MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 14, 2011

The New York University Faculty Senators Council (FSC) met at noon on Thursday, April 14, 2011 in Room 405 in the Kimmel Center for University Life.

In attendance were Senators Bogart, Capan, Cappell, David, Fernandez, Gale, Goldman, Hammack, Harrington, Hutchins, Jones, Karl, Kovner, Lebowitz, Magder, Monaco, Moran, Nolan, Phillips, Raiken, Schacht, Simon, Sternhell, Sundaram, Thompson, Tranchina, Van Devanter, Wachtel, and Zwanziger and Alternate Senators Deneys-Tunney, Newman, Reiss, and Tannenbaum. FSC Consultant/Advisor Al-Askari attended as a guest. Senior Vice Provost Paul Horn attended as a special guest.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD MARCH 10, 2011

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the March 10, 2011 meeting were approved unanimously.

PRESENTATION BY SPECIAL GUEST PAUL HORN

Senior Vice Provost for Research Paul Horn discussed the focus and new research initiatives of the NYU Office of Research. The Office is responsible for supporting and growing the research enterprise at NYU. See attached Document A. Research at NYU is a 330 million dollars per year enterprise and 2/3 takes place at the School of Medicine (SOM) and 1/3 at Washington Square. The top university for research is John Hopkins at 1.6 billion dollars spent annually on research. NYU ranks 60th nationwide. NYU has an increased focus on industrial sponsored research, which Horn stated tends to be cross-disciplinary and stimulates research in some of the most productive new arenas of science. Horn described industrial sponsored research in terms of Pasteur's Quadrant by Donald Stokes, which focuses on fundamental research, underlying principles, and solving problems of society.

Horn discussed the new initiatives currently being pursued by NYU. The first is a response to the Bloomberg administration's request for an applied science facility in New York City. He stated 18 universities and university consortiums from all over the world responded. The city suggested four sites for the facility, including Staten island, Brooklyn Navy Yard, Governors Island, and Roosevelt island. Stanford University's proposal is a 1.2 billion dollar project on Roosevelt Island. NYU’s joint proposal with Carnegie Mellon, CUNY, and the University of Toronto—suggested a number of locations including Roosevelt Island and a location adjacent to the Metro Tech center—focuses on science and technology, attracting industrial sponsors and advancing understanding of urban issues. The proposal included a request for the city to support prototype projects to use in the city’s own infrastructure. Examples of project areas include healthcare management, disaster recovery, water systems, and the environment.

The second initiative is the Abu Dhabi Innovation Institute, which would be funded by the aerospace firms with “offset responsibilities” in Abu Dhabi and with support of the Abu Dhabi government. It is offset driven and collaboratory with aerospace companies and a shared
innovation and intellectual property model. There is the possibility for the Institute to generate research opportunities for the Square. Chair-Elect Magder asked if NYU has a policy on military-related research. Horn responded the policy states that all research must be open, publishable, and contain a basic research component. He also noted research at Abu Dhabi must comply with NYU and local rules.

The third initiative is the focus on entrepreneurship at NYU which includes a new venture fund, new managing director, tech expos, and 13 student organizations related to entrepreneurship with over 4,000 students involved. For more information: [http://www.nyu.edu/about/university-initiatives/entrepreneurship.html](http://www.nyu.edu/about/university-initiatives/entrepreneurship.html)

Horn concluded by stating that NYU’s position in and of the city provides opportunities to impact cities and regions around the world through these initiatives. Senator Karl expressed concern over the bias towards science and technology rather than humanities or social science. Horn stated that while he sees the biggest opportunity for growth is in the science and technology field, assured those in the humanities and social sciences that the University continues to support research in these areas.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR FSC VICE CHAIR AND SECRETARY 2011-2012**

The Nominating Committee presented the slate for candidates for Vice Chair: Daniel Zwanziger from Faculty of Arts and Science and Carol Reiss from Faculty of Arts and Science and the slate of candidates for Secretary: Mary Ann Jones from the School of Social Work and Nancy Van Devanter from College of Nursing.

Senator Bogart provided a nomination from the floor for Marie Monaco from the School of Medicine for the position of Vice Chair. Advisor Al-Askari stated that when a nomination comes from the floor, the name is automatically added to the slate.

Senator Harrington expressed concern over an Alternate running for a position on the Executive Committee. She stated this is because Alternate Senators do not have the same role as Senators, such as they can not vote or normally serve as committee chairs. She was informed by Former Chair Black that an alternate has never been on the Executive Committee.

Alternate Senator Reiss clarified that she is an Alternate Senator-At-Large and not an Alternate Faculty of Arts and Science Senator.

The Nominating Committee will meet to discuss this issue and will communicate their decision to the FSC.

**REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON: ROBERT SCHACHT**

Chairperson Schacht informed the Council that the Former Chairs Dinner took place on Thursday, March 24 at the Torch Club. He stated at the dinner there was a discussion concerning sending information, such as resolutions, via email to all faculty. This issue will be revisited by the Council. Schacht also reminded the Council that the Year End Dinner is Tuesday, May 10 at Battery Gardens Restaurant.

**FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Governance Committee: Senator Harrington
See attached Document B. Senator Harrington presented the Committee’s resolutions regarding shared governance. She clarified that the Committee devised the four basic features of shared governance: representation, information, consultation, and reasoned justifications after spending the year studying shared governance and searching for best practices. The Committee investigated governance at major research 1 universities, including six private and one public institution by contacting their respective faculty senate councils. She commented that two additional useful resources on shared governance include the Chronicle of Higher Education and AAUP.

