MINUTES OF THE T-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 20, 2022

The New York University Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, October 20, 2022 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room with some members attending by videoconference.

In attendance were Senators Bailey, Baltacıoğlu-Brammer, Birnbaum, Buhler, Cappell, Chen, Economides, Fang, Garg, Ghose, Hartman, Hickey, Irving, Ling, Linkhoeva, Lukose, Miao, Miller, Nonken Park, Quinn, Rock, Schlick, Sen, Stimpfel, Wolff, Young, Zelikoff; Active Alternates Grier, Merritt, and Stewart; and Alternates Alter, Rampin, Schuman, and VanCleave.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the September 15, 2022 meeting were approved unanimously.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Candidates for T-FSC Chair 2023-2024

The Nominating Committee is calling for nominations for the position of Chair, 2023-2024. They ask Senators to send nominations, including self-nominations to Karyn Ridder by October 31. The list of candidates for Chair will be announced at the November T-FSC meeting and the election will take place at the December meeting.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR: DAVID K. IRVING

See attached Document A.

Chairperson Irving introduced new Council member Professor Edward Rock from the School of Law.

He asked all T-FSC Committees to communicate their Chair or Co-Chair elections and agenda items for this academic year to the Manager of Faculty Governance, Karyn Ridder.

Executive Committee Meeting with President

In follow-up to questions on NYU’s recent purchase of a MetroTech Center office building in Brooklyn, Irving noted the timing of the public news announcement was outside NYU’s control and before they could send an internal memo to NYU. The President noted the need for space and other upcoming projects, including the refurbishing of laboratories in the Silver Building and air-conditioning in Reuben Hall.

Secretary Park reported on the EC’s conversation with the President regarding compression issues, new faculty hires, and postdocs. President Hamilton reiterated that the University is aware of the compression issue in terms of salaries among faculty, and noted that the administration pursues three-year reviews to evaluate the situation. They also discussed the issue of postdocs and faculty leaving academia for industry at high rates. They discussed the University's efforts to address this problem. President Hamilton noted the efforts to recruit diverse faculty. They also discussed the differences among academic disciplines, with particular difficulties in hiring faculty in the computer science, engineering, and chemistry departments, and the biomedical sciences.
A Senator stated the most recent study on compression and showed it was an issue of inversion, meaning senior faculty people who have been at NYU more than ten years are paid less than entering professors.

*Explorance Blue*

Irving reported on the new teaching evaluation form and assessment platform, which is being piloted this fall at two schools and will be implemented university-wide next spring. Teaching evaluations are to be renamed “course feedback” and the platform NYU has engaged to tally the results is called Explorance Blue. Please see attached Document A for the new University-wide common questions required of all students.

In response to a Senator’s inquiry, Irving suggested they bring questions regarding the course feedback forms to the Interim Provost during her visit today.

**PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, VOTE**

**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Courant Institute**

*See attached Documents B and C.*

Committee member Van Cleave reported on the Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications (PPTM) Committee’s review. She noted the Committee, co-chaired by Senators Zelikoff and Partridge, have thoroughly reviewed the submitted Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines approved April 13, 2022. The PPTM Committee met by Zoom to review and discuss at length the revised Guidelines document. As a Committee, they recognized the considerable thought and deliberation that the Courant Faculty have invested in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. They reviewed the document and unanimously agreed on the edits and comments being presented to the T-FSC for discussion.

The PPTM presents five major considerations for the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for discussion. Van Cleave presented on the five considerations, see attached Document B.

In response to a Senator’s question, it was noted that school policies are reviewed every five years.

A Senator from Courant commended the work of the Committee in this review.

The recommendations were approved by vote of the Council.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION: INTERIM PROVOST DOPICO**

*See attached Document D.*

Interim Provost Dopico noted she will soon have a response regarding the C-FSC resolutions related to the Maitland Jones case and the right to grieve.

She addressed the questions sent from the Council. See attached Document D.

**Annual Merit Increase**

In response to the question on why AMI is retroactively bundled into promotion raises, Dopico noted the Provost office conducts a salary study every three years looking at compression, equity, and can also include this question on the bundling of AMI.
She noted the University has implemented a policy to disallow schools from using AMI pools to fund salary adjustments, including promotions. This is to ensure that the full AMI pool goes to AMI and is not otherwise shifted to faculty compensation.

A Senator noted the importance of taking into account the high inflation rate when determining compensation.

A Senator from the School of Medicine noted the challenge for School of Medicine faculty, who need to bring in soft money as a percentage of their salary, in addition to not receiving cost of living increases. Dopico noted the difference in policy at the medical school regarding faculty salary.

*Explorance Blue*

Dopico addressed the new course feedback common questions and the Explorance Blue platform, and plans to increase student participation in the online course feedback forms. She noted the new course evaluation questions were initially proposed by an ad hoc committee that was convened in Fall 2019, in part, in response to a report offered by the C-FSC on the question of the existence of bias in student course evaluations.

The ad hoc group issued a report in October 2021 and recommended the removal of the two questions on the overall quality of the instructor and overall quality of the class in order to limit subjective evaluation.

The overarching goal of the new questions was to shift away from a satisfaction survey towards a tool to improve teaching and learning.

Also, during this time, the Albert-based evaluation platform discontinued its support for the tool. The Committee selected Explorance Blue as a replacement. Explorance Blue has enhanced reporting capabilities in terms of open-ended responses. A Governance Committee was established for the implementation of Explorance Blue, which included representatives from the T-FSC and C-FSC. The charge of the Committee was to make any necessary revisions to the draft of common questions that the Ad Hoc Committee generated, set policies for the implementation of the new tool, and advise on reporting and communications.

The Committee has concluded its work on the set of common questions to pilot this fall. The pilot will include CAS and Liberal Studies.

In terms of school processes, schools and departments will be able to add up to 13 of their own questions to the common questions. The Governance Committee also changed the name from course evaluation to course feedback.

In terms of student response rates, Dopico noted that they will partner with the Student Government Assembly (SGA) to promote the course feedback form and also will communicate its confidentiality, which was a concern among students.

*Case and Course Evaluations*

In response to the third question regarding the recent *New York Times* article on NYU not renewing the teaching contract with Dr. Maitland Jones to teach organic chemistry based on negative student course evaluations, Dopico first stated it not the University’s practice to discuss individual personnel matters. She noted that course evaluations are not the sole reason for any faculty member not to be reappointed. She noted course feedback should be only one of several ways of evaluating teaching.
She noted the administration welcomes the T-FSC’s and C-FSC’s recommendations on how to best accomplish an assessment of teaching that involves other assessment tools in addition to the course feedback.

**GRIEVANCE: TAMAR SCHLICK**

*See attached Document E.*

Senator Schlick reported on the case regarding Maitland Jones, Jr. The issue was sent to the C-FSC for review and they developed two resolutions. Schlick reported that the first resolution endorses the right to grievance of all full-time faculty at NYU. The resolution states that the NYU Faculty Handbook should be revised to reinstate the right of all full-time faculty members to grieve, as was the case until 2015. Pending the Handbook’s revision, the NYU administration should adhere to the traditional spirit of the Handbook, which was never to deny the right to grieve to any full-time faculty member, whether classed as “Other Faculty” or not.

The second C-FSC resolution regards the specific case of Professor Maitland Jones, Jr., the full-time faculty member who was recently denied the right to grieve. The resolution states that the case should be reopened and investigated, and a complete and truthful statement should be furnished by the administration to explain how, if at all, this faculty member failed to qualify as a member of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty. If the denial of Professor Maitland Jones, Jr.’s right to grieve is found to have been improper, his grievance should be reinstated and reviewed in accordance with the procedures required by the NYU Faculty Handbook.

A Senator noted the current version of the Handbook, might put this case under “other faculty”, who do not have the right to grieve.

Senators discussed the category of other faculty and clarifying the grievance rights of faculty in all categories. It was noted it should made clear to faculty at the time of appointment their right to grieve.

Senators discussed faculty should have the right to grieve, except for very special circumstances which could be written in the contract.

