regarding Course Evaluations in Contract Faculty Review, Promotion, and Retention" will be sent to the Provost Office for discussion at the May 9 SC meeting with Provost.

Faculty Benefits & Housing

Committee Chair Renzi reported he met with Grace Cosachov Protos, the Executive Director of the Work Life Office on April 16. They discussed the Child Care Fund age restriction, how to target mental health/employee assistance programming to faculty, faculty with disabilities, home purchase assistance, retirement planning for faculty, conference travel support for faculty with dependent care responsibilities, and how best to include Work Life programming in faculty recruitment and in event planning. He suggested that she also meet with department chairs and directors to move work-life information to the departmental level.

He reported the Committee met with Trish Halley, Grace Protos, and Carol Hoffman, former Executive Director of the Columbia University Work Life Office, who is leading a special project for NYU in relation to mental health issues, needs and resources.

He also reported the meeting with the T-FSC on benefits premium increases is scheduled for June 11.

He noted the Committee has been advocating for differential increases in benefits premiums by salary rank. He noted a new study showed that at low income levels, particularly people with families, employer tax benefits can be regressive.

He stated the Committee will continue work to follow the recommendation of the Council of having the lowest increases of premiums targeted to the lower salary tiers.

No Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:

Judicial Board
Graduate Program Committee

The reports were accepted into the minutes.

NEW BUSINESS
Prison Educational Program

A Senator reported on the activities of the NYU Prison Industrial Complex Committee.

There will be two additional scholarships for incarcerated students. They are also creating a web portal that brings together research, teaching, and events regarding the prison industrial complex.

In addition, the Dean of the Libraries will create a research portal for students, staff, and faculty interested in doing research on the prison industrial complex. They will identify a network of students, advisors, and academic services in the main programs of school to provide more robust outreach and support for both formerly incarcerated students and those who have currently incarcerated family members.

Major Agenda Items for Provost

A Steering Committee member reported the Provost asked the Council to develop a set of major issues concerning continuing contract faculty members to present for next academic year. A Senator commented several major issues include contract length, job security, and protection of academic freedom.

Open Access

A Senator recommended continuing work on creating an open access policy to encourage faculty to participate in the creation of open knowledge. She reported the Division of Libraries had been advocating for this and NYU could be considered behind its peers in not having a policy.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
C-FSC—Chair’s Report
Chairperson Mary Killilea

Report for May 2, 2019

1. **Thank you**
   It has been a pleasure chairing the C-FSC for the last 2 years. I want to thank you all for dedication to the council. I look forward to continuing our work next year.

2. **Meeting with President Hamilton**
   The steering committee met with President Hamilton on April 25, 2019. We discussed the importance of undergraduate research at NYU and the role of contract faculty in mentoring undergraduates. Our discussion included highlighting the opportunities of including contract faculty as mentors and some of the limitations we face in terms of incentives and resources.

   We also discussed the need to increase the diversity of contract faculty. It was noted that Steinhardt and Tisch have been successful at increasing faculty diversity. We discussed that despite the resources provided by the University and the largely good intentions of search committees and administration that we need to do more and we need tools to evaluate the outcomes of our faculty searches.

3. **Luncheon with the Board of Trustees**
   On April 20, 2019, Bill Berkley, Chairman of NYU's Board of Trustees, invited several faculty leaders to a luncheon. The discussion focused on the Universities need to increase faculty diversity.

4. **Meeting the Provost**
   Our final meeting with the Provost is May 9, 2019.

5. **Save the Date for the C-FSC End of the Year Retreat and Celebration**
   We will have our annual retreat and celebration on Tuesday May 28, 2019.
Recommendations of the T-FSC and the C-FSC in regard to:

NYU ABU DHABI
Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty

BACKGROUND

In the fall semester of the academic year 2018/19, the NYUAD Faculty Council Steering Committee in collaboration with the NYUAD Contract Faculty Senators initiated a revision process of the existing NYUAD Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty (CF) Appointments. A vote by the NYUAD Faculty Council on December 9, 2018 on the revised version of the guidelines among our faculty via the electronic Helios Voting system produced the following result: “Should the current version of the 2018 Revised Contract Faculty Guidelines be adopted?” The results were: Yes 107, No 6, and Abstain 31. (The official NYUAD faculty count as of November 2018 is 107 Continuing Contract Faculty, plus 119 Tenured/Tenure Track and 41 Other Faculty, adding up to a total of 267. The total faculty voter turnout is thus 53.93%). After consultations between NYU Vice Provost Carol Morrow and Martin Klimke (NYUAD Vice Provost for Academic Policies & Governance), another vote was held via the electronic Helios Voting system at the beginning of this spring semester (January 27, 5pm-February 10, 5pm) to provide you with detailed information about how this policy was endorsed by the Tenured/Tenure track faculty and Continuing Contract faculty. The results were Yes 116; No 6; Abstain 19. On March 7, 2019, the Dean Fabio Piano submitted the document to NYU Provost, Katherine Fleming.

At NYU, our strong tradition is for schools to develop policies that are “consistent with school culture and history.” Within that tradition, the NYU Faculty Handbook (hereafter Handbook) provides that school policies will be reviewed by the Provost to determine “whether the substance of the policy: (i) is consistent with general University policy; (ii) is compatible with the University’s commitment to excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, or artistic achievement and service within a community of respectful and respected academic professionals; and (iii) has no adverse implications for the University.” As part of the process of finalizing the Abu Dhabi policy for its Clinical Faculty, NYU Provost Katherine E. Fleming invited the C-FSC to comment on the document called “11292018-NYUAD_CF Guidelines”, adopting the same perspective (per letter of March 7, 2010 from Katherine E. Fleming to the C-FSC and T-FSC Chairs).

The following document will enumerate various questions, comments and recommendations to the submitted policy. The recommendations are made within the body of the document for ease of review and discussion.
OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS:

RECOMMENDATION 1
We recommend the inclusion of a section that describes faculty participation in shared governance. At present, the document refers to the NYUAD Governance Guidelines and NYU AD Grievance Committee Charter, but according to our information, these policies have not yet been created.

The grievance/appeal process, of crucial importance to the faculty, should be developed by the faculty and added to the Policy document before the school sends the policy to the Provost. The process should be identified and explicitly described in this document. The NYU AD Grievance Committee Charter needs to be sent to the Provost for our review.

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

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

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

RECOMMENDATION 2
The University Guidelines for Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty, page 4, states: “Continuing Contract Faculty appointments that provide for the possibility of extended periods of employment support continuing involvement with students and colleagues and provide an appropriate and desirable element of job security. Thus, wherever possible, schools are encouraged to reduce reliance on one-year contracts. However, in addition to providing schools with an essential degree of flexibility, one-year contracts may be programmatically and academically desirable in a number of schools and
academic programs within schools; school policies shall include a rationale for a
Continuing Contract Faculty title(s) that carries a one-year appointment.

“Full-time contract faculty members are to be hired within the context of the school’s
long-term strategic planning for faculty academic programming, which is approved by
the Provost. This is true for one-year as well as multi-year contracts.”

Add language similar to the following:

“If a one-year contract is adopted, the Dean will provide a justification, similar to the
hiring plan submitted annually to the Provost, based on programmatic and academic
considerations, to the faculty through the formal governance structure established at the
school (the Faculty Assembly, etc.).”

RECOMMENDATION 3
We recommend a clear description of each type of faculty and of each rank, along with
the specific requirements for reappointment, and promotion for each rank. As is, the
policy is unclear as to what is required for promotion from one rank to another. These
requirements are a necessary component of a reappointment and promotion policy.

RECOMMENDATION 4
Since Continuing Contract faculty are exclusively non-tenured, add language describing
the differences between tenured faculty expectations and non-tenured faculty
expectations is necessary. This is important because in some schools Continuing
Contract faculty primarily have teaching responsibilities, while in other schools
Continuing Contract faculty are expected to maintain an active scholarly, research,
creative and/or professional life. For faculty in schools without continuing
research/creative expectations for Continuing Contract faculty, continued creative,
intellectual, and scholarly engagement in their fields can be encouraged, though not
required, as appropriate to the area of the appointment.