The Council discussed the practice of a code of confidentiality also known as “deliberative privilege” used at times in task force or committee settings. Senator Jones stated that deliberative privilege has been used against the FSC, particularly in regards to benefits and branch campus issues. Immediate Past Chair Hammack stated when he has witnessed the use of deliberative privilege, business, transactions with other parties, or negotiations were involved that could be threatened by information being distributed. He suggested including this exception to the resolution. Senator Nolan expressed concern that the administration could assign many discussions to the category of transactions. Hammack added the Council may need to follow the confidentiality agreement or be denied membership on these task forces. Chair-Elect Magder suggested allowing attendees to report the substance of the meetings, but not attribute comments to specific individuals.

Harrington stated the Committee hopes these four resolutions will be added to the Faculty Handbook. Vice Chair Zwanziger commented many of these items already are in the handbook. Harrington responded these resolutions outline a clear procedural process regarding shared governance, which is not clarified in the Handbook. Senator Monaco stated there has been a failure of shared governance, which is the reason for these resolutions. Upon a motion duly made and seconded the Council approved unanimously by a vote of 29 senators the sentiment of these resolutions and agreed the final text will be reviewed at the next FSC meeting.

Tenure Modifications Committee: Senator Monaco

See attached Documents C and D. Senator Monaco presented the Committee’s review of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (ISAW) and the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Institute of Fine Arts (IFA). In the ISAW document, the Committee suggested recommending that 1 member of ad hoc Faculty Review Committee be appointed by someone other than Director, such as the Dean of FAS. They also suggested that the Director not attend the meeting of the Faculty Review Committee and the vote of the Committee members be by closed ballot and reported by numbers. Finally they suggested the Director must forward the report of the Committee as well as the results of the closed vote to the Provost. Alternate Senator Tannenbaum asked about the Director’s reporting structure, which Monaco will investigate. The Committee’s main inquiry regarding the IFA document concerns the reason to submit guidelines and which guidelines are currently in use. Monaco will follow-up on these questions and report back at the next FSC meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 PM.
NYU Research: New Initiatives

Faculty Senate Council
April 2011
NYU’s Ranks 60th Nationwide

NYU, including Medical School

NYU 2002 – 2008 growth rate = 39%
NIH 2002 – 2008 growth rate = 11.4%
NSF 2002 – 2008 growth rate = 9.5%

2008 John’s Hopkins Expenditures = $1.68B
Expenditures by School at Washington Square 2002-2008

Washington Square Expenditures by School

$ in Thousands

- FAS 60% inc.
- WAGNER 33% dec.
- DENTISTRY 118% inc.
- CLMS no change
- Total 44% inc.

SoM 38% inc.
New Initiatives

- Increased Focus on Industrial Sponsored Research
  - Expands federally funded research into interesting new areas
  - Provides cohesion for inter-disciplinary programs
  - Attracts entrepreneurial faculty and students
  - Potentially stimulates research in some of the most productive new arenas of science
    - 50% of recent Nobel prizes in physics & chemistry
    - Many major academic award in math & other fields

Pasteur’s Quadrant

Quest for fundamental understanding

Yes

No

Consideration of use

Yes

No

Bohr’s Quadrant
(Pure Basic Research)

Hobbyist’s Quadrant

Edison’s Quadrant
(Pure Applied Research)

Pasteur’s Quadrant
(Use-inspired Basic Research)

Donald E Stokes
New Initiatives

- Response to NYC’s desire to create an Applied Science Facility

- Abu Dhabi Innovation Institute
  - “Offset” driven “Collaboratory” with aerospace companies
  - Open (shared) innovation and intellectual property model
  - Initial Scope
    - Distributed energy
    - Visualization
    - Autonomic systems
    - Systems Engineering
  - Target expense stream to grow to be approximately $20 million per year or about $160-180 million over ten years

- Establish a focus on entrepreneurship
  - Create Venture Fund
  - Business plan competitions
  - Tech expos
  - Mentorship and student organizations
Entrepreneurship

It’s happening at NYU.

The most complex problems will yield only to a combination of the deepest insights and the boldest willingness to act. So, entrepreneurship occupies a special place at universities: the span of higher education’s research enterprise and the interests of its scholars to advance human knowledge not only through inquiry into the fundamental nature of things,
March 10, 2011

TO: Faculty Senate Council

FROM: FSC- Governance Committee (FSC-GC)

Christine Harrington christine.harrington@nyu.edu, Chair
Bruce Bogart bogarb01@nyumc.org
Anthony Kovner anthony.kovner@nyu.edu
Carl Lebowitz carl.lebowitz@nyu.edu
Marie Monaco mem6@nyumc.org
Eric Simon eric.simon@nyu.edu
Daniel Zwanziger daniel.zwanziger@nyu.edu

RE: Report and Proposed Resolutions

A.Proposed Reply to SOM’s Feb. 17, 2011 Letter (aka Dr. Landau’s Letter)

Dear Dr. Landau:

Thank you for your letter of February 17, 2011.

In response, we would like to let you know that NYU’s Faculty Senators Council (FSC) is a University-wide body whose jurisdiction is defined by University Bylaw 41(c) as follows:

The Faculty Senators Council may consider any matters of educational and administrative policy and shall function as the Faculty Personnel Committee of the Senate.