Chair Irving noted the Governance Committee is reviewing the Faculty Handbook this semester and this discussion will be included in their review. The Council will continue discussion of this issue.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

*See attached Document G.*

**No Discussion/Questions on the following submitted reports:**

Senate Taskforce on University Calendar

**Reports at Meeting:**

There were no additional reports at the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
Full list of common questions approved for Fall 2022 pilot, with response options

(1) How clear were the goals of the course? Course
   5 = Very clear
   4 = Clear
   3 = Neutral
   2 = Unclear
   1 = Very unclear

(2) How effective were the assignments in helping you meet the course goals? Course
   5 = Very effective
   4 = Effective
   3 = Neutral
   2 = Ineffective
   1 = Very ineffective

(3) How effective was the design/structure of the course in helping you learn? Course
   5 = Very effective
   4 = Effective
   3 = Neutral
   2 = Ineffective
   1 = Very ineffective

(4) How clearly did the instructor communicate what was expected of you in this course? Instructor
   5 = Very clearly
   4 = Clearly
   3 = Neutral
   2 = Unclearly
   1 = Very unclearly

(5) How effective was the instructor in explaining challenging concepts and/or methods? Instructor
   5 = Very effective
4 = Effective
3 = Neutral
2 = Ineffective
1 = Very ineffective

(6) How timely was the feedback that you received on your work? [Instructor]
5 = Very timely
4 = Timely
3 = Neutral
2 = Untimely
1 = Very untimely

(7) How helpful was the feedback to you in improving your work? [Instructor]
5 = Very helpful
4 = Helpful
3 = Neutral
2 = Unhelpful
1 = Very unhelpful

(8) How inclusive did you find this class environment towards people of diverse backgrounds, identities, and life experiences? [Instructor]
5 = Very inclusive
4 = Inclusive
3 = Neutral
2 = Excluding
1 = Very excluding

(9) To what extent were diverse voices and perspectives integrated into the course resources? [Course]
5 = Well integrated
4 = Integrated
3 = Neutral
2 = Omitted
1 = Totally omitted
(10) How receptive was the instructor to diverse student viewpoints? 

5 = Very receptive  
4 = Receptive  
3 = Neutral  
2 = Unreceptive  
1 = Very unreceptive  
0 = Not applicable

(11) On average, how many hours per week did you spend on course-related work outside of class? [Examples include completing readings and other assignments, reviewing notes, studying with peers, rehearsing, or attending the instructor’s office hours.]

0-2  
3-5  
6-8  
9-11  
12-14  
15-17  
18-20  
>20

(12) Is there anything else you would like to share about your learning experience? [You may elaborate on your previous responses, or add other information.]

[Open-ended question]
From: NYU T-FSC Senate, Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications Committee (PPTM), Judith T. Zelikoff, MS, Ph.D. and Nicola C. Partridge, BSc, PhD, Co-Chairs, Janet H. Van Cleave, PhD, RN, FAAN presenting member
To: T-FSC

Date: 10/10/22

Re: Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines For Courant Institute

The PPTM Committee, Co-Chaired by Drs. Judith Zelikoff and Nicola Partridge, have thoroughly reviewed the submitted Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines approved April 13, 2022. The PPTM Committee met by Zoom to review and discuss (at length) the revised Guidelines document. As a Committee, we recognized the considerable thought and deliberation that the Courant Faculty have invested in this Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. We reviewed the document and unanimously agreed on the edits and comments being presented to the T-FSC for discussion.

The PPTM presents these five major considerations for the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for discussion with the T-FSC at the October 20th meeting. The statements and comments below are not meant to capture all of the PPTM comments found (in detail) in the Courant Institute Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document included in the packet.

1. Promotion and tenure guidelines as independent, free-standing documents that provide a guideline for tenured/tenure track faculty as they pursue promotions and tenure.

   The PPTM suggested the following to help with the clarity of the document:
   
   - Define terms (i.e., "Director," "Department," "APTC," "Chair," and "Unit") and committees (i.e., APTC and FRC) at the beginning of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for clarity and readability of the document;
   - Provide a figure of the promotion and tenure timeline for the Computer Science and Mathematics Department since the Departments’ processes differ.


   The PPTM, continues to recommend updating these terms and use terms that may be perceived to have less derogatory intent, such as “weaknesses.” Please note our previous call for an update of the NYU Faculty Handbook, particularly to address these antiquated phrases.

3. Elections of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committees when appropriate. The Courant Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee is composed of “a standing committee of tenured faculty that is appointed at the beginning of the academic year by the Department Chair in consultation with the Director.” (Page 2, Section 4. Guidelines and Procedures, Stages I, II, III: Departmental Review: Stage I – Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee).

   The PPTM recognizes that the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide schools/colleges the option to appoint or elect the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure
Committee (APTC) (See the New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines page 3, Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, 2nd paragraph). However, the PPTM suggests elections should be considered when possible to ensure appointment, promotion, and tenure committee is broadly representative of tenured faculty members.

4. Privacy of the promotion and tenure evaluation process. Eligible members of the Courant Departments of Mathematical Science and Computer Science review external letters from outside evaluators, candidate's materials, and other relevant documents as part of their evaluation process (See Section 4. Guidelines and Procedures, Stages I, II, III: Departmental Review: Stage I – Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee and Pages 3 and 7).

The PPTM recognizes that this work aligns with the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and is in keeping with some of the department's traditions. Therefore, we suggest:

- The faculty eligible for these reviews are clearly defined in the Courant Institute Promotion and Tenure Guidelines;
- The review processes are undertaken with careful consideration of the balance between representative faculty participation and protecting the candidate’s privacy.

5. Clarity of the committee(s) that are instrumental in the evaluation of tenure or promotion. The Courant Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines specify that for each tenure and/or promotion case, the Department Chair, in consultation with the chair of the APTC, appoints at least three tenured faculty members to comprise a Faculty Review Committee (FRC). This committee is responsible for preparing the initial review of the candidate (Page 3, Section 4. Guidelines and Procedures, Stages I, II, III: Departmental Review: Stage I – Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee).

The PPTM suggests providing clarity regarding committees such as the Faculty Review Committee by specifying the composition of the committee and rank of the committee members appointed to this committee. For example, is a prespecified number of Full Professors, Associate Professors, or both appointed to this committee?

Other recommendations include:
The Guidelines prescribe that members of the Faculty Review Committee and external evaluators should not be scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis or postdoctoral advisor, co-authors or other close associates. (See Section 4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III: Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committees (Page 2) and External Evaluators (Page 6)).

The PPTM suggests greater specificity in defining the term “close associates.” An example is the National Institutes of Health criteria that prohibits a study section member from reviewing a proposal from a colleague they have collaborated with or had any other professional relationship (e.g., served as mentor) within the past three years (See https://grants.nih.gov/policy/peer/peer-coi.htm).

In the Assessment of Research Contributions, the Guidelines state that the assessment of a candidate’s scholarly research must address issues of quality, significance, impact, and future development, including the quality and significance of the journals or conferences in which the candidate’s work has appeared and the relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received by the candidate (See Section 4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III: Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure, Assessment of Research Contributions, Page 5).

The PPTM suggests providing examples of journals and conferences that are considered
"quality" and have "significance" and examples of external grants considered "reasonable" and "competitive" to help tenure track/tenured faculty focus on the critical activities needed to achieve promotion.

In the Assessment of Service, the Guidelines propose the assessment of a candidate’s service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the department, the University and the candidate’s research community, or broader scientific community (See Section 4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III: Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure, Assessment of Service, Page 6).

*The PPTM suggests providing examples of criteria that define “quality and significance of service” and examples of “the candidate’s research community or broader scientific community.”*
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
PROPOSED FOR COURANT INSTITUTE

1. INTRODUCTION
This document sets forth the core principles and procedures for tenure and promotion at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University. They are designed to support high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotion, and to ensure a comprehensive, rigorous, and fair review of the candidates.

2. UNIVERSITY APPROVAL
Any subsequent material changes to these guidelines will be presented to the Provost of New York University for approval. The Provost shall consult with the Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) prior to making the final decision about subsequent material changes. In the absence of school guidelines or if school guidelines are inconsistent with University policies, the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines will control. As with all NYU policies, this Policy is subject to change and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

3. STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION
All candidates for tenure should demonstrate a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research, with strong reputations for scholarly excellence and the commitment and capacity to stay at the forefront of their fields. Candidates for tenure also must have distinguished records as teachers and mentors of students and they are expected to have conducted research that has had substantial impact on their discipline. Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research together with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in the candidate’s field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the Department and the Institute?

It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. All these factors must be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure.

The inquiry for promotion to full professor is similar: is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in her/his field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers? In addition, the candidate must have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The expectation is that the new work marks significant new scholarly research since the conferring of tenure.

