



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Faculty Committee on the Global Network
Tuesday, April 10, 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
President's Conference Room, Bobst Library

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN THE MEETING

Eliot Borenstein, FAS (Russian & Slavic Studies) *Co-Chair*

Martin Klimke, NYU Abu Dhabi, *Co-Chair*

Sylvain Cappell, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences

Lindsay Davies, Liberal Studies

Chris Dickey, College of Global Public Health

Billie Gastic, School of Professional Studies

Alexander Geppert, NYU Shanghai

Guido Gerig, Tandon School of Engineering

Sam Howard-Spink, Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council

Dale Hudson, NYU Abu Dhabi

Matthew Kleban, FAS (Physics)

Kristie Koenig, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

Heather Lee, NYU Shanghai

Peter Loomer, College of Dentistry

Todd Porterfield, Gallatin School of Individualized Study

Gail Segal, Tisch School of the Arts

Mal Semple, Global Sites (NYU Sydney; FAS)

Paul Smoke, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service

Allison Squires, Rory Meyers College of Nursing

Carol Sternhell, FAS (Journalism)

Marti Subrahmanyam, Leonard N. Stern School of Business

Joseph Weiler, School of Law

Jiawei Zhang, Leonard N. Stern School of Business

Guests

Duane Corpis, Associate Professor of History; Global Network Associate Professor (NYU Shanghai)

Andrew Hamilton, President, NYU

MEETING NOTES

The committee received a report on a listening session about both/and-policy that was conducted as part of an October 11, 2017 faculty forum with NYU SH faculty. Some Shanghai faculty declined to contribute because they did not want to risk their anonymity.

Below is a summary of some general consensus points and opposing positions:

Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Many felt that the non-standardized coordinated hiring and tenure process has been successful as is, but that it has depended on the degree of mutual engagement between a specific Shanghai program and its home department in New York. While some faculty found their relationships with New York departments to be collegial and cooperative, others ran up against problems in the affiliation process. There are some uncertainties about procedures among NYU SH faculty currently, and sometimes there are no obvious affiliations in New York to pursue with a new hire if it was not organized prior to the search.

Some NYU SH areas and programs are interested in building a strong base for Asian Studies and are keen to hire people in area specialties that are not represented in New York departments. They also want to keep space at the portal for faculty who are not in Asian Studies. For these reasons, they feel it is important to create interdisciplinary connections with New York departments.

Newly Hired Tenure-Track Faculty

There is some confusion among newly-hired tenure-track faculty about the tenure process. New hires occasionally ask about the composition of the tenure-granting committee, which is public and mostly composed of tenured faculty at NYU. The New York faculty on the promotion and tenure committee have held occasional meetings in Shanghai for NYU SH faculty.

Standards for tenure are not perceived as uniform or consistently clear among programs and departments in NYU SH. Tenure-track faculty feel that they need to create relationships with New York departments to get tenure but feel that they lack the mechanisms to do that. Their concern is that they will be judged by colleagues they barely know using what are perceived as unclear criteria. There was consensus at the forum that no tenure-track hire should be made in which the expectations for tenure are unclear. Additionally, standards for tenure should not change from one year to the next. Furthermore, some tenure-track faculty feel uncertain about the standards for tenure in relationship to their especially intense service obligations in building new programs at a new university, or because of the limitations of professional development resources available to faculty at a university in China (limitation of grant opportunities from US or other non-Chinese grant giving institutions, as well as the continuous need to travel beyond China for research or professional activities).

Contract Faculty Hires

Some faculty were hired by inter-portal committees with representatives from New York and Shanghai, some by committees with only NYU SH faculty members, but some were hired unilaterally by deans. This latter type of hiring sometimes happens without much communication from New York, and with inconsistent communication to NYU SH faculty.

