



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Faculty Advisory Committee on NYU's Global Network

February 13, 2014 (8:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.)

Meeting Notes

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN MEETING

Eliot Borenstein, FAS (Russian & Slavic Studies) *Co-Chair*
Una Chaudhuri, FAS (English) *Co-Chair*
Jose Alvarez, School of Law
Sylvain Cappell, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences (Mathematics)
Jennifer Carpenter, Stern School of Business
Andrea Chambers, SCPS (Design-Publishing)
Patricia Corby, College of Dentistry (Bluestone Center for Clinical Research)
Lucinda Covert-Vail, Division of Libraries
Michael Dinwiddie, Gallatin School of Individualized Study
Richard Foley, Administrative Liaison to the Committee (Vice Chancellor for Strategic Planning)
Scott Fritzen, NYU Shanghai
Don Garrett, FAS (Philosophy)
Paul Glimcher, FAS (Neural Science)
Natasha Iskander, Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
Martin Klimke, NYU Abu Dhabi (FAS, History)
Victoria Morwitz, Stern School of Business
Fred Myers, FAS (Anthropology)
Charles Newman, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences (Mathematics)
Robert Rowe, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development (Music & Music Education)
Gail Segal, Tisch School of the Arts (Graduate Film)
Malcolm Semple, NYU Sydney (FAS)
Joshua Tucker, FAS (Politics)
Nancy Van Devanter, College of Nursing

Report on Meeting

Co-Chairs Eliot Borenstein and Una Chaudhuri opened the meeting by asking committee members to reflect upon Provost David McLaughlin's participation in the last meeting held on February 4. Eliot Borenstein expressed his appreciation that Provost McLaughlin accepted a number of positions that the committee has developed. For example, he accepted the principle that NY departments have the prerogative, even if rarely used, to revoke affiliations with faculty at the portals. Likewise, he accepted that the processes, and practices deemed appropriate for governing relations among the NY schools, the portals, and the sites during this start-up period will need to be re-evaluated as the portals and sites mature and hence shouldn't be thought of as permanent. Finally, he accepted that the roles that NY departments play in searching for and hiring tenured and tenure track at the portals ought also apply to arts faculty. It was noted, moreover, that the Provost had reiterated these commitments at a recent meeting of the Provost's Council on Science and Technology.

Discussion then turned to the issue of graduate programs and students at the portals. It was immediately noted the issues involving doctoral programs and students are quite different from those of professional masters programs and students and thus in formulating recommendations, the committee needs to distinguish the two

With respect to doctoral programs and students at the portals, some members of the committee said that they believed that the views of top university administrators differ on whether it should be a long term goal of the portal campuses to develop doctoral programs independent from those in NY; in particular, the leadership of the portals regard this as an appropriate long term goal while the NY provost thinks this shouldn't be even a long term goal. The committee expressed its desire for the clarification on this issue.

In further discussion of this issue, it was noted that Biology, Chemistry, and NYU Poly have reached agreement with NYU Abu Dhabi about doctoral students. There are differences in the form of the agreements, but they all specify conditions under which students would be in residence in Abu Dhabi and trained by faculty there, with the funding for the students provided by NYU Abu Dhabi. The Biology and Chemistry agreements still need final approval from GSAS. In addition, Neural Science is engaged in similar conversations with NYU Shanghai.

This discussion then led the committee to pose to itself the following general question: Is the current arrangement by which NY departments and schools are deeply involved with key processes at the portals (e.g., those involving searching for, hiring, and tenuring faculty) a temporary phase in the transition of these campuses to largely autonomous academic units (analogous to NY schools), or are we assuming that these portal campuses will continue to be hybrid units even in the long run, with continuing involvement from NY schools and departments in key processes?

Eliot Borenstein asked each committee member briefly to give his or her thoughts on this issue. Committee members expressed a range of opinions, but in addition a number of members of the committee argued that it was simply too early to decide. Whatever their take on this general issue, most members seemed to agree that the appropriate kinds of connections between the portals and NY schools/departments would need to vary significantly across disciplines. For example, some members observed that in many disciplines the training of doctoral students is best done with a critical mass of faculty and doctoral students in close proximity to one another, and hence it may prove pedagogically difficult to provide doctoral students with training they require if faculty and students are spread out at geographically distant campuses.

Some members of the committee again also expressed uneasiness at the FAS/NYU-AD “Guiding Principles” document (this issue had come up at the previous meeting), fearing it might too easily be taken as a model for other schools. They also urged that the committee itself in making its recommendation take pains to avoid being so prescriptive in its recommendations that it discourages creative use of the network by NY’s professional schools.

With respect to both doctoral and professional masters programs, some members expressed the need for the committee to focus on the funding models for these programs. With respect to funding, it was mentioned that the models might have to differ at NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai, given the different financial situations of the two portals, and differ again with respect to programs at the portal sites. This observation provoked additional observations about there being other important differences between NYU Abu Dhabi and NYU Shanghai, including differences in their undergraduate programs and students (e.g., a greater emphasis on quantitative programs at Shanghai), the lesson being that what works for one portal may not work for the other.

The committee concluded with two points: First, a desire to better understand the differences between the Abu Dhabi and Shanghai campuses. Second, an interest in using a portion of the next meeting to explore issues of faculty circulation, with a special focus on the costs and benefits of faculty circulation at the sites.