



**Date:** April 26, 2017

**Memo to:** Katherine Fleming, Provost

**From:** Fred Carl  
Chairperson, C-Faculty Senators Council  
A/Y 2016-2017

**Subject:** C-Faculty Senators Council Review: Tandon School of Engineering Guidelines for Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Grievance Procedures, and Voting Rights

The C-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached recommendations regarding the Tandon School of Engineering Guidelines for Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Grievance Procedures, and Voting Rights, as approved at the April 25, 2017 Council meeting.

**cc:** Katepalli R. Sreenivasan, Dean, Tandon School of Engineering  
Richard Thorsen, Tandon School of Engineering  
Carol Morrow, Vice Provost  
Peter Gonzalez, Associate Provost for Academic Appointments

*C-FSC Steering Committee Members:*

Mary Killilea, C-FSC Vice Chairperson

Joseph Borowiec

John Halpin

Larry Slater

Susan Stehlik

Patrick Ying

Brian Mooney, C-FSC Personnel Policies & Contract Issues Committee Chair

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

**Tandon School of Engineering  
Proposed: Guidelines for Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment,  
Reappointment, Promotion and Grievance Procedures, and Voting Rights**

**Background**

From a letter dated January 5, 2017 sent by Provost Katherine Fleming: “The Dean of the Tandon School has submitted to me the school’s guidelines pertaining to C- Faculty. I am advised that this document was drafted with extensive iterative faculty input, including an authoring ad hoc working group of C-Faculty and T-Faculty that included faculty senators; discussion with the Tandon Faculty Executive Committee and at Tandon faculty meetings; and surveys of C-Faculty. The full process is detailed in the attached memo from Richard Thorsen, Tandon’s Interim Associate Dean for Academic Administration.”

The following document consists of recommendations made jointly by the C- FSC Personnel Policies & Contract Issues Committee and the T-FSC Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Committee in an effort to improve the *Tandon School of Engineering Guidelines for Continuing Contract Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Grievance Procedures, and Voting Rights* and to ensure its compliance with the University Guidelines For Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty Appointments.

**I. SUBSTANTIVE MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**I. Introduction**

1. Comment: 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.”

1. Recommendation: 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.”

## **II. Scope**

2. Comment: Since Continuing Contract faculty are exclusively non-tenured, add language describing the differences between tenured faculty expectations and non-tenured faculty expectations. 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.

### 2. Recommendation:

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]**”

## **III. Appointment and Reappointment**

3. Comment: The University Guidelines for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, page 4, states: “Continuing Contract Faculty appointments that provide for the possibility of extended period 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.”

3. Recommendation: “If a one- or two-year contracts are 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, Faculty Senate, etc.).”

4. Comment: To prevent the establishment of a permanent group of continuing contract faculty on one-year appointments, add language allowing for a transition to an appointment of at least three years for faculty on one-year appointments or a combination of one-year and two-year appointments who successfully complete a formal review, such as:

4. Recommendation: “Faculty members on continuous one-year appointments or a combination of successive one-year and two-year appointments who successfully complete their third-year formal review shall move to at least a three-year appointment.”

5. Comment: In the first paragraph, the policy provides only that reappointment to a three-year contract subsequent to an initial one-year or two-year contract “may be appropriate.” This presents the possibility of the creation of a permanent group faculty on continuing one-year or two-year appointments.

5. Recommendation: Delete “may be appropriate” and change sentence to “...reappointment shall be to terms of three years for Assistant and Associate Industry Professors and lecturers, and five years for Industry Professors and Senior Lecturers.”

6. Comment: The policy does not address the term length of appointments subsequent to an initial three-year or five-year contract.

6. Recommendation: When promoted to a three-year contract (Industry Assistant Professors and Lecturers) subsequent appointments shall be for at least three years.

7. Recommendation: When promoted to a five-year contract (Industry Associate Professors and Senior Lecturers) subsequent appointments shall be for at least five years.

8. Comment: The two bullet points in this section provide the faculty member with notification dates, but these provisions do not address the possibility that the faculty might not be reappointed for curricular needs or structural changes.

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.