The standards for tenure apply both to internal promotion cases and to external appointments with tenure. Many of the details given in the next part of this document are specific to internal promotion cases. Tenured external appointments are discussed further at the end of this document.
4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: STAGE I
The Director makes recommendations to the Provost regarding tenure and promotion in the Computer Science (CS) Department and the Mathematics (Math) Department. The recommendation of the Director must be informed by the department, the faculty, and experts in the candidate’s field.

All tenure dossiers must be submitted by the Department Chair to the Director’s office no later than March 1, and by the Director to the Provost’s office no later than June 1. In order to meet these deadlines, the candidate should normally submit their materials by October 15 of the previous year; exceptional cases should be discussed with the Chair. Earlier submissions are encouraged.

Faculty Responsibilities
The duty of the tenured faculty to deliberate and give advice on tenure decisions is one of their highest responsibilities. The process begins with their review, and it is highly dependent upon the thoroughness, fairness, and rigor of their review. To give weak advice on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at a later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an abdication of departmental responsibility. Thus, a department report that is considered by the Director to fall into this category will be returned to the department with a request that the problem be corrected.

An assessment must not ignore candidates’ defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure, and “advocacy” assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration. It is far more helpful to the candidate, the departmental committees and faculty, and the Director to have a balanced discussion of a candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.

It is essential that tenured faculty members who participate in the promotion and tenure process uphold high standards of responsibility and ethical behavior. Responsibility includes the obligation to give careful attention to the materials of a tenure case and to share the results of that deliberation with eligible departmental colleagues. Ethical behavior includes a clear obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings both during and following the review, since confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.

DEPARTMENTAL APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEES
There is a long tradition at Courant of one committee in each of the CS and Math departments holding the primary departmental responsibility for appointments, promotion and tenure. Traditionally, this committee has been called the Appointments Committee, but, to reflect its responsibility for promotion and tenure as well as initial appointments, henceforth its name will be the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APTC). This is a standing committee of tenured faculty that is appointed at the beginning of the academic year by the Department

1 Prior to 2020, CS Department cases were also reviewed by the Faculty of Arts and Science Promotion and Tenure Committee and its Dean.
Chair in consultation with the Director. Associate professors may serve on the committees, but they do not participate in discussions about promotion to full professor. The CS Department APTC consists of at least 6 members; the Math Department APTC consists of at least 12 members. Department chairs may attend the APTC meetings of their department, as ex officio non-voting members, but they do not count toward the minimum number of members.

For each tenure and/or promotion case, the Department Chair, in consultation with the chair of the APTC, appoints at least three tenured faculty members to comprise a Faculty Review Committee (FRC) responsible for preparing the initial review of the candidate. It is not required that members of the FRC serve on the APTC. The candidate’s thesis advisor, postdoctoral adviser and other close collaborators may not serve on the FRC and must recuse themselves from the APTC discussion and vote. When relevant, the candidate’s spouse or partner or other close family member must be recused from the entire promotion and tenure process.

Once appointed, the first responsibility of the FRC is to review the materials provided by the candidate (the list of required documents is included below) and to select a list of external evaluators to consult with a request to review the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. When the external letters have been received, the FRC prepares a detailed written report on the candidate’s research, teaching and service (see below for more details), and makes a recommendation in favor of or against tenure and/or promotion.

After the FRC review is completed, the chair of the FRC should present its report and the FRC’s recommendation to the departmental APTC. It is the responsibility of the APTC to verify the completeness of the candidate’s materials and of the FRC’s written report, to review them in detail, and to make its own recommendation in favor of or against the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate. If the APTC has concerns about the report it may ask the FRC to address these before making its recommendation. A split vote in the APTC indicates some doubt on the recommendation. Re-voting must not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity, or to avoid reporting a split vote. The Chair and all members of the APTC must (physically or electronically) sign the signature page of the docket, attesting that they have read the docket and that it represents the opinions of the committee clearly and fairly.

The next stage of the review differs in the two departments of Courant. In the Math Department, the APTC’s recommendation is transmitted directly to the Chair of the Department. In the CS Department, the APTC recommendation undergoes a subsequent review and vote by the faculty. The FRC’s written report, along with the APTC’s recommendation, the candidate’s materials, external letters and other relevant documents, must be made available for inspection at least a week before a meeting of eligible CS faculty takes place. The eligible CS faculty consist of all tenured faculty for tenure cases and all full professors for cases of promotion to full professor. After the meeting, a vote on the case will be taken by electronic secret ballot. A reasonable effort must be made to enable all eligible CS faculty, including faculty on leave, to have access to all relevant materials and to participate in the discussion and vote.

2 This procedure has been used successfully by the Math department for decades.
3 This procedure is consistent with long-established procedures at FAS, which governed Computer Science policy before 2019.
4 A summary of Cross Appointments can be found at https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/provost/documents/OAA/Cross_Appointments_GNF_March2019.pdf
Reviews of faculty with appointments involving more than one unit of the University ("cross appointments") shall ensure the input of all relevant units. The primary appointment unit leads the promotion or tenure process, according to the rules of the unit, with representation of secondary units.

All evaluations of individuals with joint appointments in more than one unit must include an discussion of the special circumstances of the appointment, expectations for the candidate's multi-disciplinary activities, perspective and position, and the judgment of how well the appointee has met these expectations. The composition of the FRC must include members of both units. Both units must vote on the report, and follow their individual guidelines on procedures. If the joint appointment is between the two departments of Courant, both Chairs must consult together on the case and forward both departments’ recommendations to the Director. If the joint appointment is with a school or center outside Courant, the recommendation should also be sent to the relevant Dean or Director. If the units arrive at significantly different recommendations, the Director, Directors, or Director and Dean will ordinarily invite the Chairs together to discuss the case. When the joint appointment is with a unit outside Courant, the Director or Dean of the secondary school should send a letter to the Director or Dean of the primary school for inclusion in the docket.

In the cases when a secondary appointment does not involve tenure, the rules of continuation of the joint appointment are regulated by binding MOUs between units. These MOUs must be finalized at the time a faculty member is hired or the joint appointment is made, and the faculty member needs to be informed of the terms and procedure of continuing the joint appointment after tenure.

Where the candidate has an Associated Appointment in a secondary unit, the departmental review must include a written evaluation from the secondary department explaining, among other matters thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that unit’s mission. This evaluation may be written by the Chair of the secondary unit after formal consultation with the faculty members of the unit.

In the case of an Affiliated Appointment, written evaluations on the secondary appointment are recommended but are not required.

**Materials to be Provided by the Candidate**

--- an up-to-date curriculum vitae, including:
--- list of publications, including links to a representative set of publications or to a web page which includes links to publications
--- list of courses taught by the candidate, with dates and with syllabi or links to web pages where syllabi may be found
--- list of postdoctoral advisees, if any
--- list of Ph.D. dissertations supervised and master’s and undergrad students advised, including actual or expected graduation dates
--- list of Ph.D. committees on which the candidate has served
--- list of all external grants obtained, with dates, funding amounts, and the candidate’s role (PI, co-PI, etc.)
--- list of service to the Department and to the candidate’s research community.
--- statements of the candidate’s teaching philosophy and research interests and accomplishments, including a description of the relationships among works already published, a description of new projects planned or under way, and a description of the place teaching occupies in the candidate’s career.

--- any other information the candidate wishes to provide, such as a statement on the candidate’s effort to promote diversity, equity and inclusion.

Faculty Review Committee (FRC) Report

Properly prepared, detailed, and well-documented dockets are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the department’s evaluation of the candidate. The report of the FRC must not be an advocacy document; it must strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. It must indicate, with reasons, the basis for a recommendation in favor of or against tenure and/or promotion of the candidate. If the FRC cannot achieve a consensus on the recommendation, this should be indicated in the report. If there is a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, the FRC should share that information in its report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation. The report must be a balanced assessment of the candidate’s performance. Documents that do not deal with evident weaknesses, in the case of a positive recommendation, or that do not deal with evident strengths, in the case of a negative recommendation, are not acceptable.

a. Field of Expertise

The FRC report must explain the importance of the candidate’s field of expertise. In what ways does the strength the candidate offers in that field advance the department’s current ambitions? How does the candidate’s field supplement other strengths in the department and vice versa? How does the candidate’s field and performance affect the standing of the department?

b. Assessment of Research Contributions

The assessment of a candidate’s scholarly research must address issues of quality, significance, impact, and future development, taking into account the external letters that were received. The quality and significance of the journals or conferences in which the candidate’s work has appeared should be appraised. The assessment of the candidate’s research should include comparisons with other scholars at similar stages in their careers in the discipline at large.