For those schools, a model might be the following (adapted from the FAS Website,
“Recruitment of New Faculty, Section 1.7, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical
Associate Professor, Clinical Professors, Overview,”

“Continuing Contract Faculty lines differ from tenure-track lines. Although continuing
contract lines are without tenure, they are typically multiyear and research is not part of
their formal responsibilities, and hence teaching loads are greater.”

We recommend that for faculty in schools with continuing research/creative
expectations for Continuing Contract faculty, a model might be the following:

“Continuing Contract Faculty lines are typically multiyear and differ from tenure lines at
the School in the following ways: [enumerate those differences].”
RECOMMENDATION 5
Review document for consistency in language on the length of an initial contract.

RECOMMENDATION 6
The word “typically” is used often within the policy. We recommend more clarity. See recommendations below.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY ABU DHABI
Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty (CCF) Appointments

INTRODUCTION

Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty (referred to as Continuing Contract Faculty) represent a distinct and vital part of the university academic community and contribute significantly to the university’s academic and service missions. Policies applicable to this group of faculty members must reflect the contributions that they make to the university’s commitment to academic excellence and service (including administrative responsibilities), while also embodying the university’s right to require exceptional teaching, scholarship and creative/artistic activities (where applicable), and service of all full-time faculty.

The NYU Abu Dhabi Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty Guidelines (the Guidelines) set forth the principles and procedures for appointments, reappointments, and promotions at NYU Abu Dhabi. The purpose of these Guidelines is to map out the review principles and processes for Continuing Contract Faculty at NYUAD. They are designed to support standards of academic excellence in the processes of appointments, reappointments, and promotions and aim to provide a comprehensive and fair review of the candidates.

These guidelines shall apply to all appointments, reappointments, and promotions henceforth. Upon reappointment review for existing contracts, these guidelines shall apply with respect to, for example, review procedures, notification, consistency in case of reappointments with regard to length of contract, rank and title, etc. These guidelines shall apply immediately to all new appointments.

RECOMMENDATION 7
The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, revised December 15, 2015, page 1, Section II., Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1, states:

“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 FTCCF 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 New York 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.

Mechanisms for timely distribution 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.

These Guidelines are being implemented at NYU Abu Dhabi (NYUAD) to supplement NYU faculty policies applicable to Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty as outlined in the NYU Faculty Handbook. If any part of these Guidelines is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies then in effect will control.

Scope
These Guidelines apply to all NYUAD Continuing Contract Faculty. The titles currently held by Continuing Contract Faculty at NYUAD are the following:

- Arts Professor (Associate Arts Professor, Assistant Arts Professor)
- Professor of Practice (Associate Professor of Practice, Assistant Professor of Practice)
- Senior Language Lecturer (Language Lecturer)
- Senior Lecturer (Lecturer, Associate Lecturer, Assistant Lecturer)
- Teaching Professor (Associate Teaching Professor, Assistant Teaching Professor)
- Research Professor (Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor)

An ongoing review is determining the appropriateness and usage of these titles in conjunction with an assessment of faculty appointment policies at NYUAD as the institution has evolved.

Rights and Responsibilities
The responsibilities of Continuing Contract Faculty at NYUAD include, among others: teaching assignments, student advisement, program and committee responsibilities, scholarship and creative activities (where applicable), and avoidance of conflicts of interest.

The rights and privileges of NYUAD Continuing Contract Faculty are governed by the NYU Faculty Handbook and the NYUAD Faculty Governance Guidelines. They include, among others, academic freedom, leaves of absence, sabbaticals (when eligible), as well as serving as Principal Investigator on

1 https://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/faculty-policies-applicable-to-full-time-continuing-contract-faculty.html

- Global Professor
- Professor (Associate Professor, Assistant Professor)
RECOMMENDATION 8
According to our information, the NYUAD Faculty Governance Guidelines (mentioned above) do not yet exist. We recommend that these Guidelines be formulated as soon as possible, and a link to these Guidelines should be placed in this policy.

RECOMMENDATION 9
In schools where professional, scholarly and/or creative activity is either required or encouraged for reappointment and promotion, professional development funds and research leave or sabbatical should be provided to further support professional, scholarly, or creative work. A description of that eligibility, and the process governing it, should be explicitly stated in the policy.

In schools where the Continuing Contract faculty’s responsibilities are exclusively teaching, professional development funds that support that faculty member’s continued growth in teaching their field should be provided.

Participation in NYUAD Governance
Other than eligibility for tenure, and except for participation in tenure decisions or those otherwise set aside by University Bylaws as falling within the exclusive domain of tenured and tenure track faculty, Continuing Contract Faculty enjoy the same rights and responsibilities as tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the governance of NYUAD and in the academic divisions in which they teach. Voting rights at NYUAD are extended to Continuing Contract Faculty in accordance with the guiding principles of the NYU Faculty Handbook and the NYUAD Faculty Council. In accordance with University Bylaws, Section 82(c), Faculty Membership, College and School Governance, Continuing Contract Faculty may hold their own faculty meetings and may grant rights of attendance and voting privileges to other categories of faculty of NYUAD.

Future Amendments
As noted above, NYUAD is finalizing its procedures and processes for faculty nomenclature. Any amendment to these guidelines must be in writing and must be approved by the Provost of NYUAD, following consultation with the NYUAD Faculty Council, and the Provost of NYU. As with all NYUAD policies, these guidelines, or any provision hereof, are subject to change and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

RECOMMENDATION 10
The policy should follow the letter and the spirit contained in the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, revised December 15, 2015, page 1, Section II., Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1, which states:

“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.” Add 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.”

1. REVIEW PRINCIPLES

These guidelines regarding Continuing Contract Faculty shall apply to all appointments, reappointments and promotions, subject to the terms of the employment contract between the faculty member and NYUAD, and the laws of the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

Authorization
All faculty lines and appointments require prior authorization from the NYUAD Provost. All initial appointments, reappointments, and promotions of faculty shall be approved by the NYUAD Provost.

2 All NYUAD standing, full-time faculty currently have PI-status for internal research grant opportunities offered by NYUAD.

and are normally initiated by the relevant NYUAD Divisional Dean following consultation with the relevant faculty.

Criteria for Review
All contracts must include a clear statement of the criteria for each scheduled review for reappointment and/or promotion.

Guiding criteria for the formal review may include, without limitation:

1) commitment to excellence in teaching, as evidenced by, for example, syllabi and other course materials, course/program development and innovation, instructor development, student advising, capstone supervision, classroom observations, reports from program heads, self-presentation, samples of student works (scholarly or creative/artistic), evidence of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.;
2) (when applicable) scholarly and/or artistic/creative activity, including, but not limited to, for example, research, publications, creative productions, exhibitions, and performances;
3) student advising and mentoring
4) service including, but not limited to, service to the University community and within and to one’s profession; and
5) additional academic roles and administrative responsibilities that contribute to NYUAD and the University’s educational, research, and service mission.

The expectations for achievement in teaching (based on contractually assigned teaching load/course equivalencies), service, and (if applicable) scholarly and/or artistic/creative activity, in order to achieve reappointment or promotion must be set out clearly in each individual contract.

In cases where professional, scholarly and/or artistic/creative activity are required or encouraged for reappointment and promotion, relevant funding to support this activity will be made available.
addition, information will be shared and publicly announced about respective internal grant/funding opportunities (on a competitive basis and with clear designations of eligibility) to support this activity.

The career pathway for Continuing Contract Faculty must be specified in the initial contract (or any subsequent reappointment after these guidelines have come into effect). Faculty may choose whether to be evaluated for promotion or reappointment at the same rank. Candidates who apply for promotion and are unsuccessful will still be eligible for reappointment at the same rank. The relative criteria for promotion or reappointment are to be specified in the original letter of appointment.

