MINUTES OF THE T-FACULTY SENATORS COUNCIL MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2022

The New York University Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) met at noon on Thursday, September 15, 2022 in the Global Center for Academic & Spiritual Life at 238 Thompson Street, 5th Floor Colloquium Room with some members attending by videoconference.

In attendance were Senators Bailey, Baltacıoğlu-Brammer, Birnbaum, Chen, Economides, Fang, Hartman, Hickey, Irving, Ling, Linkhoeva, Lukose, Makarov, Miao, Miller, Nonken, Park, Quinn, Schlick, Sen, Shelley, Stimpfel, Wolff, Young, and Zelikoff; Active Alternates Merritt and Stewart; and Alternate Senators Alter (for Lu), Fleming, Rampin, Righetti (for Garg), and Schuman.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the May 5, 2022 meeting were approved unanimously.

INTRODUCTIONS

Council members made introductions.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR: DAVID IRVING

Chairperson Irving welcomed Council members. He noted the Council’s work over the summer, including forming a Grievance Committee to serve on a case and working to resolve issues around faculty returning to China during the lockdown.

He reported the Personnel Polices and Tenure Modifications Committee’s charge this academic year is to review several School’s hiring and promotion standards policies. These policies are reviewed every five years. He noted additional members can be added to the Committee if needed.

In addition, the Provost Office sent proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook for Council review. The Governance Committee is charged with this review and additional committee members can be added if needed.

Irving reported on the Middle States Review and referred Council members to Document A in the binder, which provides notes for the T-FSC on the NYU Self-Study 2024.

The undertaking of a self-study is designed to demonstrate the University’s commitment to ongoing cycles of reflection, evaluation, and improvement. The self-study has six goals to provide comprehensive evidence that NYU currently meets the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Standards for accreditation and requirements of affiliation: 1) focus on continuous improvement in the attainment of the NYU mission and institutional priorities, 2) engage the entire community in an inclusive and transparent self-appraisal process, 3) have the self-study serve as a “masterclass on nyu”, 4) provide opportunities to enhance community-wide connection with NYU’s mission, 5) enrich a collective commitment to belonging, learning and action to improve for current and future generations, and 6) emerge with a community-generated actionable blueprint for positive institutional change over the next eight years.

Irving reported that a new teaching evaluation form and assessment platform is being piloted this fall at four schools at NYU, and will be implemented University-wide next spring. Teaching evaluations are to be renamed as course feedback. The software is Explorance Blue.
Irving reported Interim Provost Gigi Dopico will attend a Council meeting this fall. President Hamilton will also attend a Council meeting to report on the search for and transition to a new President. He noted the Presidential Search Committee is undergoing a series of listening meetings to call ideas from across the University to better understand what attributes the NYU community values in a new President.

He noted the Council Committees will begin their work for the year and the Executive Committee will continue to tackle agenda items and current issues as they arise this academic year.

**PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE**

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

*See attached Documents B and C.*

Co-Chair Zelikoff presented on the Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications Committee’s review of the policy.

She reported on the five recommendations as the major points for discussion. *See attached Document B: Wagner Cover Letter.*

In response to a Senator’s question on additional letters of evaluation, Zelikoff noted the Committee felt that solicitation of an additional three letters is unnecessary and would add substantial time to the process.

In response to a Senator’s question on addressing antiquated and disparaging phrases, Zelikoff noted this is a recommendation to change terminology that is offensive or combative. It is not a change in the actual assessment.

The recommendations were approved by vote of the Council.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

**Carlo Ciotoli, Vice President, Campus Health**

Vice President Ciotoli reported the Covid-19 case count in New York City has been declining since midsummer. He noted the focus is on preventing severe cases of Covid through vaccination and medication.

He reported on the recent loosening of restrictions at NYU, including visitors being allowed to campus.

He also noted the potential lifting of the mask mandate and eliminating the testing requirement for those who have approved exemptions from vaccination.

Ciotoli reported on cases of monkeypox. The University devised a plan with the Student Health Center for rapid identification and reporting cases to the Health Department, potential treatments, and vaccination, if eligible. He noted the case count has been trending downward over the last several weeks.

