MINUTES OF THE T-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 7, 2022

The New York University Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, April 7, 2022 via Zoom.

In attendance were Senators Amin, Barker, Cappell, Coslovsky, Economides, Friedman, Garg, Geppert Gyorgy, Irving, Jauernig, Ling, Lukose, Makarov, Merritt, Miao, Nonken, Park, Quinn, Schlick, Shelley, Stimpfel, Suzuki, Young, and Zelikoff; Active Alternate Conte; and Alternate Senators Grier, Righetti, Stewart, Van Cleave, and Partridge (for Ricci).

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the March 3, 2022 meeting were approved unanimously.

VICE CHAIR AND SECRETARY ELECTION

See attached Document E.

The election of T-FSC Vice Chair and Secretary for 2022-2023 took place by online ballot with the following slate of candidates presented by the Nominating Committee: for Vice Chair: Marilyn Nonken of the Steinhardt School and an open candidate seat, and for Secretary: Christopher Park of the Grossman School of Medicine and an open candidate seat.

Nominating Committee Chair Stimpfel reported the results of the election: Marilyn Nonken will serve as Vice Chair and Christopher Park will serve as Secretary next academic year. They will join Chair-elect Irving and outgoing Chair Merritt on the Executive Committee.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR: DARCEY MERRITT

Middle States Review: Self-Study Working Groups

Chair Merritt announced that the Middle States Review Co-Chairs asked the T-FSC to nominate 5-7 faculty members to fill 1-2 roles on the self-study working groups slated to convene in Fall 2022 through Spring 2023. The chosen members will join other faculty, students, and staff in conducting the formal work of the study. Merritt asked that Council members who are interested to contact the Executive Committee. Those who serve on this Committee will not have to serve on other Council, Senate, or University Committees next academic year.

Year End Dinner

Merritt raised the idea of again hosting the T-FSC Year End Dinner in May, which was cancelled the last two years due to COVID-19. The View at Battery Park, formerly Battery Gardens and the past venue for the event, is available the evening of Wednesday, May 11. By general consensus, the Council agreed to move forward with hosting the event.

Provost Departure
Merritt reported, as was communicated on April 5 by the President, that Provost Katherine Fleming has been appointed President and CEO of the J. Paul Getty Trust, effective August 1, 2022.

She noted the Executive Committee meets with the Provost Office next week and will inquire on the process of the appointment Interim Provost and the new Provost.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT COUNCIL (AMC) SCOG REPRESENTATIVES ON AMC REPRESENTATION IN THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Administrative Management Council (AMC) Senate Committee on Organization and Governance (SCOG) Representatives on AMC Representation in the University Senate

See attached Document F.

AMC Chair Mike McCaw introduced the presentation, noting the challenges the AMC faces as they engage in university governance while representing the broad span of constituents across the University with a small number of seats on the University Senate. He introduced AMC Senator Cassie Bizarro.

Bizzaro reported in February of 2021, SCOG launched a survey to the entire University Senate. The survey gathered input on the Senate’s role in information sharing and as a deliberative body. It also found 50% of respondents said that they would prefer to attend a mix of in-person and remote. The current hybrid model opens up more possibilities regarding size as the model helps address space issues in the room.

Bizzaro stated the AMC represents full-time administrators at NYU. She presented the current organizational structure of the University Senate, which includes the current number of senators in each Council and the number of constituents that they represent. The AMC has the second largest number at 3,736 constituents, but the fewest number of voting members, at 7 senators and 13 alternate senators.

McCaw presented on ways to address more equitable representation of administrators within the University Senate. The AMC is proposing a realignment that would be a better fit with the current Senate structure to create more equity for the AMC. They suggest the new AMC Senate representation include one Senator and one alternate senator for every school and administrative unit/division. This would total 28 Senators, which changes the number of constituents each Senator represents from 534 constituents to 133, and representation in the overall Senator from 4.96% to 17.3%.

A Senator inquired how this proposal would improve the work of the Senate. He also noted the issue of increased size. A Senator inquired if there is enough interest from AMC constituents to participate in the AMC and fill the increased number of open seats.

Bizzaro reported on the strong level of interest, noting for the past three years of attendance data they have had 100 percent attendance of the 7 senators, and that guest passes are frequently used by administrators to attend the Senate meetings.

A Senator inquired if there is flexibility in asking for the large increase to 28 seats. Bizzaro noted they developed that number by calculating one Senator per school. She noted there might be more flexibility in how to incorporate administrative units.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: MIRA NESS, CEO OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

Special Presentation: Mira Ness, CEO of New York University Federal Credit Union

See attached Document G.
CEO Ness explained the definition of a credit union, stating it is a financial institution similar to a bank, but is not-for-profit, member owned, and serves a specific community.

The NYU Credit Union was created in 1982. It is governed by the Board of Directors and serves all of the NYU schools and NYU Langone hospitals. There are branches at 726 Broadway, at NYU Langone Center, in Mineola, and has 30 ATMs all over the campus. Members can also use any Citibank branch ATM for free. NYU employees, faculty, students, alumni, and their family members can become members. The majority of members are NYU employees.

The Credit Union offers credit card balance transfers. For those with a credit score over 700, the gold credit card offers 6.90% for the first 6 months and 8.9% fixed rate after, no annual fee, with a max limit of $15,000, and a promotional limit of up to $50,000.00 with a balance transfer.

The Credit Union offers debt consolidation. Rates are between 10%-17.5% and you can consolidate up to $45,000.

Ness noted one of their biggest products is the mortgage suite, which is up to 95% financing in all 50 States. Last year the Credit Union did $71 million in mortgages. They offer down payment assistance loans, mortgage preparedness loans, a home buyer grant for first time home buyers in NY/NJ, home equity loans, and lines of credit.

Other benefits include auto-financing with rates as low as 1% on new or used auto purchases, discounted Citibike memberships of $5/month, free financial webinars and seminars, and free consulting by certified financial counselors.

The Credit Union also offers quick cash loans of $500 until payday at zero percent.

Ness presented the NYU Credit Union website and demonstrated how to use tools such as the quick mortgage rate calculator.

She added that during COVID, they processed many business loans and paycheck protection loans.

The Council thanked Ness for her presentation.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: CAMPUS SAFETY

Fountain Walker, Vice President of Global Campus Safety presented. He was also joined by Executive Vice President Martin Dorph.

Walker report the Department of Campus Safety partners with NYPD and the park enforcement police on incidents. He noted Campus Safety works with these external bodies when an incident occurs outside buildings which does not fall under their purview. They also encourage students to engage with law enforcement.

Walker noted current initiatives in Campus Safety including a more active role, higher visibility of officers, security camera additions around Gould Plaza and other locations, improvements to SafeNYU app and a new AI application. They are also gathering feedback from community members, pursuing ways to provided educational opportunities for students, and planning ways to engage with faculty. They are also working with partners in campus and student life and Office of Global Inclusion, Diversity, and Strategic Innovation to ensure Campus Safety is in line with strategic initiatives and goals of the institution.

Walker reported the new hire of Dr. Patty McSteen. She is the former Dean of Students at Ohio University and will bring her 25 years of student affairs experience to enhancing community engagement initiatives.

A Senator inquired how an incident is handled if it occurs inside a NYU building versus outside a NYU building. Walker noted inside the building if there is an issue such as an argument, noise disruption, or
other event where no physical harm is or could be taking place, campus safety should be contacted. If it is an incident inside or outside the building that involved potential physical harm, is life threatening, etc. the police should be contacted.

It was noted Campus Safety is not allowed by state law to exercise police powers inside or outside the building. The role of campus safety is access control, emergency and crisis management, and community engagement.

A Senator recommended Campus Safety get involved with the Reality Show on campus to communicate on safety.

In response to questions on improving safety and recent incidents, Walker noted Campus Safety works with the NYPD daily and they engage closely with the Deputy Mayor of Public Safety. They have also engaged with the Asian Hate Crimes Task Force. He noted Campus Safety also needs help from the community in regards to reporting.

A Senator inquired on additional cameras being added to NYU buildings to cover surveillance of Washington Square. Walker responded they have a network of cameras and, many do cover Washington Square Park. He noted cameras are not a deterrent to crime but are an investigative tool.

A Senator applauded Campus Safety for their work in orienting new students coming to New York City with different safety tips. She asked if there could be increased police presence in areas where recent incidents have occurred. She also suggested hosting a student information session.

A Senator inquired on the refusal to report to law enforcement. Walker noted there has been an increase in refusal to report and lack of confidence in law enforcement. He added it is the individual’s choice to interact with law enforcement. Dorph added this is an area for McSteen to assist with and help counsel students on resources.

PPTM REVIEW OF GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE NYU DIVISION OF LIBRARIES

See attached Document A and B.

Committee Member Conte presented the review and recommendations of the Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications (PPTM) Committee regarding the Guidelines. The Committee met several times by Zoom to review and discuss the Guidelines document. As a Committee, they unanimously agreed on these edits and comments being presented to the T-FSC for discussion. Conte presented the details of Document A, which provides a summary of the added, deleted, or questioned text highlighted in yellow and the rationale for such changes in italics for each section. This summary primarily reflects substantive changes. For expediency, smaller editorial suggestions regarding typos, punctuation, use of acronyms, etc. are marked in Document B. See attached Document A.

A Senator questioned the rationale for why candidates have the right to specify the names of only up to two individuals whom they do not want to be solicited for the letters from external and internal evaluators. Conte noted they can inquire on the rationale.

The recommendations were approved by vote of the Council.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Compensation recommendation and Retirement committee issues

See attached Document C.
These topics will be moved to the May meeting.

**COVID UPDATE**

Senator Makarov reported there is a slight uptick in rates of COVID in New York. However, the rates are overall low as is the rate of hospitalization.

**T-FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

*See attached Document D.*

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

Superblock Stewardship Advisory Committee (SSAC)

**Reports at Meeting:**

**Inclusion, Equity, Diversity**

Committee Chair Nonken reported the Committee developed a survey on Council diversity. They will be sending this survey to all Council members to gather information for a demographic analysis of the T-FSC. They worked with the Disabilities Inclusion, and Accessibility Working Group on the survey. Questions included on age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, ability, socio-economic status. Results will be shared at May Council meeting.

**Global Network University**

Co-Chair Cappell reported the Committee met with Faculty Committee on NYU’s Global Network and C-FSC GNU Committee. They received a report on the administration policies and recent changes.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
From: NYU T-FSC Senate, Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications Committee (PPTM),
Jill Conte, Member

To: T-FSC

Date: 4/1/2022

Re: Guidelines and Standards for Promotion and Tenure NYU Division of Libraries

The PPTM Committee, Co-Chaired by Drs. Judith Zelikoff and Nicola Partridge, have
thoroughly reviewed the submitted NYU Division of Libraries’ Guidelines and Standards for
Promotion and Tenure. The PPTM Committee met several times by Zoom to review and
discuss (at length) the Guidelines document. As a Committee, we unanimously agreed on the
edits and comments being presented to the T-FSC for discussion. Please find below a
summary of our added, deleted, or questioned text highlighted in yellow and our rationale for
such changes in italics for each section. Please note that this summary primarily reflects
substantive changes. For expediency, smaller editorial suggestions regarding typos,
punctuation, use of acronyms, etc. are marked in the accompanying PDF file of the guidelines
document, but are not reflected in this cover letter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (p. 1)
Suggest numbering sections of the document for ease of navigation and reference.