The FSC recognizes senators, elected to the FSC by the voting faculty of Schools, as the official representatives of Schools. Committees within Schools, such as the Benefits and Tenure Committee of the Faculty Council at the School of Medicine, do not have standing to override FSC Resolutions.

That being said, we would like to keep channels of communication open with all the Schools.

Sincerely,
B. Governance Committee Report

1. Administrative Accountability on Shared Governance

As part of the FSC-GC’s on going role, we have established an **Accountability Ledger**. The purpose of the Accountability Ledger is to track incidents we know of where established practices and procedures of shared governance have not been followed by the Administration, as well as incidents where there is compliance.

Some examples of a lack of shared governance FSC-GC has discussed include:

- The BD of Trustees did not follow University procedures to “consult with faculty” in the appointment of the current President, nor were they followed when the BD of Trustee unilaterally reappointed him to this office.
- Appointing faculty who are not elected, appointed, or even vetted by the duly elected representatives of the faculty (FSC) to serve on University committee, and alleging that “faculty have been consulted” when FSC expresses concern over a policy making process.
- Requiring FSC members, as well as the random faculty the Administration appoints to University committees to pledge “deliberative privilege”, thus preventing consultation with and representation for faculty interests.
- Supporting School of Medicine threats to take away the economic guarantees of tenure established by the Faculty Handbook.
- Side-stepping the processes of “consultation with faculty” at the School level and the University level while planning and implementing academic reforms, such as the Faculty of Arts and Science Graduate Financial Aid Reform (aka FAR 4).
- Bypassing the duty to “consult faculty” with “Trustee-driven proposals”, such as the recent case of a “Trustee-driven decision” to reduce faculty-retirees’ medical benefits.
- The sudden statement from the Administration that “there is no faculty housing shortage,” after years of admitting there is such a shortage and trying to plan accordingly.
- Many faculty have expressed to their FSC representatives that they view the planning and implementation of the “Global University” and “Project 2031” as lacking adequate “consultation with the faculty” (i.e., notification, of administrative decisions, is not “consultation”).

Before an incident can be registered on the Accountability Ledger it must be carefully documented and researched. Incident reports are to be submitted to the Governance Committee with complete documentation, references and contact information so the Committee is able to verify incidents.

2. Communications (access to information) as a Governance Issues

**We Recommend:**
FSC Senators circulate, through their Schools and departments, the agreement FSC
worked out with the Administration (see Memo from Provost McLaughlin, 3/32011), which allows Senators access to NYU-Direct email for the purpose of communicating with the faculty (their constituents).

B. RESOLUTIONS on Shared Governance

There are 4 basic features of shared governance:

1. **Representation** (not “notice and comment”)

WHEREAS: Shared governance means that input from the faculty’s duly elected representatives (FSC) is central to the process of “consulting with faculty”,

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Faculty’s Senate Council will have representatives, selected by the FSC, on University Committees dealing with all matters that affect faculty.

2. **Information**

BACKGROUND: The Faculty Senators’ Council functions as the personnel committee for the faculty. As such, it is obligated to represent the faculty’s interest in dealing with the administration, and to insure that the faculty is informed on issues that pertain to them and impact their well-being. It has been common practice by the administration to impose a rule requiring confidentiality with respect to deliberations on certain topics, such as, but not limited to, benefits. This practice is referred to as “deliberative privilege”.

WHEREAS: This practice prevents the faculty from obtaining timely knowledge concerning issues that affect them, and

WHEREAS: This practice prevents the administration from obtaining valuable feedback from the faculty as a whole,

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senators’ Council does not support the practice of a code of confidentiality, also known as “deliberative privilege”, except in cases concerning information specific to individuals, whose privacy rights transcend the need for transparency.

3. **Consultation**

WHEREAS: Shared governance means seeking faculty input before decisions are made that affect the faculty and adequately responding to faculty input,
IT IS RESOLVED: That when a decision is not pressing, a reasonable length of time for consultation must be provided (i.e., during semesters this means a few weeks in order to have a regular FSC meeting). During the summer when FSC is not in session, decisions should be postponed. If a decision is absolutely necessary during the period when the FSC is not in session, then all efforts must be made to communicate with the FSC Executive Committee, who will take appropriate actions to inform all Senators.

4. **Reasoned Justifications**

WHEREAS: Deliberation is an important element of the consultation process,

IT IS RESOLVED: That the Administration will provide, in writing, its reasons for not accepting the FSC’s advice developed though the process of consultation.
Incorporates Review by Provost Office and Office of General Counsel, January 10, 2011 and
ISAW Faculty Input of January 11, 2011

Institute for the Study of the Ancient World
New York University
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The guidelines given in this document are to be read in the context of the statement “New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines” (available at http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html) and of the policy statements on academic tenure in the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.).

These guidelines recognize the special circumstances of the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World (“ISAW”), including its small faculty size and the absence of a departmental structure. Should ISAW substantially grow or change its structure, these guidelines will be modified accordingly through the same process by which they were adopted.

1. Standards.

1.1. A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in tutorial instruction, research seminars, and the direction of research in the context of a research university, together with the promise of effective contributions toward the work and intellectual life of ISAW and NYU, are prerequisite for tenure and promotion at ISAW. Once these prerequisites are met, a candidate must have a record of outstanding scholarly research and publication. In the absence of such a record, tenure or promotion will not be granted.

