

1 **Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service**
2 **Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures**

3
4 May 24, 2016
5

6
7 **I. INTRODUCTION**
8

9 This document sets forth standards and procedures for tenure and promotion at the Robert
10 F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service (Wagner). It is intended to support a
11 comprehensive and fair review of candidates, while ensuring high academic standards in
12 awarding tenure and promotion. Standards and procedures for promotion with tenure are
13 detailed in Section II, with standards and procedures for promotion to full professor
14 described in Section III, and for external hires with initial appointment with tenure
15 (associate or full professor) in Section IV.
16

17 The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines¹ include the following:
18

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

26 The review for tenure and promotion will not ignore candidates’ defects. Lack of
27 perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and “advocacy” assessments that
28 attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than
29 admiration...It is essential that tenured faculty members who participate in the
30 promotion and tenure review process uphold high standards of responsibility and
31 ethical behavior. Responsibility includes the obligation to give careful attention to
32 the materials of a tenure case and to share the results of that deliberation with eligible
33 colleagues. Ethical behavior includes a clear obligation to maintain the
34 confidentiality of the proceedings, since confidentiality makes honest and open
35 discussion possible”.
36

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

¹ The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are available at
<https://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html>.

1 rank² who make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean reviews the docket and
2 recommendation of the faculty, and makes a recommendation to the Provost who has
3 ultimate authority for the decision on promotion and tenure.

5 **II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW**

7 **A. Standards for Tenure**

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

12 “A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching in the context of a
13 research university is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU, as is the promise of effective
14 contributions toward the work of the individual’s department or school and the
15 intellectual life of the University. Once these prerequisites are met, outstanding
16 scholarship or creative work in the arts is the requirement for tenure. Thus, in order
17 to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a
18 record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research together
19 with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship. In the
20 absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

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

25 It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of
26 measurement. Each case shall be examined in detail by making explicit
27 comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or
28 weaknesses. Context may be a criterion in judging the strength of a particular
29 candidate. All these factors will be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a
30 recommendation on tenure or promotion”.

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

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.

1 **B. Procedures For Tenure Review**

2
3 1. Introduction
4

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

- 10 ▪ Seven years for faculty appointed at the assistant professor level, with tenure
11 review conducted in year six;
- 12 ▪ Five years for faculty appointed at the associate professor level, with tenure
13 review conducted in year four; or
- 14 ▪ Four years for faculty appointed at the assistant or associate level following “a
15 term of more than three years i.e., not less than seven semesters of full-time
16 teaching in one or more institutions of higher education other than New York
17 University in the ranks or ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or
18 professor,” with tenure review conducted in year three.
19

20 All non-tenured tenure track faculty are reviewed annually during their probationary
21 period by the P&T Committee (or a subcommittee thereof) to assess performance at
22 Wagner and progress toward tenure, and to make a recommendation to the Dean on
23 reappointment. A special, more intensive, review is conducted in the third year for
24 faculty with a seven-year probationary period, the second year for faculty with a five-year
25 probationary period, and early in the second year for faculty with a four-year
26 probationary period. Reviews are typically conducted in the spring of the academic year,
27 except for the tenure review which commences in the fall of the penultimate year of the
28 probationary period. These annual reviews leading up to tenure review are intended as a
29 mentoring process to help guide the candidate in development of his/her academic career
30 and to prepare the candidate for tenure review. The reviews are also intended to advise
31 the candidate on adequacy of progress towards tenure, with a goal providing early notice
32 to the candidate if tenure appears unlikely.
33

34 2. Annual Reviews
35

36 Each year, a subcommittee will be appointed by the P&T Committee to conduct the
37 review and make recommendations to the full P&T Committee. The subcommittee will
38 include one tenured faculty member who will serve as chair (except when on sabbatical
39 or leave) on all subsequent reviews of said junior faculty member during his or her
40 probationary period. In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban

1 Planning faculty³, the subcommittee chair shall be a faculty member with a primary
2 appointment on the Urban Planning faculty.⁴ The candidate shall submit a CV and a
3 memo for discussion with the subcommittee that includes a description of:

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

13
14 For candidates with a seven or five year probationary period, the review in the first year
15 is primarily intended to familiarize the candidate with the tenure review process and to
16 help focus future reviews. In subsequent years, except for the intensive review and
17 tenure review described below, an annual review will be conducted by a subcommittee
18 appointed by the P&T Committee. The goal is to provide guidance to the candidate in
19 his/her academic career and to monitor continuing progress towards tenure.