INTRODUCTION (p. 1)
   a. “This Guidelines document supplements the NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws, Libraries
   Faculty Handbook, the NYU Faculty Handbook, and the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.”
   Broken link embedded in document. Consider linking to the website instead of the PDF:
   https://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook.html

   b. “As with all NYU and Division of Libraries policies, this document is subject to
   change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.” Suggest
   spelling out in this introduction which libraries at NYU sit within the Division of Libraries and
   whose faculty members are subject to these guidelines.

APPOINTMENT (p. 2)

Academic Preparation for Probationary Initial Appointment to the Tenure and Tenure
Track Faculty
   a. “The academic preparation for a probationary initial appointment to the Tenure and
   Tenure Track Faculty is normally established on the basis of a master’s degree in library
   science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized
   foreign equivalent, and a second graduate degree.” Are these the criteria for appointment and
   promotion to this rank, or just initial appointment? Suggest clarifying the difference between the
two.
Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Associate Curator

b. "Full-time service in the rank of Library Associate will not be counted toward the attainment of tenure." Does reference to "service" in this rank cover job performance, service, and scholarship/publications? Consider spelling out more fully what aspects of the job will or won’t count toward the attainment of tenure during the period of employment in this rank.

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Curator
c. “The candidate must also demonstrate outstanding achievements in bibliographical activities, in research, in education, and in other professional activities.” This is the only place where the phrase "bibliographical activities" appears in the document. Consider aligning the criteria in this section with those outlined in the Promotion to Curator section of these guidelines, which better reflect the language of the NYU P&T Guidelines. Also consider aligning this section with the criteria outlined in the NYU Faculty Handbook: "The rank of Professor should be granted only after careful consideration of the individual’s character, scholarship, productivity, teaching ability, and reputation among peers in [their] own field, as well as [their] capacity for inclining students toward noteworthy attainments. It should be granted only to [faculty members] who have been so tested that there is reasonable certainty of their continuing usefulness throughout the remainder of their working years. It should never be granted as the reward of seniority and should be reserved as a mark of distinction in the field of scholarship and instruction. It should never be granted as a recognition of usefulness in administration."

d. “The candidate must also demonstrate outstanding achievements in bibliographical activities, in research, in education, and in other professional activities.” Consider reconciling the language of "research" here with the aforementioned language of "scholarship or creative or artistic work" for Associate Curator.

e. “The candidate must also demonstrate outstanding achievements in bibliographical activities, in research, in education, and in other professional activities.” Is this a reference to the candidate’s educational attainment(s) or the candidate’s achievements as an educator? Consider aligning the language in this section with the criteria outlined in the Promotion to Curator section of these guidelines, which better reflect the language of the NYU P&T Guidelines.

STANDARDS (pp. 2-5)

Overview
a. “The process for the election and responsibilities of the ARP are defined in the NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws and Handbook.” As these are separate documents, consider unlinking and referring to them separately as "NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws and Libraries Faculty Handbook" (as they were in the Introduction).

b. “The tenure vetting process also includes review by the Libraries Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC), and it is informed by independent external evaluations and such other information as deemed appropriate by the ARP Panel, TAC, and ultimately the Provost.” Consider inserting “by the elected members of the Libraries Tenure Advisory Committee.”
c. “The tenure vetting process also includes review by the Libraries Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC), and it is informed by independent external evaluations and such other information as deemed appropriate by the ARP Panel, TAC, and ultimately the Provost.” Consider explaining this group earlier in the document along with ARP and define the purpose of TAC. See additional comments later in the document suggesting information be moved up for context.

d. “...and it is informed by independent external evaluations and such other information as deemed appropriate by the ARP Panel, TAC, and ultimately the Provost.” Suggest adding a sentence here: "For additional details on this process, see Tenure Review section." Or better, give the section and number and refer to that in the text.

e. “In the case of significantly divergent recommendations, the Dean may choose to seek additional information, but has no obligation to do so.” Suggest deleting the phrase "but has no obligation to do so."

Conferring of Tenure

f. “The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure in the Division of Libraries is an inquiry...” Suggest stating explicitly somewhere in this document that this is a 6-year tenure track where candidates apply for tenure at the end of their fifth year, and that the promotion and tenure process is “up or out.”

g. “Each case must be examined in some detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths and acknowledging limits or weaknesses.” Suggest deleting the word "some."

Criteria for Tenure

h. “A high standard of excellence in job performance is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU.” Is job performance weighted heavier than the other two criteria for tenure? If not, consider moving this sentence to the job performance section, below.

Promotion to Curator

i. “In addition, it is required that the candidate provide evidence of significant academic achievement beyond the work considered at the point of having been awarded tenure.” This language isn’t found in the NYU P&T Guidelines or Faculty Handbook. Would "significant scholarly or creative or artistic achievements" be a more accurate description based on previous language in these guidelines? And if so, how is this requirement distinct from the publication of new research and professional advancement, referenced in the sentence that follows? Consider clarifying.

GUIDELINES (pp. 6-7)

Lateral Appointments

a. “The Provost’s Office has established a timeline for the review of tenure dockets, including new hires with tenure. In such cases, the Libraries must facilitate an accelerated review of the candidate’s materials and submit completed dockets to the Provost Office no later than April 15 for a September 1st start date.”
give June 1 as the date by which tenure dockets must be submitted to the Provost.

b. “Preliminary materials (e.g. CV, statement of service and research interests, list of evaluators, and publications) will be needed as soon as possible for the ARP Panel.” Per NYU and Libraries P&T guidelines, candidates cannot identify or suggest evaluators. The ARP Panel generates this list itself and thus it is not supplied as "preliminary material." Consider deleting.

Role of Division of Libraries Human Resources in Evaluation

c. “All aspects of Tenure and Promotion procedures fall under the purview of faculty governance and are to be carried out by Libraries faculty, including the Dean, tenured elected members of the ARP and TAC.” Consider creating and including in these guidelines a flow diagram of the review process, which outlines all the participants and stages of review. See GSOM and LISOM guidelines for reference.

PROCEDURES (p. 7)

Third Year Review
a. “After an Assistant Curator has completed their third year in that rank, the Dean of Libraries shall consult the Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Committee to assess the individual’s progress toward achieving the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Curator.” Because third year review materials are due March 1 during a candidate’s third year of service, consider rewording this sentence to read: “As an Assistant Curator nears completion of their third year in that rank ...”.

Third Year Review Process
b. “The process for soliciting external letters is outlined below in the Review section.” Consider numbering sections of this document and then clarifying which section this refers to using its number designation and correct title/sub-title.

MATERIALS FOR CANDIDATE DOSSIERS (pp. 8-9)
a. “A list of committees and other formal groups that the candidate served.” Suggest changing to "...on which the candidate has served."

b. “In addition to the required materials, candidates may also include in their dossiers evidence of the quality of their scholarly, creative or artistic work, as appropriate. For example:” Suggest including as examples in this list: competitive grant funding; evidence that demonstrates one’s national or international reputation.

TENURE REVIEW (pp. 9-13)
a. Composition of ARP, ARP Panels, and the TAC Suggest contextualizing ARP/P&T Panel and defining TAC earlier in the document. Consider incorporating more fully the language about these bodies from the Libraries bylaws to create a stand alone document (i.e., linking guidelines and bylaws may create confusion down the road). Again, create and include a flow diagram of the process.

b. “Dossiers are assigned to a Panel composed of the eligible tenured members of the ARP.” Suggest spelling out explicitly what constitutes eligibility.
c. “In cases in which there is not the requisite number of Curators to consider an application from Associate Curator to Curator, the Dean will assemble a panel of tenured faculty of appropriate rank (e.g., Full Professor) from other schools.” Consider adding “…the Dean will, in consultation with the Panel Chair or, if the Panel Chair is an Associate Curator, with Curators who are members of ARP,…” to align with language in NYU P&T Guidelines.

d. **ARP Responsibilities and Process** Consider moving the information in this section so it appears earlier in the document for context.

Structure and Requirements of ARP Panel Report

e. “Although the ARP Panel may choose how to structure its report, the final version should contain five primary components: Assessment of Work Performance; Assessment of Research and Scholarship, and Assessment of Service; **Summary of Solicited letters**; and the Recommendation of the Panel.” Consider clarifying this heading. Is it to summarize the content of the letters or to summarize the evaluators’ qualifications and their reasons for being chosen (per pp. 12-13 of this document and in the NYU P&T Guidelines)? Also, suggest spelling out how and where in the report the panel should incorporate feedback from evaluators; would this be in a sixth section?

Solicitation of Letters from External and Internal Evaluators

f. “A complete ARP Panel docket for cases that involve the conferral of tenure or the promotion to Curator must include a minimum of five letters from highly qualified external evaluators.” Suggest adding a note about conflict of interest, per the NYU Faculty Handbook.

g. “The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at U.S. institutions; if appropriate, evaluations should be solicited from abroad.” Suggest changing "should" to "could."

h. “If there is unpublished work to be considered, the ARP Panel should ask external evaluators to comment on the quality of the unpublished work.” Consider specifying somewhere explicitly in the document that the ARP panel identifies and solicits evaluators.

i. “As a professional courtesy, evaluators should be given six weeks to return their evaluations.” Suggest spelling out to whom the letters should be returned.

j. “The ARP Panel should take special care to anticipate potential conflicts of interest when soliciting letters.” Suggest reiterating here what constitutes a conflict of interest.

k. “Candidates have the right to specify the names of up to two individuals whom they do not want to be solicited and provide a rationale.” Suggest clarifying what the process is for relaying this info and to whom.

l. “The evaluator must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor or co-author. Co-authors will be acceptable reviewers only in certain fields, such as fields with very small membership or fields in which papers typically have a large number of authors.” Consider providing a timeframe for when two scholars are no longer considered "closely associated." For example, see GSOM and LISOM guidelines.
m. “In all communications with evaluators, they should be assured that their letters will be held in strictest confidence and that the letters will be seen only by the ARP Panel, the Dean, the TAC, and the Provost’s Office.” Suggest adding language here to communicate that each group with access to the materials must maintain confidentiality as well.

**Recommendation of the ARP Panel**

n. “The Panel’s letter must include a summary of its discussion preceding the vote, as well as a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate’s work occupies in the relevant discipline or field.” Suggest adding more details about the voting process, e.g., closed vote, etc.

**TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROLE** (pp. 13-14)

Suggest moving this section earlier in the document for context.

a. “This level of review by the TAC is intended to be the equivalent of the vote of the full faculty that other Departments at the University conduct.” Suggest changing from “other” to “some” (e.g., medical, dental, and nursing faculties don’t conduct a faculty-wide vote).

b. “In the event that a Dean’s recommendation is contrary to that of the Panel and/or the TAC, the Dean will provide the respective committee(s) with their reasons. The committee(s) will then have ten business days in which to provide further information or counter-argument(s) before the Dean’s final recommendation is made to the Provost.” Suggest specifying these committee(s) as the ARP Panel and TAC explicitly.

c. “The Dean will ordinarily make a final recommendation to the Provost by April 15.”

Consider adding language from NYU P&T Guidelines that outlines what the Dean submits to the Provost: “The Dean's recommendation to the Provost constitutes the definitive recommendation of the department and will be accompanied by the docket, the ARP recommendation, and the TAC recommendation.” Also consider adding language about who will receive copies of the submission and correct the deadline, per the NYU Faculty Handbook: “The dean shall forward his or her recommendation by June 1 to the Provost, with a copy to the department head or chairperson and to the advisory body or, in schools without departmental organization, to the dean's advisory body. The dean's recommendation shall be accompanied by the recommendations he or she has received from the department head or chairperson and the advisory body.”

**GUIDELINES FOR APPEAL** (p. 14)

a. “Grievance procedures are explained in The Faculty Handbook.” Is this the NYU Faculty Handbook or the Libraries? Consider clarifying.

**REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR GUIDELINES**

a. “Once changes to policy are identified, they are sent to the Office of the Provost for initial consultation, then sent to faculty for review and vote for adoption, and finally returned to the Office of the Provost and to other bodies as appropriate for formal review.” Consider incorporating text from NYU P&T Guidelines that explicitly calls out T-FSC review: “Any newly created school guidelines, and any subsequent material changes to them, must 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 material changes.”

SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS (pp. 15-18)

Sample Solicitation Letter, External Reviewer, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion
a. “Please note that evaluators must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.” Suggest spelling out here what constitutes a "close associate." Refer to previous comments of this nature, above.

Sample Solicitation Letter, Promotion Review for Promotion to Curator
b. “The normal expectation will be the publication of significant new research, professional advancement, and impactful service to the university and/or profession since the conferring of tenure.” Service is never mentioned as a criterion for promotion to Curator in these P&T guidelines, other than a passing mention to "professional activities" in the criteria outlined on p. 2. NYU P&T Guidelines only make mention of "work" in the form of "new scholarly research or artistic achievement." NYU Faculty Handbook calls out "the individual's character, scholarship, productivity, teaching ability, and reputation among peers in his or her own field, as well as his or her capacity for inclining students toward noteworthy attainments." Consider reconciling language in letter with these guidelines as (re)written. Refer back to a previous comment regarding revisions to criteria for promotion to Full Curator.

c. “Please note that evaluators must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.” Refer to previous comments regarding "close associates." Consider clarifying this concept further.

Sample Solicitation Letter, Internal Reviewer, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion
d. “The most important criterion for tenure is the effectiveness of performance as a librarian, which is evidenced by the candidate’s continuing ability to perform at the highest professional level in areas that contribute to the educational and research mission of the University.” Is one criterion weighted more than the other two? Consider reconciling or deleting this sentence altogether. (See related comment in "Criteria for Tenure" section, opening sentence.)

e. “Please note that evaluators must not be an individual with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.” Refer to previous comments regarding "close associates." Consider clarifying this concept further.
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Date of faculty vote: October 15, 2021

**Introduction**

This *Guidelines* document supplements the *NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws, Libraries Faculty Handbook*, the *NYU Faculty Handbook*, and the *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*. If any part of this document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies then in effect will control. As with all NYU and Division of Libraries policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action. This document addresses processes related to the appointment of Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty, the conferral of tenure (including initial appointment), processes related to promotion from Assistant Curator to Associate Curator, and promotion from Associate Curator to Curator.
Appointment

Academic Preparation for Probationary Initial Appointment to the Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty

The academic preparation for a probationary initial appointment to the Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty is normally established on the basis of a master’s degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and a second graduate degree.

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Assistant Curator

A library faculty appointment as Assistant Curator is granted to one possessing a master’s degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association or a recognized foreign equivalent, and an additional graduate degree. In addition to this educational requirement, criteria for this rank include evidence of significant professional contributions and at least two years of successful library experience.

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Associate Curator

A library faculty appointment as Associate Curator is granted to one possessing a master’s degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and an additional graduate degree. Criteria for this rank includes a record of at least six years of outstanding job performance in professional library experience; service to the Libraries, the university, and the profession; and scholarship or creative or artistic work. An appointee at the Associate Curator rank must also possess the same qualifications as a person promoted to the rank. Full-time service in the rank of Library Associate will not be counted toward the attainment of tenure.

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Curator

A library faculty appointment to Curator is granted to one possessing a master’s degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and an additional graduate degree. The candidate must also demonstrate outstanding achievements in bibliographical activities, in research, in education, and in other professional activities. The appointee must also possess the same qualifications as a person promoted to the rank.

Standards

Overview

Tenure and promotion are granted at NYU Libraries on the basis of high achievement and recognition for excellent job performance, scholarship, and service. All candidates for tenure should demonstrate a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research or creative work, 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. Where appropriate to their role as a librarian, they are expected to conduct research or creative work that has demonstrated a potential impact on policy and practice in their field. 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 or creative work in the arts together with a record of effective job performance integrally influenced by scholarship or creative work. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

Successful candidates demonstrate clearly and objectively that their accomplishments merit tenure and promotion. In the Division of Libraries, tradition and faculty-approved policy hold that tenure vetting occurs through a multilevel process, which involves detailed evaluation by a Panel formed from the tenured members of the Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Committee (ARP). The ARP Committee is elected each year by the library faculty. The process for the election and responsibilities of the ARP are defined in the NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws and Handbook. The tenure vetting process also includes review by the Libraries Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC), and it is informed by independent external evaluations and such other information as deemed appropriate by the ARP Panel, TAC, and ultimately the Provost.

For the purposes of the review of candidates for tenure and promotion, the Division of Libraries is without a departmental organization. The term “department” as used in this document refers only to an operational unit of the Division of Libraries, which functions as a single academic department. In this configuration, the Panel from the ARP Committee is tantamount to departmental promotion and tenure (P&T) committees that exist in other schools at NYU. The ARP Panel Chair (like all members of the Panel) is a tenured member of the Library faculty, who functions as the equivalent of a Departmental Chair for those processes dictated by NYU’s Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure.

Upon receiving a report from the ARP Panel and TAC, the Dean of the Division of Libraries in turn makes recommendations to the Provost of the University regarding promotion and the conferring of tenure. While there is often a remarkable degree of unanimity in the recommendations made at the various levels of review, it is not unusual for there to be divergent opinions. Disagreement may occur because of differences in perspective, differences in the weighing of strengths and weaknesses in the candidate’s case, additional information not evident in the preceding stages of the evaluation, and so on. In the case of significantly divergent recommendations, the Dean may choose to seek additional information but has no obligation to do so.

Purpose of Guidelines and Standards for Tenure and Promotion

The professional roles and responsibilities of academic faculty librarians differ widely from faculty in other disciplines. For instance, librarians do not generally teach credit-bearing courses, and their work roles cover responsibilities that often depart from traditional divisions of faculty labor in higher education. Furthermore, contributions to knowledge in librarianship may not take the form or extent of scholarly research and publication expected in other academic fields; consequently, many tenured and tenure track librarians
engage in modes of creativity and innovation that require deep expertise in information studies, knowledge architecture and preservation, and related fields in order to be evaluated critically. These guidelines acknowledge this uniqueness and intend to inform the process of evaluating the job performance and academic contributions of faculty librarians in order to facilitate the process of evaluation, promotion, and the conferral of tenure.

Statement of Academic Freedom

The New York University Faculty Handbook states, “Academic freedom is essential to the free search for truth and its free expression. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Freedom in teaching is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student in learning” (Title I.ii). Academic freedom is essential for librarians, in research and in work supporting teaching and learning in the University. In 2006 the American Library Association passed a resolution in support of academic freedom stating that academic freedom is “indispensable to librarians, because they are trustees of knowledge with the responsibility of ensuring the availability of information and ideas, no matter how controversial, so that teachers may freely teach and students may freely learn” (ALA IR B.2.5). Tenured and tenure-track librarians at New York University must have the freedom to research, develop collections, and provide access to information without fear of censorship or professional repercussions. They hold each of the rights and obligations as stipulated in the New York University Faculty Handbook.

Conferring Tenure

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure in the Division of Libraries is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in their field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers at NYU, nationally, and, if relevant, abroad? It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement, and context becomes a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. Each case must be examined in some detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths and acknowledging limits or weaknesses. These factors must be carefully and openly weighed.

In order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, candidates must have a record of outstanding scholarly achievement and recognition for it within their field; they must be able to demonstrate that they are effective library professionals; and they should have made substantial contributions, in their research and core job responsibilities, to the work of the Division of Libraries, the life of the University, and their professional organization(s). In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be awarded.

Educational Requirements for Tenure

The educational requirements to be awarded tenure are that the candidate holds a master’s degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and an additional graduate degree.
Criteria for Tenure

A high standard of excellence in job performance is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU. The criteria for tenure include:

a. **Job Performance:** Effectiveness of performance as a librarian evidenced by the continuing ability to perform at the highest professional level in areas that contribute to the educational and research mission of the University is a criteria for tenure. Candidates who do not have a record of excellent job performance will not receive tenure.

b. **Service to the Libraries, the University, the Community, and the Profession:** Effectiveness of service as evidenced by successful service on committees, participation in institutional governance, research workshops for students or faculty, advisement of students and student groups, and/or participation in professional and learned societies is the second requirement for tenure. Such service should evidence active participation, not merely tacit membership in committees or other groups. Candidates who do not have a record of significant service will not receive tenure.

c. **Scholarly, Creative or Artistic Activity:** Significant scholarship or creative or artistic work is essential for tenure. Scholarly, creative or artistic activity is evidenced by publication or the execution of significant research in librarianship or other academic areas, or by outstanding creative or artistic work. Scholarship, like creative work and contributions to descriptive standards, is the foundation of academic pursuits and is essential for tenure at a research library. Tenure will not be granted without significant contributions to scholarship or creative or artistic work.

In order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement in these categories.

Promotion to Curator

The inquiry for promotion to Curator is essentially the same as for promotion to Associate Curator: Is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in their field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers at NYU, nationally, and internationally? In addition, it is required that the candidate provide evidence of significant academic achievement beyond the work considered at the point of having been awarded tenure. The normal expectation will be the publication of significant new research and professional advancement since the conferring of tenure. In applications for promotion to Curator, the docket must clearly indicate which materials distinguish the candidate’s achievements since the last review for promotion.

Resubmission of Materials for Promotion to Curator

If a candidate’s application for promotion to Curator is not viewed favorably at any level of the review process, the candidate shall not reapply for promotion without additional relevant documentation that provides evidence of significant advancements or achievements required to achieve the rank of Curator.
Guidelines

Acceleration of Schedule

Applications for early promotion and early conferral of 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 promotion and/or tenure ahead of schedule, unless the case is clearly exceptional. The Dean and the candidate’s immediate supervisor should 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. The ARP Panel and the TAC, along with the letter writers these groups contact, must also specifically address the grounds for an early tenure and promotion application in their reports. However, even with affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure unless the case is truly exceptional and compelling, not least because the expectations and standards to which candidates are held in the ordinary course of review and promotion are already very high.

Lateral Appointments

In the case of lateral appointments, NYU practice at all schools is for explicit written arrangements to require a tenure review at the Department, School, and University levels; their appointments are made pending completion of the tenure review and this shall be recorded in their appointment letters. The Provost’s Office has established a timeline for the review of tenure dockets, including new hires with tenure. In such cases, the Libraries must facilitate an accelerated review of the candidate’s materials and submit completed dockets to the Provost Office no later than April 15 for a September 1st start date.

Preliminary materials (e.g. CV, statement of service and research interests, list of evaluators, and publications) will be needed as soon as possible for the ARP Panel. The full list of materials needed is within the New York University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines section, Tenured External Appointments (Lateral Hires). The ARP Panel must submit the completed docket to the Dean and TAC no later than April 1. The TAC will present their report to the Dean 10 days after receiving the ARP Panel docket. When the start date differs from September 1st and the established review cycle within the Division of Libraries, the timeline will be adjusted accordingly.

For external hires with tenure, the report must provide a summary of the department search committee report including size and composition of the candidate pool.

Role of Division of Libraries Human Resources in Evaluation

All aspects of Tenure and Promotion procedures fall under the purview of faculty governance and are to be carried out by Libraries faculty, including the Dean, tenured elected members of the ARP and TAC. See the NYU Libraries Bylaws for more information. However, it is acknowledged that Division of Libraries Human Resources (HR) plays an important supporting role in facilitating certain logistical elements of the application for tenure and promotion process, including the generation of reminder emails sent to
candidates, the generation and management of cases on a digital case management system, and the inclusion of candidates’ annual Performance Evaluations, Third-Year Reviews, and letters of appointment in the candidate’s dossier.