RECOMMENDATION 11
The "relative criteria for promotion or reappointment" need to be part of a reappointment and promotion policy. Most, if not all, NYU policies include this criteria.

Probationary Period and Review

RECOMMENDATION 12
We suggest that the section on pages 4-5, entitled "Terms of Appointment" might precede this section. This change would avoid raising (an unwarranted) question about the conditions that would normally justify only a one-year appointment. Alternatively, there could be simply a parenthetical reference to the later section, e.g., “Contract duration is explained in the section on ‘Terms of Appointment’ (pp.4-5, below).”

Continuing Contract Faculty are typically appointed to multi-year contracts. In accordance with UAE law, all initial appointments is subject to a probationary period of six months. As is the case for all NYUAD employees, Continuing Contract Faculty employment is subject to the individual faculty member obtaining and maintaining all approvals, clearances, and documentation as required by UAE law.

The relevant NYUAD Divisional Dean will conduct an initial review of the candidate’s performance within the first six months of the first year of any contract. In the case of a one-year contract, a successful initial review will make the candidate eligible for a renewal of not less than one year. In the case of initial contracts of two or more years, a successful probationary review will lead to the continuation of the full contract.

RECOMMENDATION 13
There appears to be a range of time for an initial contract. It has been stated as one year or two years or more. Initial contract lengths needs to be clarified by providing examples for each type of initial contracts.

In the event of a decision to terminate the appointment following a negative initial review, the faculty member must be notified in writing of the probationary review decision in a timely manner, and no later than six months after the beginning of the first year of the contract.

Guiding criteria for review within the first six months of the first year of appointment may include, without limitation, commitment to excellence in teaching, as evidenced by, for example, syllabi and other course materials, course/program development and innovation, instructor development, student advising, classroom observations, reports from program heads, self-presentation, samples of student works (scholarly and/or creative/artistic), and evidence of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.; and/or (when applicable) scholarly and artistic/creative activity, including, but not
limited to, for example, research, publications, creative productions, exhibitions, and performances; student advising; consistent service including, but not limited to, service to the University community and within and to one’s profession; and additional academic roles and administrative responsibilities that contribute to NYUAD and the University’s educational, research, and service mission. When appropriate, professional activities and the quality of service contributions to the division and to the university may be considered.

Renewal of Contracts
Continuing Contract Faculty shall be subject to formal review. Faculty on multi-year appointments shall be reviewed in the penultimate year of appointment. Faculty on a series of one and/or two-year contracts shall be reviewed in the first semester of the third year of continuous appointment.

A faculty member’s eligibility to be considered for reappointment does not create a presumption in favor of reappointment, even if the faculty member has met or exceeded the expectations set out in the contract. Any review for reappointment and promotion shall consider major curricular and structural changes (e.g. termination of a program) and/or improvements in academic programs, even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement for reappointment or promotion. Major curricular or structural changes do not, however, automatically warrant a denial of reappointment. In the case of such changes, the review considers whether the faculty member is able to teach in the revised curriculum or new academic structure and, if so, in what capacity.

If it is established (based on the aforementioned stipulations) by the beginning of the penultimate year of the contract that a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term, there is no review and reappointment process; the faculty member shall be so notified in writing by the end of the first month of the penultimate year. However, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development to be conducted within a time framework specified

Terms of Appointment
Continuing Contract Faculty are typically appointed for a period of three to five years:

- Rank of Assistant Professor/Lecturer: 3 years.
- Rank of Associate Professor/Lecturer: 4 years.
- Rank of Full Professor/Lecturer/Senior Lecturer: 5 years.

RECOMMENDATION 14
We recommend that the word “typically” (stated above) be deleted or replaced with explicit criteria for renewal.

RECOMMENDATION 15
At NYU, an appointment of at least five years is the norm for Clinical Associate/Lecturer. Provide an increase in term of appointment as follows: Associate Professor/Lecture: 5 years. We also recommend an increase in term for Full Professor/Lecturer/Senior Lecture to 6 years; this is the case at certain schools (e.g., The Gallatin School).

Reappointment after the completion of a successful review process must be at the same rank (except in

\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{Nothing precludes candidates for renewal from voluntarily requesting contracts of less than one year.}\]

cases of promotion) with consistency in title and will typically be at least for the same duration as
the previous contract length.

**RECOMMENDATION 16**

We recommend that the word “typically” (stated above) be deleted or replaced with explicit reasons for a change in contract length.

In some cases, Continuing Contract Faculty appointments can be made for a period of one or two years at the faculty member’s request or to address a specific academic need or a major programmatic change. Typically, faculty members on continuous one-year appointments are expected to move to multi-year appointments after the completion of two consecutive, successful review processes.

**RECOMMENDATION 17**

We recommend that the word “typically” (stated above) be deleted or replaced with explicit reasons as to why faculty members on continuous one-year appointments do not move to multi-year appointments. Please see recommendation #2.

In case of a negative review, the final year of the contract will become the terminal year of appointment.

On an exceptional basis, an additional one-year extension may be offered upon prior authorization by the NYU Provost; a successful formal review by the end of the then penultimate year of the contract may result in a multi-year reappointment.

**Notification**

For Continuing Contract Faculty on a contract of three or more years (both on an initial or subsequent three or more years contract), the review process for reappointment will take place in the final semester of the penultimate year of the contract, and the faculty member will be notified as to reappointment by no later than the end of the academic year of the penultimate year of the contract (i.e., August 31, in most cases).

Continuing Contract Faculty on a one or two-year contract will be notified of the reappointment decision by no later than 180 days prior to the expiration date of the appointment (i.e., March 1, in most cases).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Term</th>
<th>Docket Materials Due</th>
<th>Timing of Review Process</th>
<th>Notification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary period and review for all initial contracts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Within first six month of employment</td>
<td>180 days after the start date of the appointment (by March 1, in most cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial or Subsequent 1 or 2-Year Contract</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>180 days prior to expiration date of the appointment (by March 1, in most cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive 1 or 2-Year appointments</td>
<td>Typically by October 1</td>
<td>First semester of the third year of continuous appointment</td>
<td>180 days prior to expiration date of the appointment (by March 1, in most cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-Year Contracts of 3+ Years

Typically by December 1

Final semester of the penultimate year of the contract.

No later than the end of the academic year of the penultimate year of the contract (typically by August 31)

In connection with formal reviews for reappointment and promotion, NYUAD will make available to all faculty in print and/or on the faculty portal:

i. Statement of the academic criteria in the areas of teaching, program and/or curriculum and course development, research (where appropriate), the creative and performing arts (where appropriate), and program and school service that will guide the committee’s evaluation.

ii. Statement of the criteria of assessment in effect at the time.

RECOMMENDATION 18
Recommend clarifying the ambiguity of the phrase, “at the time.” This could be a factor in a grievance. Is the intent “at the time of appointment” or “at the time of the review”?

iii. Calendar for reviews and communication to faculty members that accords fair and timely notice of a review and of its outcome in writing, as well as adequate notice to faculty to pursue alternative employment in the event of a negative decision.

In addition to reviews at the time of potential reappointment, Continuing Contract Faculty on a contract greater than one year must submit an annual activity report to the relevant NYUAD Dean. In addition, NYUAD may carry out formal performance assessments (not more frequently than annually) in the course of multi-year appointments that are at least three years.

RECOMMENDATION 19
It is not clear why “formal reviews” are taking place, except for reappointment and promotion. It seems a contract faculty member may be subject to a formal review at any time. What is included in the “formal review”? What is the process? What is the purpose? We recommend that the last sentence above be deleted, unless clarified.

2. FORMAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR REAPPOINTMENT

The review process for reappointment commences when a candidate for reappointment submits his or her docket for review to the relevant NYUAD Dean in accordance with the timeline above.