20
21 The review process typically involves one or more meetings of the candidate with the
22 subcommittee, and the subcommittee makes a written report to the full P&T Committee
23 characterizing its findings, including a recommendation on reappointment.⁵ The vote by
24 the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment
25 shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to
26 a voice vote. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near
27 consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A brief report (generally an
28 amended version of the memo received by the Committee incorporating any discussion or
29 additional views from the full P&T Committee) summarizing the information gathered,
30 assessing performance and progress toward tenure, delineating any actions recommended
31 by the Committee to the candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment
32 with a tally of the vote is forwarded to the Dean and to the candidate. The candidate
33 shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of
34 the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns identified in the report.

35

³A “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.

⁴This document contains special provisions for the Master of Urban Planning program to comply with accreditation standards of the Planning Accreditation Board.

⁵In 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.

1 3. Intensive Review
2

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

11
12 The candidate will submit an updated CV and personal statement for discussion with the
13 subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee and meet with the subcommittee. The
14 subcommittee will submit a written report to the full P&T Committee assessing progress
15 to date and likelihood of the candidate achieving tenure status, including a
16 recommendation on reappointment.⁶ The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the
17 candidate should be recommended for reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot
18 unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. Re-voting shall not
19 be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid
20 reporting a split vote. A brief memo (generally an amended version of the memo
21 received by the Committee incorporating any discussion or additional views from the full
22 P&T Committee) summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and
23 progress towards tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the
24 candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is
25 forwarded to the Dean and the candidate. The candidate shall then submit a memo to the
26 P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond
27 to any issues or concerns raised in the report.
28

29 4. Tenure Review
30

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

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

- 37
38
 - 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.

- 1 accomplishments;
- 2 ▪ Summary of teaching activity at Wagner and student evaluations;
- 3 ▪ Description of service at Wagner, NYU, his/her scholarly field(s) of interest,
- 4 and the public; and
- 5 ▪ Any evidence of potential influence on public policy, management, and
- 6 planning.
- 7

8 Second, the P&T Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the tenure

9 review docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report to the full P&T

10 Committee assessing the candidate's scholarly work/research, teaching, and service,

11 and providing a recommendation on tenure. The subcommittee shall include at least

12 three tenured Wagner faculty members of appropriate rank (*i.e.*, associate professors

13 and full professors). The subcommittee may also include one non-voting NYU

14 faculty member of appropriate rank with a tenured appointment in a unit outside of

15 Wagner and having substantive expertise in the candidate's field of study.⁷ Where

16 feasible, subcommittee members will not include scholars with whom the candidate

17 has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close

18 associate.

19 The tenure docket prepared by the subcommittee should include:

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

26 The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide that:

27 External letters shall be from evaluators who are not scholars with whom the

28 candidate has been closely associated, such as a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-

29 author⁸, or other close associates. Nor shall they be scholars that have been

30 suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators. If the Department inadvertently

31 solicits an opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate, this must

32 be noted in the departmental report. The Department may also choose to include

33 additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the

34 candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided

35 that this information is clearly noted in the docket. The University's policy

36 regarding the confidentiality of such external letters and other tenure decision

⁷In 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.

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

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

7 The letter of solicitation for external evaluation should come from the subcommittee
8 chair of the Wagner School, and should follow the prototype attached Appendix A.
9 The letter should explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate's peers,
10 and it should not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the
11 evaluator is desired. The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators should be
12 preserved; only eligible voters (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner)
13 may be allowed access to the letters. Neither the names of writers, nor the content of
14 the letters may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond faculty
15 eligible to vote (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner), not even in
16 summary form. In all communications with them, external reviewers must be
17 assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, to the extent allowed by
18 law, and that they will be seen only by faculty members entitled to vote, the Dean,
19 and the Provost's Office.