8. Recommendation: Add the following language (paraphrased from the Tisch Arts Professor Policy, 2013, the Tisch Teach Policy, 2014, and the Gallatin Contract Faculty Policy, 2015),

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

#### **IV. Reappointment Review**

##### **A. Contracts Continuing Beyond the Third Year of Continuous Service from Initial Appointment**

9. Comment: It is not clear if this section is intended to cover faculty on continuous 1-year contracts

9. Recommendation: Clarify whether this applies to faculty on continuous 1-year contracts.

10. Comment: The first bullet point concerns the composition of the reappointment committee and directs that the committee consist of at least two members. If there are only two or some other even number of members, they may deadlock on decision.

10. Recommendation: The committee should consist of three or five or some other uneven number of members.

11. Comment: The first bullet point does not indicate how committee members are selected.

11. Recommendation: The committee should be made up of elected, not appointed, members from the appropriate department.

12. Comment: The first bullet point specifies that the committee chair be appointed by the Department Chair. The spirit of elections should pertain to the selection of the chair as well as the other members of the committee.

12. Recommendation: The committee chair should be elected from among the committee members.

13. Comment: The third bullet point presents a list of items to be assessed as evidence of teaching quality. It does not include reports of classroom teaching observations.

13. Recommendation: Insert language from the list “Materials for the promotion review” on page 4 of the policy, “Written evaluations of classroom teaching observed by voting faculty.”

14. Comment: The materials for review include materials demonstrating evidence of “Research and Scholarship” and of “Creative and Performance Arts.” It appears that some faculty will be expected to produce research and creative output, but the policy is silent on the availability of leave time and research funds for such faculty.

14. Recommendation:

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 added.

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.

### **Materials for the reappointment review**

15. Comment: The list of materials is incomplete in comparison to the list of materials to be considered for promotion found on page 4.

15. Recommendation: Conform the list of items to the list provided for Promotions so that it includes statements of teaching and service, list of all courses taught since the previous appointment, and written evaluations of classroom teaching observed by voting faculty. Consider specifying other materials. 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.

### **Process for department evaluation**

16. Comment: Voting faculty does not include Industry Assistant Professors or Lecturers. This creates a bifurcation that may exclude long-term Assistant Professors or Lecturers.

16. Recommendation: Include as voting members Industry Assistant Professors and Lecturers who have been reappointed to second 3-year contracts when the vote concerns reappointment of other Industry Assistant Professors or Lecturers.

17. Comment: The paragraph concerning voting members does not specify who votes on the reappointment of Industry Professors and Senior Lecturers.

17. Recommendation: Add this clarification.

18. Comment: The “Process for department evaluation” section does not actually explain details of the procedures to be followed.

18. Recommendation: The Committee Chair should coordinate the creation of the committee’s report and recommendation for reappointment, which is then submitted to the 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.recuitment.htm> HYPERLINK "<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html>")<sup>1</sup> HYPERLINK "<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recuitment.html>")):

“The committee will prepare a written review for the 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).”

19. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify what constitutes a vote of the committee.

19. Recommendation: Specify that a majority vote of the Reappointment Committee and the Promotion Committee shall be required for a successful review for a recommendation for reappointment or promotion, and that all votes of both Committees shall be by secret ballot. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

20. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify the procedure according to which the committee will prepare its report.

20. 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 Dean. The review should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division of opinion, the minority opinion should be appended to the majority review.”

21. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify a procedure to follow when the Dean agrees with a committee’s decision to reappoint a faculty member.

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

“In the event that the Dean follows the recommendation of the committee to reappoint and/or for promotion, the summary letter to the faculty member with notification of intent to reappoint or for promotion should include the length of reappointment/appointment, and a signature block for the faculty member.”

22. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify a procedure to follow in the event the Dean disagrees with a committee’s decision to reappoint a faculty member.

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

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

23. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify the faculty member’s rights in the event of a decision not to reappoint.

23. 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. If the report names

references who have provided evaluations for the review in confidence, their names and other identifying details will be redacted from the copy provided to the faculty member.”

## **V. Promotion**

### **Statement of principles**

24. Comment: The paragraph omits “service” as an indicator of performance and achievement.

24. Recommendation: Add “service” to the list: “...teaching, research, scholarship, service or in other duties.”

### **Review Process**

25. Comment: The second paragraph under “Review Process” does not explain how the promotion review committee will be formed.