The candidate’s success at securing external grants should be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development. The relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received by the candidate should be appraised. When evaluating candidates engaged in interdisciplinary research, the record should be considered as a whole, rather than separately in each field.

c. Assessment of Teaching Performance

The assessment of a candidate’s teaching performance must appraise the quality and pertinence of courses developed (if any), provide an assessment of teaching performance, and evaluate the candidate’s contributions to the undergraduate and graduate teaching program of the department. Specific evaluation and an analysis of the effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate teaching must be provided in narrative form. Evidence may include a written evaluation of a class session observed by a member of the FRC and an assessment of course evaluations.
carried out by the department or by the college (or school). A list of courses taught by the candidate should be included, with links to web pages where syllabi may be found. An assessment of the candidate’s record of advising Ph.D. students, as well as master’s and undergraduate students, and postdoctoral fellows if relevant, should also be given.

**d. Assessment of Service**

The assessment of a candidate’s service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the department, the University and the candidate’s research community, or broader scientific community. The assessment may include a discussion of participation in professional organizations in the candidate’s field.

**External Evaluators**

The FRC report should include a list of the external evaluators who were consulted, including those who declined (along with the reasons given for declining, if any), a brief description of their qualifications, and a summary of their letters. The evaluators’ CVs should be provided as part of the docket.

The docket must include at least five letters from outside evaluators who are recognized leaders in the candidate’s discipline. These five letters must be from evaluators who are not scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis or postdoctoral advisor, co-authors or other close associates. Furthermore, the evaluators must not be suggested by the candidate. If the department inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate, this must be noted in the report.

The department may also choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the docket. These letters may be included in addition to, but not instead of, the five letters from unconflicted external evaluators not identified by the candidate.

**Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators:** Evaluators normally will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory or research institute). Evaluators must be recognized leaders in the candidate’s discipline. Evaluators must be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations. The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at United States institutions. For each evaluator, the docket should include a statement of the evaluator’s expertise and the reason they were chosen as an evaluator, as well as an explicit statement as to whether or not the evaluator has a conflict of interest with the candidate.

**Solicitation of Letters from Outside Evaluators:** The letter of solicitation must be sent by the office of the APTC Chair, Department Chair or the Director, and it must follow the prototype attached as an Appendix. The letter must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate’s peers, and it must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. All evaluators must be provided with the same C.V., candidate statement or statements, and links to web pages where some of the candidate’s published work is available to the evaluator.

**Confidentiality of Evaluations:** It is University policy to treat as confidential all evaluations of
University faculty, making only such limited exceptions as are necessary to permit informed review of promotion and tenure decisions by the appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University. The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved. Neither the names of writers nor the content of the letters may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond eligible members of the department, not even in summary form. In all communications with them, writers of letters must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, except as required by law, and that they will be seen only by eligible tenured faculty in the department, appropriate decision makers within the university, and their administrative staff.

**Third Year Review**

All tenure dockets, except for lateral hires, must include a copy of the Third-Year Review of the candidate and of the formal letter written to the candidate by the Department Chair at its completion. This formal early review on tenure prospects should have been completed in the third year of service in the probationary period for assistant professors whose probationary timetable is not shortened due to qualifying previous service.

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

The Chair must forward the case docket, the FRC report, the recommendation of the APTC, and, in CS, the number of eligible faculty votes for and against tenure and/or promotion, along with the Chair’s recommendation on the case, to the Director of Courant, and should inform the APTC of the recommendation.

The Chair’s letter must include a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate’s work occupies in the relevant discipline and explain why it is important to the Department that this field be represented on its faculty.

**DIRECTOR’S REVIEW: STAGE II**

The Director of Courant is responsible for evaluating the docket prepared by the department and making a recommendation to the Provost. The Director may, but is not obliged to, solicit additional letters of evaluation. If there are questions in any particular case, the Department Chair and/or the chair of the APTC may be asked to clarify the docket or to provide additional information.

Before submitting the recommendation to the Provost, the Director will inform the Department Chair of the proposed recommendation. In the case of a Director's recommendation contrary to that of the Department Chair, the APTC and/or (in CS) the eligible tenured faculty vote, the Director will provide the Department Chair with the reasons. The Department Chair, in consultation with the APTC, will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Director’s final recommendation is made to the Provost.

If the Director has a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, that information should be clearly expressed in the Director’s letter to the Provost. Indicators of doubt may include (but are not limited to) a split vote within the FRC or the APTC, or a clear difference of opinion between the FRC and the APTC, or (in CS cases) a split vote among the eligible faculty voting on the case.

---

5 NYU policy regarding the confidentiality of external letters and other tenure decision materials is found in the Legal Protection for Faculty Members policy at [http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-andguidelines/legal-protection-for-faculty-members.html](http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-andguidelines/legal-protection-for-faculty-members.html).
PROVOSTIAL REVIEW: STAGE III

The Provost evaluates every tenure and promotion docket and recommendation. In doing so, the Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation and may appoint an ad hoc committee composed of tenured faculty to seek further counsel. Before making a final decision, the Provost will inform the Director of the pending decision. In those cases in which the Provost’s pending decision is contrary to the recommendation of the Director, the Provost will provide the Director with the reasons and give the Director an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost’s final decision. The Provost shall notify the Director of the final decision, along with reasons thereof if the Director’s recommendation is disapproved. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Director will write to the Department Chair and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

5. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

Mandatory Review for Tenure

A docket and recommendation must be submitted to the Director for all faculty in their mandatory review year, whether the recommendation is positive or negative. If, however, the candidate tenders a letter of resignation on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review, effective on or before August 31 of the final probationary year, a docket and recommendation need not be submitted. The letter must state explicitly that the resignation was freely tendered without duress. In this instance, the Department Chair must forward the letter of resignation to the Director on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review year.

Tenured External Appointments (Lateral Hires)

At the Courant Institute, the departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APTC) is, as noted earlier, responsible for recommendations on initial appointments at all ranks as well as for promotion and tenure. A tenure review is required for all lateral hires at the tenured level. When the APTC is considering recommending a tenured position for an external candidate, a Faculty Review Committee (FRC) will be appointed as described earlier, with the same responsibilities for collecting at least five letters from unconflicted, qualified external evaluators and writing a detailed report assessing the candidate’s scholarly research. The FRC should include evidence of teaching performance, such as course evaluations where available. If teaching evaluations are not available, the report should include an indication of how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the Department and reasons for why the Department expects that the candidate will meet NYU’s teaching standards. The FRC’s report will be reviewed by the APTC. If the APTC wishes to proceed with the appointment, the case will then be reviewed in CS cases by the eligible faculty, and in all cases by the Chair, and by the Director, as described earlier.

The docket submitted to the Provost should include the following

- A memo from the Director describing why the candidate is an important hire for the Institute and a justification for establishing a tenured position within the department in the candidate’s field of expertise.
- The candidate’s most current CV
• Five external evaluations from qualified individuals not associated with the candidate nor identified/suggested by the candidate, with a list stating the credentials of these individuals. Letters solicited from individuals selected by the candidate can be included as supplementary information as long as their provenance is clearly identified.
• The written report of the FRC, as described earlier.
• A summary of the recommendation of the APTC.
• A description of the candidate’s teaching and an indication of how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the Department. If evaluations are not available, alternative assessment of teaching ability must be provided by the Chair.

If a letter of appointment is sent to the external candidate before the tenure review has been completed by the Provost, it should state that the appointment is pending completion of the tenure review.

Tenure Clock Stoppage
The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal University rules adopted by the Board of Trustees, and may be extended in accordance with standard University policy as set forth in the Faculty Handbook. For those candidates who have been granted an extension, NYU policy is to evaluate the productivity of the candidate as if the candidate had been in probationary status for the normal duration, so that the candidate is not penalized for having received the extension.

Acceleration of Schedule
Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure must be considered extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution to propose candidates for tenure ahead of schedule. The Director must be consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. It should be noted that external letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. The FRC report and the Department Chair’s letter to the Director must also specifically address this issue. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the Director will not recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

Appeal
In the event of a negative decision, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University’s Faculty Grievance Procedure.

