



Date: May 16, 2016

Memo to: David W. McLaughlin, Provost

From: Fred Carl
Chairperson, C-Faculty Senators Council
A/Y 2015-2016

Subject: Recommendations of the C-FSC regarding Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments, Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP)

At the May 12, 2016 meeting of the C-Faculty Senators Council, the attached recommendations were approved.

cc: Katherine Fleming, Deputy Provost and Vice Chancellor
Carol Morrow, Senior Associate Provost/Chief of Staff to the Provost
Steven E Koonin, Director, Center for Urban Science & Progress (CUSP)
Paul M Horn, Senior Vice Provost of Research
Peter Gonzalez, Assistant Provost for Academic Appointments

C-FSC Steering Committee Members:

Randy Mowry, C-FSC Vice Chairperson
Joseph Borowiec
David Elcott
Mary Killilea
Susan Stehlik
Patrick Ying

John Halpin, C-FSC Personnel Policies & Contract Issues Committee Chair

**Recommendations Of
The Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council
In Regard To:**

**NYU CUSP (Center for Urban Science and Progress)
POLICY ON FULL-TIME NON-TENURE TRACK CONTINUING
CONTRACT FACULTY (FTNTT/CCF)**

Background

From a letter dated November 6, 2015, sent by Provost David McLaughlin:

“CUSP was established in 2012 with an award from the NYC Economic Development Corporation. A University-wide center, CUSP is authorized to make appointments of FTNTT/CF faculty and to offer cross appointments to T/TT faculty with primary appointments in NYU schools. As a new unit, CUSP has made only a couple of FTNTT/CF appointments. Accordingly, the policy was primarily formulated by the office of the Director. The terms of the award require CUSP to report to the EDC on the size and composition of its faculty. Finalizing the CUSP policy at this time – even before there is a full quorum of faculty – is necessary to allow CUSP to properly appoint and report on its faculty to the EDC.

“As is the case with all such policies, CUSP worked together with my office and the Office of General Counsel to edit this document to ensure consistency with University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments. As part of the process of finalizing the policy, I invite the T-FSC and the C-FSC to provide comments from a University-wide perspective. To reiterate my expectations: At NYU – and as stated in the University Guidelines – our strong tradition is for schools to develop policies that are "consistent with school culture and history." Within that tradition, the Guidelines provide 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." My expectations are that the Faculty Senators Councils adopt the same perspectives for their review, doing so with deference to each school's distinct style and mode of presentation.

“As is our practice, I will consider the Councils' comments in consultation with CUSP before finalizing the document. Please let me know if you have questions that my office can address to facilitate your review, and feel free to consult Professor Koonin. Thank you for your prompt attention to this document.”

The following document consists of recommendations made by the C-FSC Personnel Policies & Contract Issues Committee in an effort to improve the NYU CUSP Policy On Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Continuing Contract Faculty (FTNTT/CCF) and to ensure its compliance with the University Guidelines For Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments.

Substantive Major Recommendations:

Recommendations

1. Add the following language to the introduction of the CUSP Policy:

“Every five years, the Director of CUSP will appoint a committee of faculty and administrators to review this policy. Working with the Director, the committee will prepare a written report, including the success of and/or challenges in implementing the policy, which will be provided to the Provost of the University.”

2. The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, page 1, Section II. Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1, state:

“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 FTNTT/CF 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 CUSP faculty. It is our understanding that no consultation was made with the CUSP 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 Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, allowing the CUSP faculty, acting, according to its charter or its faculty governance structure, through its Faculty Assembly or similar body, 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 faculty charter or governance structure, should be included and stated explicitly.

3. CHANGES TO POLICY

The policy should follow the letter and the spirit contained in the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, page 1, Section II. Formulation of School Policies, paragraph 2, sentence 1, which state:

“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 FTNTT/CF shall participate in formulating and/or amending the school policy to the extent and manner in which school governance policies permit.”

Recommendation:

Add the following:

“Any amendment to this Policy must be in writing, submitted in advance to the CUSP contract faculty for discussion, for the possibility for amendments, and for a vote at a regularly scheduled Faculty Assembly or faculty meeting, following the Faculty Charter or shared governance structure.”

4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Recommendation

“Where professional, scholarly and /or creative is required for reappointment and promotion, professional development funds and research leave eligibility 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 added.”