25. Recommendation: 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.

26. Comment: The second paragraph under “Review Process” does not specify the procedures for the work of the promotion review committee.

26. 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 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.htm> HYPERLINK

"<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html>") HYPERLINK

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

“The committee will prepare a written review for the 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).”

27. Recommendation: Specify that a majority vote of the Reappointment Committee and the Promotion Committee shall be required for a successful review for a recommendation for reappointment or promotion, and that all votes of both Committees shall be by secret ballot. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

28. 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 Dean. The review should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division of opinion, the minority opinion should be appended to the majority review.”

### **Materials for the promotion review**

29. Comment: Although the list of materials for promotion review includes many salient documents, other possible materials are not included.

29. Recommendation: Consider specifying other materials. 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.

30. Comment: The Materials for the promotion review section asks for copies of student course evaluations and course syllabi, but does not limit the request to any time period.

30. Recommendation: The time period under consideration could be limited to the current reappointment period or six years, whichever is longer.

31. Comment: The paragraph on voting procedures for promotions provides that it be a “closed” vote, but the voting for reappointments is not closed.

31. Recommendation: In the interests of transparency, the voting result should not be closed.

32. Comment: The “Process for department evaluation” section does not actually explain details of the procedures to be followed.

32. Recommendation: The Committee Chair should coordinate the creation of the committee’s report and recommendation for promotion, which is then submitted to the 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.htm> HYPERLINK "<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html>")<sup>1</sup> HYPERLINK "<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html>"):

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

33. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify what constitutes a vote of the committee.

33. Recommendation: Specify that a majority vote of the Promotion Committee shall be required for a successful review for a recommendation for promotion, and that all votes of both Committees shall be by secret ballot. In the case of a split opinion, the minority opinion should also be included in the report as an appendix.

34. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify the procedure according to which the committee will prepare its report.

34. 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 Promotion Committee, but all members of the committee should read the review before it is submitted to the Dean. The review should represent a collective judgment of the committee or, in the case of a divided opinion, a majority of the committee. If there is a division of opinion, the minority opinion should be appended to the majority review."

35. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify a procedure to follow when the Dean agrees with a committee's decision to promote a faculty member.

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

"In the event that the Dean follows the recommendation of the committee to promote, the summary letter to the faculty member with notification of intent to promote should include the length of reappointment/appointment, and a signature block for the faculty member."

36. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify a procedure to follow in the event the Dean disagrees with a committee's decision to promote a faculty member.

36. 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.htm> HYPERLINK  
"<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html>")<sup>1</sup> HYPERLINK  
"<http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.recruitment.html>"):

"If the school Dean's decision is contrary on promotion to that of the Promotion Committee or the divisional dean, the Dean will provide the committee with the reasons. The committee members will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter--argument before the Dean's decision is finalized."

37. Comment: The Process for department evaluation section does not specify the faculty member's rights in the event of a decision not to reappoint.

37. Recommendation: Add language similar to the following:

“In all cases of an appeal to a negative decision related to promotion by the Dean, the candidate will have access to the Promotion Committee's full report, including its recommendation and any comments from the faculty. If the report names references who have provided evaluations for the review in confidence, their names and other identifying details will be redacted from the copy provided to the faculty member.”

## **VI. Grievance**

### **C. Continuing Contract Faculty Who Are Eligible to Grieve**

38. Comment: The second paragraph entirely deprives faculty on initial appointments of one or two years of any grievance rights based on reappointment. This is contrary to the University Guidelines which provide under “Grievance Procedures” in the section “Who Can Grieve”:

“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.”

38. Recommendation: Delete this paragraph.

### **D. Procedure to Be Followed when a Continuing Contract Faculty Member Wishes to Seek Settlement of a Grievance**

39. Comment: Section (2) The last sentence provides that a faculty member “may appeal to the Dean to convene the School of Engineering Faculty Grievance Committee.” The sentence seems to suggest that the Dean has some discretion whether to convene the grievance committee.