Preparation of the Docket Materials
Each division/program or area may determine, with approval from the Provost and relevant Dean, the exact makeup of the reappointment and promotion docket, as appropriate to the specific area or discipline. Normally, dockets should include:

a. A summary of most salient accomplishments in the statutory areas of review, including teaching philosophy, strategies, and goals; scholarship and creative/artistic achievements; administrative responsibilities; and service to NYUAD. (This summary should normally not exceed 2–3 pages in length and in no case shall exceed 5 single spaced pages.)
summary should be accompanied by a copy of the criteria for review as specified in the original letter of employment.

b. A current, up-to-date CV. The CV may be updated as the process continues to reflect changes in academic achievement and accomplishment.

c. Materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness (e.g., faculty course evaluations, peer observations of teaching, formal assessments of teaching effectiveness, syllabi, lecture notes, assignments or URL, and other relevant documents).

d. Demonstration of service to the NYUAD Community (e.g. curriculum development, faculty governance, student mentoring, etc.).

e. Where applicable, a professional portfolio (showing publications, creative productions, performances and professional development) demonstrating significant contributions to the field during the appointment period.

f. Other evidence appropriate to the candidate’s discipline.

g. Candidates are encouraged to include any additional evidence that he or she believes bears on the case for reappointment or promotion, not otherwise identified above.

Faculty Review Committee

a. The NYUAD Divisional Dean, in consultation with the Program Head or the research center director (when applicable), appoints and charges the Faculty Review Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 20

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

For the composition of the committee, please see section 4.

b. Candidates for reappointment or promotion will be notified by the end of the first month of the academic year in the penultimate year of an appointment that they are eligible for review.

c. Candidates will submit materials for review to the NYUAD Divisional Dean prior to the end of the first semester of the penultimate year of the contract (typically by December 1).

d. The NYUAD Divisional Dean forwards the materials for review to the committee, which assesses it based on the review criteria specified in the candidate’s contract and formulates a recommendation for or against reappointment.

e. The committee submits its recommendation to the NYUAD Divisional Dean along with a written explanation of its assessment. A majority vote of the committee is required for recommendation for reappointment. The committee prepares the written recommendation on reappointment, including any minority opinions. One or more members of the committee may prepare the written recommendation but each member of the committee will review and sign it before it is submitted to the relevant NYUAD Dean.

RECOMMENDATION 21

We recommend that that candidate under review should get a copy of the review committee’s letter.

NYUAD Dean

a. The relevant NYUAD Divisional Dean reviews the recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee and submits his/her recommendation to the NYUAD Provost together
with all materials of the docket. The NYUAD Provost may, in turn, seek additional information, and/or internal or external reviews.

b. In formulating his/her decision, the NYUAD Divisional Dean may seek additional information (including, but not necessarily limited to, internal or external letters of review of the candidate’s professional contributions, e.g. student evaluations of teaching, internal letters of review of the candidate’s teaching, and service contributions). In the event that external letters are solicited, these evaluators should not be scholars or artists with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, joint producer, or other close associates.

**QUESTION - 22**

Is this possibly too categorical an exclusion? While it may be customary to exclude a thesis adviser, if the candidate worked on a collaborative research or creative project or co-authored important journal articles or books at some distinct period in the past (5-10 years, for example) with certain individuals, wouldn’t their perspectives on the candidate (and his/her continued productivity in their fields) be of some merit?

c. If the NYUAD Divisional Dean’s decision is contrary to the recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee on reappointment, title, or length of contract, the Dean will provide the committee with reasons for not accepting its recommendation. In case a Dean’s decision not to reappoint the candidate is contrary to the committee’s recommendation, the committee members will have ten business days in which to provide additional feedback to the Dean before the Dean’s decision is finalized and submitted to the NYUAD Provost.

d. The Provost conveys his or her decision to the NYUAD Dean. The NYUAD Divisional Dean then conveys the decision to the candidate in writing.

e. The outcome of the review process will typically be discussed by the NYUAD Dean with the candidates in person.

f. In the case of a negative decision, candidates may avail themselves of the grievance procedures outlined in section 6 (“Grievance Procedures”).

g. Continuing Contract Faculty on a one or two-year contract will be notified of the decision no later than 180 days prior to the expiration date of the appointment and in the case of reappointment, receive a contract within the next 4 months. Continuing Contract Faculty on a contract of three or more years will be notified no later than the end of the academic year of the penultimate year of the contract (i.e. August 31, in most cases) together with a contract for reappointment or a written notification of non-reappointment.

h. In the event of a decision to reappoint, the Continuing Contract Faculty shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another contract of equal or greater length.

i. **RECOMMENDATION 23**

We recommend that the word “normally” be deleted, unless explicit criteria is offered as to why the faculty member would not receive another contract after a successful reappointment review.

j. In the event of a decision not to reappoint, the Continuing Contract Faculty member shall continue to be under contract until the end of the contract expiry date.
3. **FORMAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROMOTION**

The process for promotion is initiated by the candidate who confirms his/her eligibility with the relevant NYUAD Divisional Dean. The criteria for promotion are set out in each Continuing Contract Faculty’s contract, but typically to merit promotion, a candidate must demonstrate a record of outstanding teaching and service and (if applicable) distinguished professional accomplishments. Years served in previous institutions may be taken into consideration.

**RECOMMENDATION 24**

Again, eligibility requirements need to be provided for each title promotion.

   a. Assistant / Associate Lecturers may be considered for promotion to the next rank after one term of appointment (of at least 3 years) at rank. Lecturers may be considered for promotion to the next rank after two terms of appointment (of at least 4 years) at rank. For professorial ranks, faculty at the assistant level may be considered for promotion after two terms of appointment (of at least 3 years) in rank. Faculty at the associate level may be considered for promotion after one term of appointment (of at least 4 years) in rank.

   b. Any faculty member may submit a request for early promotion to the relevant NYUAD Dean. A promotion ahead of schedule will be granted only under extraordinary circumstances. It is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution to propose candidates for promotion ahead of schedule.

   c. The review process for promotion is the same as the process for reappointment as outlined in section 2 of this document. The review committee will provide an assessment for contract renewal purposes, and in the same letter (if applicable) recommend whether the candidate meets the expectations for promotion.

   d. Any negative decision on an application for promotion shall not affect eligibility for the continuation or renewal of an existing contract.

   e. Continuing Contract Faculty appointments are normally not convertible to tenure track appointments. In rare cases, and then only with provostial approval, a non-tenure track position may be converted into a tenure track one for which the incumbent is eligible to apply within the search process. In these rare cases, conversion of a non-tenure track position into a tenure track position will not foreshorten an existing contract duration as could occur, for example, if the conversion occurred before expiration of an existing contract and the contractee was not selected for the tenured or tenure track appointment. However, a Continuing Contract Faculty faculty member must not be prohibited from applying for and being considered for any tenure track opening that arises within his or her school or elsewhere in the University; nor may his or her doing so be treated with prejudice.

**NOTE- 25**

Once promotion requirements for new titles are specified elsewhere in this document, this section will be clearer.

4. **COMPOSITION OF FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEE**
a. The NYUAD Divisional Dean will appoint a Faculty Review Committee of three or five faculty members. At least one member of the committee will normally be a senior member of the Continuing Contract Faculty. Whenever possible, the majority of committee members shall be Continuing Contract Faculty. The committee may also include members of the tenured faculty. Finally, the committee may include an external member (i.e. an scholar/artist from outside of NYU) who is an expert in the field.

**RECOMMENDATION 26**
As is the norm for many, if not all, contract-faculty policies at NYU, the review committee should be made up of elected, not appointed, members.

b. In the usual case, the committee for reappointment or promotion shall be composed entirely of faculty of greater rank (whether tenured, tenure-track, or Continuing Contract Faculty) than the candidate, except in the case of a Full Professor, where all committee members need to have the rank of Full Professor. Typically, the majority of the committee shall be from the same academic discipline as the candidate. Typically, at least one member of the committee must be an NYUAD faculty member. Other members may be drawn from faculty at NYU portal campuses in New York and Shanghai.

c. In the review of any particular case, committee members shall recuse themselves in the case of an apparent or actual conflict of interest.

d. The committee may seek additional information (including, but not necessarily limited to, internal or external letters of review of the candidate’s professional contributions). In the event that external letters are solicited, these evaluators should not be scholars or artists with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, joint producer, or other close associates.