5. Introduction, Page 3

Recommendation

Knowledge of roles and responsibilities should come from the contract, not from the Deputy Director. This needs to be clearly stated. Also, the following passage needs to be deleted:

“FTNTT/CF faculty are encouraged to work directly with their cognizant Deputy Director to understand their individual roles and responsibilities, identify opportunities for professional development and contribute to the excellence of the Center for Urban Science and Progress.”

6. III. Titles and Terms of Employment

D. Titles and Areas of Responsibility for FTNTTICF, Page 3

“Full-time Non-Tenure Track Contract Faculty are experienced practitioners, teachers and researchers in their areas of specialization. At CUSP, the FTNTT/CF title is: Professor of Practice. The Professor of Practice's primary role involves teaching, student advising, and mentoring. The normal teaching load for Professors of Practice is up to six courses per year, although responsibility for coordination of the Masters students' intensive project course may reduce the classroom teaching load. Teaching faculty are expected to develop and create innovative curriculum and new course syllabi and engage in program review, accreditation compliance and assessment of curricula. Faculty appointed with this title will possess advanced academic credentials, will be full-time members of CUSP, and will have a demonstrated interest in pedagogy. Titles may include assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, or professor of practice.”

Clarification Needed

Is there a teaching load baseline of 6 courses, or not? A range does not express a norm.

Moreover, this section is unclear. What kind of mentoring will be offered? Research? Career? How does it differ from advising? How often are faculty expected to develop and create innovative curriculum and new course syllabi? We recommend that the phrase, “expected to develop and create innovative curriculum and new course syllabi...” be replaced with “encouraged to develop...” Indicate advanced academic credentials: MA, MS, or PhD.

7. CONTRACT FACULTY AND TENURED FACULTY DISTINCTION

Recommendation

As CUSP contract faculty are exclusively non-tenured, add language describing the differences between tenured faculty expectations and non-tenured faculty expectations. Add the following,

“Continuing Faculty lines differ from tenure-track lines. “Continuing Contract Faculty lines are typically multiyear and differ from tenure lines at the School in the following ways: [identify the differences].”

8. III. B. Terms of Employment, Page 3

“Each full-time contract faculty appointment is to be secured by a written contract, specifying a fixed term, signed by the parties to it, and filed with the University Office of Academic Appointments prior to commencement of employment. Such contracts shall include the following terms negotiated between the faculty member and the appropriate administrator with the authority to do so, and approved by the Director of CUSP.

- “start and end dates of the appointment;
- an indication of whether the faculty member is eligible to be considered for reappointment upon conclusion of the current contract;
- academic responsibilities, compensation, and obligations of the appointment;
- particular responsibilities and benefits; and
- agreement to be bound by applicable University policies.”

Recommendation

Explicitly state the academic responsibilities, compensations, and obligations of the appointment and spell out the particular responsibilities and benefits.

9. III C. Duration of Contracts, Page 4

“Within the framework of CUSP's long term staffing plans, extended periods of employment support continuing involvement with students and colleagues and provide an appropriate and desirable element of job security. As such, CUSP FTNTT/CF appointments will typically be secured by a three-year contract with renewable terms, unless a one-year renewable contract is more appropriate based on CUSP's academic curricular needs.”

Recommendation

To satisfy the requirement, as stated in the “University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments,” that “school policies shall include a rationale for a FTNTT/CF title(s) that carries a one-year appointment,” add the following language:

“If a one-year contract is adopted, the CUSP dean must supply a written justification, based on programmatic and academic considerations to the faculty or the faculty governance body.”

10. III C. Duration of Contracts, Page 4

“As such, CUSP FTNTT/CF appointments will typically be secured by a three-year contract with renewable terms,…”

Recommendation

The word “typically” needs to be deleted, unless the contract may be longer than three years, in which case, the statement should read “As such, CUSP FTNTT/CF appointments will be secured by a three-year contract (or longer) with renewable terms,…”

11. IV. Hiring, Reappointment, and Promotion

“Appointment processes for FTNIT/CF reflect CUSP's overriding commitment to enhance academic excellence and to provide students with the best available educational experience. Thus, each FTNTT/CF appointment and reappointment shall be evaluated in the light of the contribution it makes to the distinct excellence of CUSP including its educational and research programs, and shall exemplify the university's commitment to appoint and retain the best faculty in all disciplines.”

Recommendation

If a Contract Faculty member is not engaged in research, how will they contribute to the research programs?