---


Appendix: Sample Letter for Soliciting External Evaluations for Mandatory Tenure and Promotion Review of Internal Candidates

Dear,

Y X, currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Computer Science/Mathematics, is being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. We would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research and potential for future success and your recommendation as to whether or not Professor X should be promoted and receive tenure. You will find Professor X’s curriculum vitae, research and teaching statements attached to this email. A selection of his/her published work is available at [THIS LINK]. If you need any additional materials, we will forward them upon your request.

We would appreciate receiving

• a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of X’s research record, including the intellectual quality and originality of his/her work and his/her rate of publication;
• your comments on the extent to which his/her record shows scientific vision and/or leadership; and
• your comments on the scope, significance, and impact of his/her work.

We also would be grateful for an explicit comparison of Professor X with the most prominent individuals working in the same field at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. IF APPLICABLE: [Please note that the University has extended the tenure clock for this faculty member, in accordance with University policy.] IF APPLICABLE: [comment on early tenure case].

If you have knowledge of Professor X’s teaching ability, mentoring record, or service to the professional community, we would appreciate your comments on these matters as well. [For CS candidates: Likewise, if you know whether his/her work has influenced industrial practice, or is likely to do so in the future, we would appreciate your comments on this.] In addition, please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

[COVID impact statement] We draw your attention to the fact that this candidate’s dossier includes work performed in one or more years in which Covid placed severe restrictions on all faculty members. [If appropriate] Also note that the tenure clock was automatically extended for all tenure-track faculty, including this candidate, for 1 year.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment as to whether or not Professor X would be considered a strong candidate for promotion and tenure in other leading departments in the field.

We would appreciate receiving your letter within six weeks, by [GIVE DATE] if possible. You may send it by email to [email address here]. As the University expects the department to provide biographical information about referees, we would be grateful if you could include a copy of your
current curriculum vitae with your letter.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the tenured professors of the [Computer Science/Mathematics] department, appropriate decision makers within the University, and our administrative staff.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review. The department and I will be very grateful for your help. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at [address here] or by phone at [phone number here].

Sincerely
Appendix: Sample Letter for Soliciting External Evaluations for Tenure Review for an External Appointment

Dear,

Y X, currently [give current position], is being considered for a tenured position with the rank of Professor [or Associate Professor] in the Department of Computer Science/Mathematics at the Courant Institute. We would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research and potential for future success and your recommendation as to whether or not Professor X should be appointed to a tenured position.

You will find Professor X’s curriculum vitae, research and teaching statements attached to this email. A selection of his/her published work is available at [THIS LINK]. If you need any additional materials, we will forward them upon your request.

We would appreciate receiving

• a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of X’s research record, including the intellectual quality and originality of his/her work and his/her rate of publication;
• your comments on the extent to which his/her record shows scientific vision and/or leadership; and
• your comments on the scope, significance, and impact of his/her work.

We also would be grateful for an explicit comparison of Professor X with the most prominent individuals working in the same field at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome.

If you have knowledge of Professor X’s teaching ability, mentoring record, or service to the professional community, we would appreciate your comments on these matters as well. [For CS candidates: Likewise, if you know whether his/her work has influenced industrial practice, or is likely to do so in the future, we would appreciate your comments on this.] In addition, please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment as to whether or not Professor X would be considered a strong candidate for tenure in other leading departments in the field.

We would appreciate receiving your letter within six weeks, by [GIVE DATE] if possible. You may send it by email to [email address here]. As the University expects the department to provide biographical information about referees, we would be grateful if you could include a copy of your current curriculum vitae with your letter.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the tenured full professors [or tenured professors] of the [Computer Science/Mathematics] department, appropriate decision makers within the University, and our administrative staff.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review. The department and I will be very grateful for your help. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at [address here] or by phone at [phone number here].
Sincerely,

**Appendix: Summary of Documents to be submitted by the Director to the Provost**

Materials submitted by the candidate, including CV, research and teaching statements.

Report of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC), including assessment of candidate’s research, teaching and service contributions, as well as a list of external evaluators who were consulted, including those who declined (with reasons if provided), a brief description of their qualifications, and a summary of their letters.

External recommendation letters and CVs of the recommenders.

For internal tenure cases: Course evaluations, the candidate’s third-year review and the letter written to the candidate by the Department Chair on completion of the review.

Department Chair’s recommendation letter, describing the candidate's work and its importance to the department, and reporting the vote of the departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APTC) and, in CS cases, the vote of the tenured faculty in the department (full professors only in the case of promotion to full professor).

Director’s recommendation letter.
The council is looking forward to having time with the Provost on October 20th at 12:30pm. Carlo has generously allowed us to once again serve lunch. Karyn lays out quite a spread, so please feel free to join us in person prior to 12:30. If you opt for zoom, we will save you one of those giant chocolate chip cookies.

Please feel free to bring up any topic you deem of interest to the TFSC. We are eager to learn how you plan to lead the university in the coming months. Having said that we solicited our council members to ask if there were any specific concerns they would like to ask.

- Why is AMI retroactively bundled into promotion raises? This makes promotions lower than they appear at first, variable from year to year, and confounds an annual merit increase with the merit that comes from the years of work to accomplish the promotion.

- Can you speak to the new course feedback common questions and the Explorance Blue platform, as well as plans to increase student participation in the on-line course feedback forms.

- The Interim Provost spear-headed the task force on a uniform student course evaluation for undergraduate students. In light of the recent New York Times’ article on NYU not renewing the teaching contract with Dr. Maitland Jones Jr. to teach organic chemistry based on negative student course evaluations, I would like to know her view on evaluating a faculty’s teaching effectiveness/performance.

To ensure the meeting with the Provost is not dominated by the articles in the press about Professor Jones, I have asked our Grievance Committee to examine and respond to the two resolutions crafted by the CFSC and to hold a discussion on the subject after your presentation.
Date: October 13, 2022
Memorandum to: Georgina Dopico, Interim Provost
From: Noelle Molé Liston
Chairperson, C-Faculty Senators Council
A/Y 2022-2023
Subject: C-Faculty Senators Council Resolution regarding the Right to Grieve

The C-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached resolution. This was approved by the Council at the October 13, 2022 meeting.

cc: Kristen Day, Vice Provost
Ellen Schall, Senior Presidential Fellow
David K Irving, T-FSC Chairperson
Thomas Blaylock, C-FSC Vice Chair
Sylvia Maier, C-FSC Secretary
Gay Abel-Bey, C-FSC Steering Committee Member
Beth Latimer, C-FSC Steering Committee Member
Robin Mitnick, C-FSC Steering Committee Member
Ethan Youngerman, C-FSC Steering Committee Member
Heidi White, C-FSC Faculty Grievance Committee Chair
Karyn Ridder, Manager of Faculty Governance
Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council’s  
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE RIGHT TO GRIEVES  
Approved 26-0, 1 Abstention on October 13, 2022

Whereas the right to file a grievance is a fundamental right of all NYU full-time faculty members, a right of inestimable importance, and

Whereas blocking the right to grieve leaves a full-time faculty member unable to enforce any other rights, and

Whereas the right to grieve was indeed guaranteed for all faculty members in every NYU Faculty Handbook from 1973 to 2014, and

Whereas, either by accident or design, in 2015, the NYU Faculty Handbook was changed so that the right to grieve was granted only to Tenure/Tenure Track faculty and Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty members, and denied to faculty members classed as “Other Faculty” in NYU Bylaw 88, and

Whereas the Council has received a copy of a message sent from the FAS administration to an NYU full-time faculty member denying that faculty member a right to grieve, on the alleged grounds that the faculty member was “Other Faculty,” and

Whereas the message sent from the FAS administration fails to indicate which of the three conditions, sufficient in themselves to guarantee membership in the full-time continuing contract faculty, the faculty member has failed to fulfill, and

Whereas a similar tactic might be used against any other member of the full-time continuing contract faculty—the tactic of denying a faculty member’s full-time continuing contract-faculty status without ever indicating what part of the definition of that status the faculty member has failed to fulfill, and

Whereas the Council views this practice as a dangerous precedent, deeply threatening to anyone who expects the university to fulfill its legal obligations to its employees, and a practice that could be easily copied in other cases, and

Whereas the practice could easily result in an arbitrary and capricious denial of rights,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the C-FSC strongly recommends the following:

1. The NYU Faculty Handbook should be revised to reinstate the right of all full-time faculty members to grieve, as was the case until 2015.

