

The Leonard N. Stern School of Business
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

February 2006

1. INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth principles and procedures for tenure and promotion at NYU Stern.¹ It is designed to support high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotions, and to provide a comprehensive and fair review of the candidates. The successful implementation of the guidelines to achieve and maintain high academic standards depends on the leadership of the tenured faculty, department chairs, dean, the provost and the president. Procedures for promotion with tenure are detailed in Sections 2-4. Additional procedures for promotion to full and for external hires with tenure are detailed in Section 5.

2. STANDARDS

A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching in the context of a research university is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU Stern, as is the promise of effective contributions toward the work and intellectual life of the individual's department, Stern, and the University. Once these prerequisites are met, outstanding scholarship is the requirement for tenure. Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research together with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the department?

It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context may be a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. The current and future shape of programs in a department and in a school may be relevant considerations. All these factors must be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure or promotion.

¹ It has been reviewed by the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senators Council and has been deemed to be in full compliance with the University's guidelines. Any changes to the guidelines in this document must be submitted to the Office of the Provost for approval.

3. GUIDELINES & PROCEDURES

The Dean of the NYU Stern School of Business makes recommendations to the Provost regarding tenure and promotion. The recommendation of the Dean must be informed by the department, Stern faculty at large, and experts in the candidate's field. This occurs through a multilevel process involving detailed evaluation within the department, review by the school-wide Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, independent external evaluations, and such other information as deemed appropriate by the Dean.

NYU Stern will publish and submit to the Provost its annual tenure process calendar in advance. Relevant dates are a mixture of those required to guarantee adequate consideration and those that ensure the process moves in a timely fashion. These include the date by which:

- Candidate submits work to department chair
- Department chair submits names of outside reviewers
- Departmental committee prepares case
- Outside letters are solicited
- All tenured faculty of appropriate rank meet to hear and vote on the case
- School committee meets to hear and vote on the case
- Dean informs department chair and Advisory Committee of his/her proposed recommendation to the Provost.

3.1 Department

Departmental Responsibilities

1. The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure decisions is perhaps their highest responsibility. 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 abdication of departmental responsibility. Reports that are considered by the Dean or Promotion and Tenure Committee to fall into this category will be returned to the department with a request that the problem be corrected.

2. Assessments must not ignore candidates' defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to promotion or tenure, and "advocacy" assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration. It is far more helpful to the candidate, the School P&T Advisory Committee, and the Dean to have a balanced discussion of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

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

Departmental Guidelines & Procedures

4. Departmental procedures must conform to the guidelines below. If there are questions of interpretation, the department chair must be consulted in advance with the Dean or his/her representative.

Departmental Votes: Eligibility of Members

5. The entire tenured faculty of a department is authorized to vote and to make a collective recommendation for or against tenure at the rank of associate professor. The vote should be by closed ballot and reported by numbers.

6. Chairs of departments with fewer than three tenured members must consult with the Dean about drawing upon faculty from other departments in fields related to that of the candidate so as to form an ad hoc committee consisting of three or more members.

7. A reasonable effort must be made to enable eligible faculty on leave to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote. When a faculty member is unable to attend the meeting because of a leave or other absence, he or she may make his/her views known to the other eligible members through written or electronic communication. Because an absent member will not have had the opportunity to hear views discussed at the meeting, he or she will not be able to vote.

Departmental Review: Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee

8. The tenured faculty of appropriate rank of the department, and such others involved in departmental votes as noted above, must be presented with a detailed, formal, written review of the candidate.

9. This review is conducted by a Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee. This committee may be appointed by the department chair, or it may be elected, following traditional practice in the department. Departments may establish ad hoc committees for each promotion and tenure case, or they may establish a single committee each year to review all cases. In either case, the committee must consist of at least three members who are eligible to vote, as described above. The committee must not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or

other close associate; such individuals are, however, eligible to participate in the full departmental discussion and vote on the committee report.

