I. INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth standards and procedures for tenure and promotion at the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service (Wagner). It is intended to support a comprehensive and fair review of candidates, while ensuring high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotion. Standards and procedures for promotion with tenure are detailed in Section II, with standards and procedures for promotion to full professor described in Section III, and for external hires with initial appointment with tenure (associate or full professor) in Section IV.

The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines\(^1\) include the following:

“...The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is perhaps their highest responsibility. Their review is central to the process, 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 responsibility...

The review for tenure and promotion will not ignore candidates’ defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and “advocacy” assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration...It is essential that tenured faculty members who participate in the promotion and tenure review 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 colleagues. Ethical behavior includes a clear obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings, since confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.”

Pursuant to the Wagner Governance Bylaws, an Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (hereinafter referred to as “P&T Committee”) is appointed by the Dean with the advice of the Faculty Advisory Committee which is elected by the faculty. As is detailed below, in conducting promotion and tenure reviews, the P&T Committee will prepare a docket, including a report from the P&T Committee with a recommendation on promotion or tenure, which is then provided to tenured faculty of appropriate

---

rank\textsuperscript{2} who make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean reviews the docket and recommendation of the faculty, and makes a recommendation to the Provost who has ultimate authority for the decision on promotion and tenure.

II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW

A. Standards for Tenure

The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines include the following general standards:

“A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching in the context of a research university is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU, as is the promise of effective contributions toward the work of the individual’s department or school and the intellectual life of the University. Once these prerequisites are met, outstanding scholarship or creative work in the arts 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 shall 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. All these factors will be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure or promotion”.

At Wagner, we recognize that both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s field may cut across several disciplines and sectors. Engagement in public service is encouraged at Wagner, and we value faculty scholarship and research that has the potential to influence public policy, management, and planning. In making appointments and decisions on promotion and tenure, Wagner will attempt to balance its collective needs and talents, and, accordingly, the weighting of these standards may differ among individual candidates.

\textsuperscript{2} That is, associate professors and full professors for promotion to associate professors and conferral of tenure, and full professors for promotion to full professor.
B. Procedures For Tenure Review

1. Introduction

Non-tenured tenure track faculty include all full time Wagner faculty who are appointed for a tenure track position and are eligible for tenure status as specified in Academic Freedom and Tenure Title I, Section V as set forth in the NYU Faculty Handbook. These faculty are reappointed annually, typically with a pre-tenure probationary period as follows:

- Seven years for faculty appointed at the assistant professor level, with tenure review conducted in year six;
- Five years for faculty appointed at the associate professor level, with tenure review conducted in year four; or
- Four years for faculty appointed at the assistant or associate level following “a term of more than three years i.e., not less than seven semesters of full-time teaching in one or more institutions of higher education other than New York University in the ranks or ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor,” with tenure review conducted in year three.

All non-tenured tenure track faculty are reviewed annually during their probationary period by the P&T Committee (or a subcommittee thereof) to assess performance at Wagner and progress toward tenure, and to make a recommendation to the Dean on reappointment. A special, more intensive, review is conducted in the third year for faculty with a seven-year probationary period, the second year for faculty with a five-year probationary period, and early in the second year for faculty with a four-year probationary period. Reviews are typically conducted in the spring of the academic year, except for the tenure review which commences in the fall of the penultimate year of the probationary period. These annual reviews leading up to tenure review are intended as a mentoring process to help guide the candidate in development of his/her academic career and to prepare the candidate for tenure review. The reviews are also intended to advise the candidate on adequacy of progress towards tenure, with a goal providing early notice to the candidate if tenure appears unlikely.

2. Annual Reviews

Each year, a subcommittee will be appointed by the P&T Committee to conduct the review and make recommendations to the full P&T Committee. The subcommittee will include one tenured faculty member who will serve as chair (except when on sabbatical or leave) on all subsequent reviews of said junior faculty member during his or her probationary period. In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban
Planning faculty, the subcommittee chair shall be a faculty member with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty. The candidate shall submit a CV and a memo for discussion with the subcommittee that includes a description of:

- Scholarship/research to date (attaching publications/manuscripts under review from the current year) and a description of future plans including:
  - A description of the candidate’s field(s) of interest for scholarship and research;
  - A listing of leading scholars/researchers in the field(s) of interest; and
  - A listing of journals targeted for current and future publication;
- Teaching activity at Wagner, with course syllabi and student evaluations attached;
- Service at Wagner, at NYU, in his/her scholarly field(s) of interest, and to the public; and

For candidates with a seven or five year probationary period, the review in the first year is primarily intended to familiarize the candidate with the tenure review process and to help focus future reviews. In subsequent years, except for the intensive review and tenure review described below, an annual review will be conducted by a subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee. The goal is to provide guidance to the candidate in his/her academic career and to monitor continuing progress towards tenure.