2. Pending the Handbook’s revision, the NYU administration should adhere to the traditional spirit of the Handbook, which was never to deny a right to grieve to any full-time faculty member, whether classed as “Other Faculty” or not.
Date: October 13, 2022

Memorandum to: Georgina Dopico, Interim Provost

From: Noelle Molé Liston
Chairperson, C-Faculty Senators Council
A/Y 2022-2023

Subject: C-Faculty Senators Council Resolution regarding Professor Maitland Jones, Jr.

The C-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached resolution. This was approved by the Council at the October 13, 2022 meeting.

cc: Kristen Day, Vice Provost
Ellen Schall, Senior Presidential Fellow
David K Irving, T-FSC Chairperson
Thomas Blaylock, C-FSC Vice Chair
Sylvia Maier, C-FSC Secretary
Gay Abel-Bey, C-FSC Steering Committee Member
Beth Latimer, C-FSC Steering Committee Member
Robin Mitnick, C-FSC Steering Committee Member
Ethan Youngerman, C-FSC Steering Committee Member
Heidi White, C-FSC Faculty Grievance Committee Chair
Karyn Ridder, Manager of Faculty Governance
Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council’s  
RESOLUTION REGARDING PROFESSOR MAITLAND JONES, Jr.  
Approved 26-0, 1 Abstention on October 13, 2022

Whereas the CFSC has passed the “CFSC RESOLUTION REGARDING THE RIGHT TO GRIEVE (Oct. 13, 2022), and

Whereas the Council has received a copy of a message sent from the FAS administration to Professor Maitland Jones, Jr., an NYU faculty member, denying that faculty member a right to grieve, on the alleged grounds that the faculty member was “Other Faculty,” and

Whereas the definition of who qualifies as a member of the full-time continuing contract faculty is explicitly stated in University Bylaw 87, section a, and

Whereas the definition in Bylaw 87, section a, sets forth the following three conditions (each enumerated by a lower-case Roman numeral) that qualify faculty as a member (or as members) of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty: “The Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty consists of faculty who are not Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty and who: (i) have full-time appointments at the University; (ii) have titles or appointments that do not prohibit indefinite contract renewals (although promotion within the appointment category, such as from assistant to associate, may be required for renewal); and (iii) are not visiting faculty (including persons who have tenure or are on the tenure track at another institution and persons who are on leave from another institution or a company),” and

Whereas the message sent from the FAS administration fails to indicate which of the three conditions, sufficient in themselves to guarantee membership in the full-time continuing contract faculty, Jones has failed to fulfill, and makes no mention of Bylaw 87, section b which describes the aforementioned NYU faculty member very aptly, “Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty have an array of titles, which may vary depending on the college or school, and which may overlap with Other Faculty titles. On rare occasions, the title of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor are utilized for Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty, most commonly in the case of senior faculty who come to the University after a distinguished career at another institution and at the Abu Dhabi and Shanghai portal campuses.”

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the C-FSC strongly recommends the following:

1. The specific case of Professor Maitland Jones, Jr., the full-time faculty member who was recently denied a right to grieve, should be reopened and investigated, and a complete and truthful statement should be furnished by the administration to explain how, if at all, this faculty member failed to qualify as a member of the Full-Time Continuing Contract Faculty.

2. If the denial of Professor Maitland Jones, Jr.’s right to grieve is found to have been improper, his grievance should be reinstated and reviewed in accordance with the procedures required by the NYU Faculty Handbook.
Faye Flam: An NYU professor got fired. Then everyone missed the point

Bloomberg Opinion (TNS) Oct 13, 2022

The disruption associated with the COVID-19 pandemic is loosening society’s grip on some stubborn assumptions about different facets of life, especially work and education. The latest: that the hardest college classes are the most rigorous, as exemplified in last week’s hullaballoo over the case of an New York University professor of organic chemistry fired after students protested their bad grades.

The general public is rightly nervous about any changes that could degrade the quality of future doctors. Our lives could be on the line here. But where’s the evidence that we get better care by weeding out students who don’t get an A (or at least a B) in this course?

It’s easy to paint students who complain about their grades as entitled. But we can’t say whether the students were struggling despite working hard, or whether the professor, Maitland Jones Jr., was doing a good job of teaching.

And the reason the situation captured headlines isn’t because of that narrow question. It’s because it raises so many others: Is it the job of a college professor to identify the best and the brightest, or to create the best and the brightest? Are test scores the best way to evaluate students — and are student evaluations the best way to appraise teachers? Has something about the pandemic hobbled students’ ability to learn?

In the traditional weed-out model of medical education, there’s an underlying assumption that patients get better care from doctors who’ve passed an organic chemistry class that was failed by 80% of the students
— surviving a kind of trial by fire. But maybe that’s wrong. Maybe we’d get better treatment from a doctor whose teacher was so skilled that only 20% of students failed that class.

It’s a conundrum that had me seeking out experts in science education. Chemistry professor Stacey Lowery Bretz of Miami University in Ohio has won awards both for teaching excellence and for research. She told me she “detests” the very idea of weed-out courses.

“I’d like to be a gateway, not a gatekeeper,” she said. “I don’t want to punish students or pronounce them unfit.”

She told me that when doctors find out what she does for a living, they often tell her they hated organic chemistry. “That doesn’t exactly instill confidence,” she said. “It’s a tragedy because chemistry is a really elegant and beautiful way to see the world.”

Organic chemistry teaches people something she thinks is fundamental to medicine — the ability to see how a reaction can have a different outcome if you change the external conditions. That’s how the body works, and how drugs work, so it’s good for health professionals to be able to think this way. Students who just learn to pass tests by solving equations don’t come away with the deep understanding that helps to solve novel problems.

She’s not alone in feeling repulsed by the idea of weeding students out. “That is absurd ... how can I be the one who decides an 18-year-old is not qualified to be a physician?” asked Oluwatoyin Asojo, chair of chemistry at Hampton University in Virginia. She also taught at a medical school — the Baylor College of Medicine — before coming to teach undergraduates at Hampton. To her, the goal is not to make classes easier, but to give students the tools they need to get through hard classes.
But there’s another thing brought to the forefront about this case that’s not right — and that’s the way professors are evaluated. Are university administrators putting too much weight on what students think about their professors?

Student reviews loom large in professors’ careers and they are a terrible barometer of quality, said Vicente Talanquer, a chemistry professor at the University of Arizona. Studies of reviews have found that they don’t measure teaching effectiveness.

Professors usually get their jobs based on research skills, then they get thrown into teaching with little or no instruction or support, Talanquer said. Universities could do a better job of supporting their faculty members’ teaching skills.

As much as people want to find a villain in the NYU controversy, it might not be Jones or the students. Jones was there because he wanted to keep teaching after retiring from a tenured job at Princeton University. He has expressed concerns that in the last couple of years, students were not just unprepared, but also unable to focus. He told me via email this could stem from something beyond just the disruption of the pandemic.

A problem concentrating is different from laziness or a sense of entitlement. And the students told the New York Times they never intended to get Jones fired; they just wanted better grades.

Whatever went wrong at NYU, there’s good reason to change a punitive system where professors have to worry about student petitions and students fear too many mistakes on a test will disqualify them from the career they want before they’re even out of school. University science departments need to find more evidence-based ways to evaluate students and professors.
At N.Y.U., Students Were Failing Organic Chemistry. Who Was to Blame?

Maitland Jones Jr., a respected professor, defended his standards. But students started a petition, and the university dismissed him.

Students said Maitland Jones’s course was too hard and blamed him and his teaching methods for their poor showings. Credit...Janice Chung for The New York Times
In the field of organic chemistry, Maitland Jones Jr. has a storied reputation. He taught the subject for decades, first at Princeton and then at New York University, and wrote an influential textbook. He received awards for his teaching, as well as recognition as one of N.Y.U.’s coolest professors.

But last spring, as the campus emerged from pandemic restrictions, 82 of his 350 students signed a petition against him.

Students said the high-stakes course — notorious for ending many a dream of medical school — was too hard, blaming Dr. Jones for their poor test scores.

The professor defended his standards. But just before the start of the fall semester, university deans terminated Dr. Jones’s contract.

The officials also had tried to placate the students by offering to review their grades and allowing them to withdraw from the class retroactively. The chemistry department’s chairman, Mark E. Tuckerman, said the unusual offer to withdraw was a “one-time exception granted to students by the dean of the college.”