39. Recommendation: Change the sentence to read: “shall have the right to appeal to the Dean who shall convene the School of Engineering Faculty Grievance Committee.”

### **E. Appeal from a Dean's Decision on Reappointment or Promotion**

40. Comment: In section (2), parts (b), (c) and (e) the name of the Grievance Committee is incorrect. Also, the composition of the Grievance Committee needs to be corrected.

40. Recommendation: Change to “Continuing Contract Faculty Senator's Council Faculty Grievance Committee.” Change “drawn from a standing committee that shall consist of the members of the C-FSC Faculty Grievance Committee and the T-FSC Grievance Committee” to “composed of one member drawn from the C-FSC Grievance Committee, one member drawn from the T-FSC Grievance Committee, and one senior administrator who is a continuing contract faculty member chosen by the Chair of the C-FSC.”

41. Comment: Part (d) omits reference to violations of academic freedom as a ground for pursuing a grievance. The University Guidelines for CCF provide as a ground for grievance decisions that “violated the academic freedom of the faculty member in question.”

41. Recommendation: Change the first sentence to read: “The Committee shall not judge professional merits, but only ascertain whether procedural safeguards have been observed or whether the grievant’s academic freedom has been violated.”

#### F. Appeal from a Dean’s Decision on Matters Such As Duties, Salaries, Perquisites, and Working Conditions

42. Comment: The paragraph refers to “informal procedures” but does not specify what those procedures are.

42. Recommendation: Specify the informal procedures as meetings, correspondence, etc.

### **VII. Voting Rights of Continuing Contract Faculty at Faculty Meetings**

43. Comment: Paragraph 5 indicates that the Grievance Procedure is not included in this document but is under development. 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.

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

44. Recommendation: 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.

45. Recommendation: 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.

## **II. SUBSTANTIVE MINOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **II. Scope**

46. Comment: Whereas the “Industry Professor” title is defined in terms of the expected background of the faculty member, the Lecturer titles are defined in terms of their duties.

46. Recommendation: Define the two categories of faculty in consistent ways, either by background, or by duties, or by the combination of both.

### **IV. Reappointment Review**

#### **A. Contracts Continuing Beyond the Third Year of Continuous Service from Initial Appointment**

47. Comment: On the top of page 3, at the end of the third bullet point, there is a provision concerning “Creative and Performance Arts.”

47. Recommendation: Clarify “innovation and impact in conducting creative and performance arts.”

#### **B. Contract Not Continuing Beyond the Third Year of Continuous Service from Initial Appointment**

48. Comment: The wording is confusing,

48. Recommendation: Add the word “respectively” as follows: “...pursuant to a one- or two-year contract, respectively, shall not be required to undergo the review process....”

## **VII. Voting Rights of Continuing Contract Faculty at Faculty Meetings**

49. Comment: Paragraph (2) provides that the Tandon School of Engineering Faculty “may separately poll and record the votes” of the various categories of faculty. The sentence is unclear.

49. Recommendation: Change to “may separately poll and record: 1) the opinions of the T-TT and emeritus faculty; and 2) the opinions of the voting and non-voting continuing contract faculty.”

50. Comment: The language concerning eligibility to run for the position of Speaker-Elect is confusing: “Only the T-TT faculty are eligible to run for the Speaker-Elect position (eventually serving as the Speaker and Past Speaker). However, those Continuing Contract Faculty who were previously granted individual voting rights are also eligible to run for the Speaker-Elect position.”

50. Recommendation: Change to “Two categories of faculty are eligible to run for the position of Speaker-Elect (eventually serving as the Speaker and Past Speaker): 1) T-TT faculty; and 2) those Continuing Contract Faculty how were previously granted individual voting rights.”

51. Comment: Paragraph 5 concerning the Nominations and Elections Committee is confusing as it states that membership on that committee will draw from three standing committees, including the very same Nominations and Elections Committee.

51. Recommendation: Clarify this sentence.

### **III. EDITORIAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **I. Introduction**

52. Comment: In the quotation, “university” in the last line is not capitalized.

52. Recommendation: Capitalize “University.”

53. Comment: The technically correct name for the faculty is “Full-time Continuing Contract Faculty.”

53 Recommendation: Insert “Full-time”