Regarding the polio case, Ciotoli noted the only public health recommendation is to get vaccinated if not vaccinated. There are no recommendations for boosters.

In response to a Senator’s question on requiring the bivalent vaccine, or updated booster, Ciotoli noted they recommend receiving the vaccination, but do not have an immediate plan to require.

A Senator inquired on the visitor policy and need to upload vaccination proof ahead of time, rather than at the event door, which can have a longer turn around time. Ciotoli noted the benefit of doing ahead of time
is to ensure the proper documentation is being used and approved. He noted the issue of visitors not being able to access events the day of if their documentation at the door is incomplete.

He noted there are on-site vaccination check stations, which allow same-day vaccination verification on weekdays for visitors. Locations are the Gould Welcome Center (50 West 4th Street), 2 MetroTech Center Lobby, and NYU College of Dentistry (345 East 24th Street).

A Senator inquired on how the decision is being made for mask mandates. Ciotoli responded his recommendations come from public health recommendations. He noted the CDC looks at case counts, hospital admission rates, and hospital bed counts to access transmission risks.

Senators offered positive feedback for the Covid team’s communications, particularly the short email format.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION: NYU BOOKSTORE**

Sarah Romero McMillen, Project Administrator in the Office of the Provost, Nancy Wetmore-Mathews, Course Materials Manager at NYU Bookstore, and Karen Nercessian, Associate Vice Provost Strategy and Implementation, presented on the initiative.

The Office of the Provost has been partnering with the NYU Bookstore to improve faculty adoption rates of books, textbooks, or any course materials. Under the umbrella of affordability, this provides the Bookstore with ample time to secure the preferred textbook and leverage economies of scale. It also improves data collection on courses not requiring textbooks or materials, or using Open Educational Resource materials. She noted that the Higher Education Opportunity Act requires schools to list the required materials as soon as they are decided for a course so students have full transparency of the cost of taking a course. Lastly, she stated the importance of students being prepared for class on day 1, which benefits the overall student academic experience.

The goal is to increase the adoption rate to at least 65%. It was noted that the optimal timeframe for future semester adoptions is by the midterm of the current semester.

To select course materials, faculty can go to brightspace.nyu.edu. If a faculty member does not plan to adopt any materials, they can also inform the Bookstore through this platform.

A Senator inquired whether, if in the process of communicating book orders, the faculty member could be alerted on the book cost. Wetmore-Mathews responded faculty members can search for comparisons in the discovery tool.

**T-FSC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Reports at Meeting:**

**Faculty Benefits & Housing**

Co-Chair Ling noted the Benefits Committee met with University Human Resources to discuss the health insurance premium raises. They meet again next week to receive the final premium increase number. She noted open enrollment begins in October. She also reported on improvements in health care benefits, including no co-pays for gynecology and obstetric services at NYU Langone and improvements in infertility treatment.
Finance & Policy Planning

Co-Chair Economides reported on the success in advocating for and receiving the bonus payment to all faculty of 3% with a max at $5000. The Council thanked the Committee for their efforts.

NEW BUSINESS

Executive Committee (EC) Meetings with President and Provost

Chair Irving encouraged the Council to communicate suggested questions or topics to be added to the agendas for the EC meetings with the President and Provost.

A Senator noted the need to support faculty with young families, including expanding the Child Care Scholarship Program and the number of backup daycare days.

A Senator asked the EC to inquire on NYU’s recent purchase of a MetroTech Center office building in Brooklyn.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.
Notes for the TFSC  
NYU Self-Study 2024

Key Updates:

