

1
2 **Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service**
3 **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Procedures**
4
5
6

7
8
9 September 20, 2005
10
11

12 **1. INTRODUCTION**
13
14

15 This document sets forth principles and procedures for tenure and promotion at the
16 Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service (Wagner). It is intended to support
17 high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotions, and to provide a
18 comprehensive and fair review of the candidates. Procedures for promotion with tenure
19 are detailed in Section 2. Additional procedures for promotion to full and for external
20 hires with tenure are detailed in Sections 3-4.
21
22

23 The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is
24 perhaps their highest responsibility. Their review is central to the process, and it is
25 highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor. To give weak advice to
26 the Dean on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at a later stage
27 subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an abdication of
28 responsibility.
29
30

31 The review for tenure and promotion will not ignore candidates' defects. Lack of
32 perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and "advocacy" assessments that attempt to
33 gloss over imperfections do not meet the standards of a rigorous review. It is essential
34 that tenured faculty members who participate in the promotion and tenure review process
35 uphold high standards of responsibility and ethical behavior. Responsibility includes the
36 obligation to give careful attention to the materials of a tenure case and to share the
37 results of that deliberation with eligible colleagues. Ethical behavior includes a clear
38 obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings, since confidentiality makes
39 honest and open discussion possible.
40
41

42 Pursuant to the Wagner School Governance Bylaws, a Promotion and Tenure Committee
43 (P&T Committee) is appointed by the Dean with the advice of the Nominating
44 Committee which is elected by the faculty. In conducting promotion and tenure reviews,
45 the Committee may act as a committee of the whole, or may appoint a subcommittee to
46 prepare the docket for review by the full P&T Committee. The subcommittee may
47 consist of members of the P&T Committee or such other members of the faculty
48 designated by the Committee. The subcommittee (or committee of the whole) shall
49 consist of at least three members who are tenured faculty of appropriate rank, as
50 described herein and, where feasible, will not include scholars with whom the candidate
51 has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate;
52
53

1 such individuals are, however, eligible to participate in the full faculty discussion and
2 vote as described below.

3
4 The Dean makes recommendations to the Provost regarding tenure and promotion. The
5 recommendation of the Dean should include the numerical vote of the Promotion and
6 Tenure Committee and the vote of the tenured faculty of appropriate rank.

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

11 Candidates for promotion notify the Dean and Promotion and Tenure Committee
12 of intent to seek promotion;

13 Candidate submits required supporting materials to the Promotion and Tenure
14 Committee;

15 Promotion and Tenure Committee makes decision to proceed to seek outside
16 review;

17 The Promotion and Tenure committee prepares case;

18 Outside letters are solicited and reviewed;

19 All eligible faculty are convened to hear and vote on the case. Pursuant to
20 Wagner School Governance Bylaws, the vote shall be by closed ballot and
21 reported by numbers to maintain confidentiality; and

22 Dean informs Promotion and Tenure Committee and the full faculty of his/her
23 proposed recommendation to the Provost.

24

25 **2. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW**

26

27 **Standards**

28 A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching in the context of a research
29 university is a prerequisite for tenure at Wagner, as is the promise of effective
30 contributions toward the work of the School and the intellectual life of the University.
31 Once these prerequisites are met, outstanding scholarship is the requirement for tenure.
32 Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at Wagner, a candidate
33 must have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research
34 together with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship. In the
35 absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

36
37
38 The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure
39 among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same
40 field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the School?
41 Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-

1 disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate's field may cut across
2 several disciplines and sectors.

3
4 It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of
5 measurement. Each case shall be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by
6 delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context may
7 be a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate, including the specific and
8 particular characteristics and nature of the candidate's field. The current and future shape
9 of programs at Wagner may also be considered. All these factors will be carefully
10 discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure or promotion.

11
12 **Guidelines & Procedures For Tenure Review**

13
14 Introduction

15 Non-tenured, tenure track faculty include all full time Wagner faculty who are appointed
16 for a tenure track position and are eligible for tenure status as specified in Section V(1-7)
17 Academic Freedom and Tenure of the NYU Faculty Handbook. These faculty are
18 reappointed annually, typically with a pre-tenure probationary period as follows:

- 19 ▪ Six years for faculty appointed at the assistant professor level;
- 20 ▪ Five years for faculty appointed at the associate professor level; or
- 21 ▪ Four years for faculty appointed at the assistant or associate level following "a
22 term of more than three years i.e., not less than seven semesters of full-time
23 teaching in one or more institutions of higher education other than New York
24 University in the ranks or ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or
25 professor."