**Procedures**

**Third Year Review**

After an Assistant Curator has completed their third year in that rank, the Dean of Libraries shall consult the Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Committee to assess the individual’s progress toward achieving the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Curator. The schedule for notification of the Third-Year Review is indicated by the Dean and communicated to candidates in letters of reappointment.

**Third Year Review Process**

Candidates undergoing a Third-Year Review will submit a dossier composed of the materials enumerated in the Materials for Candidate Dossiers section of this document. A Panel composed of at least three tenured members of the ARP Committee conducts the review. Only tenured members of the ARP may conduct a Third-Year Review.

In addition to the candidate’s materials, the panel will consider the candidate’s past two performance evaluations and reappointment letters (provided by Human Resources) and internal and external evaluations. After receiving the Third-Year Review dossier, the ARP panel will solicit at least two internal letters and three letters from external reviewers. The process for soliciting external letters is outlined below in the Review section. The internal evaluations should only concern the candidate’s job performance and serve to augment the information provided in the Performance Evaluations and reappointment letters. The ARP panel will solicit a minimum of three external evaluations from highly qualified external evaluators. External evaluators will normally hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction, such as a research university library or equivalent rank in a research library or non-academic institution (e.g., library, laboratory, museum, or research institute).

**Third Year Review Report**

Upon review of a candidate’s Third-Year Review dossier, the ARP panel will prepare a report summarizing the candidate’s progress toward the requirements for conferral of tenure and promotion to Associate Curator. Appended to the report will be all the materials reviewed, the current curriculum vitae for each external reviewer, and a rationale for selecting each internal and external reviewer.

**Delivery of Feedback on Third Year Review**

Upon completion of the review, candidates will receive from the Dean a summary of the review deliberations. The report will redact specific names but will focus on synthesizing overarching themes, strengths, and weaknesses of the dossier that was submitted.
Materials for Candidate Dossiers

The materials compiled by candidates are referred to collectively as the **dossier**, while all elements assembled by the ARP Panel, which include the dossier, external review letters, and report, are referred to as the **docket**. Candidates for tenure and promotion submit a dossier that contains evidence of professional and scholarly accomplishments and demonstrates that their record is worthy of tenure. The dossier must consist of the following required materials:

- Current curriculum vitae (provided by candidate)
- A list of committees and other formal groups that the candidate served. The list should include dates of service, roles on the committee, and the chair’s name(s)
- Candidate’s personal statement (provided by candidate)
- Copies of the candidate’s scholarly, creative or artistic work, or documentation when appropriate. Examples include monographs, peer-review published articles; vetted book chapters; published translations of literary works; scholarly or professional publications; or other significant works; video recordings; published artworks; published prose or poetry; screenplays; exhibition catalogues or descriptions; conference proceedings; workshop materials; course syllabi; digital projects; book reviews; conference or other programs (provided by candidate).

The candidate should indicate the review process (i.e., peer-review, solicited contribution, awards) that their scholarly work underwent.

Candidates are invited in their personal statement to narrate the ways in which work accomplishments, service, and research have shaped their career trajectory. The statement should address the candidate’s effectiveness in core job responsibilities, including their impact on and service to the university and profession. The candidate statement can address the role of teaching in their career when applicable. Finally, the candidate’s personal statement should adopt an informative, jargon-free style that establishes the context in which they wish their scholarship to be seen by a non-expert.

It is required that the candidate will augment their curriculum vitae or personal statement with information that indicates whether a publication is peer reviewed. If the candidate has produced co-authored or collaboratively written and researched scholarship, they should also provide a statement outlining their responsibility for the work and the role they had in each project or publication. In addition, candidates should not include or list any personal or professional references on the version of the curriculum vitae that they submit in their dossier.

In addition to the required materials, candidates may also include in their dossiers evidence of the quality of their scholarly, creative or artistic work, as appropriate. For example:

- Published reviews of the candidate’s books, articles, or digital projects (provided by candidate)
• Readers’ reviews of the candidate’s unpublished books or articles (provided by candidate)
• Invited or peer-reviewed contributions (provided by candidate)
• Citation analysis (provided by the candidate)
• Published reviews of productions or performances, or other creative or artistic work (provided by candidate)

The University recognizes that COVID-19 may have had an adverse impact on faculty members’ teaching and research performance. To ensure that the review for promotion and tenure reflects the impact of COVID-19, faculty have the option to include a COVID-19 impact statement in their promotion and/or tenure dossier. The impact statement should include a short description of the impact COVID-19 had on their performance of their duties, including teaching and research and creative work. The impact statement should be incorporated into the statements on teaching and research. Note that any external evaluators contacted by the department or the Dean’s office will receive the statements of teaching and research as part of the materials to be reviewed. The information provided in this COVID-19 impact statement will not negatively affect the tenure or promotion review. At a minimum, the information will be treated neutrally and at a maximum, it may positively impact the review.

Candidates dossiers will be supplemented (by Libraries’ HR) with the candidate’s Third-Year Review materials, copies of the candidate’s last three Performance Evaluations, provided by Human Resources, that are completed and on file at the due date of the dossier), letters of evaluation from highly qualified external evaluators (solicited by the ARP Panel at its discretion), and the ARP Panel report.

Tenure Review

Composition of ARP, ARP Panels, and the TAC

Dossiers are assigned to a Panel composed of the eligible tenured members of the ARP. The ARP Panel consists of four to eight faculty, depending on the total number of cases the ARP reviews each cycle. The Panel reviews the dossiers, solicits letters, votes and collectively makes a recommendation for or against tenure at the rank of Associate Curator. All formal votes of the Panel must be registered and recorded on the report to the Dean. In cases involving promotions to Curator, the vote and authority resides only with those on the ARP committee who hold the rank of Curator. The Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC) is an elected committee of five tenured faculty members. Only Tenured members of the faculty may vote to elect members of the TAC.

Any ARP Committee and TAC members who are closely associated with a candidate, as enumerated in the NYU Faculty Handbook, should recuse themselves for all immediate deliberations involving the candidate, including service on ARP Panels or the TAC.
In cases in which there is not the requisite number of Curators to consider an application from Associate Curator to Curator, the Dean will assemble a panel of tenured faculty of appropriate rank (e.g., Full Professor) from other schools.

**ARP Responsibilities and Process**

It is the responsibility of the tenured members of the ARP Committee to form Panels that review the dossiers for individual cases. The duty of the members of the Panel is to give advice on promotion and tenure decisions. The process begins with their review, and it is highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor. To give weak advice to the Dean 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 abnegation of faculty responsibility. Reports that are considered by the Dean to fall into this category will be returned to the ARP Panel with a request that the problem be corrected.

**Structure and Requirements of ARP Panel Report**

The report of the ARP Panel is not an advocacy document; rather, it aims to provide a fair and thoughtful assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and should indicate, with reasons, the basis for the ARP Panel's recommendation. Properly prepared, detailed and well-documented dockets are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the ARP Panel's evaluation of the candidate. Indeed, it is the thorough and honest appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in each of the criteria that is most useful to the TAC and to the Dean, often more so than the final vote, for such candor gives substantive meaning and texture to the evaluation. The Panel is strongly urged to complete deliberations in a timely manner in order to prevent delays from unforeseen complications that may arise.

Although the ARP Panel may choose how to structure its report, the final version should contain five primary components: Assessment of Work Performance; Assessment of Research and Scholarship, and Assessment of Service; **Summary of Solicited letters**; and the Recommendation of the Panel. All members of the ARP Panel must sign a Signature Page, attesting that they have read the docket and that it represents the opinions of the committee clearly and accurately. The completed docket is then forwarded to the Dean to initiate the subsequent stages of the review process.

The Assessment of Work Performance must document and appraise the effectiveness of the candidate’s ongoing engagement with core job responsibilities in their role within the Libraries. Candidates must demonstrate excellence in their work performance and demonstrate how their work has had a substantive impact on Libraries programs and services. A precondition for tenure is effectiveness of performance as a librarian, which is evidenced by the candidate’s continuing ability to perform at the highest professional level in areas that contribute to the educational and research mission of the University. In this section of the report, the ARP Panel should weigh the completed Performance Evaluations for the prior three years, as well as assess the candidate’s work record by tenured colleagues (solicited by the Panel). The Assessment of Work Performance should cite
Performance Evaluations, and they may reference internal evaluations from colleagues about the candidate’s role in committee and other group work.

The Assessment of Research and Scholarship addresses issues of quality, significance, coherence, and future development. The candidate’s written work, published and unpublished, should be carefully read by all members of the ARP Panel. The quality and significance of the venues in which the candidate’s work has appeared (e.g. monographs, journals, conference papers, websites, blogs, etc.) should be appraised. In the case of joint authorship, the report should include information about the norms of the field regarding order of authorship and an assessment of the candidate’s contributions to the co-authored work.

The Assessment of Service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the Division of Libraries, University, and profession. Specific comments, including testimony from fellow Panel members, specification of authorship of particular reports and the like, are helpful. The Assessment of Service can include a discussion of participation in professional organizations in the candidate’s field.

In the case of those who are being considered for tenure upon appointment, the report must also include a summary of the recommendations of the Search Committee and must identify the external referees consulted by the department in the search process. A letter from a suitable evaluator selected by the search committee, which answers all the relevant questions of the tenure review process, may be used as one of the department’s five required external letters for the Promotion and Tenure docket. The report may also include letters from other search committee referees as supplemental materials to the docket.

Solicitation of Letters from External and Internal Evaluators

A complete ARP Panel docket for cases that involve the conferral of tenure or the promotion to Curator must include a minimum of five letters from highly qualified external evaluators. The letters of solicitation, which are to follow the prototype attached in the Appendix, must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate’s peers, and must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. All letters of evaluation must be current (written within one year of the review process).

External evaluators will normally hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction, such as a research university library, or a position of equivalent rank in a research library or non-academic institution (e.g., library, laboratory, museum, or research institute). External evaluators, similarly, should hold rank equivalent to that for which the candidate is applying, and evaluators should be recognized leaders in the candidate’s discipline. Evaluators should be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not drawn exclusively from extremely narrow interest groups or specializations. At least one of the five evaluators must be a scholar identified with broader sectors of the discipline in question. The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at U.S. institutions; if appropriate, evaluations should be solicited from abroad.
All external evaluators should be provided with the same materials submitted in the candidate dossier, including published work, c.v., and statement of work performance, service, and research interests. If there is unpublished work to be considered, the ARP Panel should ask external evaluators to comment on the quality of the unpublished work. Documents relating to the candidate’s Performance Evaluations and internal deliberations at NYU Libraries (e.g., appointment letters and Third-Year Reviews) are not to be circulated to external evaluators.

A complete ARP Panel docket must also include at least three letters from faculty who hold tenure at any school at New York University, including the Division of Libraries. The letters must explicitly request evaluation of the candidate’s job performance and/or service, and it must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. Panels are expected to use the appropriate template to solicit letters (see Appendix). In soliciting letters, the Panel seeks perspectives from colleagues at NYU who have taken a leadership role on projects, working groups, or other endeavors in which the candidate has been involved. Such letters are meant to augment the candidate’s application and speak to the effectiveness of job performance. Thus, these internal NYU tenured faculty evaluators are not furnished with any of the candidate’s application materials. As a professional courtesy, evaluators should be given six weeks to return their evaluations. The ARP Panel should take special care to anticipate potential conflicts of interest when soliciting letters. Candidates have the right to specify the names of up to two individuals whom they do not want to be solicited and provide a rationale. However, the Panel is not beholden to these requests.