10. It is the responsibility of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to assemble the relevant materials, to review them in detail, and to prepare a written report for presentation to the tenured faculty of appropriate rank. The file and the written report must be made available for inspection well in advance of the meeting of eligible faculty at which the case will be discussed and the vote taken. The numerical vote of the Committee must also be contained in the report.

Cross Appointments

11. In the case of a Joint Appointment, the composition of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee must include members of both units. Both units must vote on the report, with the guidelines herein outlined concerning procedures and reporting applying to both. Each Chair must forward his or her unit's recommendation to the Dean only after consultation with the other unit. If the departments or programs arrive at significantly different judgments, the Dean will ordinarily invite the Chairs together to discuss the case.

12. When the candidate has an Associated Appointment in a secondary department or program, the departmental review must include a written evaluation from the secondary department explaining, among other matters thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that program's mission and to its administration. This evaluation may be written by the Chair of the secondary department after formal consultation with departmental or program members.

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

Materials for the Departmental P&T Committee

14. The Departmental P&T Committee must prepare a Promotion and Tenure docket for examination by departmental tenured faculty of appropriate rank and for subsequent forwarding to the Dean and Provost. This docket must begin with an assessment of the prerequisites:

The candidate's teaching performance and teaching potential within the context of a research university, together with supporting evidence and documentation, in the form of a teaching portfolio. The teaching portfolio will include:

- Candidate's learning goals for his/her students in the context of one or more specific courses
- Description of strategies and methods employed to help students attain those goals

- Some evidence that students have actually attained those goals
- Student evaluations (both an aggregated summary across courses and complete CFE reports for all course sections taught)
- Reports of departmental assessments of teaching effectiveness
- List of advisees (graduate and undergraduate)
- List of PhD dissertation direction
- List of MS, MA, MFA thesis direction
- List of PhD committees

The candidate's service record and potential contributions toward the work and intellectual life of the department, Stern, University and the academic community.

Once these prerequisites as reflected in teaching and service are met, tenure will be judged and granted on the basis of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research. As evidence for such, the docket must include:

- Current curriculum vitae
- Candidate's personal statement
- Copies of the candidate's scholarly work
- Assessment of candidate's scholarly work
Assessment should include evidence of the quality of the scholarly work as appropriate. For example,
 - Citation analysis, including comparative analysis of comparable peers
 - Academic book reviews
 - Readers' reviews of unpublished books
- Assessment of how the candidate's teaching is influenced and shaped by his/her scholarly work.
- Copy of candidate's Third-Year Review, and Sixth-Year Review if applicable
- A list of evaluators, together with their scholarly credentials and an explanation for why they were chosen.
- At least five (5) letters of evaluation from highly qualified external evaluators. These five letters must be from evaluators who are not scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associates. Nor can they be scholars that have been suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators. If the department inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate, this must be noted in the

departmental report. The department may also choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the docket. The University's policy regarding the confidentiality of such external letters and other tenure decision materials is found in Section C of the statement on Legal Protection for Faculty Members, Faculty Handbook (1999 ed.) p.85.

- Report of the Departmental P&T Committee

In addition the department may submit additional materials that it considers informative and useful for the assessment of the case, under a section of the docket titled "Supplementary Materials."

15. The candidate's personal statement must narrate the trajectory of his/her career, including a description of the relationships among works already published or distributed, a description of new projects planned or under way, and a description of the place teaching, including particular courses, occupies in the career.

16. The assessment of a candidate's scholarly research must address issues of quality, significance, impact, and future development. The candidate's work must be carefully reviewed by at least three senior members of the department, who must jointly sign this portion of the Report. The quality and significance of the journals or other venues of distribution in which the candidate's work has appeared must be appraised. If they are not the best representatives in the field, the best must be named, and the absence of work in them must be explained. The report must indicate what parts of the candidate's work are based on the dissertation, and for such work, what advances have been made after the dissertation. In fields where external funding is important, the candidate's success at securing grants must be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development. The assessment must list and appraise the relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received by the candidate.

17. Dockets can, and often must, include supplemental information about the candidate's work that may not be evident from the rest of the record. Examples might be referees' reports for unpublished works, reports of grant review panels, etc.