26
27 Annual Review

28 All tenure track faculty are reviewed annually during their probationary period by the
29 Promotion and Tenure Committee (or a subcommittee thereof) to assess performance at
30 Wagner and progress toward tenure, and to make a recommendation to the Dean on
31 reappointment. A special, more intensive, review is conducted in the third year for
32 faculty with a six-year probationary period, the second year for faculty with a five-year
33 probationary period, and early in the second year for faculty with a four-year
34 probationary period. The process and information gathered typically include the
35 following:

- 36 ▪ A meeting with the faculty member; and
- 37 ▪ The faculty member's curriculum vitae, statement to the Dean, published work
38 from the previous year, teaching evaluations, and syllabi.

39 After a discussion, a vote is conducted by secret ballot on whether the candidate should
40 be recommended for reappointment, and a brief memo summarizing the information

1 gathered, assessing performance and progress toward tenure, and providing the
2 recommendation on reappointment is forwarded to the Dean and to the candidate.

3

4 **Intensive Review**

5 A special, more intensive, review is conducted in the third year for faculty with a seven-
6 year probationary period, in the second year for faculty with a five-year probationary
7 period, and in the first year for faculty with a four-year probationary period. The goal of
8 the review is to ensure that the candidate is progressing sufficiently that award of tenure
9 can be expected. The process and information gathered typically include the following:

10 ▪ A meeting with the faculty member;
11 ▪ The faculty member's curriculum vitae, statement to the Dean, published work,
12 teaching evaluations, and syllabi;
13 ▪ A personal statement from the candidate detailing scholarly accomplishments to
14 date, teaching experience, academic/professional service, and career plans.

15

16 After a discussion, a vote is conducted by secret ballot on whether the candidate should
17 be recommended for reappointment, and a brief memo summarizing the information
18 gathered, assessing performance and progress towards tenure, and providing the
19 recommendation on reappointment is forwarded to the Dean and to the candidate.

20

21 **Tenure Review**

22

23 The process of reviewing candidates for tenure by the P&T Committee involves three
24 steps. In the first step, the Committee makes a determination of whether to seek outside
25 review of the candidate. If a determination is made to seek outside review, the second
26 phase involves gathering a docket of materials by a P&T subcommittee (or committee of
27 the whole) for the review and discussion by the P&T Committee. The third step involves
28 preparing a report of the P&T Committee on the candidate and forwarding the report and
29 docket to the tenured faculty of appropriate rank.

30

31 The process and information gathered for the first step typically involves the following:

32 ▪ A meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (or a subcommittee thereof)
33 with the candidate to discuss the review process;
34 ▪ The candidate's curriculum vitae, published work, syllabi, and teaching
35 evaluations;
36 ▪ A personal statement detailing scholarly accomplishments, teaching experience,
37 academic/professional service, and career plans; and
38 ▪ A solicitation of letters of comment from all Wagner faculty.

39 After review of the materials, the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes a
40 determination of whether to seek full outside review. If the decision is not to seek full
41 outside review, the matter is referred to the tenured faculty of appropriate rank for a final

1 determination as to whether to seek outside review.

2 If a determination is made, either by the Committee or full faculty, to seek outside review

3 the Promotion and Tenure Committee or subcommittee will prepare a promotion and

4 tenure docket for examination by eligible voters and for subsequent forwarding to the

5 Dean and Provost. This docket begins with an assessment of the prerequisites:

6 ▪ The candidate's teaching performance and teaching potential within the context of

7 a research university, together with supporting evidence and documentation, in

8 the form of a teaching portfolio, which may include:

9 – Candidate's statement of his/her teaching philosophy;

10 – Course syllabi;

11 – Student evaluations;

12 – Reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching

13 effectiveness;

14 – List of advisees (graduate and undergraduate);

15 – List of PhD dissertation direction;

16 – List of MS, MA, MFA thesis direction; and

17 – List of PhD committees.