12. IV. Hiring and Promotion, A. Eligibility and Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion, Page 4

“Faculty appointed under three-year full-time contracts may be eligible for reappointment. CUSP contracts will specify whether this is the case. CUSP will provide regular written feedback to faculty on three-year contracts regarding their performance based on standards embodying the highest levels of achievement. However, even in those cases in which a candidate satisfies the appropriate standards of achievement, the decision to reappoint or promote may be impacted by curricular, structural, or financial changes.”

Recommendation

The policy should indicate that curricular or structural changes do not automatically warrant a

denial of reappointment. Instead, the denial should have a rational basis, and it should include a process for determining whether the professor can or cannot teach under the new curriculum or structure. Add the following language after the penultimate sentence (paraphrased from the Tisch Teachers Contract Faculty Policy, 2014 and the Gallatin Contract Faculty Policy, 2015):

“In such event, the review would focus on whether the CUSP professor would be able to teach in the revised curriculum or academic structure and, if so, in what capacity.”

Recommendation

Specification of framework needed.

13. IV. Hiring and Promotion

B. Reappointment/or Three-Year Contracts, Page 4

“Reappointment requires a formal review process. The process shall be conducive to insuring that candidates for reappointment and promotion exhibit the highest level of performance and achievement -whether in teaching, or traditional research and scholarship.”

Recommendation

Delete the word “whether.” And add the word service so that the sentence reads, “in teaching, service, or if applicable, traditional research and scholarship.”

Will the candidate be reviewed only on teaching or only on research and scholarship? Evaluative measures are unclear. Add “See Appendix B.”

14. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES -- REAPPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION

Include for consistency that for faculty whose responsibilities are primarily administrative, greater weight will be given to performance in this area in reviews for reappointment or promotion.

15. IV. Hiring and Promotion

B. Reappointment/or Three-Year Contracts, Page 4

“Review for reappointment/non-reappointment is conducted in the penultimate year of the initial term of appointment and completed by the end of that penultimate year. In the event of a decision to reappoint, the FTNTT/CF shall complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another three-year term. In the event of a decision to not reappoint, the contract faculty member shall be notified of the intention to not reappoint no later than August 31st of the penultimate year, and shall continue to be under contract for the final year.”

Recommendation

Delete “normally” in the sentence, “In the event of a decision to reappoint, the FTNTT/CF shall

complete the remainder of his/her term and shall be reappointed, normally, for another three-year term.” And add the following, “Subsequent appointments will be for three years.”

16. IV. Hiring and Promotion

B. Reappointment/or Three-Year Contracts, Page 4

Recommendation

There is no prior mention of terms greater than three year contracts. Indicate terms for Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, and (Full) Professor of Practice. These titles and terms need to be defined earlier in the document. Add the following language,

When promoted to a three-year contract (Assistant Professor of Practice), subsequent appointments shall be for three years.

When promoted to a five-year contract (Associate Professor of Practice), subsequent appointments shall be for five years.

When promoted to a XX-year contract (Professor of Practice), subsequent appointments shall be of the same length.

As a five-year appointment is the norm for the rank of Associate Contract Faculty, provide an increase in term of appointment for (Full) Professor of Practice; this is the case at certain schools (e.g., The Gallatin School).

17. IV. Hiring and Promotion

B. Reappointment/or Three-Year Contracts, Page 4

Recommendation

Delete the word “aspires”; a time line should be given. Delete the phrase, “which may vary on a case-by-case basis.” It is unclear why reviews would differ for different candidates.

Also add date when committee will begin its review.

18. IV. B. Reappointment for Three-Year Contracts, Page 5

“CUSP's process for review of three-year contracts, including promotion reviews, will include: a review, which is advisory to the cognizant Deputy Director and the Director, comprised of one senior FTNIT/CF and two NYU TTF who have joint appointments in CUSP”

Recommendation

The committee(s) should be made up of elected members, not appointed; contract faculty should make up the majority if possible.

19. IV. B. Reappointment for Three-Year Contracts, Page 5

“...a statement of the academic criteria in the areas of teaching, program development, research and scholarship, and service that will guide the committee's evaluation”

Recommendation

If the statement of academic criteria has been established, then where is it? If not, who provides it?

20. IV. B. Reappointment for Three-Year Contracts, Page 5

“Review for reappointment and promotion shall consider curricular and structural changes and improvements in academic programs.

“In addition to formal reviews at the time of potential reappointment, each FTNTT/CF member on a three-year contract shall annually submit to his/her cognizant Deputy Director an activity report, using an activity report form, which will shall be provided to each FTNTT/CF member 30 days in advance of its due date.”