1.2. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure and promotion is an inquiry. Is the candidate for tenure or promotion among the strongest in his/her field, in comparison with other scholars in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of ISAW? It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses that may be improved.

2. Promotion and Tenure Committees.

2.1. Because of its relatively small size and lack of a departmental structure, the Director of the ISAW will appoint an ad hoc Faculty Review Committee for each case of tenure or promotion, with members typically chosen from ISAW as well as other NYU faculties. A recommendation is made that one member of the ad hoc committee be appointed by someone other than the director, such as the Dean of FAS. This will prevent the appearance that the process is under the total control of the Director.

2.2. In the case of initial appointment to tenure rank, the Faculty Review Committee will be composed of the tenured members at or above the proposed rank of the candidate who served on the search committee. If there are fewer than three such members on the search committee, the Director of ISAW will appoint additional members from among the eligible faculty of ISAW or
from other closely related faculties in the University to create a quorum of three. The Director will appoint a Chair of the Faculty Review Committee from among the members of the Committee, who will administer the business of the Committee.

2.3 In the case of reviews of faculty members already serving at ISAW, the Faculty Review Committee will be composed of three members at appropriate rank who will be appointed by the Director. **It is suggested that one member of this committee be appointed by someone other than the Director, such as the Dean of FAS.** If there are too few ISAW faculty members suitable for service on a particular Committee, the Director of ISAW will appoint appropriate members from other closely related faculties in the University to create a quorum of three. The Director will appoint a Chair of the Faculty Review Committee, who will administer the business of the Committee. The Director will not attend the meetings of the Faculty Review Committee. The vote of the Committee members will be by closed ballot and reported by numbers.

2.4 It is the responsibility of the Faculty Review Committee to gather the relevant materials for the case, both from the candidate and from a minimum of five external referees. All letters to outside referees are sent by the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee on behalf of the committee. The materials gathered by the Faculty Review Committee, together with its assessment of the candidate, form the docket that goes to the full tenured faculty of the Institute for its consideration.

3. **Materials included in the docket.**


3.2. Assessment of teaching performance and potential. This assessment is to be specific to the character of ISAW’s doctoral program, focusing on the leading of research seminars, the supervision of research, and the conducting of tutorial instruction. The docket may include the following information:

- Candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy and practices
- Syllabi or descriptions of seminars
- List of doctoral students directed and committees served on
- Record of observation of teaching
- Student evaluations, including letters solicited from students or former students

3.3. Assessment of the candidate’s record of contributions to the work of the Institute, of the University, and of the larger academic community, or of potential for such contributions.

3.4. Assessment of the candidate’s scholarly work. This assessment should consider not only the quality of the candidate’s published and forthcoming work but its specific suitability to ISAW’s distinctive mission. The docket should include, as appropriate, the following information and documents:

- Candidate’s statement of research aims and plans
- Copies of major and representative scholarly publications
External assessments of the candidate’s publications, including reviews
Copies of any earlier reviews (in the case of internal candidates for tenure)
List of the external referees, with brief indication of their scholarly interests and reason for their selection
The external referees’ letters

3.5 The five referees should not be scholars with whom the candidate has had a close association, such as a dissertation adviser. (Co-authors should not be included unless the association is relatively minor or unless the candidate’s work is in a narrow field where it would be difficult to find enough equally qualified referees.) The referees should be suggested by members of the Faculty Review Committee or in consultation with external experts, not by or in consultation with the candidate. In the event that five independent scholars cannot be identified, additional letters may come from scholars who have an association with the candidate, but any such connection shall be disclosed.

4. Review by the ISAW Faculty.

4.1 The docket prepared by the Faculty Review Committee will be made available to the entire tenured faculty of ISAW, except that in the case of promotion to the rank of Professor only those members at that rank may participate in the process. The faculty will vote whether to accept the recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee and will submit its recommendation to the Director. The vote must be by closed ballot and tallied following departmental custom or departmental decision.

5. Review by the Director.

5.1 The Director of ISAW is responsible for evaluating the docket and making a recommendation to the Provost. The Director will consider the recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee and the vote of the full ISAW faculty in preparing this recommendation. The director must forward the report of the committee as well as the results of the closed vote (including the number of positives, negatives and abstentions) to the Provost. The Director will inform the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee and the candidate of the recommendation. In the case of a recommendation contrary to the vote of the faculty, the Director will provide the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee with reasons for the recommendation, and the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee will have an opportunity for further information or counter-argument before the Director makes a final recommendation to the Provost.

5.2 In the case of internal candidacies, the Director of ISAW ordinarily will submit the docket to the Provost with a recommendation no later than March 1.


6.1 In the case of a Joint Appointment between ISAW and another school of the University, the Faculty Review Committee must include members selected from ISAW and the relevant academic department in the other school. The eligible faculty of ISAW and the eligible faculty of the other school shall vote whether to accept the recommendation of the Faculty Review
Committee, and the votes shall be forwarded to the Director of ISAW and the Dean of the other school, respectively. The ISAW Director and the Dean will forward a joint decision to the Provost. If the ISAW Director and the Dean find themselves in disagreement, they will discuss the case jointly and individually with the Provost.

7. Review by the Provost.

7.1 The Provost will evaluate each docket, including the ISAW Director’s recommendation. The Provost may convene an ad hoc committee to advise him or her on ISAW promotion and tenure cases.