Evaluators (both external and internal) cannot be suggested by the candidate, nor can the suitability of potential evaluators be discussed with the candidate. The evaluator must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor or co-author. Co-authors will be acceptable reviewers only in certain fields, such as fields with very small membership or fields in which papers typically have a large number of authors. If the Panel should inadvertently solicit an opinion from someone it later learns had a conflict of interest, was close to the candidate, or whom the candidate independently suggested, note of that fact must be made in the ARP Panel report.

The letters from external and internal evaluators must remain confidential. Neither the names of the authors nor the content of the letters may be communicated, not even in summary form, to the candidate or anyone else who is not involved in the review process. In all communications with evaluators, they should be assured that their letters will be held in strictest confidence and that the letters will be seen only by the ARP Panel, the Dean, the TAC, and the Provost’s Office.

The Report of the ARP Panel must include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined, and those, if any, identified by the candidate as inappropriate. All ARP Panel communications with potential evaluators should be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written and why the particular referee’s opinion...
matters must be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for each of the declinations. CVs are required for all external evaluators.

**Recommendation of the ARP Panel**

The Chair of the ARP Panel forwards the completed docket, including the report and the vote of the ARP Panel to the Dean. 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, will not be accepted.

The Panel’s letter must include a summary of its discussion preceding the vote, as well as a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate’s work occupies in the relevant discipline or field. It may also be helpful for the report to include information about the usual criteria for excellence in the candidate’s discipline (e.g., quality of venues within which the work appears).

**Dean of Libraries Role**

The Dean has *de jure* authority to recommend tenure decisions contrary to faculty advice, although that power is usually used sparingly, and in a properly functioning tenure process it may never be used.

Upon receiving a completed docket from the ARP Panel, the materials are conveyed to the Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC). As an elected committee, the TAC shall advise the Dean on all individual tenure recommendations and on all individual promotion recommendations that involve a tenure decision. The Dean of the Faculty may solicit additional reviews that are treated as confidential and are for their own use, and that of the TAC. To ensure that the Dean does not solicit evaluators already contacted in the process, the Panel is required to provide the Dean with a list of all evaluators solicited or considered.

**Tenure Advisory Committee Role**

All tenured members of the library faculty can serve on the Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC), and five members (who do not also currently serve on the ARP) are elected each year. The Dean sits with the TAC without a vote and with their voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the Committee. If there are questions in any particular case, the Chair of the ARP Panel or the full Panel may be asked to attend a meeting of the TAC to clarify the docket or to provide additional information.

The TAC, upon deliberating the case and considering the docket compiled by the Panel, makes its recommendation to the Dean in the form of a written response that includes its own evaluation of the candidate’s docket as well as a report of further deliberations. This level of review by the TAC is intended to be the equivalent of the vote of the full faculty that other Departments at the University conduct. After receiving advice, the Dean will forward to the Provost the recommendation of the ARP Panel and TAC as well as their own recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. In the event that a Dean’s recommendation is contrary to that of the Panel and/or the TAC, the Dean will provide the respective
committee(s) with their reasons. The committee(s) will then have ten business days in which to provide further information or counter-argument(s) before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost. If the Dean has a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, the Dean should share that information in the Dean's report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation. Indicators of doubt may include a split vote within the ARP panel, or a clear difference of opinion between the ARP panel and the TAC. The Dean will ordinarily make a final recommendation to the Provost by April 15.

Provost’s Role

The Provost shall evaluate each tenure and promotion docket and recommendation submitted by the Dean. In evaluating a promotion or tenure recommendation submitted by the Dean, the Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation, and may appoint an ad hoc advisory committee composed of tenured faculty from NYU schools outside of the Libraries to seek further counsel. The Provost shall support or oppose the Dean’s recommendation in their final decision. In those cases, in which the Provost’s decision will be contrary to the recommendation of the Dean, the Provost will provide the Dean with the reasons in writing and will give the Dean an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost’s final decision. The Provost shall notify the Dean of the final decision, along with reasons thereof, if the Dean’s recommendation is disapproved.

Notification of Decision

Immediately upon notification of the Provost’s final decision, the Dean will inform the candidate, the ARP Panel and the TAC.

Guidelines for Appeal

In the event of a negative decision regarding tenure and/or promotion, the candidate may appeal to the Libraries Faculty Grievance Committee. Should the decision of the Libraries Grievance Committee not be satisfactory to the candidate, they may then further appeal to the President to convene the Faculty Council Grievance Committee, an advisory body made up of faculty from different schools within NYU. It makes its recommendations to the President. Grievance procedures are explained in The Faculty Handbook.

Pausing Tenure Clock

All policies and procedures regarding the stoppage of the tenure clock for faculty are detailed in the University Guidelines. Candidates who have had their tenure clock paused should be evaluated as if they had the tenure clocks of the normal duration (and not extended).

Review Schedule for Guidelines

NYU Libraries shall review the policies and procedures contained within this document every five years according to the governance structures established by the NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws. To facilitate a review, the Library Council will charge a working group to
investigate the policies, suggest revisions (including revisions to the Library Bylaws, if applicable), and draft a report summarizing changes and recommendations. Once changes to policy are identified, they are sent to the Office of the Provost for initial consultation, then sent to faculty for review and vote for adoption, and finally returned to the Office of the Provost and to other bodies as appropriate for formal review.

Sample Solicitation Letters

Sample Solicitation Letter, External Reviewer, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion

Dear :

[Candidate name], [Job title] currently an Assistant Curator in the Division of Libraries, is being considered for tenure and promotion. This process is described in the NYU Division of Libraries Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure [link to Guidelines]. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of their published and unpublished research. The candidate’s dossier (curriculum vitae, their statement, and copies of published or unpublished works) are available through Interfolio.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of [name]’s research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, and rate of publication. Your comments on the scope and significance of their research and service would be valued. We also request an explicit comparison of the candidate with their peers at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would also be welcome. When evaluating the candidate’s scholarship, please consider the candidate’s scholarly, artistic, or creative activities in the context of their overall responsibilities, as described in their personal statement. If you have knowledge of [name]’s service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well.

Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate. Please note that evaluators must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.

To assist in your review, we draw your attention to the fact that this candidate’s dossier includes work performed in one or more years in which COVID-19 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.

We will need your letter within six weeks, sooner if possible. We are expected to provide biographical information about referees and would be very grateful if you could submit a current curriculum vita with your letter.

Let us assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the members of the Promotion & Tenure Panel at NYU Libraries, and appropriate decision-makers and review panels within the University. We would
appreciate addressing your response to this request to The Promotion & Tenure Panel, NYU Libraries, and submitting via Interfolio.

We thank you for generously assisting us. We realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely, XXXXXX Promotion & Tenure Panel Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Committee NYU Libraries

Sample Solicitation Letter, Promotion review for promotion to Curator

Dear :

[Candidate name], [Job title] currently an Associate Curator in the Division of Libraries, is being considered for promotion to the rank of Full Curator, a process described in the NYU Division of Libraries Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure [link to Guidelines]. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of their published and unpublished research.

The candidate’s dossier (curriculum vitae, their statement, and copies of published or unpublished works) is available through Interfolio. If you need copies of any other of their published or unpublished works to make your evaluation, please let us know immediately, and they will be sent. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of [name]’s research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, and rate of publication. Your comments on the scope and significance of their research and service would be valued. We also request an explicit comparison of the candidate with their peers at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. When evaluating the candidate’s scholarship be mindful that the professional roles and responsibilities of academic faculty librarians differ widely from faculty in other disciplines. Contributions to knowledge in librarianship may not take the form or extent of scholarly research and publication expected in other academic fields.

For promotion to full Curator, the candidate for promotion must show evidence of significant academic achievement beyond the work considered at the point of having been awarded tenure. The normal expectation will be the publication of significant new research, professional advancement, and impactful service to the university and/or profession since the conferring of tenure. The candidate was conferred tenure and Promoted to Associate Curator in [DATE here].

Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate. Please note that evaluators must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.

We will need your letter within six weeks, sooner if possible. We are expected to provide biographical information about referees. We would, therefore, be very grateful if you could submit with your letter a current curriculum vita.
Let us assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the members of the Promotion & Tenure Panel at NYU Libraries, and appropriate decision-makers and review panels within the University.

We would appreciate addressing your response to this request to the Promotion & Tenure Panel, NYU Libraries, and submitting via Interfolio. We thank you for generously assisting us. We realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely, XXXXXX Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Committee Panel NYU Libraries

Sample Solicitation Letter, Internal Reviewer, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion

Dear :

[Candidate name], [Job title] is currently an Assistant Curator in the Division of Libraries and is being considered for tenure and promotion.

The process for tenure and promotion and the role of internal reviewers is described in the NYU Division of Libraries Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure [insert link].

Reviews from within NYU Libraries or from members of the NYU Faculty should evaluate work performance and the effectiveness of service to the university and the profession. Therefore, we ask that you, as a member of the NYU Faculty, provide your candid assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in those two areas alone. [Attached to this request is a listing of the candidate appointment dates and titles, and a listing of all service and committee work for NYU.]

Candidates for Tenure must demonstrate excellence in their work performance and demonstrate how their work has had a substantive impact on Libraries programs and services. **The most important criterion for tenure is the effectiveness of performance as a librarian, which is evidenced by the candidate’s continuing ability to perform at the highest professional level in areas that contribute to the educational and research mission of the University.**

Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate. Please note that evaluators must not be an individual with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.

To assist in your review, we draw your attention to the fact that this candidate’s dossier includes work performed in one or more years in which COVID-19 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.

We will need to receive your letter by [DATE], sooner if possible.
Let us assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the members of the Promotion & Tenure Panel at NYU Libraries, and appropriate decision-makers and review panels within the University.

We would appreciate addressing your response to this request to The Promotion & Tenure Panel, NYU Libraries, and submitting via Interfolio. We thank you for generously assisting us. We realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely, XXXXXX Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Committee NYU Libraries
Memo from TFSC to SFAC on compensation (DRAFT)

March 2022

TFSC proposes that compensation increases in 2022-23 and beyond be composed of two components. The first component should be an automatic salary increase based on the Consumer Price Index. In addition, the second component should be based on good performance of academic duties. For example, if the CPI is 5% and faculty performance is excellent, valued at 3%, the total compensation increase should be 8%. We believe that such a setup is fair, just, and equitable, and will help boost both the morale of the faculty and the faculty retention rate.

In terms of the first component, the CPI increase, TFSC proposes the use of the US Bureau of Labor Statistics index for New York-Newark-Jersey City despite the fact that this CPI underestimates prices in NYC. Currently in February 2022, the value of this index is 5.1% higher than a year ago. Consequently, in terms of the first component of the increase of compensation for 2022-23, we propose a 5.1% increase. We are very much aware that the United States is in the early stages of an inflation spiral and by the time academic year 2022-23 starts it is very likely (almost certain) that inflation would be at a much higher level. So, TFSC is being conservative in asking for the CPI increase of February 2022 rather than of June 2022.

For the second component of the increase, the good performance component, we propose 3%. This is an increase of the usual pool for rewarding merit, which in recent years has been on the order of 1% (as it was in 2021). In addition to helping make up some of the remaining discrepancy between base pay increases and inflation, the rationale for increasing the merit component is that it (1) provides a much-needed morale boost for higher-performing faculty; (2) incentivizes faculty to improve their compensation through high performance rather than by seeking outside offers; and (3) provides an ongoing opportunity for deans and other decision makers to address compensation inequity relating to gender, identity, and salary compression. Especially in regard to the issue of morale, it is worth mentioning that MIT recently announced (https://president.mit.edu/speeches-writing/special-pay-increase-and-endowment-performance) a 3% base pay increase on top of the normal annual salary review increase. Likewise, Dartmouth announced a 3% bonus (https://www.vnews.com/Dartmouth-endowment-grows-by-$2.5-billion-42948060) “in recognition of the challenges employees—full-time and part-time faculty, staff and researchers—faced during nearly two years of the pandemic.” NYU faculty has performed heroically during the covid years and has met similar challenges mentioned by MIT and Dartmouth with exceptional success.