The review process typically involves one or more meetings of the candidate with the subcommittee, and the subcommittee makes a written report to the full P&T Committee characterizing its findings, including a recommendation on reappointment. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A brief report (generally an amended version of the memo received by the Committee incorporating any discussion or additional views from the full P&T Committee) summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and progress toward tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is forwarded to the Dean and to the candidate. The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns identified in the report.

---

3 A “primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty,” as such term is used herein, is a distinction that is made at hire or at some later point by agreement with the Dean.
4 This document contains special provisions for the Master of Urban Planning program to comply with accreditation standards of the Planning Accreditation Board.
5 In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, if the subcommittee does not recommend reappointment, the matter shall first be referred to the Urban Planning Program for consideration by Urban Planning faculty members of appropriate rank, who shall make a recommendation to the full P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall consider, but not be bound by, the recommendation of the Urban Planning faculty.
3. **Intensive Review**

A special, more intensive, review is conducted in the third year for faculty with a seven-year probationary period, in the second year for faculty with a five-year probationary period, and in the first year for faculty with a four-year probationary period. The goal of the review is to assess whether the candidate’s progress toward tenure is satisfactory. The candidate’s field(s) of scholarship/research are expected to be well defined, publications to date and in progress strong, teaching and service at Wagner/NYU satisfactory, and any potential influence on public policy, management, and planning described.

The candidate will submit an updated CV and personal statement for discussion with the subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee and meet with the subcommittee. The subcommittee will submit a written report to the full P&T Committee assessing progress to date and likelihood of the candidate achieving tenure status, including a recommendation on reappointment. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A brief memo (generally an amended version of the memo received by the Committee incorporating any discussion or additional views from the full P&T Committee) summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and progress towards tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is forwarded to the Dean and the candidate. The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns raised in the report.

4. **Tenure Review**

The process of reviewing candidates requesting consideration for tenure by the P&T Committee in the penultimate probationary year involves six steps:

First, the candidate submits by September 15th of the penultimate probationary year materials required for inclusion in the tenure docket including a CV, personal statement, all publications, course syllabi, and teaching evaluations for all NYU courses. The personal statement should include:

- Detailed description of the candidate’s scholarship and research

---

6 In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, if significant uncertainties or deficiencies are noted or if the subcommittee does not recommend reappointment, the matter shall first be referred to Urban Planning faculty members of appropriate rank, who shall make a recommendation to the full P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall review and consider, but not be bound by, any recommendation of Urban Planning faculty.
accomplishments;

- Summary of teaching activity at Wagner and student evaluations;
- Description of service at Wagner, NYU, his/her scholarly field(s) of interest, and the public; and
- Any evidence of potential influence on public policy, management, and planning.

Second, the P&T Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the tenure review docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report to the full P&T Committee assessing the candidate’s scholarly work/research, teaching, and service, and providing a recommendation on tenure. The subcommittee shall include at least three tenured Wagner faculty members of appropriate rank (i.e., associate professors and full professors). The subcommittee may also include one non-voting NYU faculty member of appropriate rank with a tenured appointment in a unit outside of Wagner and having substantive expertise in the candidate’s field of study. Where feasible, subcommittee members will not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.

The tenure docket prepared by the subcommittee should include:

- The materials submitted by the candidate as described above;
- Letters from the director of the candidate’s program and specialization at Wagner assessing the candidate’s teaching and service engagement;
- Letters from at least five external reviewers as described below;
- The subcommittee report;
- Such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate.

The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide that:

External letters shall 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 shall 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

---

7 In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, the subcommittee shall be chaired by a faculty member with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty and the majority of its voting members shall be Urban Planning faculty members.

8 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.
materials is found in Section C of the statement on Legal Protection for Faculty Members in the Faculty Handbook.

At Wagner, external evaluators generally will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, and will be recognized leaders in the candidate’s field. Evaluators should be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations.

The letter of solicitation for external evaluation should come from the subcommittee chair of the Wagner School, and should follow the prototype attached Appendix A. The letter should explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate’s peers, and it should not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators should be preserved; only eligible voters (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner) may 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 faculty eligible to vote (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner), not even in summary form. In all communications with them, external reviewers must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, to the extent allowed by law, and that they will be seen only by faculty members entitled to vote, the Dean, and the Provost’s Office.

The report of the subcommittee should 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 should be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written should be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for any declinations.

The report of the subcommittee should provide a detailed summary and assessment of the candidate’s scholarship/research, teaching, service, and actual and/or potential public policy, management, and planning engagement and impact. The report should not be an advocacy document, but should strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The report will generally include an explicit recommendation on whether tenure should be granted, with a detailed rationale for the recommendation. The vote by the subcommittee on any recommendation for tenure shall be by closed ballot, with a tally of the vote included in its report.