7.2 The Provost will support or oppose the ISAW Director’s recommendation in his/her final decision and will inform the Director of his/her pending decision. In those cases in which the Provost’s decision is contrary to the recommendation of the Director, the Provost will provide the Director with the reasons and give the Director an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost issues a final decision. The Provost will notify the Director of the final decision, along with reasons for the decision if the Director’s recommendation is disapproved.


8.1 In the event of a negative decision on tenure or promotion, the candidate shall have the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of NYU's Faculty Grievance Procedures appearing at pp. 56-58 of the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.), available at http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/FacHbk2008.pdf.
Institute of Fine Arts - New York University

Promotion and Tenure

1. Introduction

The principles and procedures for tenure and promotion at the Institute of Fine Arts (IFA) of New York University (NYU) are designed to ensure high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotions and to provide a comprehensive, rigorous and fair review of the candidates. The successful implementation of these principles and procedures depends upon the leadership of the IFA Director in consultation with the tenured faculty of the IFA in conjunction with NYU’s Provost and President. IFA procedures will conform to the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, which are available at http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html.

2. Standards

2.1. A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching in the context of a research university, together with the promise of effective contributions toward the work and intellectual life of the IFA and NYU, are prerequisite for tenure and promotion at the IFA. Once these prerequisites are met, a candidate must have a record of outstanding scholarly research and publication, which may include distinguished curatorship and art criticism. In the absence of such a record, tenure or promotion will not be granted.

2.2. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure and promotion is an inquiry. Is the candidate for tenure or promotion among the strongest in his/her field, in comparison with other scholars in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the IFA? It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses that may be improved.

3. Guidelines and Procedures

3.1. Promotion and Tenure Calendar

3.1.1. In any academic year in which the IFA expects to conduct a tenure and promotion procedure, the IFA Director will submit to the Provost a tenure and promotion process calendar at the beginning of the academic year. Relevant dates include those required to guarantee adequate consideration and those that ensure the timely progress of the inquiry. These include the date by which:

* The candidate submits dossier to the Faculty Review Committee (defined below in Section 3.3.1)
* The Chair of Faculty Review Committee prepares a tenure or promotion docket and solicits outside evaluators.

Comment [NC1]: It is unclear why IFA needs to submit guidelines. What have they been doing up to now? Have they been following FAS guidelines or some variation, thereof, such as those used by Courant? As a member of FAS, it would seem that the Dean of FAS should be involved in this process.
* The eligible voting faculty of the IFA meets to hear a report from the Faculty Review Committee and to vote on the case.
* The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee submits the full docket, including the report of the Faculty Review Committee and the vote of the faculty, to the Director of the IFA.
* The IFA Director informs the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee of his/her recommendation to the Provost, and the Chair informs the candidate of the IFA Director’s recommendation.
* In the case of a Director’s recommendation contrary to that of the IFA faculty eligible to vote, the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee has ten (10) working days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Director’s final recommendation is made to the Provost.
* The IFA Director sends his/her final recommendation to the Provost.

3.2. Mandatory Review

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

3.2.2. A candidate may choose to resign during the tenure decision year. The candidate ordinarily should notify the IFA Director of the decision to resign before the Director submits his/her final recommendation to the Provost. The letter must state explicitly that the resignation was freely tendered without duress. The IFA Director will forward the letter of resignation to the Provost.

3.3. Appointment of the Faculty Review Committee

3.3.1. In consultation with the IFA Deputy Director for Faculty and Administration and the tenured faculty, the IFA Director will appoint an ad hoc Faculty Review Committee for each promotion and tenure case. The Faculty Review Committee is made up of at least three (3) members selected from the entire tenured faculty (which is authorized to vote for or against tenure at the rank of associate professor), or from among the ranks of full professors, (who are authorized to vote for or against promotion from associate to full professor). The Committee must not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate; such colleagues may, however, participate in the eligible voting faculty discussion and vote on the Committee report.

3.3.2. The Deputy Director for Faculty and Administration will chair the Faculty Review Committee. If the Deputy Director for Faculty and Administration is not eligible...
to serve on the Committee, the Director of Graduate Studies will chair the Faculty Review Committee.

3.3.3. The Chair of the IFA Conservation Center serves *ex officio* on each promotion and tenure Faculty Review Committee for Conservation Center faculty. In the case of a Joint Appointment between the IFA and another school of NYU, the composition of the Faculty Review Committee must include members of both units.

3.4. Responsibilities of the Candidate

3.4.1. The candidate must submit a dossier, which includes a *curriculum vitae* and a personal statement, to the Faculty Review Committee. The candidate’s personal statement should narrate the trajectory of his/her career. The personal statement should include a description of the relationship among works already published or distributed and a description of new projects planned or under way and should address the candidate’s teaching philosophy and the role that teaching (including particular courses) occupies in her/his career.

3.5. Promotion and Tenure Docket

3.5.1. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee must prepare a Tenure or Promotion docket for examination by eligible faculty voters and for subsequent forwarding to the IFA Director and the Provost. The docket will include the candidate’s dossier and must be made available for inspection well in advance of the meeting of the eligible faculty at which the case will be reported and discussed and the vote taken.