The most recent data from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (https://www.bls.gov/regions/new-york-new-jersey/news-release/consumerpriceindex_newyorkarea.htm) indicates that between January 2019 and January 2022, the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U) corresponding to New York, Newark, and Jersey City increased by 8.8%: 2.5% between January 2019 and January 2020, 1.2% between January 2020 and January 2021, and 5.1% between January 2021 and January 2022. During that time, the salaries of the tenured faculty (along with those of the continuing contract faculty and administrative staff) increased by a base rate of 4% in total: 2% in FY 2019-2020, 0% in FY 2020-2021 due to NYU's covid mitigation measures, and 2% in FY 2021-2022, with some faculty receiving additional small merit-based increases. This means that the purchasing power of faculty salaries has not kept up with inflation, with a net shortfall of 4.8% since January 2019.
NYU can afford to restore faculty salaries to their January 2019 purchasing power: although tuition is only one part of NYU's revenues (currently around 59%), it is the single largest component, and it is the component that is most directly connected to the value added by the tenured faculty. Tuition per student has increased by roughly 2.9% in each of the past three years, for a net increase over the same period of 8.7%, which is roughly equal to the local CPI increase described above, and roughly twice the net faculty decline in purchasing power. We also note that the number of undergraduate students has not decreased.

In summary, we urge the University to automatically increase tenured faculty salaries (and likewise, the salaries of continuing contract faculty and administrative staff) by an amount equal to the trailing local consumer price increase as described above, with an appropriate additional amount available to distribute for superior performance, both this year and in future years. For the upcoming fiscal year of 2022-23, this would mean a CPI-based increase of at least 5.1% before merit increases. With a performance-based increase of 3%, this makes the total proposed compensation increase for 2022-23 at 8.1%.
Dear Superblock resident and member of the NYU Community

I am happy to report back to you on the response from University Leadership on the list of requests and concerns we submitted to them in our Fall Report in 2021. We concentrated our concerns in three categories: Demographics, 181 Mercer (the new building), and life in a post-pandemic world. The University Leadership responded by organizing their reactions in three categories: Completed/Underway, Delays due to COVID, and To Be Reassessed After 181 Mercer Opens. These seem fair to me and were presented to the SSAC on 2/23.

We are now presenting them to the larger community and will, as always, be eager for your response, either directly or through your respective tenant associations.

Cordially,
Laurence Maslon
Chair, Superblocks Stewardship Advisory Committee
MOVING FORWARD
2022

Report from the SSAC to the NYU Administration – Thoughts and recommendations from the Superblocks Stewardship Advisory Committee

FALL 2021
Introduction

Seven-and-a-half years ago, the Superblock Stewardship Advisory Committee (SSAC) was formed, following a recommendation from the University Space Priorities Working Group (USPWG). Among the items in our original charter were four specific charges for the committee to take on as its brief:

- Recommending Improvements to the superblocks, including the obligations the University must fulfill under its agreement with the City;
- Giving input on the architectural process, including feedback on the design and function and impact of a new building on the 181 Mercer site;
- Monitoring overall quality-of-life on the superblocks, including efforts to mitigate the effects of construction, as well as more general quality-of-life concerns; and
- Continuing ongoing stewardship and communication between the University and the external community.

As we move forward into 2022, these four charges still seem relevant and pertinent. Many aspects of our lives, both personally and professionally, were put on pause during the pandemic, but the SSAC continued to meet on a regular basis over the last year and a half and has continued to advance, with varying degrees of progress, the agenda within our ongoing mission. (In fact, two final items of our last report to the community in Fall of 2019—only a few months before the pandemic upended our normal routines—traffic calming on West 3rd Street and the renovation of the Mercer Playground have been completed or are nearly complete.)

However, we are acutely aware that, with the start of the fall 2022 semester, we will be moving into a new landscape, both figuratively and literally. Therefore, starting in the spring of 2021, the SSAC has focused on the new needs and imperatives that will emerge post-pandemic for the superblocks and its residents and the surrounding community.

The SSAC looked at three areas that, going forward, will have a significant impact on the superblocks: The shift in Demographics for both Silver Towers and Washington Square Village; the final stages of construction of 181 Mercer – and then its occupancy – which will alter the physical and pedestrian landscape of the neighborhood; and, finally, the enduring (or ephemeral) changes in our community.

1 Since the Spring of 2015 through the Fall of 2019, the SSAC has produced five reports. In each report, we made a series of suggestions – the majority of which were acted on by the University as resources and planning/approvals were obtained.
home spaces, and work spaces in the post-pandemic environment. What follows is a series of observations and recommendations based on our deliberations.

**Demographics: A More Family-Centered Community**

In April of 2021, upon request of the SSAC, the Office of Faculty Housing (OFH) conducted an analysis of the demographics of the residents living on the superblocks (see appendix). Among the charts in the data, one revealed that the number of apartments with occupants with three or more occupants exceeded 400, while the number of two-person and one-person apartments were respectively 350 and 380. More than one-third of residential apartments are inhabited by families.

This data reinforced the SSAC’s own experience that there are more family-centered needs emerging on the superblocks in terms of both physical space (outdoor and indoor) as well as timing of events and activities (particularly in coordination with the non-college school calendar year; i.e., holidays, summertime, etc.). This evolution toward families and children will no doubt continue when the faculty housing at 181 Mercer is complete and overall leads to a cultural shift in how the University approaches the priorities within resident housing.

Although the University and the OFH have been very responsive to previous requests and have added numerous play spaces and family spaces in the last few years (the Sideyard and the Backyard in 2018; and, working with the NYC Department of Parks and Recreation and Community Board 2, a renovated Mercer Playground in 2021), the demand for outdoor spaces only increased during the pandemic. Sasaki Garden, meant as a contemplative space, has become a de facto play space because of its central location (perhaps the Mercer Playground renovation will draw off some of that activity). In terms of indoor space for use by families and children, this has been a repeated request from families and some tenant organizations. An indoor space in 2 WSV was in the planning stages when the pandemic hit; it was deemed by tenants with families to be a necessary space.

In order to better serve the growing family community, to coordinate better OFH supervision and activity, and to increase communication between the OFH and the residential cohort, we recommend the following:

- The completion of the indoor family play space in WSV 2 as soon as practicable, given funding and timing of capital projects, following specific recommendations from the various tenant associations;
- Within the constraints of weather conditions and the need for maintenance, the continuation of communications regarding closures of outdoor areas to
provide the maximum amount of open space, especially in the spring and summer, when school is out (see appendix for 2021 lawn maintenance schedules and communications);

- Now that NYU Returns has dictated a return to the office, a continuation of monitoring by OFH or their designees on a consistent basis to observe compliance with traffic and other safety rules, proper use of outdoor space, and condition of signage, etc.;

- Continued clarification and coordination of uses, procedures and signage to gain access to all outdoor spaces and related equipment;

- Replacement of all deteriorated signage, the design and installation of which the SSAC was involved with a few short years ago, which has not held up due to weather and fabrication flaws on the part of the contractor;

- Continuation of the successful “Happening” activities and a periodic assessment of the appropriate types and frequency of events with an eye toward evolutionary improvement (see appendix for June 2021 survey results and FY21 and Fall 2021 participation data);

- An event to celebrate the opening of Mercer Playground; perhaps in the spring of 2022, when work is complete, to familiarize our residents and those of the surrounding community of this new amenity;

- The University should investigate the condition of the eastern wall of the Key Park (located on NYU property) especially as it now borders the renovated Mercer Playground and Mercer Street itself becomes a well-used pedestrian thoroughfare to the new building.

### 181 Mercer Street: A Signature Addition to the Landscape

While we are still at least a year away from 181 Mercer being open and fully occupied (and are not, by profession, urban planners or psychics) there are some items that emerge for consideration. Let us first commend the University and its staff for moving the construction along with dispatch and clear communication. To our knowledge, any disruptions were minimal and complaints (at least to the SSAC) were also minimal.

We are aware that the emergence of a building the size and scope of 181 Mercer and the fact that it will be used by a wide range of constituents -- from students to faculty to athletes to performers -- on a daily basis will alter the landscape and movement of people around the neighborhood unlike what we have seen in decades. There will obviously be increased pedestrian traffic on the block itself as well as other routes to the building. Many of these changes will emerge over time and depend on usage and pedestrian preference, but the following are some areas to be attentive to:
• Due to the anticipated increase in pedestrian traffic through Washington Square Village driveways, the University should carefully assess current grading and drainage issues along those driveways. In addition, because the superblocks will possibly become a more prominent path to the south, the WSV canopies and other long-standing and much needed cosmetic upgrades should be considered;
• The SSAC looks forward to more information on the Greene Street Walk, both its design and what amenities/activities will be allowed/encouraged;
• Because of the addition of the Mercer Playground and expected increased foot traffic, the SSAC recommends a deeper investigation into the asphalt areas (running east/west) north and south of the Key Park. These areas have long been in a limbo in terms of practical usage and upkeep; there is an opportunity here to put the space to better use.
• Investigate complementary activities that can take place in the Mercer building itself given its proximity to other NYU programs and activities. For example, one idea is to develop a composting program in the building given its proximity to the Urban Farm Lab on Houston Street.

Post-Pandemic Environment: The Way We Live Now

While the SSAC is not in a position to predict changes in behavior and preferences in a post-pandemic environment, we are invested in how the lives of residents, business conditions, and changes in the urban landscape will take shape in the near future.

Some observations about life during the pandemic:

• There was a substantive change in the way we live/interact/spend our time. Members of the committee mentioned a desire for more time and options outdoors; attention to landscaping; and introduction of sustainable materials to the ecosystem. Certainly the balance between outdoor activities and indoor (work) obligations come into consideration;
• The Committee suggests that the University look into nearby currently empty space to meet a range of continuing university needs from indoor play for children to tennis and other racquet sports (such as the New York Sports Club on Mercer Street).
• The existing gardens on the superblocks -- Community Agriculture Club space in the Sideyard (Washington Square Village) and the Urban Farm Lab, (behind Silver Towers on Houston Street) -- have worked out well and are welcome additions.
• We are also cognizant of two larger evolving community projects which may be influential but over which we have minimal control: the outcome of the Noho/Soho Rezoning and the School Construction Authority decision on the current Morton-Williams space (the latter will resolve by the end of 2021, we believe).

Other Considerations

While the SSAC is aware that there are several urban issues beyond our brief (indeed, some beyond NYU’s control and advocacy), we welcome briefings and advice from relevant University offices such as Community Engagement and Real Estate on neighborhood issues and developments that are often brought to our attention. One would be the stabilization and/or upgrading of the retail areas along Mercer Street between Bleecker and Houston Streets. Another is how NYU can work with local organizations such as chambers of commerce, elected officials, and community boards to help strengthen and keep vibrant the neighborhoods contiguous to the superblocks.

In Conclusion

In the year ahead, we will see the completion of important new facilities and projects for NYU in and around the superblocks. We will also be returning, one hopes, to pre-pandemic routines that allow for more in-person interaction and social events but undoubtedly there will also be changes in behavior and preferences of how and where to spend one’s time and ways of conducting business and how to mesh work-life responsibilities. We seem to be at an inflection point where it seemed both necessary and felicitous to raise some questions and offer some suggestions.