20 The report of the subcommittee should include a list of all potential evaluators who
21 were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined. All
22 communications with potential evaluators should be documented and included in the
23 docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written should
24 be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for any declinations.

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

34
35 Third, the report of the subcommittee will then be reviewed by the full P&T
36 Committee.⁹ The vote by the P&T Committee on whether tenure should be granted
37 shall be by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a
38 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.

1 consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A report from the full P&T
2 Committee (generally an amended version of the subcommittee report incorporating
3 any discussion or additional views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the
4 vote of the full committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the
5 full docket will be made available to all tenured Wagner faculty.
6

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

19 Fifth, the Dean will review the docket and report from the P&T Chair and transmit
20 the docket and recommendation on tenure to the Provost. The Dean may also solicit
21 additional external reviews. The Dean will inform the full faculty entitled to vote on
22 tenure of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of
23 submission. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the faculty,
24 the Dean will provide the faculty entitled to vote on tenure with a statement of the
25 reasons. The faculty will then have ten days in which to provide further information
26 or counter-argument before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost.
27 Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the full faculty
28 eligible to vote on tenure and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

29 In the event of a negative decision on tenure, the candidate has the right to file a
30 grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance
31 Procedures as specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook.
32

33 Any time prior to the Dean's recommendation to the Provost, an untenured faculty
34 member may voluntarily withdraw his/her candidacy for tenure. However, such faculty
35 member shall not be eligible for a full-time appointment or position at NYU any time
36 beyond his/her probationary period, as provided in Title I, Section V, Paragraph 3 of the
37 Statement in Regard to Academic Freedom and Tenure as set forth the the NYU Faculty
38 Handbook.
39

40 5. Tenure Clock Stoppage

41

42 Pursuant to the guidelines provided in the NYU Faculty Handbook, tenure clock stoppage
43 may be granted for a maximum of two semesters during the probationary period for any

1 one of, or combination of, the stipulated personal reasons (pp. 47-48). In other cases, as
2 further stated in the NYU Faculty Handbook, a request for tenure clock stoppage will
3 require advance approval by the Dean and the Office of the Provost.

4 5 6. Early Tenure Review 6

7 Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure are considered
8 extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of
9 the institution to propose candidates for tenure ahead of schedule. The Dean must be
10 consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early
11 consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily
12 distinguished from strong cases. It must be noted that external letter writers must be
13 asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. Even with
14 these affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure unless the
15 case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for
16 candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

17 18 **III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL** 19 **PROFESSOR** 20

21 **A. Standards for Promotion**

22 The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines include the following
23 general standards for promotion to full professor:
24

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

35 In applying these standards, Wagner values both high quality applied and theoretical
36 scholarship. Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a
37 candidate's "field" may cut across several disciplines and sectors. The standards of
38 "excellence and effectiveness in teaching" and "effective contributions toward the work
39 of the individual's department or school and the intellectual life of the University" cited
40 in the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for tenure are also applied when
41 promotion is considered. Wagner recognizes the importance of public service and the
42 potential for scholarship and research to have an influence on public policy,
43 management, and planning, and a candidate's contributions in these areas may also be

1 considered. There is an expectation that the candidate is fully engaged at Wagner to help
2 build and strengthen Wagner’s academic programs and scholarly community, including
3 significant effort in mentoring junior faculty.
4

5 **B. Procedures for Promotion**

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

9 First, the candidate notifies the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Dean by May
10 15th of the intent to seek promotion during the following academic year. By
11 September 15th of that year, the candidate submits materials required for inclusion in
12 the promotion docket including a CV, personal statement, and all publications,
13 course syllabi and teaching evaluations since tenure was conferred. The personal
14 statement should include:

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

22 Second, the P&T Committee members of appropriate rank will meet to review the
23 promotion docket to make a determination on whether to proceed with the case and
24 seek external review of the candidate.¹⁰ The vote by the P&T Committee on whether
25 to seek external review shall be conducted by closed ballot. Re-voting shall not be
26 undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid
27 reporting a split vote. If the decision is not to proceed with external review, the
28 Committee will prepare a report documenting the rationale for its decision which
29 will be provided to the Dean and the candidate.