Marc A. Walters, director of undergraduate studies in the chemistry department, summed up the situation in an email to Dr. Jones, before his firing.

He said the plan would “extend a gentle but firm hand to the students and those who pay the tuition bills,” an apparent reference to parents.

The university’s handling of the petition provoked equal and opposite reactions from both the chemistry faculty, who protested the decisions, and pro-Jones students, who sent glowing letters of endorsement.

“The deans are obviously going for some bottom line, and they want happy students who are saying great things about the university so more people apply and the U.S. News rankings keep going higher,” said Paramjit Arora, a chemistry professor who has worked closely with Dr. Jones.
University officials tried to placate the students, even allowing them to withdraw from the class retroactively, a highly unusual step. Credit...Janice Chung for The New York Times

In short, this one unhappy chemistry class could be a case study of the pressures on higher education as it tries to handle its Gen-Z student body. Should universities ease pressure on students, many of whom are still coping with the pandemic's effects on their mental health and schooling? How should universities respond to the increasing number of complaints by students against professors? Do students have too much power over contract faculty members, who do not have the protections of tenure?

And how hard should organic chemistry be anyway?

Dr. Jones, 84, is known for changing the way the subject is taught. In addition to writing the 1,300-page textbook “Organic Chemistry,” now in its fifth edition, he pioneered a new method of instruction that relied less on rote memorization and more on problem solving.

After retiring from Princeton in 2007, he taught organic chemistry at N.Y.U. on a series of yearly contracts. About a decade ago, he said in an interview, he noticed a loss of focus among the students, even as more of them enrolled in his class, hoping to pursue medical careers.
Recent Issues on America’s College Campuses

- **A Tough Course**: New York University dismissed a respected chemistry professor after students said his class was too hard, igniting a debate over academic standards.

- **Harvard Slavery Report**: After the university issued a report investigating its ties to slavery earlier this year, both Harvard and the descendants of enslaved people with links to the school are debating, What is justice now?

- **U.S. News College Rankings**: The accuracy of the U.S. News & World Report college rankings are increasingly called into question, but the list remains a dominant reference guide for families evaluating colleges.

- **Oberlin Bakery Lawsuit**: After a yearslong legal fight, Oberlin College will pay $36.59 million to a local bakery that said it had been defamed and falsely accused of racism after a worker caught a Black student shoplifting.

“Students were misreading exam questions at an astonishing rate,” he wrote in a grievance to the university, protesting his termination. Grades fell even as he reduced the difficulty of his exams.

The problem was exacerbated by the pandemic, he said. “In the last two years, they fell off a cliff,” he wrote. “We now see single digit scores and even zeros.”

After several years of Covid learning loss, the students not only didn’t study, they didn’t seem to know how to study, Dr. Jones said.

To ease pandemic stress, Dr. Jones and two other professors taped 52 organic chemistry lectures. Dr. Jones said that he personally paid more than $5,000 for the videos and that they are still used by the university.

That was not enough. In 2020, some 30 students out of 475 filed a petition asking for more help, said Dr. Arora, who taught that class with Dr. Jones. “They were really struggling,” he explained. “They didn’t have good internet coverage at home. All sorts of things.”

The professors assuaged the students in an online town-hall meeting, Dr. Arora said.

Many students were having other problems. Kent Kirshenbaum, another chemistry professor at N.Y.U., said he discovered cheating during online tests.

When he pushed students’ grades down, noting the egregious misconduct, he said they protested that “they were not given grades that would allow them to get into medical school.”

By spring 2022, the university was returning with fewer Covid restrictions, but the anxiety continued and students seemed disengaged.
“They weren’t coming to class, that’s for sure, because I can count the house,” Dr. Jones said in an interview. “They weren’t watching the videos, and they weren’t able to answer the questions.”
Dr. Jones said that after two years of pandemic learning loss, students not only didn’t study: They seemed to not know how to study. Credit...Janice Chung for The New York Times

Students could choose between two sections, one focused on problem solving, the other on traditional lectures. Students in both sections shared problems on a GroupMe chat and began venting about the class. Those texts kick-started the petition, submitted in May.

“We are very concerned about our scores, and find that they are not an accurate reflection of the time and effort put into this class,” the petition said.

The students criticized Dr. Jones’s decision to reduce the number of midterm exams from three to two, flattening their chances to compensate for low grades. They said that he had tried to conceal course averages, did not offer extra credit and removed Zoom access to his lectures, even though some students had Covid. And, they said, he had a “condescending and demanding” tone.

“We urge you to realize,” the petition said, “that a class with such a high percentage of withdrawals and low grades has failed to make students’ learning and well-being a priority and reflects poorly on the chemistry department as well as the institution as a whole.”

Dr. Jones said in an interview that he reduced the number of exams because the university scheduled the first test date after six classes, which was too soon.

On the accusation that he concealed course averages, Dr. Jones said that they were impossible to provide because 25 percent of the grade relied on lab scores and a final lab test, but that students were otherwise aware of their grades.

As for Zoom access, he said the technology in the lecture hall made it impossible to record his white board problems.

Zacharia Benslimane, a teaching assistant in the problem-solving section of the course, defended Dr. Jones in an email to university officials.

“I think this petition was written more out of unhappiness with exam scores than an actual feeling of being treated unfairly,” wrote Mr. Benslimane, now a Ph.D. student at Harvard. “I have noticed that many of the students who consistently complained about the class did not use the resources we afforded to them.”

Ryan Xue, who took the course, said he found Dr. Jones both likable and inspiring.

“This is a big lecture course, and it also has the reputation of being a weed-out class,” said Mr. Xue, who has transferred and is now a junior at Brown. “So there are people
who will not get the best grades. Some of the comments might have been very heavily influenced by what grade students have gotten.”

Other students, though, seemed shellshocked from the experience. In interviews, several of them said that Dr. Jones was keen to help students who asked questions, but that he could also be sarcastic and downbeat about the class’s poor performance.

After the second midterm for which the average hovered around 30 percent, they said that many feared for their futures. One student was hyperventilating.

But students also described being surprised that Dr. Jones was fired, a measure the petition did not request and students did not think was possible.

The entire controversy seems to illustrate a sea change in teaching, from an era when professors set the bar and expected the class to meet it, to the current more supportive, student-centered approach.

Dr. Jones “learned to teach during a time when the goal was to teach at a very high and rigorous level,” Dr. Arora said. “We hope that students will see that putting them through that rigor is doing them good.”

James W. Canary, chairman of the department until about a year ago, said he admired Dr. Jones’s course content and pedagogy, but felt that his communication with students was skeletal and sometimes perceived as harsh.

“He hasn’t changed his style or methods in a good many years,” Dr. Canary said. “The students have changed, though, and they were asking for and expecting more support from the faculty when they’re struggling.”

N.Y.U. is evaluating so-called stumble courses — those in which a higher percentage of students get D’s and F’s, said John Beckman, a spokesman for the university.
N.Y.U. is evaluating so-called stumble courses — those in which an unusually high percentage of students get D’s and F’s. Credit...Janice Chung for The New York Times

“Organic chemistry has historically been one of those courses,” Mr. Beckman said. “Do these courses really need to be punitive in order to be rigorous?”

Dr. Kirshenbaum said he worried about any effort to reduce the course’s demands, noting that most students in organic chemistry want to become doctors.

“Unless you appreciate these transformations at the molecular level,” he said, “I don’t think you can be a good physician, and I don’t want you treating patients.”

In August, Dr. Jones received a short note from Gregory Gabadadze, dean for science, terminating his contract. Dr. Jones’s performance, he wrote, “did not rise to the standards we require from our teaching faculty.”

Dr. Gabadadze declined to be interviewed. But Mr. Beckman defended the decision, saying that Dr. Jones had been the target of multiple student complaints about his “dismissiveness, unresponsiveness, condescension and opacity about grading.”

Dr. Jones’s course evaluations, he added, “were by far the worst, not only among members of the chemistry department, but among all the university’s undergraduate science courses.”
Professors in the chemistry department have pushed back. In a letter to Dr. Gabadadze and other deans, they wrote that they worried about setting “a precedent, completely lacking in due process, that could undermine faculty freedoms and correspondingly enfeeble proven pedagogic practices.”

Nathaniel J. Traaseth, one of about 20 chemistry professors, mostly tenured, who signed the letter, said the university’s actions may deter rigorous instruction, especially given the growing tendency of students to file petitions.