Third, the report of the subcommittee will then be reviewed by the full P&T Committee. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether tenure should be granted shall be by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near

---

9In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, the subcommittee report shall first be reviewed by the Urban Planning faculty of appropriate rank, and a recommendation made to the full P&T Committee on tenure. The P&T Committee shall review, but not be bound by, any recommendation of Urban Planning faculty.
consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A report from the full P&T Committee (generally an amended version of the subcommittee report incorporating any discussion or additional views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the vote of the full committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket will be made available to all tenured Wagner faculty.

Fourth, the chair of the P&T Committee will present the case to tenured faculty of appropriate rank at a meeting with due notice as provided in the Wagner Governance Bylaws. After a discussion, a vote will be taken and tallied. The vote shall be by closed ballot, and only those present in person or by means of conference telephone or similar communications are entitled to vote on tenure. A tally of the number of absent members should be recorded and reported separately. The Chair of the P&T Committee shall transmit the tally of the vote and a summary of the discussion to the Dean and shall notify the candidate of the faculty’s decision. Reasonable doubt for granting tenure precludes a favorable recommendation. If a reasonable doubt exists, the Chair of the P&T Committee shall indicate as much to the Dean in the Chair’s report to the Dean. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.

Fifth, the Dean will review the docket and report from the P&T Chair and transmit the docket and recommendation on tenure to the Provost. The Dean may also solicit additional external reviews. The Dean will inform the full faculty entitled to vote on tenure of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of submission. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the faculty, the Dean will provide the faculty entitled to vote on tenure with a statement of the reasons. The faculty 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. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the full faculty eligible to vote on tenure and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

In the event of a negative decision on tenure, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedures as specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook.

Any time prior to the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost, an untenured faculty member may voluntarily withdraw his/her candidacy for tenure. However, such faculty member shall not be eligible for a full-time appointment or position at NYU any time beyond his/her probationary period, as provided in Title I, Section V, Paragraph 3 of the Statement in Regard to Academic Freedom and Tenure as set forth the the NYU Faculty Handbook.

5. Tenure Clock Stoppage

Pursuant to the guidelines provided in the NYU Faculty Handbook, tenure clock stoppage may be granted for a maximum of two semesters during the probationary period for any
one of, or combination of, the stipulated personal reasons (pp. 47-48). In other cases, as further stated in the NYU Faculty Handbook, a request for tenure clock stoppage will require advance approval by the Dean and the Office of the Provost.

6. Early Tenure Review

Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure are considered extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution to propose candidates for tenure ahead of schedule. The Dean 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. It must be noted that external letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. 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.

III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

A. Standards for Promotion

The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines include the following general standards for 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 scholarly work and publications distinguish the candidate’s achievements since awarding tenure.

In applying these standards, Wagner values both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s “field” may cut across several disciplines and sectors. The standards of “excellence and effectiveness in teaching” and “effective contributions toward the work of the individual’s department or school and the intellectual life of the University” cited in the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for tenure are also applied when promotion is considered. Wagner recognizes the importance of public service and the potential for scholarship and research to have an influence on public policy, management, and planning, and a candidate’s contributions in these areas may also be
considered. There is an expectation that the candidate is fully engaged at Wagner to help build and strengthen Wagner’s academic programs and scholarly community, including significant effort in mentoring junior faculty.

B. Procedures for Promotion

The P&T Committee shall assume the same role as with tenure review, except that only full professors shall participate in the process. The process largely parallels that for tenure review and involves six steps:

First, the candidate notifies the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Dean by May 15th of the intent to seek promotion during the following academic year. By September 15th of that year, the candidate submits materials required for inclusion in the promotion docket including a CV, personal statement, and all publications, course syllabi and teaching evaluations since tenure was conferred. The personal statement should include:

- Detailed description of the candidate’s scholarship and research accomplishments clearly delineating scholarship and research since tenure;
- Summary of teaching activity at Wagner and student evaluations;
- Description of service at Wagner, NYU, his/her scholarly field(s) of interest, and the public; and
- Evidence of engagement and potential impact on public policy, management, and planning.

Second, the P&T Committee members of appropriate rank will meet to review the promotion docket to make a determination on whether to proceed with the case and seek external review of the candidate. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether to seek external review shall be conducted by closed ballot. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. If the decision is not to proceed with external review, the Committee will prepare a report documenting the rationale for its decision which will be provided to the Dean and the candidate.

Third, if the P&T Committee determines to proceed with the case and seek external review, the Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the promotion review docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report to the full P&T Committee assessing the candidate’s scholarly work/research, teaching and service, and providing a recommendation on promotion. The subcommittee shall include at least three Wagner faculty members with full professor rank. Where feasible,

---

10In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, the decision to seek outside review shall first be considered by the Urban Planning faculty of appropriate rank and a recommendation made to the P&T committee. The P&T Committee shall consider, but not be bound by, the recommendation of the Urban Planning faculty.