- Since the last update to the TFSC, there have been many significant milestones accomplished in planning for self-study 2023-2024:
  - **Spring 2022:**
    - **Appointment of self-study steering committee** - the Steering Committee is leading all phases of the self-study process. A stellar group of faculty and administrators are co-chairing six working groups oriented around each institutional priority (Impact, Research, Students - Educational Effectiveness, Students - Support of the Student Experience, Global and Policy). One steering committee role will focus on implementing opportunities to engage the NYU community throughout the study.
    - **Self-Study Preparation Site Visit** - A virtual self-study preparation site visit from our Middle States Liaison took place June 15-16. Individually scheduled meetings were held with President Hamilton, members of the Board of Trustees, the Steering Committee as well as over 100 representatives from faculty, administrative and student leadership groups from across the University, to discuss NYU preparedness for the upcoming study.
  - **Summer 2022**
    - **Appointment of Self-Study Working Groups** - The six working groups have been populated with faculty from schools and institutes across the University and from a wide array of academic disciplines. They will participate in these working groups alongside a selection of administrators and students.
    - **Acceptance of our Self-Study Design** - Middles States accepted our submission of a 40 page self-study design, which outlines our approach, leadership teams, planning, and desired outcomes of the self-study.
TFSC Involvement

- In addition to the great faculty representation on leadership teams and working groups, there are other opportunities for faculty across the University to participate in the process. All are invited to participate in community forums and information sessions that will be structured to help engage and garner feedback from the community.
- Faculty will also be asked to provide feedback on early draft of the Self-Study Narrative Report after the working groups conclude their research.

Fall Milestones/Activities

- **Announcement to the Community**: President Hamilton/Interim Provost Dopico announced Self-Study for Middle States Accreditation to the community on September 9th - signaling the official start of the self-study process.
- **Working Groups Convene**: The working groups will convene in September through March, meeting twice monthly to conduct their research and analysis and to prepare summary reports on their findings and recommendations.
- **Launch of the external website**: nyu.edu/self-study will be the official source for information on self-study 2023-2024. The site will be updated regularly with announcements, events and other opportunities to engage the community. The website also has a copy of the self-study design where you can find more information about the process.

Future Milestones

- As the study unfolds, faculty will be kept informed of significant activities and milestones: A few to keep on your radar are:
  - Participation in community information sessions Fall 2022 - Summer 2023
  - Opportunities to provide feedback self-study findings and report Spring 2023 Summer 2023
  - Participate in evaluation team site visit - Spring 2024
Re: Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures

The PPTM Committee, Co-Chaired by Drs. Judith Zelikoff and Nicola Partridge, have thoroughly reviewed the submitted NYU Wagner Graduate School of Public Service Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures revised and adopted on Dec. 1, 2021. The PPTM Committee met by Zoom to review and discuss (at length) the revised Guidelines document. As a Committee, we unanimously agreed on the edits and comments being presented to the T-FSC for discussion.

The PPTM consider the following five recommendations as the major points for discussion with the T-FSC that will be discussed in the September 15th meeting:

Number and letter sections of the document:

1. The Wagner document included numerous quotes from the Faculty Handbook and it is clear from those quotes, that there is an urgent need for an update of the Handbook, particularly to address antiquated and disparaging phrases. There are several phrases that brought this to our attention, for example: a) Introduction, Line 26, “An assessment must not ignore a candidate’s defects;” b) Introduction, Lines 27-28, “Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and “advocacy” assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration.

2. Section II. Standards and Procedures for Tenure Review, A. Standards for Tenure: Line 3, Page 5: As the subcommittee appointed by the Wagner P&T Committee and consisting of 2 tenured members appears more like a mentorship committee than a separate P&T subcommittee, we suggest it be renamed/reformatted to reflect the procedures of a Mentoring Committee, which will also be more in line with many of the other NYU schools.

3. B. Procedures for Tenure Review, #4, Tenure Review: Line 20, We suggest a timeline that considers the actual amount of time for which a colleague is considered to be too “closely associated” to serve as an evaluator; such a timeline is used by NIH in its Conflict of Interest documents.

4. Content of Subcommittee Report, Line 3: “…..views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the vote of the full committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket will be made available to all tenured Wagner faculty. It is suggested that for the sake of privacy and confidentiality that this process of sharing with all Wagner tenured faculty, be reconsidered.

5. Content of Subcommittee Report, Sixth bullet, Lines 28-30: “The NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide that the Dean is generally expected to solicit at least three additional letters of evaluation.” While this is a direct quote from the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guideline documents, we strongly feel that solicitation of an additional three letters are unnecessary (given the 6-10 evaluation letters previously requested and
acquired earlier) and would add substantial time to the process. The PPTM Committee recognizes this comment would require a change to the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, but as stated above in Point 1 it appears such action could be considered for a more up-to-date document.