5. **GROUND FOR STOPPING THE CONTRACT CLOCK**

The contract clock may be stopped for reasonable cause, e.g. medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, (same sex) domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation.

**QUESTION - 27**
Why the restriction on the term “domestic partner”? Should the sex of the domestic partner matter? Is this simply intended to acknowledge a recognized, binding relationship?

6. **GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE**

**Who Can Grieve**
With respect to grievances related to reappointment and promotion: A Continuing Contract Faculty member who is not eligible for reappointment cannot grieve a decision not to reappoint. Individuals on multi-year contracts of three years or more who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be reappointed do have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision with respect to reappointment or promotion or the terms of reappointment or promotion; and they are entitled to grieve in the event they are denied reappointment without review for reasons other than elimination of the position.
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; and they are entitled to grieve the process in the event they are not reappointed after a third year review when a review had been explicitly promised in connection with the possibility of reappointment subject to it, but was not undertaken for reasons other than elimination of the position.

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

With respect to grievances related to other matters: All Continuing Contract Faculty, including faculty on one-year appointments, are eligible to grieve.

**Grievances Related to Reappointment and Promotion**

Grievances related to reappointment and promotion of Continuing Contract Faculty are restricted to allegations of procedural defects and irregularities. Outcomes of the review process or decisions reached through the review process can be grieved only to the extent that they involve violation of university-protected rights of faculty members.

Thus, a grievance must allege that 1) the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration; or 2) that the decisions violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question, in which case the burden of proof falls to the grievant. A decision not to undertake the reappointment process where a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open is not the basis for a grievance.

**Informal Settlement**

In the case of grievances related to reappointment and promotion, attempts shall be made to settle the dispute in a timely manner (typically within 15 working days after the request for an informal settlement) by informal discussions between the grievant and the NYUAD Provost, possibly with the assistance of mediators.

**RECOMMENDATION 28**

Add the following language:

“If the faculty member decides that the grievance cannot be settled informally, at a level below the Dean, or by the Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean who shall convene the grievance committee of the school or faculty within 15 days of the faculty's written notification.”

**NYUAD Vice Chancellor and NYUAD Grievance Committee**

In the event that the grievance is not settled informally at the level of the NYUAD Provost, the faculty member may appeal to the NYUAD Vice Chancellor to convene the NYUAD Grievance Committee, which is elected and appointed in accordance with the NYUAD Governance Guidelines and the NYUAD Grievance Committee charter.

**QUESTION & RECOMMENDATION 29**

How is the committee formed? The NYU Grievance Committee Charter does not yet exist, according to our information. The constitution of the grievance committee (how it is formed; who is a member, etc.) must be included in a
The NYUAD Vice Chancellor must convene the NYUAD Grievance Committee within 15 business days of receipt of written notice of the faculty member’s appeal. In the event that the NYUAD Vice Chancellor does not convene the NYUAD Grievance Committee within said time, the faculty member has the right to bring it to the attention of the Provost of NYU.

RECOMMENDATION 30
In the case of schools where a division dean receives the committee report and passes that with a recommendation to reappoint or to promote to a school Dean, add language to ensure that the school Dean receives the full record and recommendation of the Review Committee, as well as the recommendation of the divisional dean, similar to the following:

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

RECOMMENDATION 31
Add language similar to the following:
“In all cases of an appeal to a negative decision related to reappointment or promotion by the Dean, the candidate will have access to the Review/Promotion Committee’s full report, including its recommendation and any comments from the faculty.”

The grievance committee will then hear evidence and report to the NYUAD Vice Chancellor in writing on its findings of fact and its opinion on a fair disposition of the case. The NYUAD Grievance Committee does not judge the professional merits of the case and only considers the appeal based on the grounds specified above. After deliberation, the NYUAD Grievance Committee advises the NYUAD Vice Chancellor of its recommendation.

The NYUAD Grievance Committee will provide its recommendation to the NYUAD Vice Chancellor within 30 business days of the convening of the committee.

RECOMMENDATION 32
Add the following language:
“The Grievance Committee Chair shall provide the grievant with status updates every two (2) months for the duration of the process.”

For grievances brought by a member of the Continuing Contract Faculty, the NYUAD Grievance Committee will be expanded to include at least two seniors member of the Continuing Contract Faculty, if two senior members of the Continuing Contract Faculty are not already on the faculty-appointed Grievance Committee (bringing it to a total of seven member.

The NYUAD Vice Chancellor reviews the NYUAD Grievance Committee’s recommendation and all pertinent information, decides the case, and notifies the faculty member and the NYUAD Grievance Committee in writing of his/her decision, together with reasons therefore and information about the procedure for appeal, no later than 15 working days after receiving the recommendation of the NYUAD
Grievance Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 33
Add the following language (paraphrased from the Liberal Studies Reappointment and Promotion Policy, February, 2018) “If the committee’s report is accepted by both the grievant and the Dean, the matter shall be considered settled. However, if the Dean shall deny any findings of fact, or refuse to implement suggestions by the committee made as a part of the committee’s recommendations on the disposition of a case, the Dean is required to reply in writing giving in detail his or her reasons. This memorandum must be sent both to the grievant and to the committee.”

As a standing committee of the faculty, the NYUAD Grievance Committee must regularly report to the faculty on the number of cases heard or under study and the ultimate disposition of such cases, (for example, amicably settled or on appeal).

RECOMMENDATION 34
The development of this grievance process should be undertaken with full participation by the Continuing Contract Faculty and submitted to the faculty for discussion and a vote by the faculty. The process of consideration must include the right to offer amendments, and the vote may occur during a regular faculty meeting or by electronic ballot, as the faculty governance body may determine. Please see Recommendation #1.

Provost of NYU
If the decision of the NYUAD Vice Chancellor is not satisfactory to the faculty member, he or she may, within 15 working days of receipt of the NYUAD Vice Chancellor’s decision, appeal in writing to the Provost of NYU (or his/her designee) specifying all grounds for and materials in support of the appeal.

Appeals from the NYU Abu Dhabi Vice Chancellor’s decision can be made only on the basis of the grounds specified above. Where such an appeal is made, the NYUAD Vice Chancellor will transmit to the Provost of NYU a report of the proceedings in the case at its earlier stages.

The Provost of NYU will decide the case, and notify the grievant and the NYUAD Vice Chancellor. If the advice of the latter is not followed, the reasons will be reported with the decision. The decision of the Provost of NYU is final and subject to no further review.

RECOMMENDATION 35
Appeals should follow the spirit of the NYU Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Senate Grievance Committee should be convened for appeals. Why would contract-faculty at Abu Dhabi NYU not receive the same consideration as NYU contract faculty in New York?

7. CONTACTS
Subject Contact

General Inquiries Faculty HR Affairs Department, NYUAD
+971 2 628 4048
nyuad.faculty.hr.affairs@nyu.edu
April 24, 2019

Dear Mary:

After considerable deliberation, including a year-long review of school-level grievance policies, the C-FSC Grievance Committee respectfully requests that the C-FSC put forth a resolution to amend, replace and clarify the Grievance Procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook, reissued May 15, 2018 and approved by the New York University Board of Trustees, February 19, 2015.

Currently, inconsistencies and ambiguities in the language contained within the Grievance Policy undermine both the spirit of the safeguards provided to contract faculty, and NYU’s efforts to create a culture of inclusion, diversity, equity, and belonging.

I submit the following proposed changes on behalf of the 2018-2019 C-FSC Grievance Committee.

We unanimously endorse the following proposed changes.

Best regards,
BXW

PROPOSED CHANGES (pages 57-60)

**Grievance Procedures**

This section establishes University procedures by means of which Continuing Contract Faculty can seek redress of their grievances. A grievant must be a faculty member of New York University when he or she initiates the appellate grievance procedure under “Appeal from a Dean’s Decision on Reappointment and Promotion,” below.