11In the case of an Urban Planning candidate, the subcommittee shall be chaired by an Urban Planning faculty member and the majority of its members shall be Urban Planning faculty members.
subcommittee members will not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as co-author or other close associate.

The promotion docket prepared by the subcommittee should include:

- The materials submitted by the candidate as described above
- Letters from the director of the candidate’s program and specialization at Wagner assessing the candidate’s teach and service engagement
- Letters from at least five external reviewers as specified in Section II for tenure review
- The subcommittee report
- Such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate

Letters from outside evaluators shall be obtained in a manner and according to the process described above for tenure review. The report of the subcommittee should 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 should be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written should be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for any declinations.

The report of the subcommittee should provide a detailed summary and assessment of the candidate’s scholarship/research, teaching, service, and public service engagement/impact. The report should not be an advocacy document, but should strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The report will generally include an explicit recommendation on whether promotion should be granted, with a detailed rationale for the recommendation. The vote by the subcommittee on any recommendation for promotion shall be by closed ballot.

Fourth, the report of subcommittee will then be reviewed by P&T Committee members of appropriate rank. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether promotion should be granted shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. A report from the full Committee (generally an amended version of the subcommittee report incorporating any discussion or additional views from the full Committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket shall be made available to all Wagner faculty of appropriate rank.

Fifth, the chair of the P&T Committee will present the case to the faculty of appropriate rank at a meeting with due notice as provided in the Wagner Governance Bylaws. After a discussion, a vote will be taken and tallied. The vote shall be by closed ballot, and only those present in person or by means of conference telephone or similar communications equipment (provided that all persons participating in the

---

12 In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, the subcommittee report shall first be reviewed by Urban Planning faculty of appropriate rank, and any recommendation made to the full P&T Committee on promotion. The P&T Committee shall review, but not be bound by, any recommendation of the Urban Planning faculty.
meeting can hear each other) are entitled to vote on promotion. A tally of the
number of absent members should be recorded and reported separately. The Chair of
the P&T Committee shall transmit the tally of the vote and a summary of the
discussion to the Dean and shall notify the candidate of the faculty’s decision.
Reasonable doubt for granting promotion precludes a favorable recommendation. If
a reasonable doubt exists, the Chair of the P&T Committee shall indicate as much to
the Dean in the Chair’s report to the Dean. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the
sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split
vote.

Sixth, the Dean will review the docket and report from the P&T Chair and transmit
the docket and a recommendation on promotion to the Provost. The Dean may also
solicit additional external reviews. The Dean will inform full faculty entitled to vote
on promotion of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10
days of submission. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the
faculty, the Dean will provide the faculty entitled to vote on promotion with a written
statement of the reasons. The faculty 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. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write
to the full faculty entitled to vote on promotion and to the candidate informing them
of the decision.

In the event of a negative decision on promotion, the Dean shall provide the
candidate a rationale for the decision in writing. In such case 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 specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook.

Any time prior to the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost, the candidate may
voluntarily withdraw his/her candidacy for promotion from Associate to full Professor.

IV. INITIAL APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE

In the case of initial appointment of a faculty member with tenure as an associate or full
professor, the P&T Committee may conduct the review on an expedited basis in a manner
consistent with the process and intent of the guidelines and procedures set forth above.
The docket and committee report shall be presented at a meeting of the full faculty
entitled to vote and the process for faculty vote and review by the Dean shall be
conducted as provided above and in a manner consistent with Wagner Governance
Bylaws.

V. PARTICIPATION AND VOTING

On matters related to general P&T Committee business, including development,
adoption, and amendment of Appointment and Promotion Standards and Procedures for
Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, all members of the P&T may participate
and vote. For development, adoption, and amendment of Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures and for recommendations on award of tenure, participation and voting shall be limited to tenured faculty members. For recommendations on promotion to full professor, participation and voting shall be limited to tenured full professors.
APPENDIX: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS

TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

Dear xxxx:

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

I am enclosing Professor Smith's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies and/or descriptions of her work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor Smith's work with respect to scholarly research, originality, scope, and significance. We also request an explicit comparison of her work with other 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 Smith's teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor Smith would be considered a strong candidate for promotion and tenure in other leading departments or schools in the field. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure at Wagner 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 School? Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s “field” may cut across several disciplines and sectors.

We would like your letter by [insert date], sooner if possible. The University's promotion procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current curriculum vitae. Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the tenured professors of the School, 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,
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 at the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service. 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 or descriptions 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 and schools in the field. The process of evaluating a candidate for appointment at Wagner 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 School? Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s “field” may cut across several disciplines and sectors.

We would like your letter by [insert date], sooner if possible. The University's promotion and tenure procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current curriculum vitae.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the full professors [and associate professors if hiring is at the associate level] of the School, 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,