3.5.2. The docket must address the prerequisites for tenure and promotion, *i.e.*, the candidate’s teaching performance and teaching potential within the context of a research university and his/her record and promise of effective contributions toward the work of the IFA and the intellectual life of the IFA and NYU. Supporting evidence and documentation should take the form of a teaching and service portfolio, which may include:

* Candidate’s statement of his/her teaching philosophy
* Course syllabi
* Student evaluations
* Reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness
* List of IFA and other NYU advisees
* List of PhD dissertation candidates supervised
* List of MA qualifying papers and theses supervised
* List of comprehensive PhD examination committees
* List of PhD defense committees
* The candidate’s service record and potential contributions toward the work of the IFA and the intellectual life of NYU and the academic community.

Comment [NC4]: Why is this administrator on each committee?
3.5.3. Once the prerequisites as demonstrated in teaching and service are met, tenure or promotion will be judged and granted on the basis of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research, including, if relevant, curatorial accomplishment and leading art criticism. As evidence of such leadership in the field, the docket must include:

* Copies of the candidate’s scholarly work, curatorial publications, and/or art criticism
* Evidence of the quality of the scholarly work as appropriate, including academic book reviews, exhibition reviews in journals and newspapers of record, readers’ reviews of manuscripts, assessment of the candidate's research, curatorialship, and/or art criticism, and assessment of the candidate’s teaching as shaped by his/her scholarly and/or curatorial and critical work
* Copy of the candidate's Third-Year Review
* A list of outside evaluators, together with their scholarly credentials and an explanation of why they were chosen

3.5.4. The docket must include specific explanations for the choice of particular outside evaluators contacted, including the CVs of the evaluators and a brief statement of why the particular evaluator’s opinion matters (e.g., the evaluator is the most widely published author in the candidate’s field; the evaluator is in a different discipline but edits the premier journal in the candidate’s field, etc.). All Faculty Review Committee invitations to potential evaluators must be documented and included in the docket, as well as an explanation for each of the declinations.

3.5.5. Dockets can, and often must, include supplemental information about the candidate's work that may not be evident from the rest of the record. Examples might be reader’s reports for unpublished works, reports of grant review panels, published reviews of scholarship or curatorial works, etc. The Faculty Review Committee and/or the IFA Director may submit additional materials considered informative and relevant to the assessment of the case, under a section of the docket titled “Supplementary Materials”.

3.6. Solicitation of Outside Evaluators

3.6.1. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee will obtain at least five (5) letters of evaluation from highly qualified external evaluators. These primary evaluators may not be scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-author, co-curator, or other close associates. Nor can they be scholars who have been suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators, although they can be solicited to provide supplementary material. If the Chair inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone he/she later learns is close to the candidate in any way, this circumstance must be noted in the Faculty Review Committee report.

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

3.6.3. Evaluators must be recognized leaders in the candidate’s discipline. Evaluators must be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations. At least one of the evaluators must be a scholar identified with broader sectors of the discipline in question. The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at United States institutions; whenever appropriate and possible, evaluations must be solicited from abroad.

3.6.4. The letter of solicitation must follow the prototype set forth in Section 7 below. The letter must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate’s peers, and it must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired.

3.6.5. All evaluators must be provided with the same curriculum vitae, personal statement, and copies or descriptions of the candidate’s work. If unpublished work forms a part of the docket, the IFA must ask all evaluators to comment on its quality.

3.6.6. The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; only the Faculty Review Committee, the eligible voting members of the IFA faculty, the IFA Director and the Offices of the Provost and the President of the University must be allowed access to the letters, and they should be advised of the importance of maintaining confidentiality. In all communications with them, writers of letters must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, except as required by law.

3.7. Responsibilities of the IFA Faculty Review Committee

3.7.1. The Faculty Review Committee must present a detailed oral report on the candidate for the eligible voting faculty of the IFA. In arriving at its recommendation to the eligible voting faculty, the Faculty Review Committee must take with utmost seriousness the processes of scholarship review, comparative evaluation, peer review, teaching evaluations and excellence, and faculty colleague consultation.

3.7.2. The evaluation by the Faculty Review Committee must not ignore candidates’ defects. It must strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. 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 support. It is far more helpful to the candidate, the voting faculty and the IFA Director to have a balanced discussion of a candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.

3.7.3. The Faculty Review Committee’s assessment of a candidate’s scholarly research, curatorial contributions, or art criticism must address issues of intellectual and scholarly quality, significance, impact, and future development. The quality and significance of the journals or venues of distribution or exhibition in which the candidate’s work has appeared must be appraised. The assessment must indicate what parts of the candidate’s
work are based on the dissertation, and for such work, what advances have been made after the dissertation. In fields where external funding is important and generally available, the candidate's success at securing grants must be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development. The assessment must list and appraise the relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received by the candidate.

3.7.4. The Faculty Review Committee’s assessment must explain the importance of the candidate's field of expertise to the fields of art history and/or archaeology and/or conservation. In what ways does the strength the candidate offers in the relevant field advance the IFA’s mission and ambitions? How does the candidate’s field supplement other strengths in the IFA, and vice versa? How does the candidate’s field and performance affect the standing and visibility of the IFA, along with its attractiveness to top graduate students in the field?

3.7.5. The candidate’s position in the field and the discipline as a whole must be described as precisely as possible. This appraisal must include comparisons with other scholars both within the IFA and in the discipline at large. While most comparisons should focus on scholars at a similar career stage, promise to match the accomplishments of more senior scholars may be addressed.