“Now the faculty who are not tenured are looking at this case and thinking, ‘Wow, what if this happens to me and they don’t renew my contract?’” he said.

Dr. Jones agrees.

“I don’t want my job back,” he said, adding that he had planned to retire soon anyway. “I just want to make sure this doesn’t happen to anyone else.”
Editorial: The New York Times article on Maitland Jones was incomplete.

An article published in the New York Times on Monday discussed the firing of Maitland Jones Jr., a renowned chemistry professor. The article, however, gravely misrepresented NYU students.
A former student of Maitland Jones reads the Oct. 4, 2022, edition of The New York Times, in which an article about NYU firing Jones was published. (Manasa Gudavalli for WSN)

On Monday, The New York Times published a news article about the firing of a renowned professor from NYU’s organic chemistry program this summer. Maitland Jones Jr., the article reads, was a professor of chemistry so respected that he actually wrote the textbook on the subject. But students of his Organic Chemistry II class last semester put together a petition asking for additional support, and the article claims that because of it, he was dismissed from the university.

The article was misinformed, overly opinionated for a news story, incomplete in its reporting, and ignorant to the realities of being a student and young person today.

Frequent readers of the Washington Square News know that as a publication independent of NYU, we’re no stranger to holding the university accountable for its missteps. In this case, however, we feel that the Times’ reporting gravely misrepresented the situation.

Stephanie Saul, the reporter who wrote the Times article, implies that student sentiment about Jones was unique to the spring of 2022. However, it was not at all unfamiliar.

John Beckman, a spokesperson for NYU, told the Times that Jones’ student-submitted course evaluations “were by far the worst, not only among members of the chemistry department, but among all the university’s undergraduate science courses.” The Times, however, did not mention Jones’ standing until quite late in the piece.

There are dozens of comments across social media warning students about taking Jones’ class dating back more than a decade. WSN also accessed student evaluation records for courses taught by Jones, which showed that his scores had
been consistently low for years — long before the spring 2022 student petition. In the past five years, Jones’ co-professors teaching the same course typically had scores around or above 4.0 on a 5.0 scale, while Jones averaged around 3.3. In his final semester, his evaluation score dropped to 2.4. The stark contrast between those numbers shows that students weren’t just complaining about the intensity of the course.

Students of Jones’ fall 2020 class wrote an 11-page document outlining their grievances with his handling of the course — not the course content. Their requests were reasonable, considering the circumstances. They were part of an experimental semester, one that was forced to combine the in-person with the online, and Jones was not considerate of the need for change. The document explains that more work is not equivalent to more learning, and provides an estimate of how much time an average student spends on the class per week. Students said they spent 11 to 19 hours per week on the course — a course that traditionally takes up 10 to 15 hours per week.

In an email Jones sent to his students after he was fired, he apologized to those who did well in the course. “I send ... an apology to those of you who cruised through this course with a relentless stream of 100s,” he wrote in the email. “I didn’t stretch you, and thus deprived you of the chance to improve beyond an already formidable baseline.”
No professor should apologize to students who did well for not creating a curriculum where they would struggle. That is not the mark of a teacher. “It is very difficult to be self critical,” he concluded. “It is hard to accept personal responsibility when we meet failure, as each of us will at some point, but it is an essential life skill you would be wise to develop.”

Jones did not follow his own advice and accept any personal responsibility in his email.

**Questions asked, questions unanswered**

Beyond mischaracterizing the nature of students’ complaints, Saul, the Times reporter, unsuccessfully attempts to connect to a broader national story about intergenerational differences and so-called “wokeism” on college campuses. An entire paragraph of her article is devoted to rhetorical questions about what university education should look like, and whether students have too much power. We are not told the answers to these questions, or even who is asking them — if anybody is.

Saul writes, “This one unhappy chemistry class could be a case study of the pressures on higher education as it tries to handle its Gen-Z student body.”

Perhaps it was difficult for Jones, 84, to adjust his long-perfected teaching methods to a rapidly changing online environment. NYU made no documented effort to work with him to improve his teaching methods and respond to student concerns while maintaining the rigor of the course, which could have provided a less drastic solution than his termination. As Jill Filipovic, an alum of our publication, wrote in a CNN column responding to the Times story, NYU’s decision to terminate Jones’ contract raises serious questions about how much power students should have in the hiring, retention and firing of professors. But Saul’s characterization of Generation Z as defiant and lazy is nothing new. She implies in her writing that NYU was trying to appease its students because they had more control over it than students in the past. She quotes Paramjit
Arora, a chemistry professor who worked closely with Jones, as saying that the university tried to keep its students happy in order to keep its rankings high. But students banded together, not for the first time, to correct something they found morally troubling, and they succeeded. If anything, that is a testament to Gen-Z’s communicative power.

‘And how hard should organic chemistry be anyway?’

Organic chemistry is a difficult class, to be sure. It’s often considered a weed-out class for students aspiring to go to medical school, and that reputation is well-deserved. But many of Jones’ students said he went out of his way to make it harder.

WSN spoke to six students about their experiences in Jones’ class. Most spoke on condition of anonymity, due to concern that their applications to medical school could be negatively impacted if they shared their thoughts.

Grace Paschal, who graduated from NYU this past May with a B.S. in biology, took organic chemistry with Jones.

“He was teaching and writing the book like he expected you to be just as receptive to organic chemistry as he was and to take it in just as easily without breaking it down,” Paschal said. “He was not receptive to questions, and I didn’t want to open myself up for him to be rude to me.”

Students have made clear that Jones refused to be helpful, but the article opened an avenue for a slew of insults to be thrown at NYU students. Both in the comments section of the article and throughout social media, people have called students lazy and over-privileged. Blogger Freddie deBoer wrote on Substack, “I hope you never get treated by one of the doctors who emerges from this mess.”

Medical school is already incredibly difficult to get into. Regardless of whether they put in the work or not, or of the grades they get in any STEM class at the university, the integrity of NYU students will be called into question because of this article. And regardless of whether Jones deserved to be fired, considering he
was planning to retire the following year, his point of view should not have been put on a pedestal without adequate sourcing of the student perspective.

*All the News That’s Fit to Print*

“Specifically regarding the New York Times piece, a lot of blame is being put on students,” one former student of Jones said. “It’s belittling and degrading that people don’t understand these are severe concerns that come from a place of struggling in the classroom. I don’t know why it’s considered a news piece.”

As practicing student journalists, we felt that Saul’s reporting went against many rules we have been cautioned against breaking. She quotes largely from Jones, other chemistry professors and NYU representatives, but neglects to offer readers the essential perspective of current NYU students, and fails to substantiate her claims about Gen-Z students.

Saul does quote one former student: Ryan Xue, who has since transferred to Brown University. He was *initially introduced* as a student who did well in the class, and quoted as saying, “This is a big lecture course, and it also has the reputation of being a weed-out class, so there are people who will not get the best grades.”

A few hours after publication, upon Xue’s request, the article was edited to remove the exact grade he received in the course. In its place, a second sentence from his interview was added, which he felt was needed in order to accurately convey his point of view: “Some of the comments might have been very heavily influenced by what grade students have gotten.”

The New York Times has a responsibility to report news accurately and objectively, and this article should not have met its high standards for publication. It needlessly threw the integrity of Jones’ students, and others at NYU, into question. Instead, it served as a puff piece for Jones to air out his personal frustrations, while failing to answer any of the questions it posed.
Summary of Senate Taskforce on University Calendar

The Senate Calendar Taskforce has met throughout the AY; Robert Young and Amy Witkoski Stimpfel attended, co-chaired by Beth Kienle-Granzo and Julie Mostov.

**Purpose:** Make recommendations for development of calendar guidelines beginning in Fall 2024 (next 3-year cycle)

**Timeline** (to have work done): early fall 2022

**Work to date:** The Task Force for University Academic Calendar Guidelines (Task Force) was convened in April 2021 to review the existing academic calendar guidelines (guidelines) for the purpose of recommending changes, including consideration of the Senate Executive Committee’s recommendation to forgo scheduling classes on election day. The Task Force met six times, from April 2021 to October 2022. A memo was submitted with recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration at their next meeting on 10/18. Based on the response from the Senate Executive Committee, the memo/recommendations will likely be shared at the University Senate meeting on November 3, and/or provided to SAAC for the upcoming cycle for the Fall 2024-Summer 2027 academic calendar, which are typically approved by the Senate at the March or April meeting.