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

19. The candidate's position in the field and the discipline as a whole must be described as precisely as possible. This appraisal must include comparisons with other scholars both within the department and in the discipline at large.

20. The Assessment of Teaching Performance must appraise the quality and pertinence of courses developed, provide an assessment of teaching performance, and evaluate the candidate's contributions to the undergraduate and graduate teaching program of the department and Stern. Specific evaluation and an analysis of the effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate teaching must be provided in narrative form. Evidence may be obtained both through the judgments of faculty (e.g., evaluation of course syllabi, first hand evaluation of class sessions by either a member of the P&T Committee or another tenured colleague) and through student evaluations. A list of all Ph.D. dissertations Masters theses supervised by the candidate, including those in progress, should be appended. A list of all the committees that the candidate has served on must also be supplied.

21. The Assessment of Service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the department, Stern, and the university. Specific comments, including testimony from fellow committee 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.

22. The Report of the Committee must include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined. All communications with potential evaluators must be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written must be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for each of the declinations.

23. The evaluation by the P&T Committee must not be an advocacy document; it must strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. It must indicate, with reasons, the basis for the departmental recommendation.

Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators

24. Stern's Vice-Dean of Faculty will solicit at least five letters from outside evaluators, based upon recommendations by the department. These evaluators must not be scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associates. Nor can they be scholars that have been suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators. If the department inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns was close to the candidate, this must be noted in the departmental report.

25. Evaluators selected normally will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory or research institute).

26. Evaluators must be recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline. Evaluators must be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations. At least one of the 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 United States institutions; when appropriate, evaluations should be solicited from abroad.

Solicitation of Letters from Outside Evaluators

27. The letter of solicitation, which must come from Stern's Vice-Dean of Faculty, must follow the prototype attached as Section 6. The letter must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate's peers, and it must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired.

28. The docket must include specific explanations for the choice of particular referees contacted. The explanations must consist of more than the CVs of the referees. They must state why this particular referee's opinion matters (e.g., she is the most widely published author in the candidate's field; he is in a different discipline but edits the premier journal in the candidate's field, etc). It is particularly important to exclude referees, such as former advisors or collaborators, who have a personal or professional connection to the candidate – such letters cannot be accepted by P&T, and the time needed to obtain replacement letters can significantly delay consideration of a case.

29. All evaluators must be provided with the same C.V., personal statement, and copies or descriptions of the candidate's work. If unpublished work is to be part of the docket, the department must ask all evaluators to comment on its quality.

30. The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; only eligible voters in the department must be allowed access to the letters. Neither the names of writers nor the content of the letters may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond eligible members of the department, not even in summary form. In all communications with them, writers of letters must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, except as required by law, and that they will be seen only by tenured members of the department, the school committee on promotion and tenure, the relevant dean(s), and the Provost's Office.

Presenting the Committee Report for a Vote

31. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must present the case to a full special departmental meeting of tenured faculty of appropriate rank. After a discussion, a vote must be taken and tallied. The vote should be by closed ballot. Absent members may arrange for their views to be heard at the meeting, but they will not be eligible to vote because they will not have had the benefit of the open discussion of the case.

32. Reasonable doubt for granting tenure precludes a favorable recommendation. If a reasonable doubt exists, the department must indicate as much to the Dean and the School Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. Re-voting must not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split committee or departmental vote.

Mandatory Review

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

Recommendation of the Chair

34. The report of the Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure and the vote by tenured faculty of appropriate rank are advisory to the Department Chair. The Chair must forward the report and vote (including the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions, if any) to the Dean with his or her own recommendation and the docket. 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.

35. The chair's letter must include a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate's work occupies in the relevant discipline or field, and explain why it is important to the department that this field be represented on its faculty. It may also be helpful for this statement to include information about the usual criteria for excellence in the candidate's discipline (e.g., quality of venues within which the work appears).