3.7.6. The Faculty Review Committee’s assessment of teaching performance must appraise the quality and pertinence of courses developed, provide an assessment of teaching performance, and evaluate the candidate's contributions to the teaching program of the IFA. Specific evaluation and an analysis of the effectiveness of graduate teaching must be provided in narrative form. Evidence may be obtained both through the judgments of faculty (e.g., evaluation of course syllabi, first-hand evaluation of class sessions by either a member of the Faculty Review Committee or another tenured colleague) and through student evaluations. A list of all PhD dissertations and MA Qualifying Papers and theses supervised by the candidate, including those in progress, should be appended. A list of all the examination and PhD defense committees that the candidate has served on must also be supplied.

3.7.7. The Faculty Review Committee’s assessment of service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the IFA, NYU, and the professions of art history and/or archaeology and/or conservation. Specific comments, including testimony from fellow committee members, specification of authorship of particular reports and the like, are helpful. The Assessment of Service should also include a discussion of participation in professional organizations and institutions in the candidate’s field.

3.7.8. The Report of the Faculty Review Committee must include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined. Declinations are not necessarily a weakness: many scholars default on these responsibilities because of time pressures, even once they have agreed to evaluate.

3.8. Responsibilities of the IFA Faculty
3.8.1. The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is perhaps their highest responsibility, and the process is highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor.

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

3.8.3. The entire tenured faculty of the IFA is authorized to vote and to make a collective recommendation for or against tenure at the rank of associate professor. The vote should be reported by numbers. Faculty having attained the rank of full professor are authorized to vote and to make a collective recommendation for or against promotion from the rank of associate professor to full professor.

3.8.4. A reasonable effort must be made to enable eligible faculty on leave to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote. When a faculty member is unable to attend the meeting because of a leave or other excused absence, he or she may make his/her views known to the other eligible faculty through written communication and cast his or her vote in absentia. Such communications and votes are to be gathered and communicated to the Faculty Review Committee and the eligible voting faculty by the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee.

3.9. Presenting the Faculty Review Committee Report for a Faculty Vote

3.9.1. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee must present the case to a full special meeting of those IFA faculty members eligible to attend and vote. The Director of the IFA may attend the meeting, but should not take part in the deliberations. After a discussion, a vote must be taken and tallied. The administration of the vote is the responsibility of the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee. As the IFA faculty cherish their tradition of consensual tenure and promotion decisions, the vote ordinarily will be open. As a matter of procedure, however, the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee will offer the possibility of a secret ballot and provide materials to conduct one if the faculty decide that such a procedure would be necessary to the integrity of the decision-making process. Votes of absent members must be recorded as well.

3.9.2. Reasonable doubt for granting tenure or promotion precludes a favorable faculty recommendation. If a reasonable doubt exists, the IFA Faculty Review Committee and IFA Director must indicate as much to the Provost. While straw votes may be taken during the consensual process, a non-unanimous official vote must not be retaken for the sole purpose of avoiding a split IFA faculty vote.
3.9.3. After the meeting and the vote of the IFA faculty members eligible to attend and vote, the Faculty Review Committee will produce a detailed, written report on the case, including a discussion of the conclusions of the faculty and a numerical record of the faculty vote. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee will forward the report of the Faculty Review Committee to the Director of the IFA.

3.10. Responsibilities of the IFA Director

3.10.1. The report of the Faculty Review Committee and the vote by eligible faculty are advisory to the Director. The IFA Director may solicit additional outside letters of evaluation for his/her own use.

3.10.2. The Director will inform the Chair of the IFA Faculty Review Committee of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost. In the case of a Director’s recommendation contrary to that of the IFA faculty eligible to vote, the Director will provide the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee with the reasons. The Chair will then have ten (10) working days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Director’s final recommendation is made to the Provost.

3.10.3. The Director must forward the report of the Faculty Review Committee and vote (including the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions, if any) to the Provost with his/her own recommendation and the docket.

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

3.10.5. The Director will submit these materials along with the Report of the IFA Faculty Review Committee and the Director’s Recommendation to the Provost. This will constitute the definitive recommendation and will be accompanied by the docket and the Report of the IFA Faculty Review Committee and the faculty vote. If the date provided in the calendar submitted in accordance with 3.1.1 proves unfeasible for any reason, the Director will notify the Provost well in advance of the missed deadline.

3.10.6. Upon notification of the Provost’s decision, the Director will write to the IFA faculty eligible to vote and to the candidate to inform them of the decision.

3.11. Joint Appointments

3.11.1. In the case of a Joint Appointment between the IFA and another school of NYU, the composition of the Faculty Review Committee must include members of both units. Both units must vote on the report of the Faculty Review Committee, with the guidelines herein outlined concerning procedures and reporting applying to both. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee and the other unit Chair must forward his or her unit's
recommendation to the IFA Director and to the appropriate Dean only after consultation with the other unit. If the IFA faculty and the other unit arrive at significantly different judgments, the IFA Director and the Dean ordinarily will invite the IFA Faculty Review Committee Chair and the Chair of the other unit to discuss the case together. The IFA Director and the appropriate Dean will forward a joint decision to the Provost; if the IFA Director and the appropriate Dean find themselves in disagreement, they will discuss the case jointly and individually with the Provost.

3.11.2. When the candidate has an Associated or Affiliate Appointment in a secondary department or program, the IFA Faculty Review Committee must present the entire IFA tenured faculty with a written evaluation from the secondary department explaining, among other matters thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that program’s mission and to its administration. This evaluation may be written by the Chair of the secondary department after formal consultation with departmental or program members. The written evaluation must also be included in the IFA Faculty Review Committee’s final written report to the IFA Director.