18 ▪ The candidate's service record and potential contributions toward the work of the

19 School and the intellectual life of the University and the academic community.

20

21 Once these prerequisites as reflected in teaching are met, tenure will be judged and

22 granted on the basis of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research.

23 As evidence for such, the docket shall include:

24 ▪ Current curriculum vitae;

25 ▪ Candidate's personal statement;

26 ▪ Copies of the candidate's scholarly work;

27 ▪ Evidence of the quality of the scholarly work - for example;

28 – Academic book reviews;

29 – Readers' reviews of unpublished books;

30 ▪ Assessment of the candidate's scholarly research;

31 ▪ Assessment of the candidate's teaching, as influenced and shaped by his/her

32 scholarly work;

33 ▪ Copy of candidate's third-year/intensive review;

34 ▪ A list of evaluators, together with their scholarly credentials and an explanation

35 for why they were chosen; and

36 ▪ At least five (5) letters of evaluation from highly qualified external evaluators.

37 These external letters of evaluation shall be from evaluators who are not scholars with

1 whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a dissertation or thesis advisor,
2 co-author¹, or other close associates. Nor shall they be scholars that have been suggested
3 by the candidate to serve as evaluators. If the Committee inadvertently solicits an
4 opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate, this must be noted in the
5 Committee report. The Committee may also choose to include additional letters from
6 outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the
7 thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the
8 docket. The University's policy regarding the confidentiality of such external letters and
9 other tenure decision materials is found in Section C of the statement on Legal Protection
10 for Faculty Members, Faculty Handbook (1999 ed.) p.85, Evaluators selected normally
11 will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research
12 university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or
13 a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory or research
14 institute). Evaluators shall be recognized leaders in the candidate's field. Evaluators
15 shall be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively
16 from narrow specializations. The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at
17 United States institutions, and, when appropriate, evaluations should be solicited from
18 abroad. A report of the Committee

19
20 In addition, the Committee may include such additional materials that it considers
21 informative and useful for the assessment of the case, under a section of the docket titled
22 "Supplementary Materials."

23
24 The candidate's personal statement should narrate the trajectory of his/her career,
25 including a description of the relationships among works already published, distributed,
26 or performed, a description of new projects planned or under way, the candidate's
27 understanding of the definition of his/her field of work, and a description of the place
28 teaching, including particular courses, occupies in the career.

29
30 The assessment of a candidate's scholarly research shall address issues of quality,
31 significance, impact, and future development. The candidate's work will be carefully
32 reviewed by at least three senior members of the Committee or the Wagner School, who
33 must jointly sign this portion of the report. The quality and significance of the journals or
34 venues of distribution in which the candidate's work has appeared should be appraised. If
35 they are not the best representatives in the field, the best should be named, and the
36 absence of work in them should be explained. The report should indicate what parts of
37 the candidate's work are based on the dissertation, and for such work, what advances
38 have been made after the dissertation. In fields where external funding is important, the
39 candidate's success at securing grants should be evaluated in relation to reasonable
40 expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional
41 development. The assessment shall list and appraise the relative competitiveness of
42 grants and fellowships received by the candidate.

43

¹ 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 (i.e. multicenter clinical trials; large epidemiology studies, etc.), and then only acceptable with permission of the Dean.

1 Dockets can, and often should, include supplemental information about the candidate's
2 work that may not be evident from the rest of the record. Examples might be readers'
3 reports for unpublished works, reports of grant review panels, published reviews of
4 scholarship or other material relevant to considering the candidate's scholarship.

5
6 The docket should also include a report from the Promotion and Tenure Committee that
7 reviews the contents of the docket, highlighting important issues and providing
8 explanations where appropriate. The report should explain the importance of the
9 candidate's field of expertise. In what ways does the strength the candidate offers in that
10 field advance the School's current ambitions? How does the candidate's field supplement
11 other strengths in the School, and vice versa? How does the candidate's field and
12 performance affect the standing of the Wagner School?

13
14 The candidate's position in the field and the discipline as a whole should be described as
15 precisely as possible. This appraisal should include comparisons with other scholars both
16 within the Wagner School and in the discipline at large.