Effective Departmental Reviews

36. Properly prepared, detailed, and well-documented dockets are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the department's evaluation of the candidate. Indeed, it is the thorough and honest appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate that is most useful to the School Committee on Promotion and Tenure and to the Dean, often more so than the final vote, for it gives substantive meaning and texture to the evaluation.

37. The Chair and all members of the Departmental P&T Committee must sign the Signature Page of the Docket, attesting that they have read the docket and that it represents the opinions of the committee clearly and fairly. The completed docket is then forwarded to the Dean to initiate the succeeding stages of the review process.

3.2 Dean's Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure

38. The Dean's Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure consists of a sufficient number of full professors in the School to represent major faculty areas and is appointed by the Dean. The usual term of membership is three years and appointments are staggered to insure some continuity from year to year.

39. The Dean of the School and/or his or her representative sits with the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure without vote and with voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the Committee.

40. If there are questions in any particular case, the Chair of a Department and/or the Chair of the Departmental P&T Committee may be asked to attend a meeting of the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure to clarify the docket or to provide additional information.

41. The Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure makes its recommendation to the Dean of the School.

3.3 Responsibilities of the Dean

42. The Dean will inform the Department Chair of the advice provided by the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure as well as of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the department, the Dean will provide the Chair with the reasons. The Chair will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost.

43. The Dean will ordinarily make his or her recommendation to the Provost by March 1. This constitutes the definitive recommendation and will be accompanied by the docket, departmental recommendation and the School Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee recommendation. In cases when a professor began teaching in the spring semester and a decision must be rendered by December 31, the Dean will make a recommendation by October 1.

44. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the Department Chair and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

The Role of the Provost

45. The Provost shall evaluate each tenure and promotion docket and recommendation submitted by the Deans. In evaluating a promotion or tenure recommendation submitted by a Dean, the Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation, and may in unusual cases appoint an ad-hoc advisory committee composed of tenured faculty to seek further counsel.

The Provost shall support or oppose the Dean's recommendation in his/her final decision. The Provost will inform the Dean of his/her pending decision. In those cases in which that the Provost's decision will be contrary to the recommendation of the Dean, the Provost will provide the Dean with the reasons and 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.

Guidelines for Appeal

46. In the event of a negative decision, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedures appearing at pp. 61-63 of the Faculty Handbook (1999 ed.).

4. TENURE CLOCK

The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal University rules adopted by the Board of Trustees. The current rules are found in the University's statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Title I and II reprinted in the Faculty Handbook (1999ed) at pp. 25-35 and available on the web at <http://www.nyu.edu/academic.appointments/>. Faculty members initially appointed as assistant professors will have a maximum probationary period of eight years, usually with a formal review in year six for promotion to untenured associate professor. Faculty members initially appointed as untenured associate professors will have a maximum probationary period of four years. Please see exhibit for timing of sample cases.

4.1 Interim Reviews

Departments will conduct an annual review of untenured faculty to ascertain that the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. The third-year and sixth-year reviews must be more formal reviews whose results are conveyed in writing to the faculty member and to the Dean. If a faculty members is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the sixth year review will be a promotion review, following the procedures set out in Part 3 above. In exceedingly rare cases, a faculty member may be retained at the assistant professor rank in year six with the option for tenure review in year eight. The results of this promotion review may be a recommendation for promotion to untenured associate, a recommendation for promotion to tenured associate, or a recommendation for termination. Please see exhibit for timing of various sample cases; you can also get more information on the sixth year review at http://www.stern.nyu.edu/Faculty/docs/sixth_yr_review.doc.

4.2 Acceleration of Schedule

The Dean or Vice-Dean of Faculty must be consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. External letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. Chairs and departmental committees must also specifically address this issue. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure

unless the case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

4.3 Stopping Tenure Clock

Tenure clock stoppage may be granted, under conditions cited below, for a maximum of two semesters during the probationary period for any one of, or combination of, the following personal reasons:

Tenure clock stoppage may be authorized during a period of full service to women or men who are primary caregivers of a child; and to primary caregivers of a parent or a spouse, or a same-sex domestic partner in a health crisis of extended duration. A same-sex domestic partner qualifies if he or she is registered with the University for benefits purposes.