3.12. The Role of the Provost

3.12.1. The Provost will evaluate each tenure and promotion docket and recommendation submitted by the IFA Director. In doing so, the Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation and may in unusual cases appoint an ad hoc advisory committee composed of tenured faculty in the history of art and archaeology, conservation or closely related humanities fields to seek further counsel of an advisory, non-binding character.

3.12.2. The Provost will support or oppose the IFA Director’s recommendation in his/her final decision. The Provost will inform the Director of his/her pending decision. In those cases in which the Provost’s decision will be contrary to the recommendation of the Director, the Provost will provide the Director with the reasons and give the Director an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost’s final decision. The Provost will notify the Director of the final decision, along with reasons thereof if the Director’s recommendation is disapproved.

4. Guidelines for Appeal

In the event of a negative decision, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of NYU's Faculty Grievance Procedures appearing at pp. 56-58 of the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.), available at http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/FacHbk2008.pdf.

5. Tenure Clock

The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal NYU rules adopted by the Board of Trustees. The current rules are found in the University’s statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Title I and II reprinted in the Faculty Handbook (2008 ed.) at pp.
5.1. Acceleration of Schedule

5.1.1. Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure must be 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 Provost must be consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. External letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. The Faculty Review Committee must also specifically address this issue. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the Director 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.

5.2. Stopping the Tenure Clock

5.2.1. Policies for tenure clock stoppage are set forth in formal NYU rules adopted by the Board of Trustees. These rules are found in the Faculty Handbook (2008 edition) in the Work Load Relief Policy (pp. 53-54) and the statement on Tenure Clock Stoppage for Personal Reasons (Faculty Handbook (pp. 54-55), available at http://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/FacHbk2008.pdf.

6. Additional Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor and for Tenured External Appointments

6.1. Promotion to Full Professor

6.1.1. The procedure for promotion to the Full Professorship is essentially the same as for a tenure candidate: Is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in her/his field, in comparison with scholars at similar points in their careers at other comparably prominent institutions or in other relevant settings? There is an additional 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 published and recognized work that marks significant new scholarly research and/or curatorial achievement and/or archaeological achievement and/or distinction in conservation since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate’s achievements since the last review for promotion.

6.2. Tenured External Appointments

6.2.1. For appointments at the rank of full professor with tenure, the vote and authority reside with the full professors in the IFA. For appointments at the rank of associate professor with tenure, the vote and authority reside with all tenured faculty members in
the IFA. The vote should be reported by numbers. While the IFA Faculty cherishes its long and productive tradition of consensual decisions and open, recorded votes on tenured appointments, the IFA Director will offer the option of a secret ballot, and provide materials to conduct such a procedure if the faculty decides to exercise that option.

6.2.2. The IFA Search Committee which shall have been appointed in accordance with IFA policy will obtain at least five (5) letters of evaluation from highly qualified external evaluators selected according to the principles outlined in Sections 3.5 above. The Search Committee and/or the IFA Director may 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. Evaluators selected normally will hold a tenured position as a full professor in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., museum, conservation center, or research institute). Letters solicited from individuals selected by the candidate can be included as supplementary information as long as their provenance is clearly identified.

6.2.3. It is helpful for the IFA Director’s report to include the justification for establishing or filling a tenured position within the IFA in the candidate's field of expertise. The report also must include a summary of the recommendations of the Search Committee and must identify the external referees consulted by the IFA in the search process, indicating which were suggested by the candidate and which were selected by the IFA. The report also may include letters from other Search Committee referees as supplemental materials to the docket. In all cases a full docket must be submitted.

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

6.2.5. The IFA Director will make his/her recommendation to the Provost. This constitutes the definitive recommendation and must be accompanied by the docket and the recommendation of the eligible voting faculty.

7. Sample Solicitation Letters

7.1 Tenure and Promotion Review

Dear xxxx:

Josephine Smith, currently an Assistant Professor at the Institute of Fine Arts, 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 and scholarship.
I am enclosing Professor Smith's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies and/or descriptions of her work. Of particular value to us would be your candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor Smith’s scholarly research with respect to originality, scope, and significance. We would equally welcome your consideration of Professor Smith’s potential for sustained contributions to the field and further intellectual growth. We also request explicit and specific comparisons of her work with that of the most prominent scholars working in the field of xxxx who are at comparable as well as more advanced points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor Smith’s service to and standing in the professional community, we would appreciate your thoughts on these matters as well. Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor Smith would be considered a compelling candidate for promotion and tenure in your and other leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter within six weeks. Please forward to me a current curriculum vitae as well.

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

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

Sincerely,

7.2 Sample Solicitation Letter, External Senior Appointment

Dear xxxx:

Professor John Smith of the University West at East is being considered for a tenured appointment at the rank of full professor in the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his research and scholarship.

I am enclosing Professor X's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies or descriptions of his work. Of particular value to us would be your candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor X's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, scope, and significance. We would equally welcome your consideration of Professor X’s potential for sustained contributions to the field and for further intellectual growth. We also request an explicit comparison of his work with that
of the most prominent scholars 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 professional
community, we would appreciate your thoughts 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 compelling candidate for appointment as a full professor in your or other
leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter within six weeks, sooner if possible. Please forward to me a
current curriculum vitae as well.

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

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

Sincerely