**Principles**

Each school shall have a formal and written grievance policy that is widely available and easily accessible to faculty, reflective of the distinctive culture of the school, responsive to the University’s commitment to academic excellence and to its responsibility to provide students with access to an excellent education, and cognizant of its responsibility to faculty to afford them due process and a fair hearing of their complaint. Each such policy must identify who is permitted to grieve, what can be grieved, the grounds upon which grievances are to be judged, and the procedures for doing so.

**Types of Faculty Grievances**

Faculty grievances are classified into two main types:

1. Those connected with reappointment or promotion.
2. Those concerned with other matters, such as duties, salaries, perquisites, and working conditions.
Basis for Grievance

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

With respect to grievances concerned with other matters, a grievance must allege that 1) the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration; or 2) that the decisions violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question, in which case the burden of proof falls to the grievant.

Who Can Grieve

With respect to grievances related to reappointment and promotion: A Continuing Contract Faculty member who is not eligible for reappointment cannot grieve a decision not to reappoint. Individuals on multi-year contracts of three years or more who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be reappointed do have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision with respect to reappointment or promotion or the terms of re-appointment or promotion; and they are entitled to grieve in the event they are denied reappointment without review for reasons other than elimination of the position. 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; and they are entitled to grieve the process in the event they are not reappointed after a third year review when a review had been explicitly promised in connection with the possibility of reappointment subject to it, but was not undertaken for reasons other than elimination of the position. Continuing Contract Faculty who are subject to a review process to determine whether they are to be promoted have a right to grieve the process in the event it leads to a negative decision.

With respect to grievances related to other matters: All Continuing Contract Faculty, including faculty on one-year appointments, are eligible to grieve.

The School Grievance Process

It is expected that most grievance cases, particularly those concerned with matters such as duties, salaries, perquisites, and working conditions, will be settled within each school or faculty. The schools and faculties have wide latitude in establishing procedures to meet their needs.

(NO PROPOSED CHANGES TO ABOVE SECTIONS)

Page 58, Para 4, Proposed Changes

Current Language

In the case of all grievances, attempts shall be made to settle the dispute by informal discussions between the concerned parties, possibly with the assistance of mediators.

Proposed Language

In the case of all grievances, within 15 working days of the faculty member notifying the Dean of an intent to file a grievance, an attempt shall be made to settle the dispute by an informal discussion between the concerned parties, possibly with the assistance of mediators.
**Page 58, Para 5, Proposed Change**

**Current Language**

*If a faculty member’s grievance is not settled informally at a level below the Dean, or by the Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean to convocate the grievance committee of the school or faculty. Each school or faculty shall designate a faculty committee to hear grievances in order to advise the Dean. Unless otherwise authorized in the school’s policy and approved by the Provost, each school shall either establish a new standing faculty committee for Continuing Contract Faculty grievances, which will include senior Continuing Contract Faculty and Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty elected by the voting members of the faculty; or shall expand its existing standing grievance committee for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty to include (elected) senior Continuing Contract Faculty who shall participate in hearing and evaluating only those grievances that are filed by Continuing Contract Faculty. The faculty grievance committee(s) shall not include departmental chairpersons or department heads or any faculty member whose primary assignment is administrative.*

**Proposed Language**

*If the faculty member decides that the grievance cannot be settled informally, at a level below the Dean, or by the Dean himself or herself, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean who shall convocate the grievance committee of the school or faculty within 15 days of the faculty's written notification. Each school or faculty shall designate a faculty committee to hear grievances in order to advise the Dean. Unless otherwise authorized in the school’s policy and approved by the Provost, each school shall either establish a new standing faculty committee for Continuing Contract Faculty grievances, which will include senior Continuing Contract Faculty and Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty elected by the voting members of the faculty; or shall expand its existing standing grievance committee for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty to include (elected) senior Continuing Contract Faculty who shall participate in hearing and evaluating only those grievances that are filed by Continuing Contract Faculty. The faculty grievance committee(s) shall not include departmental chairpersons or department heads or any faculty member whose primary assignment is administrative. The Grievance Committee Chair shall provide the grievant with status updates every two (2) months for the duration of the process.*

**Page 58, Para 6, Proposed Change**

**Current Language**

*The Dean shall convocate the committee within fifteen working days of receiving the faculty member’s appeal. In any instance in which the Dean has not so convoked the grievance committee, the faculty member has the right to bring it to the attention of the Office of the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health for matters involving the School of Medicine and the Faculty of Health). An exception to this may be made only with the consent of the grievant, the Dean, and the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health).*

**Proposed Language**

*The Dean shall convocate the committee within fifteen working days of receiving the faculty member’s appeal. In any instance in which the Dean has not so convoked the grievance committee, the faculty member has the right to bring it to the attention of the Office of the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health for matters involving the School of Medicine and the Faculty of Health). An exception to this may be made only with the consent of the grievant, the Dean, and the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health).*

*The grievance committee shall hold a hearing and shall complete its deliberations and notify the Dean of its recommendations preferably within 30 days of the close of the hearing, but, in any case within 60 days.*
days. At that time, the Grievance Committee shall also notify the grievant as to whether they found a violation of the faculty member’s University-protected rights, and if so, on which grounds.

Proposed Language

The grievance committee does not judge the professional merits of the case, but considers the grounds specified above (“Basis for Grievance”). Within 15 days of obtaining the recommendation of the grievance committee, the Dean shall decide the case and in writing shall notify the concerned parties and the grievance committee of his or her decision, together with reasons therefore, and information on the procedure for appeal.

As a standing committee of the faculty, the grievance committee must regularly report to the faculty on the number of cases heard or under study and the ultimate disposition of such cases, (for example, amicably settled, on appeal to the Provost or President, or committee report rejected by the Dean.”

Proposed Language

Appeal from a Dean’s Decision on Reappointment or Promotion

Appeals from a Dean’s decision can be made only on the following grounds: a) that the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration; or b) that the decisions violated the academic freedom of the person in question, in which case the burden of proof is on the faculty member.

NO PROPOSED CHANGES

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

NO PROPOSED CHANGES

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

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

The Continuing-Contract Faculty Grievance Committee Chair shall provide the grievant with status updates every two (2) months for the duration of the process.

Current Language
The Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall hold a hearing and shall complete its deliberations and notify the Provost of its recommendations preferably within 30 days of the close of the hearing, but, in any case within 60 days. The Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall at all times follow the requisites of fair and equitable hearing, but it is not to be restricted by the technical rules of evidence or the formality of the adversary proceeding as in a court trial. In each case, the Committee shall determine its own procedure, adapting the requirements of the particular case to the equity of the situation. This shall include, for example, the question of a record of the hearing, the examination of witnesses, the schedule and public nature of meetings, etc. The grievant, however, may determine whether he or she shall have the aid of an advisor or counsel.

NO PROPOSED CHANGES

Current Language
The Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee shall not judge professional merits, but only ascertain whether procedural safeguards (as referenced above in “Basis for Grievances”) have been observed. Evidence that a decision appealed is so arbitrary that it has no rational foundation may be considered on the issue of “inadequate consideration.”

NO PROPOSED CHANGES

Page 59, Para 6, Proposed Change

Current Language
After receiving the advice of the Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee, the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health) shall decide the case, and notify the grievant, the Dean, and the Chairperson of the Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee. If the advice of the latter is not followed, the reasons shall be reported with the decision. The decision of the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health) is final and subject to no further review.

Proposed Language
Within 30 days of receiving the advice of the Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee, the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health) shall decide the case, and notify the grievant, the Dean, and the Chairperson of the Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee. If the advice of the latter is not followed, the reasons shall be reported with the decision. As a standing committee, the Continuing Contract Faculty Grievance Advisory Committee must regularly report to the Continuing-Contract Faculty Senators Council the number of cases heard or under study and the ultimate disposition of such cases, (for example, amicably settled or committee report rejected by the Provost). The decision of the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health) is final and subject to no further review.
Appeal from a Dean’s Decision on Matters Such as Duties, Salaries, Perquisites, and Working Conditions

Current Language

Where such an appeal is desired by a Continuing Contract faculty member, and the Provost of the University (or Executive Vice President for Health) is so informed within 15 days after the faculty member is notified of the Dean’s decision, the Provost (or Executive Vice President for Health) shall make informal procedures available.