We appreciate the time, resources, and support given to the SSAC by University Leadership and we look forward to our future collaborations.
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Appendices

- Office of Faculty Housing Demographics Presentation to the SSAC, April 29, 2021
- Office of Faculty Housing Lawn Maintenance Schedules and Communications, 2021
- Office of Faculty Housing Happenings Events Survey, 2021-2022 (June 2021)
- Office of Faculty Housing Happening Participation FY2021
% of Total FH Units on the Superblocks by Bedroom Size

- Studio: 70.7%
- 1 Bedroom: 70.5%
- 2 Bedroom: 73.3%
- 3 Bedroom: 71.0%
- 4 Bedroom: 76.7%
Breakdown of Units on the Superblocks by Bedroom Size
Number of Occupants in each Household

- Single Occupant: 366
- 2 Occupants: 329
- 3 Occupants: 206
- 4 Occupants: 158
- 5 Occupants: 46
- 6+ Occupants: 7
Count of Non-Affiliates on Superblocks by Bedroom Size

- Studio
- 1 Bedroom
- 2 Bedroom
- 3 Bedroom
Lawn Maintenance Schedules and Communications 2021

Note: No lawn closures in 2020 until August due to COVID-19 thus leaving lawns in poor condition and requiring longer closures.

Spring 2021 Lawn Maintenance

- Oak Grove closed April 6-May 18
- The Backyard closed May 4-June 8
- Bust of Sylvette closed May 18-June 1
  - 2-week overlap due to weather, temperatures, and soil conditions beyond our control.
  - Schedule circulated via email on April 13 and screens updated on March 23, May 4 and May 11

Fall 2021 Lawn Maintenance

- Oak Grove closed August 24-September 28
- The Backyard closed September 21-October 7
  - 1-week overlap due to weather, temperatures, and soil conditions beyond our control.
    - Note: Bust of Sylvette was reseeded and kept open throughout the entire season.
  - Schedule circulated via email on August 19 and screens updated on August 19, September 25 and October 5

Private Event Reservations - 2021

- Over 40 private event reservations in The Backyard, 4 reservations were moved to The Side Yard when lawn maintenance occurred in The Backyard.
- Furniture was made available for use in summer 2021.
NYU Faculty Housing Happenings Events Survey 2021-2022 (June 2021)

I am a resident of:
42 responses

Who in your household has attended NYU Faculty Housing Happenings community events?
42 responses

- Self: 27 (64.3%)
- Spouse/partner: 19 (45.2%)
- Children: 17 (40.5%)
- Parent/other family members: 2 (4.8%)
- Caregiver: 3 (7.1%)
- No one: 14 (33.3%)
### What recent Faculty Housing Happenings have you been aware of?

42 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmonicas in Solidarity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Events: 5-Days to a Call</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Kindness Community Practice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookbook Club (virtual)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbor Day Photo Scavenger Hunt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events with NYU Sustainability</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday card and bag, Sasaki I...</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie screenings in backyard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What outdoor NYU Faculty Housing Happenings would you be interested in attending?

Outdoor venues will include Sasaki Garden, The Backyard, Oak Grove, Bust of Sylvette/University Plaza.

42 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superblock Party</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Family Fest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Level Yoga</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Day/Family Fun Night</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts programming</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts programming</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor movie screenings</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking tours</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet programming (Dog trainings)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal events (Sasaki by...</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community building events (Sasaki by...</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community building activities (Sasaki by)...</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookbook Club (virtual)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Game Night (virtual)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have a pet but would like to participate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How likely would you be to attend an outdoor event for up to 200 people?
42 responses

How likely would you be to attend a smaller outdoor event (25-50 people)?
42 responses
With regards to NYU Faculty Housing Happenings, do you have any comments, questions and/or suggestions?

- We miss the fall festival!
- I think it's great that you are considering having these events.
- How can we get involved in the community events for planning them or brainstorming them? Would you consider dance lessons to offer to the community in partnership with NYU affiliated clubs/organizations?
- Is it really necessary to social distance and hand sanitize at an outdoor event? The CDC and NYC has issued guidance on this issue that differs. What would make me most happy would be to return to some sense of normalcy in a setting that is deemed safe by health research.
- At this point, I am burned out on virtual events. Ready to get back in person.
- More events encouraging sustainability would be great.
- Love outdoor movie nights!
Regarding typical NYU Faculty Housing Happenings, what kind are most relevant to you/your household?
### Winter 2020/2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Kindness</td>
<td>Dec/Jan</td>
<td>60 greeting cards and gift bags distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Fun Photo Contest</td>
<td>Dec/Jan</td>
<td>10 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarantine Cookbook</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>12 submissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2020 Virtual Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Days to a Calm and Peaceful Morning</td>
<td>25-Sep</td>
<td>5 participants</td>
<td>Diane Lowy/New Yorker at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Bath Meditation</td>
<td>20-Oct</td>
<td>78 participants</td>
<td>Melissa Carter/MindfulNYU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Knitting Demo</td>
<td>10-Dec</td>
<td>1 participant</td>
<td>Elizabeth New/NYU MakerSpace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Day</td>
<td>23-Apr</td>
<td>150 reuseable water bottles distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Beginnings Photo Contest</td>
<td>April/May</td>
<td>30 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbor Day Photo Scavenger Hunt</td>
<td>30-Apr</td>
<td>21 submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Research</td>
<td>5-May</td>
<td>50 students participated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Month</td>
<td>21-May</td>
<td>130 helmets distributed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2021 Virtual Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cookbook Club: Traditional Dominican Cooking</td>
<td>3-Jan</td>
<td>10 participants</td>
<td>Katherine Santana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookbook Club: Ottolenghi Flavor</td>
<td>7-Feb</td>
<td>3 participants</td>
<td>Katie Jablonsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookbook Club: Momofuku</td>
<td>7-Mar</td>
<td>6 participants</td>
<td>Sahee Yim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookbook Club: Indian-ish</td>
<td>2-May</td>
<td>4 participants</td>
<td>Avani Jalan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summer 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sasaki by Starlight: Photo Scavenger Hunt</td>
<td>29-Jun</td>
<td>38 participants and 20 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasaki by Starlight: Superblock Coloring Pages</td>
<td>20-Jul</td>
<td>14 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasaki by Starlight: Night Sky Chalk Art</td>
<td>10-Aug</td>
<td>27 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Photo Challenge</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>16 submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer in the City Photo Contest</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>18 submissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cookbook Club: The Meat Lover's Meatless</td>
<td>6-Oct</td>
<td>4 participants</td>
<td>Dana Herbsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkin Contest</td>
<td>30-Oct</td>
<td>120 kits distributed and 18 submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot-a-Paperwhite</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>12 kits distributed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Foliage Photo Contest</td>
<td>Oct/Nov</td>
<td>50 submissions (and counting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkin Spice Challenge</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>12 kits distributed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

From: Linda Chiarelli, Senior Vice President, Capital Projects and Facilities
Erin Lynch, Assistant Vice President, Faculty Housing & Residential Services
To: Laurence Maslon, Chair, Superblock Stewardship Advisory Committee
CC: Lynne Brown, Senior Vice President for University Relations & Public Affairs
Subject: Response to Superblock Stewardship Advisory Committee’s Fall 2021 Report
Date: February 23, 2022

Below please find a chart and associated notes in response to the recommendations laid out in the Committee’s Fall 2021 report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>181 Mercer</th>
<th>Post-Pandemic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed/ Underway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Superblock signage</td>
<td>• Plans for Greene Street Walk design, amenities/activities</td>
<td>• NoHo/SoHo Rezoning Enacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuation and periodic assessment of <em>Happenings</em> events</td>
<td>• Investigate complementary activities that can take place in 181 Mercer given proximity to other NYU programs and activities</td>
<td>• SCA/Bleecker St Site: Ongoing discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mercer Playground opening event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continued communications about lawn closures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regular walk throughs of superblocks by OFH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delays due to COVID (Still under review/discussion)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indoor family play space in WSV 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eastern wall of Key Park</td>
<td>• Find ways to offer residents more places to spend time outdoors, more attention to landscaping, and introduction of sustainable materials to the ecosystem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can be reassessed once 181 Mercer opens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess grading and drainage of WSV driveways</td>
<td>• Renting nearby non-NYU empty space to meet university needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WSV canopy upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Investigate uses for asphalt areas (running east/west) north and south of the Key Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Notes:

Demographics

- Indoor family play space in WSV 2 | This project was ready to begin just before COVID. This project remains a priority but due to budget limitations Faculty Housing needs to prioritize the conversion of empty apartment units and the WSV hallway renovations project.
- Superblock signage: replacement of deteriorated signs; continued clarification of verbiage on open space usage | A new signage company has been identified (also working on the 181 Mercer Street and WSV Hallway projects) and their samples have been holding up well. We are working to have the project underway in 2022.
- Continuation of “Happenings” events and periodic assessment of preferred types and frequency of events | The OFH will share an assessment of Happenings with the committee. The spring 2022 events are slated to be held outdoors. The OFH will continue sharing updates and feedback on events.
- Event to celebrate opening of Mercer Playground in spring 2022 when work is complete | The event will be planned once the color seal is complete.
- Investigate and possibly mitigate condition of eastern wall of Key Park | Additionally the OFH would like to assess the condition of the Key park itself. Considering changes and upgrades to equipment, flooring, and possible inclusion of water features where the sandbox is currently located. There is no budget currently in place for these projects.
- Continued communications about lawn closures and schedule lawn closures so maximum number of open spaces are available during spring/summer months | COVID budget restrictions have been lifted and the landscaping budget was reinstated. With the community utilizing these outdoor green spaces more this is a priority for the OFH.
- Regular walk throughs of superblocks by OFH | Ongoing.

181 Mercer Street

- Assess grading and drainage issues along WSV driveways (assuming heavier pedestrian traffic en route to Mercer St) | This is a major project, not yet in any capital plan and will need to be assessed by experts. Once 181 Mercer Street opens and the impact of that building on pedestrian and other traffic can be studied, this project can be re-evaluated in that context.
- WSV canopy upgrade should be considered | Again, this would be a major undertaking for which there are no funds in the capital budget at this time. Although not aesthetically pleasing the canopies do not present any safety or structural issues.
- Details about design, amenities/activities on future Greene Street Walk | A preview of design plans can be arranged as well as possible uses of the space. We can consider using the space to extend the OFH’s Happenings events.
- Investigate possible uses for asphalt areas (running east/west) north and south of the Key Park other than for parking or staging areas | This is an area that can be assessed and possibly re-purposed. But here again, probably best undertaken after 181 Mercer Street is open and we have a better sense of
traffic and possible uses in the context of several newly developed spaces on the southern superblock.

- Investigate complementary activities that can take place in 181 Mercer given proximity to other NYU programs and activities | Options are being considered.

Post-Pandemic Environment

- Find ways to offer residents more places to spend time outdoors, more attention to landscaping, and introduction of sustainable materials to the ecosystem | This can be undertaken in the short-term with some interventions. Longer-term, such enhancements should be done in conjunction with developments on the southern block.