"Primary care" assumes day-to-day responsibilities for the care of a child/parent/spouse/same sex domestic partner for a substantial portion of the period.

Tenure clock stoppage may be authorized to a faculty member who is granted one or more full semesters of leave, for any one, or combination of, illness/disability leave, parental leave, or personal leave.

A request for tenure clock stoppage requires advance approval by the Dean and the Office of the Provost. Requests must be made as early as possible. Tenure clock stoppage may not be granted for any semester of the period when a tenure review is mandated.

The request should be made via the Application for Stopping Tenure Clock for Primary Caregivers (Form 111).

EXHIBIT
SAMPLE PROBATIONARY PERIOD CASES (Stern School)

Case #1 (Assistant Professor) – Section V. Academic Tenure, paragraph 3

aP	1	2003-04	
aP	2	2004-05	
aP	3	2005-06	formal third year review, spring
aP	4	2006-07	
aP	5	2007-08	
aP	6	2008-09	
aP	7	2009-10	
aP	8	2010-11	tenure review during 8 th year as aP
aP	9	2011-12	terminal year OR promotion to AP & tenure 9/1/11

Case #2 (Assistant Professor promoted to Associate Professor at onset of 7th year) – Section V. Academic Tenure, paragraph 3

aP	1	2003-04	
aP	2	2004-05	
aP	3	2005-06	formal third year review, spring
aP	4	2006-07	
aP	5	2007-08	
aP	6	2008-09	sixth year review
AP	7	2009-10	1 terminal year OR promotion to AP without tenure
AP	8	2010-11	2 tenure review during 2 nd year as AP = 8 th year as aP
AP	9	2011-12	3 terminal year OR tenure 9/1/11

Case #3 (Assistant Professor promoted to Associate Professor at onset of 5th year) – Section V. Academic Tenure, paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 (c)

aP	1	2003-04	
aP	2	2004-05	
aP	3	2005-06	formal third year review, spring
aP	4	2006-07	
AP	5	2007-08	1 promotion to AP 9/1/07
AP	6	2008-09	2
AP	7	2009-10	3
AP	8	2010-11	4 tenure review during 4 th year as AP = 8 th year as aP
AP	9	2011-12	5 terminal year OR tenure 9/1/11

Case #4 (Assistant Professor promoted to Associate Professor at onset of 4th year) – Section V. Academic Tenure, paragraph 4.1

aP	1	2003-04	
aP	2	2004-05	
aP	3	2005-06	formal third year review, spring
AP	4	2006-07	1 promotion to AP 9/1/06
AP	5	2007-08	2
AP	6	2008-09	3
AP	7	2009-10	4 tenure review during 4 th year as AP = 7 th year as aP
AP	8	2010-11	5 terminal year OR tenure 9/1/10
AP	9	2011-12	6

Case #5 (Assistant Professor with +3 years of tenure-track service at another institution) – Section V. Academic Tenure, paragraph 4.3 (c)

aP	1	2003-04	
aP	2	2004-05	
aP	3	2005-06	
aP	4	2006-07	
aP	5	2007-08	tenure review
aP	6	2008-09	terminal year <u>OR</u> tenure 9/1/08
aP	7	2009-10	
aP	8	2010-11	
aP	9	2011-12	

Case #6 (Associate Professor) – Section V. Academic Tenure, paragraph 4.1

AP	1	2003-04	
AP	2	2004-05	
AP	3	2005-06	
AP	4	2006-07	tenure review
AP	5	2007-08	terminal year <u>OR</u> tenure 9/1/07

Case #7 (Associate Professor with +3 years of tenure-track service at another institution) – Section V. Academic Tenure, paragraphs 4.1 & 4.3 (c)

AP	1	2003-04	
AP	2	2004-05	
AP	3	2005-06	
AP	4	2006-07	tenure review
AP	5	2007-08	terminal year <u>OR</u> tenure 9/1/07

5. ADDITIONAL OR ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL AND TENURED EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS

5.1 Promotion to Full Professor

The inquiry for such cases is essentially the same as for a tenure candidate: Is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in her/his field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers at other comparable prominent institutions or in other relevant settings? In addition, there is a presumption that the candidate will have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be work that marks significant new scholarly research since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate's achievements since the last review for promotion.