Appeals from a Dean’s decision can be made only on the following grounds: a) that the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration; or b) that the decisions violated the academic freedom of the person in question, in which case the burden of proof is on the faculty member.

NO PROPOSED CHANGES
C-FSC Education Policy and Faculty/Student Relations

Report on the Use of Language Regarding Course Evaluations in Contract Faculty Review, Promotion, and Retention

The following is a summary of the number of direct and indirect references to the use of course evaluations in the review, promotion, and retention of continuing contract faculty across NYU. It should be noted that some schools do not yet have approved contract faculty guidelines. The references are listed by school and the pages cited are from the published versions available via the Provost’s office or the school specific pages referenced.

We included instances where the documents referenced teaching excellence or a review of teaching without specifying the manner of or instruments used for such evaluation.

The samples below cover the major ways this language is used in the existing documents. While not all contract guidelines are quoted, the samples below demonstrate a pervasive use of the course evaluation tool in these processes with inconsistent clarity and specificity as to the weight of their value, the opportunity to formally respond, or what other teaching evaluation measures are also utilized.

The committee believes that this presents significant potential problems for contract faculty given the growing understanding nationally and at NYU regarding bias in these instruments. It also presents a potential risk for misuse of course evaluations against contract faculty unless greater safeguards are built around how they are weighted in the review process.

FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCES (3.7.19)

CLINICAL PROFESSORS (Various Levels)
http://as.nyu.edu/administrative-resources/office/associate-dean/policies-and-procedures/clinical-assistant-professor--clinical-associate-professor--and-.html
p.6
“...annual merit review, which typically considers the faculty member’s teaching performance, contribution to the effectiveness of the program or department, and relevant administrative performance.”

p.7
“Reappointment is based on departmental criteria of overall performance as a teacher and, if applicable, as an administrator.”

p.8
Regarding promotion: “In addition to the consideration of teaching, administration, and service activities, recommendations regarding promotion also may be based on a prognosis of the
clinical faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of FAS.”

p.9
“The candidate should submit a personal statement, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations to the chair or director of the department…”

“The review packet to be presented to the department chair/director and/or the full faculty should normally include...
An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:
Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)”

LANGUAGE LECTURERS (Various Levels)

P.14
“...annual merit review, which typically considers the faculty member’s teaching performance, contribution to the effectiveness of the program or department, and relevant administrative performance.”

P.15
“Reappointment is based on departmental criteria of overall performance as a teacher and, if applicable, as an administrator.”

P.16
Regarding promotion: “In addition to the consideration of teaching, administration, and service activities, recommendations regarding promotion also may be based on a prognosis of the faculty member’s future achievements based on dependability, growth, potential, and versatility of the faculty member as he or she will contribute to the evolving mission of FAS.”

“The candidate should submit a personal statement, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations to the chair or director of the department…”

p.17
“The review packet to be presented to the department chair/director and/or the full faculty should normally include...
An evaluation of teaching performance of the candidate, which should include:
Course evaluations (provided by the department administration)
Course syllabi (provided by the candidate)
Reports of classroom observation (provided by department administration or committee)”
The requirements for reappointment of Clinical Assistant Professors as described below depend on evidence of **excellence in teaching**…"

“For promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, excellence in scholarship or research in an academic field and/or continuing accomplishment in a field of the arts or a profession, in addition to **excellence in teaching**…”

Upon being considered for reappointment, the Clinical Assistant Professor… To this material the Dean’s office will attach **teaching evaluations** and observations, and advising evaluations.”

“When a Clinical Assistant Professor wishes, but normally after 6 years, he or she may request at the time of reappointment to be considered for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor… The Dean’s office will collect and **include teaching evaluations** and observations, and advising evaluations, but also solicit letters from students and colleagues attesting to the candidate’s teaching, advising, and service.”

All reviews after promotion to Clinical Associate Professor will be handled by the Dean’s office. A decanal committee consisting of at least the Dean, the Associate Dean for Faculty, and the Chair of the Senior Promotion and Tenure Committee will **review the candidate’s teaching**, advising and service as well as their scholarly, creative or practical work done since the last contract.”

“The review for promotion to the position of Clinical Professor, to be undertaken by the Senior Promotion and Tenure Committee, will **focus on teaching**, advising and service, and on the faculty member’s scholarly or creative work, or practice. The **faculty member's teaching, advising and service must be demonstrated to have been**
performed with excellence in the period since the faculty member was appointed Clinical Associate Professor…”

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (3.07.2018)

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS NOT ON THE TENURE TRACK
https://med.nyu.edu/for-faculty/sites/default/files/policy-on-performance-expectations-for-research-faculty.pdf
https://med.nyu.edu/for-faculty/sites/default/files/expectations-regarding-teaching.pdf

It is not always clear which guidelines specifically apply to contract faculty, but there do not appear to be clear guidelines about how student evaluations are used in the review or promotion of contract faculty.

STERN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS (4.2016)

CLINICAL (“CONTINUING”) FACULTY
http://web-docs.stern.nyu.edu/faculty/Clinical%20Policy%202016%20April%20FINAL.pdf

p.3 Terms of Appointment
Contracts of four or five years are reserved for clinical faculty at the Full Professor rank with a demonstrated record of continuous exceptional teaching performance and an unusual level of service or academic contribution to the school.

p. 3 Evidence of teaching performance may include course materials (e.g. syllabi, lecture notes, assignments), course development and innovation, instructor development, peer classroom observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.

P. 4 [Annual Merit Reviews]
Clinical faculty members are expected to adhere to the highest levels of performance and commitment to the university and the school and the highest standards of excellence in their fields. Specifically, they should demonstrate teaching excellence, as reflected by a combination of academically rigorous course content, teaching in courses of high strategic value to the school, pedagogical innovation, student ratings, student success consistent with high quality teaching, and enrollments. Evidence of teaching
performance may include course materials (e.g. syllabi, lecture notes, assignments), course development and innovation, instructor development, peer classroom observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.

p. 4 [submissions for Reappointment packages]

There is a link to Annual Merit Review guidelines but is a stern only link https://sso.stern.nyu.edu/pf/adapter2.adapter.ping?IdpAdapter=LDAPAdapter&SpSessionAuthnAdapterId=referenceID&TargetResource=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.stern.nyu.edu%2Fuser%2Fchallenge%3Fdestination%3Dnode%2F23491

Student evaluations since the last review (both an aggregated summary across courses and complete Course Faculty Evaluations (CFE) reports for all course sections taught)

Sample syllabi (or access to online teaching sites)
List of advisees (graduate and undergraduate)
Where appropriate, reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness

P.6 [submissions for promotion]

Student evaluations since the last review (both an aggregated summary across courses and complete Course Faculty Evaluation (CFE) reports for all course sections taught)
Sample syllabi (or access to online teaching sites)
List of advisees (graduate and undergraduate)
Where appropriate, reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness

STEINHARDT (No Date)

CLINICAL FACULTY
The primary responsibilities of clinical faculty involve superb teaching and mentoring students into their chosen fields. P. 1

Criteria for Appointment at all levels:
In all cases, excellence in teaching and mentoring students is required. P. 4

Reappointment
The department peer review committee thoroughly reviews, and includes in the docket, the annual Faculty Professional Activities Report and other materials, which should include: • Student evaluations of teaching during the appointment period (and end of prior appointment period, if applicable). • Peer observations of teaching that are conducted annually by a senior member of the department during the appointment period.

Promotion

Teaching:
o Versatility – that is, excellence in teaching at more than one level (undergraduate, masters, advanced graduate) and in more than one form (e.g., lecturing to large groups, conducting discussion groups and seminars, directing field experiences in the particular discipline, guiding independent study or research).
o Excellence in course or program development.
o Exemplary and unique student achievement (which may include but is not limited to local, national, and international conference presentations, teaching awards, training grants).