17
18 The assessment of teaching performance should appraise the quality and pertinence of
19 courses developed, provide an assessment of teaching performance, and evaluate the
20 candidate's contributions to the undergraduate and graduate teaching program of the
21 Wagner School. Specific evaluation and an analysis of the effectiveness of teaching
22 should be provided in narrative form. Evidence may be obtained both through the
23 judgments of faculty (e.g., evaluation of course syllabi, first hand evaluation of class
24 sessions by either a member of the P&T Committee or another tenured colleague), and
25 through student evaluations. A list of all Ph.D. dissertations and masters theses
26 supervised by the candidate, including those in progress, should be appended. A list of
27 all the committees that the candidate has served on should also be supplied.

28
29 The assessment of service should indicate the quality and significance of service to the
30 Wagner School and the university. Specific comments, including testimony from fellow
31 committee members, specification of authorship of particular reports and the like, are
32 helpful. The assessment of service may include a discussion of participation in
33 professional organizations in the candidate's field.

34
35 The report of the Committee shall include a list of all potential evaluators who were
36 asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined. All
37 communications with potential evaluators should be documented and included in the
38 docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written should be
39 included with the docket, as well as an explanation for each of the declinations.

40
41 The evaluation by the Committee should not be an advocacy document and should strive
42 to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. It shall
43 indicate, with reasons, the basis for any recommendation.

44
45 The letter of solicitation for outside evaluation should come from the Dean of the Wagner
46 School, should follow the prototype attached Appendix A. The letter should explicitly

1 request comparative rankings with the candidate's peers, and it should not in any way
2 imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. The docket
3 should include specific explanations for the choice of particular referees contacted. The
4 explanations should consist of more than the C.V.s of the referees and should state why
5 this particular referee's opinion matters (e.g., he/she is the most widely published author
6 in the candidate's field; he/she is in a different discipline but edits the premier journal in
7 the candidate's field, etc). All evaluators must be provided with the same C.V., personal
8 statement, and copies or descriptions of the candidate's work. If unpublished work is to
9 part of the docket, the School must ask all evaluators to comment on its quality.

10
11 The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators should be preserved; only eligible
12 voters in the School may be allowed access to the letters. Neither the names of writers,
13 nor the content of the letters may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else
14 beyond eligible members of the School, not even in summary form. In all
15 communications with them, writers of letters must be assured that their letters will be
16 held in such confidence, except as required by law, and that they will be seen only by
17 tenured members of the School, the Dean, and the Provost's Office.

18
19 The Chair and all members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must sign the
20 signature page of the docket, attesting that they have read the docket and that it represents
21 the opinions of the committee clearly and fairly. The completed docket is then forwarded
22 to the tenured faculty of appropriate rank and to the Dean to initiate the succeeding stages
23 of the review process.

24
25 The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall present the case to tenured
26 faculty of appropriate rank. After a discussion, a vote shall be taken and tallied. Pursuant
27 to Wagner Governance Bylaws, the vote shall be by secret ballot and only those present
28 in person or by means of conference telephone or similar communications equipment
29 (provided that all persons participating in the meeting can hear each other) are entitled to
30 vote on tenure. A tally of the number of absent members shall be recorded and reported
31 separately. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall transmit the tally of
32 the vote and a summary of the debate to the Dean. Reasonable doubt for granting tenure
33 precludes a favorable recommendation. If a reasonable doubt exists, the chair of the
34 Promotion and Tenure Committee shall indicate as much to the Dean in the chair's report
35 to the Dean. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near
36 consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.

37
38 A docket and recommendation must be submitted to the Dean for all faculty in their
39 mandatory review year, whether the recommendation is positive or negative. If,
40 however, the candidate resigns on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory
41 review, effective on or before August 31 of the final probationary year, the letter of
42 resignation shall be submitted in lieu of the report and a letter from the chair of the
43 Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be included stating explicitly that the resignation
44 was freely tendered without duress.

45
46 The Dean of the School may also solicit additional reviews. To ensure that the Dean

1 does not solicit evaluators already contacted by the Committee, the chair of the
2 Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide the Dean with a list of all evaluators being
3 solicited by the Committee.