30 Third, if the P&T Committee determines to proceed with the case and seek external
31 review, the Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the promotion
32 review docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report to the full P&T
33 Committee assessing the candidate’s scholarly work/research, teaching and service,
34 and providing a recommendation on promotion. The subcommittee shall include at
35 least three Wagner faculty members with full professor rank.¹¹ 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.

1 subcommittee members will not include scholars with whom the candidate has been
2 closely associated, such as co-author or other close associate.

3 The promotion docket prepared by the subcommittee should include:

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

11 Letters from outside evaluators shall be obtained in a manner and according to the
12 process described above for tenure review. The report of the subcommittee should
13 include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the
14 candidate, including those who declined. All communications with potential
15 evaluators should be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for
16 the selection of the evaluators who have written should be included with the docket,
17 as well as an explanation for any declinations.

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

25 Fourth, the report of subcommittee will then be reviewed by P&T Committee
26 members of appropriate rank.¹² The vote by the P&T Committee on whether
27 promotion should be granted shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the
28 Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. A report from the full
29 Committee (generally an amended version of the subcommittee report incorporating
30 any discussion or additional views from the full Committee) replaces the
31 subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket shall be made available to all
32 Wagner faculty of appropriate rank.

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

¹²In 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 a 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.

1 meeting can hear each other) are entitled to vote on promotion. A tally of the
2 number of absent members should be recorded and reported separately. The Chair of
3 the P&T Committee shall transmit the tally of the vote and a summary of the
4 discussion to the Dean and shall notify the candidate of the faculty's decision.
5 Reasonable doubt for granting promotion precludes a favorable recommendation. If
6 a reasonable doubt exists, the Chair of the P&T Committee shall indicate as much to
7 the Dean in the Chair's report to the Dean. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the
8 sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split
9 vote.

10 Sixth, the Dean will review the docket and report from the P&T Chair and transmit
11 the docket and a recommendation on promotion to the Provost. The Dean may also
12 solicit additional external reviews. The Dean will inform full faculty entitled to vote
13 on promotion of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10
14 days of submission. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the
15 faculty, the Dean will provide the faculty entitled to vote on promotion with a written
16 statement of the reasons. The faculty will then have ten days in which to provide
17 further information or counter-argument before the Dean's final recommendation is
18 made to the Provost. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write
19 to the full faculty entitled to vote on promotion and to the candidate informing them
20 of the decision.

21 In the event of a negative decision on promotion, the Dean shall provide the
22 candidate a rationale for the decision in writing. In such case of a negative decision,
23 the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the
24 University's Faculty Grievance Procedures specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook.

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

28 **IV. INITIAL APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE**

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

38 **V. PARTICPATION AND VOTING**

40 On matters related to general P&T Committee business, including development,
41 adoption, and amendment of Appointment and Promotion Standards and Procedures for
42 Full-Time Non-Tenure Track/Contract Faculty, all members of the P&T may participate

1 and vote. For development, adoption, and amendment of Promotion and Tenure
2 Standards and Procedures and for recommendations on award of tenure, participation and
3 voting shall be limited to tenured faculty members. For recommendations on promotion
4 to full professor, participation and voting shall be limited to tenured full professors.

1 **APPENDIX: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS**

2
3 **TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW**

4
5 Dear xxxx:

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

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

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

30
31 We would like your letter by [insert date], sooner if possible. The University's promotion
32 procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current curriculum vitae
33 . Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you
34 have known the candidate.

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

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

42
43 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 by [insert date], sooner if possible. The University's promotion
31 and tenure procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current
32 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,