Widespread reputation for excellence in teaching (e.g., testimony from former students, colleagues, and client groups, data, and various awards or other recognition relevant to teaching and mentoring). o Widespread reputation for excellence in student mentoring and career advisement. o Concerted effort to engage colleagues, locally and nationally, in conversations about teaching and learning the particular discipline (e.g., organizing or leading teaching workshops, teaching-related conference presentations). o Advising, mentoring, and nurturing students and early career faculty.

Teaching evaluations. 8. Recommendation from Department Peer Review Committee. 9. Recommendation from department chairperson. 10. Letters from external referees. P. 11

Appendix A: Suggested Activities to be Included in the Review Process (**notice NO inclusion of evals here)** P. 12

Excellent. • Documentation of excellent performance in teaching includes outstanding performance in classroom teaching, advising, and mentoring. Evidence of more widespread impact of scholarship about teaching is helpful, but given that the primary role of many clinical faculty is classroom teaching, outstanding classroom teaching, and fieldwork can be sufficient for a rating of excellent. • Evidence of movement toward national visibility and clinical expertise also can contribute toward an excellent rating in teaching and may include documentation of an active role in communicating instructional efforts and innovations nationally and internationally. • This documentation may include scholarly presentations and/or publications about teaching or clinical practice. Other forms of evidence may include documentation of widespread impact of instructional materials and activities created by the clinical faculty member (e.g., textbooks, videos, Web pages, publications, catalogs, CDs, conference presentations). • Teaching awards (University, School, and external) may also provide evidence of teaching excellence.

Appendix B: Guideline for Reviews P. 15

Competency as TEACHER Demonstrated Through

• Syllabi • Student Feedback Forms (and teacher response sheet) • Teaching Portfolios

Appendix C: P. 17

RECOMMENDATION FOR CLINICAL REAPPOINTMENT

List of supporting materials used in review:

Course faculty evaluations, peer observations, syllabi or URL (required)

A. Teaching Summary (please provide an overview of the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness such as course faculty evaluations, letters from students, teaching awards, e

TISCH

ARTS PROFESSORS (All Levels) 11.8.2013
“4.1... Guiding criteria for the Department Chair’s probationary year review may include, without limitation: evidence of commitment to teaching excellence, teaching syllabi, classroom observations, reports from area heads, professional activities and the quality of service contributions to the Department and to the School.”

“4.2 The Department Chair shall conduct an annual review... the criteria used to evaluate success in the areas of teaching... ”

“5.3 The candidate should prepare a docket that contains the following…

v. Teaching evaluations for the years since appointment. (It is the responsibility of candidates to request and include their teaching evaluations in their dockets.)”

“6.6 The candidate prepares and submits a docket to the Departmental Arts Professor Promotions and Review Committee, containing the following...

vi. Teaching evaluations for the years since appointment (It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to request and include their teaching evaluations in their docket.)”

“7.1 To merit promotion to Associate Arts Professor, candidates must have a record of substantial artistic, academic, curatorial, or other professional activity and effective teaching.”

“7.2 Candidates for promotion to Associate Arts Professor must demonstrate a commitment to teaching as a vital and central activity and an exceptional record of teaching since their initial appointments as Assistant Arts Professors. A dedication to instruction and to fostering student growth and development is essential for all Tisch faculty members and especially for Associate Arts Professors.”

“8.3 Candidates for promotion to Arts Professor must be able to demonstrate that they have maintained teaching and fostering student growth and development as a vibrant and fundamental activity.”

“9.3 The Arts Professor eligible for reappointment prepares a self-report that documents maintenance of the three areas:

a. An active professional profile of high standards
b. Excellence in teaching
c. Distinguished service
Along with the self-report the Arts Professors should include a current Curriculum Vitae and any creative materials since the last review that they feel are relevant.

TEACHERS (All Levels)
https://tisch.nyu.edu/content/dam/tisch/faculty-services/TSOA%20Teacher%20Policy_Current%20Approved%2008172105.pdf

“2.2 … all TSOA Teachers are expected to engage in (a) teaching of the highest caliber…”

“4.3 … The criteria used to evaluate the TSOA Teacher’s performance… The materials which form the basis of the annual review include: (i) Teaching: teaching self-evaluations, student written evaluations and curricular materials such as class syllabi and course materials…”

“4.5 In the first semester of the third year of continuous one-year appointments, the TSOA Teacher undergoes a formal review… The TSOA Teacher’s Docket includes the following: Materials Submitted by the TSOA Teacher… Student Evaluations of Teaching… Classroom observation report…”

“5.4 The Committee’s assessment is guided by the performance standards established in the Department Policies, and consists of a thorough review of the TSOA Teacher’s Docket, which includes the following… Student Evaluations of Teaching… Classroom observation report…”
Committee on Faculty Benefits and Housing

A faculty member inquired about the new Child Care Fund for Faculty Program, which began this calendar year, and which is currently restricted to dependent children age 3 and under. It would be helpful to faculty parents—especially those who reside outside New York City, but also for those who do have access to pre-K programs—if the fund could subvent child care costs until children enter kindergarten. I raised this issue with the Benefits Office, and they report that the policy is under review. For the current benefit, see—
https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/hr/documents/LiveSmart/ChildCare-Fund.pdf

On April 16, 2019, I met with Grace Cosachov Protos, the Executive Director of the Work Life Office. We discussed the Child Care Fund age restriction, how to target mental health/employee assistance programming to faculty, faculty with disabilities, home purchase assistance, retirement planning for faculty, conference travel support for faculty with dependent care responsibilities, and how best to include Work Life programming in faculty recruitment and in event planning.

On April 19, 2019, I attended the quarterly meetings of the University’s Retirement Plan Investment Committee. This was the first at which representatives from the C-FSC, T-FSC, and AMC were in attendance. The main business of the meeting was review of recommendations from the University’s actuarial consultants, Cammack Retirement Group, about funds to be added to, removed from, or continued on the “watch list,” that is, the list of funds receiving special scrutiny of their continued suitability as retirement investment options. In addition, I asked that the University explore additional options for participants in the international retirement plan. I also asked that consideration of the Council’s March 8, 2018 resolution concerning the Vanguard Total International Bond Index Fund be added to the agenda.

We are planning a joint meeting with the T-FSC committee and representative from the Benefits Office to discuss mental health/employee assistance programming for faculty. This is now tentatively scheduled for April 30th.

We are also planning for our annual joint meeting with the T-FSC committee, representatives of the Benefits Office, and the University’s benefits consultants to discuss proposed changes to benefits for the coming calendar year. This meeting is planned for June.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent Renzi,
chair
Judicial Board Representative Report

The Judicial Board met on March 29th, 2019 for an end of year wrap up, presentation by the Office of Student Conduct, and to discuss potential changes to the student conduct policy. The report submitted with the University Senate meeting materials for our April meeting is a good overview of the work of the Judicial Board for the year. Two significant items with impact for next academic year seem important to bring to the C-FSC’s attention:

1. The Judicial Board’s name will now be the “Community Standards Committee.” This is meant to better reflect the activities of the committee and the express the values and purpose of the work.
2. The committee will continue to look at the student conduct policy related to hazing in the coming year after some discussion about an amendment to the policy and the desire to ensure it properly addresses unlawful behavior in such incidents.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Illingworth
The following new program was voted upon and approved at our meeting on April 24, 2019:

Degree Proposal: Master of Science (M.S.) in Epidemiology
School/Portal Campus: College of Global Public Health

The following three memos of intent were also approved at our April 24 meeting:

Degree Proposal: Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) Childhood-Special Education and Early Childhood-Special Education
School/Portal Campus: Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

Degree Proposal: Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) Teaching Middle and High School
School/Portal Campus: Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

Degree Proposal: Doctor of Occupational Therapy (O.T.D.) Entry Level
School/Portal Campus: Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

Submitted by: Iskender Sahin, Graduate Program Committee.