Contract faculty have two concerns about hiring procedures:

1. Differentiated practices for different hires mean faculty don't know what to expect from the process
2. A lack of clarity among hires about their comparative duties and pathways for contract renewal

NYU SH does have CCF guidelines that stipulate the committee process for renewal. Some initial and renewal contracts are for multiple years. Some people are renewed for single years, but this procedure is presumably capped after three years.

It was stated that in the last two years, incoming faculty have not been as involved in faculty governance as in previous years, when the TTF and CCF guidelines were being developed and discussed, and as a result some faculty may not have read all the documentation from the Faculty Handbook as carefully as when those policies were being formulated and discussed. There is a sentiment for greater faculty involvement at all levels of hiring and a more transparent process in hiring, renewals, and the policies and practices governing those decisions. A respective proposal for a consultative process regarding hiring practices has been drafted, but it was perceived as not representative of the views of all faculty in NYU SH.

Visit of President Andy Hamilton

Borenstein told President Hamilton that the committee's three most important agenda items are mobility, connectivity, and coordinated hiring. The committee is still collecting information before crafting a statement on these issues.

Hamilton said he is very appreciative of the committee's work. One critical question, well summarized in the progress report, is "How do we expand the strength of the global network without losing that critical dimension of quality control in departments and portals?" It is not surprising there are issues to be addressed each portal (just as there are issues at any university), and these should be discussed among scholars, faculty, and department committees to define best practice, and to allow best practice to evolve

over time as the global network does. By any measure, these portals have been enormously successful, especially in comparison to other universities who have tried to establish international campuses. There are high student application numbers to NYU's global sites, which is proof the network has helped NYU define itself in a way that's attractive to students.

Regardless of its structural strengths and weaknesses, President Hamilton embraces NYU's global network model and is committed to ensuring that it evolves in an academic way that benefits the overall university. He is often asked where the next sites will be, but feels that this is not the time for that kind of expansion. There are glaring gaps in the network (i.e. the Indian subcontinent), but NYU administration is beginning to evaluate Los Angeles as a potential geographical center; Steinhardt, Tisch, and Gallatin students would benefit from increased support on the West coast. There are also opportunities to expand in London, NYU's most popular site. Last year's Global Outcomes Research Project recommended that NYU explore how multiple sites might be used in a potential NYU undergraduate global degree, and Hamilton is exploring the potential value and student interest.

President Hamilton said that NYU should begin to separate some core concepts of the network. Circulation of faculty is essential, and this is an opportunity to rethink procedures. Faculty should be encouraged to travel abroad for shorter periods, because not everyone can spend a full year out of country. Any recommendations should take into account that there are differences between fields.

Klimke noted that recommendations for the portals have to take account of their specific organizational structures (e.g. not having traditional academic departments but different modes of administrative organization which might be shaped by interdisciplinary connectivity or other factors). Borenstein agreed with Klimke, adding that he is surprised and uncomfortable with how often the committee discusses the administrative structure of the portals. It is not the committee's remit but affects all its conversations. Hamilton responded that the portals are not that different from any new interdisciplinary program; the committee should see their task as providing support in New York for when the portals lack the senior faculty expertise needed for some matters of self-governance. He also noted that the retirement of NYU AD Vice Chancellor Al Bloom will necessitate a rigorous academic leadership search process.

A committee member noted that Gallatin deals with interdisciplinarity frequently, and wonders if school-to-school thinking could help the committee conceptualize these issues. Another member said that many faculty feel it's time to let the portals settle their own affairs.

A committee member noted that practical exigencies cause views of the global network to vary between New York and the portals. His fear is that some current practices will set in and become rationalized. This committee can be most helpful as watchdogs guarding against portal practices that aren't practical or transparent. Hamilton responded that as the University considers the next decade with evolved portals, it should remain committed to strict expectations of academic standards and measurable impacts on fields. There may end up being different processes for the portals, but academic quality should never be compromised.

Borenstein and Klimke thanked President Hamilton for visiting. At 10 am, the meeting ended.