4
5 The Dean will inform full faculty entitled to vote on tenure of his/her own proposed
6 recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of submission. In the case of a Dean's
7 recommendation contrary to that of the faculty, the Dean will provide the faculty entitled
8 to vote on tenure with the reasons. The faculty will then have ten days in which to
9 provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's final recommendation
10 is made to the Provost.

11
12 The Dean will ordinarily make his or her recommendation to the Provost by April 15.
13 This constitutes the definitive recommendation and will be accompanied by the docket
14 and the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation.²

15
16 Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the full faculty entitled
17 to vote on tenure and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

18
19 In the event of a negative decision on tenure, the candidate has the right to file a
20 grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance
21 Procedures appearing at pp. 61-63 of the Faculty Handbook (1999 ed.).

22
23 The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal University rules adopted by the Board
24 of Trustees. The current rules are found in the University's statement on Academic
25 Freedom and Tenure, Title I and II reprinted in the Faculty Handbook (1999ed) at pp. 25-
26 35.

27
28 Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure are considered
29 extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of
30 the institution to propose candidates for tenure ahead of schedule. The Dean must be
31 consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early
32 consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily
33 distinguished from strong cases. It must be noted that external letter writers must be
34 asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. Even with
35 these affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure unless the
36 case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for
37 candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

38
39 Tenure clock stoppage may be granted, under conditions cited below, for a maximum of
40 two semesters during the probationary period for any one of, or combination of, the
41 following personal reasons:

42 ▪ Tenure clock stoppage may be authorized during a period of full service, to
43 women or men who are primary caregivers of a child; and to primary caregivers
44 of a parent or a spouse, or a same-sex domestic partner in a health crisis of

² In cases when a professor began teaching in the spring semester and decision must be rendered by December 31, the Dean will make a recommendation by October 1.

1 extended duration. A same-sex domestic partner qualifies if he or she is registered
2 with the University for benefits purposes.

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

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

8 ▪ In exceptional circumstances, tenure clock stoppage may be authorized by the
9 Dean for a unique public service opportunity relevant to the candidate's field or
10 area of scholarship.

11
12 A request for tenure clock stoppage requires advance approval by the Dean and the
13 Office of the Provost. Requests must be made as early as possible. Tenure clock
14 stoppage may not be granted for any semester of the period when a tenure review is
15 mandated.

16
17 **Process for Initial Appointment with Tenure**

18
19 In the case of initial appointment of a faculty member with tenure, the Promotion and
20 Tenure Committee may conduct the review on an expedited basis in a manner consistent
21 with the process and intent of the guidelines and procedures set forth above. The docket
22 and committee report shall be presented at a meeting of the full faculty entitled to vote
23 and the process for faculty vote and review by the Dean shall be conducted as provided
24 above and in a manner consistent with Wagner School Governance Bylaws.

25
26
27 **3. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL
28 PROFESSOR**

29
30 The inquiry for such cases is essentially the same as for a tenure candidate: Is the
31 candidate for promotion among the strongest in her/his field, in comparison with
32 individuals at similar points in their careers at other comparable prominent institutions or
33 in other relevant settings? In addition, there is a presumption that the candidate will have
34 achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of
35 awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be work that marks significant new
36 scholarly research since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which
37 scholarly work and publications distinguish the candidate's achievements since awarding
38 tenure.

39
40 Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-
41 disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate's "field" may cut across
42 several disciplines and sectors.

43
44 For promotions to full professor, the vote and authority resides with the full professors in
45 the School. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall assume the same role as with

1 tenure review, except that only full professors shall participate in the process. The
2 process involves multiple steps. First the candidate informs the P&T Committee of
3 his/her request to be considered for promotion, and such request shall identify the
4 scholarly work and publications the candidate believes distinguishes his/her
5 achievements since award of tenure. After review of the materials, the Committee makes
6 a determination of whether to proceed for outside review. The members eligible to vote
7 for promotion on the P&T Committee may act a committee of a whole or appoint a
8 subcommittee to prepare a promotion review docket. The review process and content of
9 the docket and the report to full faculty entitled to vote shall parallel the guidelines for
10 tenure review.

