

# Faculty Advisory Committee on NYU's Global Network

March 5, 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  
**Joyce Apsel**, Global Liberal Studies  
**Ruth Ben-Ghiat**, FAS (Italian Studies)  
**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)  
**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)  
**Liliana Goldin**, Silver School of Social Work  
**Sameer Jaywant**, Student Senate Representative  
**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)  
**Olugbenga Ogedegbe**, Langone School of Medicine (Population Health)  
**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 the committee to discuss a draft document recommending a successor committee when the term of the existing committee ends at the end of this academic year. They explained that the draft was not meant to suggest that anything has been settled but rather to spur conversations about the need for such a committee, its composition, and responsibilities.

The committee members initially discussed how such a successor committee might relate to the possibility (discussed earlier by the committee) of there being a new academic officer who would focus exclusively on academic issues of the global sites and who would serve as the primary point of contact for faculty questions and concerns.

A variety of opinions were expressed about this position, but most members agreed that given the amount of work involved in running the global sites, there is a need for them to be the sole focus of a major administrative position (as opposed to a position that has other major responsibilities as well). Most members agreed as well that whether or not such a position is created, there is a need for greater clarity about the appropriate contact people when faculty have questions about the sites and the portals.

In discussing the successor committee, co-chair Eliot Borenstein noted that it is unrealistic for a new committee to be constituted by Fall 2014, and thus as an alternative the current committee might be extended for another academic year, with the various schools holding elections in 2014-2015 for the membership of the committee in 2015-2016. A counterproposal was that this might be a two-year process, with only half of the committee being elected one year and the other half in the next. More generally, it was agreed that committee members should have staggered terms to ensure smooth transitions in the committee from year to year.

Co-Chair Una Chaudhuri pointed out the need for the successor committee to work closely with the Faculty Senators Council's committee on the Global Network University. She suggested that one way to facilitate cooperation would be for two faculty senators from the FSC committee to serve also on the successor committee.

In the committee's discussion of the responsibilities of the successor committee, it was agreed that one of its central functions should be to serve as the key place for large academic issues about the global network to be raised and discussed and a key place as well for soliciting faculty questions and concerns about the network.

Several committee members urged that the work of the successor committee be organized around a set of standing sub-committees. Given the differences between the sites and the portals, it was further suggested that there be separate sub-committees for the sites and the portals.

In addition to standing sub-committees, the committee discussed the desirability of the successor committee having the ability to assemble special “task forces” with a set term, composed of individuals from outside the committee as well as committee members. The task forces would aid the committee in making recommendations on specific issues that lie outside the range of the committee’s immediate expertise. There was general endorsement of this proposal, and it was noted that the ability to create specialized task forces would also encourage a stronger bi-directional flow of communication between the committee and the faculty.

There were a number of other suggestions about the responsibilities for the successor committee, for example, its role of in making recommendations about changes in faculty governance as the network continues to develop, and its role in representing the concerns of even those departments and faculty who choose not to participate in the global network.

The co-chairs of the committee told the committee that they would rework the draft document in light of the discussion and return it for further discussion by the committee.

The committee then turned to a discussion to faculty circulation across the global sites, including opportunities to spend semesters teaching at the sites. Some members pointed out that there were the significant benefits of having faculty from New York teaching at the sites, while other members were more skeptical, citing the large financial costs of doing so but also the academic costs to NY departments and schools of there being NY faculty in residence at the sites in addition the portals. Co-Chair Eliot Borenstein mentioned that one possible model to consider would be one that allowed a limited number of faculty members to travel and be in residence at the sites in capacities other than teaching a course.

The meeting ended with the co-chairs stating that the next meeting would return to a discussion of the costs and benefits of various models of faculty circulation and whether this should be a University priority.