Recommendation

Is the activity form tailored to C-faculty, or is it a TT form? Ensure that the activity form is tailored for C-faculty (and is not a T-faculty form).

21. IV. C. Reappointment on One-Year Full-Time Contracts, Page 5

“CUSP Deputy Directors should conduct a performance review of and provide feedback to each FTNTT/CF member reporting to them. FTNTT/CF may be reappointed to a series of one-year full-time contracts. As is the case in 3-year contracts, eligibility to be considered for reappointment does not guarantee reappointment.”

Recommendation

Under what circumstances, would reappointment not be granted, e.g., for performance or other? Clarify.

22. IV. C. Reappointment on One-Year Full-Time Contracts, Page 5

Recommendation

To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of CUSP faculty on one- year appointments (when the norm is three- and five-year appointments), add language allowing for a transition to a three-year appointment for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal third- year review, such as:

“Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to a three-year appointment.”

23. IV. C. Reappointment on One-Year Full-Time Contracts, Page 5

“In the first semester of the third year of continuous appointments, a FTNTT/CF member shall be subject to annual review comparable to those to which faculty members on 3-year contracts are subject. The timetable for a formal review is shown below assuming the appointment terminates on August 31. The review of a FTNNT/CF member with a one-year contract that terminates on August 31 follows the general time line below, which may vary on a case-by-case basis.”

Recommendation

When did the committee start its review? Add specific dates for notice of renewal and reappointment (We suggest mid-March in order to maximize notice of reappointment) and there is no date for dean’s response (We recommend early April). This lack of specificity will cause problems.

Delete the phrase, “which may vary on a case-by-case basis.” It is unclear why reviews would differ for different candidates.

- 24.** Again, to prevent the establishment of a permanent group of CUSP faculty on one-year appointments (when the norm is three- and five-year appointments), add language allowing for a transition to a three-year appointment for faculty on one-year appointments who successfully complete a formal third- year review, such as:

“Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to a three-year appointment.”

25. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

“The rank of FTNTT/CT faculty appointed at CUSP is determined according to the following guidelines: Appointments at the Assistant level are generally made for individuals who possess 5 years work experience or less. Appointments at the Associate level are generally made for individuals who possess more than 5 years prior experience. Appointments at the Full or Senior level are generally made for individuals who possess more than 10 years of prior experience and a demonstrated record of excellence.”

Recommendation

Criteria for promotion should be stated, unless it is just time in rank. Is it Appendix B? Is it the length of contract? For promotion, Appendix B needs to describe performance thresholds for performance.

26. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

Recommendation

Unless promotion is automatic, based solely on seniority, there need to be criteria for promotion into higher ranks. There are none offered.

27. Renewal and Promotion Committee

Recommendation

The Committee should choose its own chair, who then coordinates the creation of the committee's report and recommendation for reappointment, which is then submitted to the CUSP Dean. The duties of the chair should be included in this paragraph, as well as the process of evaluating the review material. The process of the creation of the committee's report should be explicitly stated with language similar to the following (from the FAS Website, "Recruitment of New Faculty, Section 1.7, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professors, Overview," <http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html>):

"The committee will prepare a written review for the CUSP Dean evaluating and summarizing the evidence of accomplishment, noting areas that require improvement, and making a recommendation regarding reappointment, and promotion and contract length (when applicable)."

28. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

Recommendation

Add the following,

"The committee should hold a secret ballot to determine the majority opinion. In that case, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix." (This conforms roughly to procedures in place at FAS and also produces a fuller accounting of the committee's findings. It also provides the necessary record of process in the event that the faculty member receives a negative review.)

29. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

Recommendation

Specify that a majority vote of the Review and Promotion Committee shall be required for a successful review and that all votes of both Committees shall be by secret ballot.

30. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

Recommendation

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

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

31. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

Recommendation

Add detailed information: "The CUSP Dean will provide the faculty member with a written summary that includes suggestions for professional development and a recommendation regarding appointment, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee's evaluation, as well as his or her own assessment and continuing programmatic need for the appointment."

A review of promotion process needs to be included, add the following:

"The summary letter to the candidate must include the recommendation of the CUSP dean, including promotion and the length of reappointment (if that is the decision), and a signature block for the candidate."

32. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

Recommendation

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

"If the CUSP Dean's decision is contrary on appointment, title, or length of contract to that of the Review and Reappointment Committee or the Promotion Committee, the Dean will provide the committee with the reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's decision is finalized."

33. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

Recommendation

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.”

34. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion, Page 6

The grievance/appeal process, of crucial importance to the faculty, should be developed by the faculty and added to the Policy document before the Provost approves it. The process should be identified and explicitly described in this document.

Additionally, The New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Non-Tenure/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.

Recommendation

We recommend the development of this grievance process should be undertaken by the CUSP 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.

1 [http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/provost/documents/facultyHandbook/GuidelinesFinal0209 I S.pdf](http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/provost/documents/facultyHandbook/GuidelinesFinal0209%20I%20S.pdf)

Appendix B

35. For promotion, Appendix B needs to describe performance thresholds for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice and (Full) Professor of Practice.

36. Performance Reviews, Page 7

“The review process should include the FTNTT/CF's Professional Activities Report along with other materials such as:

- “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 CUSP during the appointment period.
- Current CV.

- If applicable, summary of applied research and scholarship including research projects, grant proposals, conference papers and publications.”

Recommendation

Specify how “performance” will be assessed. For example, the following factors might be considered: course materials (e.g., syllabi, lecture notes, assignments), course development and innovation, instructor development, collegial observations, self-presentation, samples of student writing, evidence of continuing influence upon students, examples of learning beyond the classroom, student evaluations, etc.

Substantive Minor Recommendations

1. Introduction, Page 3

Full-time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty (FTNTT/CF) are a distinct and important part of CUSP's academic community that contributes significantly to CUSP's academic mission. This policy governs the hiring, review, and reappointment **and promotion** of FTNTT/CF and is intended to recognize the contributions this group of faculty makes to CUSP's commitment to teaching excellence, traditional research, and other forms of scholarly achievement and service within the academic community. CUSP is committed to providing our students with an education that extends beyond the classroom and prepares them to advance knowledge, scholarship and innovation in the real world. The professional experience, guidance and accomplishments of our Full-time Non-Tenure Track/ Contract Faculty are integral to realizing this mission. FTNTT/CF faculty are encouraged to work directly with their cognizant Deputy Director to understand their individual roles and responsibilities, identify opportunities for professional development and contribute to the excellence of the Center for Urban Science and Progress.

Recommendation

Add “and promotion” (bolded above)

2. IV. Hiring, Reappointment, and Promotion, Page 4

“The hiring process includes consultation with NYU's T/TT faculty who have joint appointments in CUSP and also provides for meaningful FTNTT/CF input.”

Recommendation

Describe how “meaningful input” will be provided.

3. PROCESS AND TIMETABLE

Recommendation

IV. Hiring and Promotion

A. Eligibility and Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion, Page 4

“CUSP will provide regular written feedback to faculty on three-year contracts regarding their performance based on standards embodying the highest levels of achievement.”

Clarification

How often will written feedback be offered? Who offers the feedback? The renewal committee?

4. IV. Hiring and Promotion, A. Eligibility and Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion, Page 4

“Where a position is to be eliminated at the end of the contract term and there is no similar position open, there is no reappointment process; however, the faculty member may request a performance review for career development to be conducted within a time framework specified beforehand.”

Add language similar to:

“During the first week of the academic year in the penultimate year of an appointment, faculty member receives notification that she/he is up for review.”

5. Specify the grounds for and process of stopping the contract clock by adding language satisfying the following from the New York University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, issued June 12, 2014, revised December 15, page 6:

“Each school process for review of full-time multi-year contracts of three years or more, including promotion reviews, must include: ... the grounds for stopping the contract clock for reasonable cause, e.g., medical, personal, as primary caregiver for child, spouse, parent, same-sex domestic partner, or by contractual stipulation or negotiation;”

Minor Editorial Issues

1. Delete the word “cognizant” throughout the document.
2. Add Roman numeral IV to the “Hiring, Reappointment, and Promotion” section. Renumber subsequent sections.
3. IV. D. Eligibility for Rank and Promotion

Recommendation

Everyone has a rank. Delete the word “rank” in the section heading

4. Appendix B, Performance Reviews, Page 7

“As part of the performance assessment process for reappointment or promotion, the review committee should consider evidence of accomplishment in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, service and administration, and professional activity, and discuss where the FTNTT/CF member can focus efforts to provide feedback that will lead to further professional development.”

Recommendation

This section is unclear. It sounds like discussions will help faculty member to focus efforts that provide feedback, but it is doubtful that this is its intention.

5. The last bullet point under “Teaching” needs to be moved to the “Scholarship” category.