For promotions to full professor, the vote and authority resides with the full professors in the department.

If there are fewer than three tenured full professors (for a candidate being considered for promotion to full professor), the Dean, after consultation with the Chair, will add other committee members in fields related to the candidate's field to the review process.

When a Department Chair is a candidate for promotion, the Dean, after consultation with the chair, will designate a senior scholar in the department (or outside of the department if none is available within) to lead the review process. The report of the committee must be submitted by the chair of the departmental P&T committee directly to the Dean.

If the Department Chair is an Associate Professor, the report of the committee for promotion only cases must be reviewed by the Dean instead of the Chair.

The Dean will ordinarily make his/her recommendation to the Provost by March 1. This constitutes the definitive recommendation and will be accompanied by the docket, departmental recommendation (if any) and the School Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee recommendation.

5.2 Tenured External Appointments

For appointments at the rank of full professor with tenure, the vote and authority reside with the full professors in the department. For appointments at the rank of associate professor with tenure, the vote and authority reside with all tenured faculty members in the department. The vote should be taken by closed ballot.

Evaluators selected normally will hold a tenured position as a full professor in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory or research institute). Letters solicited from individuals selected by the candidate can be included as supplementary information as long as their provenance is clearly identified.

It is helpful for the report to include the justification for establishing a tenured position within the department in the candidate's field of expertise. 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, indicating which were suggested by the candidate and which were selected by the department. 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 outside letters for the P&T docket. The report may also include letters from other search committee referees as supplemental materials to the docket. In all cases a full docket must be submitted.

The docket must include a description of the candidate's teaching and an indication of how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the department. If evaluations are not available, alternative assessment of teaching ability must be provided by the Chair.

The Dean will ordinarily make his/her recommendation to the Provost by March 1. This constitutes the definitive recommendation and must be accompanied by the docket, departmental recommendation (if any) and the School Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee recommendation.

6. SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS

6.1 TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

Dear xxxx:

XX, currently an Assistant Professor in the XX department, is being considered for promotion <with or without tenure>. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of xx research.

I am enclosing Professor XX's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies of xx work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor XX's work with respect to scholarly research, originality, scope, and significance. We also request an explicit comparison of xx work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at

comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor XX's teaching ability or 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. Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor XX would be considered a strong candidate for promotion <and tenure> in other leading departments in the field. Stern has recently modified its timetable for promotion and tenure. Until 2004-05, candidates were evaluated in their sixth year for promotion and tenure in year seven. Now, the sixth year review is for promotion with or without tenure with a mandatory tenure review in year eight, if not earlier.

We will need your letter within four weeks, sooner if possible. The University's procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a hard copy of a current curriculum vitae or, if it is more convenient, a url pointer to your vita.

My assistant, XX, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the tenured professors of this department, and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University, to the extent allowed by law.

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

Sincerely,

XXXX

Vice-Dean of Faculty

6.2 SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER, EXTERNAL SENIOR APPOINTMENT

Dear xxxx:

Professor X of the University West at East is being considered for a tenured appointment at the rank of full professor in the XX department. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research.

I am enclosing Professor X's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies of his/her work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor X's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, scope, and significance. We also request an explicit comparison of her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor X's teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your comments

on these matters as well. Please indicate in your letter how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor X would be considered a strong candidate for appointment as a full professor in other leading departments in the field. We will need your letter within four weeks, sooner if possible. The University's procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a hard copy of a current curriculum vitae or, if it is more convenient, a url pointer to your vita.

My assistant, XX, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the tenured professors of this department, and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University, to the extent allowed by law.

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

Sincerely,
XXXX

Vice-Dean of Faculty