- Consider renting nearby non-NYU empty space to meet university needs, such as indoor play for children and tennis and racquet sports (i.e. New York Sports Club on Mercer Street) | The OFH reported they have made efforts of this nature in the past which were not well received (i.e. rented space at Chinatown Y and Palladium, as well as a bus trip to go skiing upstate). Although this is an important QoL amenity it is not mission critical to the University and given COVID restrictions and budget constraints any opportunities for this would need to be carefully evaluated in the context of other pressing priorities.
25 March 2022

To my esteemed colleagues:

I am honored to be nominated to serve as T-FSC Vice Chair. I am a Professor at NYU’s Steinhardt School, Department of Music and Performing Arts Professions, where I am Director of the Program in Piano Studies and Director of Doctoral Affairs. A concertizing artist, educator, and music historian, I am a Steinway Artist and Chair of the American Musicological Society’s Performance Committee. My writings on music— including *The Spectral Piano: From Liszt, Debussy, & Scriabin to the Digital Age* (Cambridge, 2015) and *Identity and Diversity in New Music* (Routledge, 2019)—consider the evolution of contemporary musical performance practices in relation to technological and sociological developments, and I have released more than 30 recordings. I came to the Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty Senators Council first as an alternate, and I have been senator and Secretary for the past two years. Presently Chair of the T-FSC Committee on Inclusion, Equity and Diversity, I also participate in University-wide working groups on Disabilities, Inclusion, and Accessibility, and Academic and Artistic Excellence.

Over the past two years, I have used my time in the Senate to increase faculty engagement in University governance; advocate for anti-racist education; and address the myriad practical challenges that have confronted our institution due to the changing political climate and COVID-19 pandemic. As prospective Vice Chair, I seek to assist the T-FSC leadership as liaison to the Faculty, Board of Trustees, and offices of the President and Provost. I hope to address the lack of diversity on our Council and pursue initiatives that will both empower the Faculty and safeguard our academic freedoms.

I appreciate your consideration and would welcome the opportunity to serve.

Respectfully,

Marilyn Nonken, PhD
Professor of Music
New York University, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education & Human Development
April 4, 2022

Fellow Colleagues and Senators:

I am delighted to be nominated to serve as T-FSC Secretary. I am an Associate Professor in the NYU Grossman School of Medicine and Director of Education and Translational Research in the Department of Pathology. I also am a member of the Perlmutter Cancer Center, as well as the Molecular Oncology Tumorigenesis and Immunology and Stem Cell Biology graduate training programs. My research group investigates the mechanisms that regulate normal and malignant blood stem cells, and our interests run the gamut – from determining the mechanisms that regulate blood stem cell self-renewal and aging, to developing drugs against novel therapeutic targets to eliminate leukemia stem cells.

I am a relative newcomer to the T-FSC, having been elected as one of the representatives from the medical school last year. My initial motivation for joining the T-FSC was to learn more about how the medical school interacts with the rest of NYU in order to find ways to increase cooperation between the faculty here with other parts of NYU, both with respect to research and education. I also was motivated by a desire to learn from, and share ideas with, other NYU faculty regarding best practices to effectively promote the spirit of discovery and innovation that makes NYU such a special institution, despite the increasingly challenging financial climate in which we all operate.

As a member of the T-FSC and member of the Inclusion, Equity and Diversity Committee this past year, I have come to better appreciate the importance of frequent and open communication among the faculty and administrators throughout the NYU community. If chosen to serve as Secretary of the T-FSC, I will support the Chair and other members of the Executive Committee in the execution of their duties. I will strive to find ways to optimize communication among T-FSC members as well as between the T-FSC and NYU administration, thereby increasing our impact on faculty/student life as well as University policies. I also will continue to serve as a bridge between the medical school and the wider NYU community. Finally, I remain committed to supporting the work of the T-FSC Inclusion, Equity and Diversity Committee as well as campus-wide efforts to champion DEI issues.

I look forward to the opportunity to serving, representing, and learning from my colleagues on the T-FSC. I appreciate your consideration of my candidacy.

Respectfully,
Overview
# Senate Global Overview

The C-FSC, T-FSC, SSC and the Deans council represent NYC and the portal campuses.

| Council                                                        | Number of Senators |
|                                                               |                   |
| Administrative Management Council (AMC)                       | 7                 |
| Full-time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council (C-FSC)| 30                |
| Deans Council                                                 | 21                |
| Student Senators Council (SSC)                                | 39                |
| Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC)          | 39                |
| University Officers                                           | 5                 |
| **Total**                                                     | **141**           |
What is the AMC?

Who we are

● Code 100 administrators
● Higher education professionals
● Alumni
● Adjunct professors
● Current grad/PhD students
● Parents of NYU students

Who we are not

● Clerical/Union staff
● Running the University (aka “the administration”)
● Senior leaders
● Deans, Presidents, Vice Presidents, general officers, and faculty; or principal assistants to the above with such titles as vice, deputy, associate, assistant
PART 02

AMC Representation
## Current Organizational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
<th>Number of Constituents Representing</th>
<th>Number of Constituents Represented per Senator</th>
<th>Percentage of the Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-FSC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans Council</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53,576</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>27.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-FSC</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Officers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>62,079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/nyu-at-a-glance.html](https://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/nyu-at-a-glance.html)
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Where the AMC is now

7 Senators
(includes Chair)

13 Alternate Senators
(includes Vice-Chairperson)
Suggested Defining Principles

- The AMC Senate representation would include one Senator and one alternate senators for every school and administrative unit/division*.
  - *Units/divisions would be determined by current University structures.
Proposed School Representation

Schools (as determined by current University Senate structure)

1. College of Arts and Sciences
2. College of Dentistry
3. Division of Libraries
4. Faculty of Arts and Sciences
5. Gallatin School of Individualized Study
6. Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
7. Grossman School of Medicine
8. Liberal Studies
9. NYU Abu Dhabi
10. NYU Long Island School of Medicine
11. NYU Shanghai
12. Rory Meyers College of Nursing
13. School of Global Public Health
14. School of Law
15. School of Professional Studies
16. Silver School of Social Work
17. Steinhardt School
18. Stern School of Business
19. Tandon School of Engineering
20. Tisch School of the Arts
21. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
Proposed Divisions Representation

Divisions (as determined by University structure)

1. Campus Operations (includes Campus Services; Facilities and Construction Management; Campus Safety; University Human Resources; Financial Operations and Treasury)
2. Division of Provost (includes Academic Affairs; Enrollment Management; Global Programs; Research; University Life)
3. NYU IT
4. Office of the President (includes General Counsel; Office of Equal Opportunity; Sustainability; Office of Global Inclusion)
5. Office of Student Affairs
6. University Development and Alumni Relations
7. University Relations and Public Affairs
Proposed Chair Representation

Current Structure
- The AMC Chair fills a distinct Senate position allocated to the Chair.

Proposed New Structure
- The AMC Chair would automatically fill the school/unit role where their position resides.
How would this impact the overall Senate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Number of Senators</th>
<th>Number of Constituents</th>
<th>Number of Constituents Representing</th>
<th>Percentage of the Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>7 (\rightarrow) 28</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>534 (\rightarrow) 133</td>
<td>4.96 (\rightarrow) 17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-FSC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21.28 (\rightarrow) 18.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans Council</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.9 (\rightarrow) 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53,576</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>27.66 (\rightarrow) 24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-FSC</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.66 (\rightarrow) 24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.55 (\rightarrow) 3.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141 (\rightarrow) 162</td>
<td>62,079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/nyu-at-a-glance.html](https://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/nyu-at-a-glance.html)
PART 03

Next Steps
Next Steps

1. Council Chair/members discussion and feedback
2. SCOOG discussion and feedback
3. AMC drafts resolution
4. SCOOG votes on resolution and, if approved, AMC presents at future Senate meeting
5. If approved in Senate, wouldn’t go into effect Spring 2023
Feedback
Addendum
Some Senate History

1889 | the first Bylaws to contain a description of the University Senate

2001 | 3 AMC seats added to the Senate = 80

2006 | AMC is increased to 5; Senate = 82

2009 | Liberal Studies at-large seat added to SSC and T-FSC adds 1 seat; Senate = 84

2014 | C-FSC, Abu Dhabi, Shanghai, Tandon are added to the Senate. Senate = 127

2016 | School of Global Public Health and Nursing added with each council increasing by 1-2 seats; Senate = 137

2018 & 2019 | Liberal Studies student and Dean representatives added; Senate = 138

2021 | Long Island School of Grossman student and Dean representatives added; Senate = 141
SCOG 2021-2022 Timeline

February 18, 2021
Senate presentation & survey Launched

April 22, 2021
Senate presentation, survey results shared

November 16, 2021
First working group meeting of AY21-22

April 28, 2022
Final recommendations/report delivered to full Senate

Late February, 2021
First Working Group Meetings

October 7, 2021
Consolidated working groups for 2021-2022 to continue work

January 11, 2022
AMC presentation

Current working groups

01.
Attendance and Technology Work Group

02.
Senate Composition and Role as Deliberative Body
THE CREDIT UNION DIFFERENCE

Presented by Mira Ness, CEO
WHAT IS A CREDIT UNION?
A credit union is a member-owned financial cooperative, controlled by its members and operated on the principle of people helping people, providing its members credit at competitive rates as well as other financial services. - Wikipedia

Credit unions are financial institutions, like banks, except the members own the credit union. They are nonprofit entities that aim to serve their members rather than seeking to earn a profit. Credit unions often offer better savings rates, lower loan rates and reduced fees because of this. But you must meet certain requirements to join a credit union. The requirements vary depending on how a credit union is organized. - Credit Karma
### CREDIT UNIONS

- Member-owned
- Lower interest rates as they are not-for-profit
- Smaller staffs allow for a more personalized service experience
- Low account maintenance fees
- Must qualify for membership

### BANKS

- Primary obligation are their shareholders, not their customers
- Higher interest rates to make a profit
- Larger companies
- Offer many products and services
- Many locations and accessibility
- Monthly fees and high minimums
WHEN WOULD I CHOOSE A CREDIT UNION?
WHO IS NYU FCU?
New York University Federal Credit Union will continue to be a secure and financially responsible banking institution. We are focused on the needs of our members and on their satisfaction.

Your stories and your goals matter.
WHO CAN BECOME A MEMBER OF NYU FCU?
OUR SERVICES

- Savings and Checking Accounts
- Credit Cards, Loans and Mortgages
- Bill Pay & Zelle
- Club Accounts
- Mobile Banking
- Nationwide ATM Network
AUTO FINANCING

Rates as low as 1%

New or Used Auto Purchase

Refinance from Current Lender

Lease Buyout

GAP Insurance, Depreciation Protection, Auto Deductible Reimbursement
CREDIT CARDS

CLASSIC CREDIT CARD
- 11.9% Annual Percentage Rate
- No annual fee
- 25-day grace period on purchases
- Max limit is $10,000.00

GOLD CREDIT CARD
- 6.90% for the first 6 months and 8.9% fixed rate after
- No annual fee.
- Max limit is $15,000
- Promotional limit of up to $50,000.00 with balance transfer
- Earn Rewards Points
DEBT CONSOLIDATION

Pay off high interest debts and turn them into one loan

- Rates between 10%-17.5%
- Debt free within 5 years
- Consolidate up to $45,000
MORTGAGE SUITE

- Up to 95% financing in all 50 States
- Down Payment Assistance Loans
- Mortgage Preparedness Loans
- Home Buyer Dream Grant for First Time Home Buyers in NY/NJ

- Home Equity Loans and Lines of Credit
- Realty Rewards
WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF JOINING NYU FCU?
Exclusive credit union member prices and rewards with popular programs like:

- Carvana Cash Back
- Sprint Cash Rewards, TurboTax, and more
- Hotel Stays
- Theme Parks
- Shows, Concerts, Sports Tickets
- Citi Bike Annual Discount
- Free Webinars and Seminars
- Free Financial Counseling
- Personal Finance Tools
- Payment & Savings Calculators
BECOME A MEMBER

Start your online application today!

www.nyufcu.com