11

12 If there are fewer than three tenured full professors (for a candidate being considered for
13 promotion to full professor), the Dean, after consultation with the P&T Committee, will
14 add other committee members in fields related to the candidate's field to the review
15 process.

16

17 The Dean or will ordinarily make his/her recommendation to the Provost by March 1.
18 This constitutes the definitive recommendation and will be accompanied by the docket,
19 the School Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation.

20

21 **4. TENURED EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS**

22

23 For appointments at the rank of full professor with tenure, the vote and authority reside
24 with the full professors in the School. For appointments at the rank of associate professor
25 with tenure, the vote and authority reside with all tenured faculty members in the School.
26 The vote should be taken by closed ballot in accordance with the Wagner Governance
27 Bylaws.

28

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

35

36 It is helpful for the report to include the justification for establishing a tenured position
37 within the School. The report must also include a summary of the recommendations of
38 the Search Committee and must identify the external referees consulted in the search
39 process, indicating which were suggested by the candidate and which were selected by
40 the School. A letter from a suitable evaluator selected by the search committee, which
41 answers all the relevant questions of the tenure review process, may be used as one of the
42 Schools five required outside letters for the Promotion and Tenure docket. The report
43 may also include letters from other search committee referees as supplemental materials
44 to the docket. In all cases a full docket must be submitted.

45

46 The docket must include a description of the candidate's teaching and an indication of

- 1 how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the School. If evaluations are not
- 2 available, alternative assessment of teaching ability must be provided.
- 3
- 4 The Dean will ordinarily make his/her recommendation to the Provost by April 15. This
- 5 constitutes the definitive recommendation and must be accompanied by the docket and
- 6 the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation.

1 **APPENDIX: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS**

2 **TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW**

3 Dear xxxx:

4
5 Josephine Smith, currently an Assistant Professor in the Robert F. Wagner Graduate
6 School of Public Service, is being considered for tenure and promotion. Because of your
7 knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of her published
8 and unpublished research.

9
10 I am enclosing Professor Smith's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are
11 copies and/or descriptions of her work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided
12 a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor Smith's work with
13 respect to scholarly research, originality, scope, and significance. We also request an
14 explicit comparison of her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in
15 the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments
16 you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor Smith's
17 teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would
18 appreciate your commentary on these matters as well.

19
20 Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor Smith would be
21 considered a strong candidate for promotion and tenure in other leading departments or
22 schools in the field. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure at Wagner is an
23 inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison
24 with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into
25 consideration the goals of the School? Both high quality applied and theoretical
26 scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service
27 scholarship, a candidate's "field" may cut across several disciplines and sectors.

28
29 We would like your letter within _____ weeks, sooner if possible. The University's
30 promotion procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current
31 curriculum vitae . Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what
32 specific capacities you have known the candidate.

33
34 Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the
35 tenured professors of the School, and appropriate decision makers and review panels
36 within the University, to the extent allowed by law.

37
38 Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you
39 know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

40
41 Sincerely,

1 **SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER, EXTERNAL SENIOR APPOINTMENT**

2

3 Dear xxxx:

4

5 Professor X of the University West at East is being considered for a tenured appointment
6 at the rank of full professor at the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service. Because of
7 your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her
8 research.

9

10 I am enclosing Professor X's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies or
11 descriptions of his/her work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid
12 assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor X's research with respect to
13 intellectual quality, originality, scope, and significance. We also request an explicit
14 comparison of her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same
15 field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you
16 consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor X's teaching
17 ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would
18 appreciate your comments on these matters as well. Please indicate in your letter how
19 long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

20

21 Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor X would be
22 considered a strong candidate for appointment as a full professor in other leading
23 departments and schools in the field. The process of evaluating a candidate for
24 appointment at Wagner is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in
25 his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in
26 their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the School? Both high quality applied
27 and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public
28 service scholarship, a candidate's "field" may cut across several disciplines and sectors.

29

30 We would like your letter within _____ weeks, sooner if possible. The University's
31 promotion and tenure procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a
32 current curriculum vitae.

33

34 Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the
35 full professors [and associate professors if hiring is at the associate level] of the School,
36 and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University, to the extent
37 allowed by law.

38

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

41

42 Sincerely,