Comments below in italics represent some of our added, deleted, or questioned text and our rationale for such changes. The statements and comments below are not meant to capture all of the PPTM comments which are found (in detail) on the Wagner Modification document included in the packet.

**Introduction (Pages 1, Lines 41-42):** “As is detailed below, in conducting promotion and tenure reviews, the P&T Committee will prepare a docket, including a report from the P&T Committee with a recommendation on promotion or tenure, which is then provided to tenured faculty of appropriate rank¹ who make a recommendation to the Dean.” It is unclear whether the ‘recommendation to the Dean’ is based on a vote.

**Section II. Standards for Tenure, (Page 2, Lines 20-21):** “In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.” While we recognize the phrase “will not be granted” is directly from the Faculty Handbook, we suggest a change to ‘may not’ be granted. This could also serve as a suggestion for an update to the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

**Procedure for Tenure Review, (Page 4, Line 20):** “A special, more intensive, review is conducted in the third year for faculty with a seven-year probationary period, the second year for faculty with a five-year probationary period, and early in the first year for faculty with a four-year probationary period. We feel that a review early in the first year may not only prove extremely difficult, but may not provide a clear picture of ability. Thus, we suggest conducting the review as late in the first year as possible for those with a 4-yr probationary period.

**Annual Reviews, (Page 3, Line 40):** “Scholarship/research to date (attaching publications/manuscripts under review from the current year) and a description of future plans including….” We suggest a schema of the process for annual reviews be included somewhere in the beginning of the document.

**Annual Reviews, (Page 4, Lines 19-24):** “Research and professional visibility, including presentations at conferences, public meetings, and seminars at peer schools and departments;
- The number, type, and quality of peer-reviewed articles, including consideration of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship;
- Peer-reviewed journal types and journal ranking source(s); Peer-reviewed books and monographs, if any, including consideration of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship.”

We suggest the “bulleted” guidelines include more details. We also question whether the ranking will be for journals in their field. We further suggest that “last-authorship” also be considered for visibility, as last authorship usually refers to the program leader and/or who has financially supported the project.

**Annual Reviews, (Page 5, Lines 2-3):** “In subsequent years, except for the intensive review and tenure review described below, an annual review will be conducted by a subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee.” As the subcommittee seems more reflective of a mentoring committee, we suggest that it is referred to as such and the format be adjusted to meet the criteria of a Mentoring Committee.
Intensive Review, (Page 6, Lines 23-25): “The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns raised in the report. The report shall also be made available to all tenured faculty members.” We suggest that any options open to the candidate to rebut/refute/grieve the decision be explained in this section. Moreover, The PPTM Committee suggests that this process of providing documents to all tenured faculty members be reconsidered for the sake of privacy.

Content of Subcommittee Report, (Page 10, Line 3): “….. views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the vote of the full committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket will be made available to all tenured Wagner faculty.” The PPTM Committee suggests that this process be reconsidered for the sake of privacy.
Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures
As Adopted December 1, 2021

I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

“The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is perhaps their highest responsibility. The process begins with their review, and it is highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor. To give weak advice to the…School P&T Advisory Committee or to the Dean on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at a later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an abdication of responsibility…

An assessment must not ignore candidates’ defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and “advocacy” assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration. It is far more helpful to the candidate…and the Dean to have a balanced discussion of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.

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

Pursuant to the Wagner Governance Bylaws, an Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (hereinafter referred to as “P&T Committee”) is appointed by the Dean with the advice of the Faculty Advisory Committee which is elected by the faculty. As is detailed below, in conducting promotion and tenure reviews, the P&T Committee will prepare a docket, including a report from the P&T Committee with a recommendation on promotion or tenure, which is then provided to tenured faculty of appropriate rank\(^2\) who make a recommendation to the Dean. The


\(^2\) That is, associate professors and full professors for promotion to associate professors and conferral of tenure, and full professors for promotion to full professor.
Dean reviews the docket and recommendation of the faculty, and makes a recommendation to
the Provost who has ultimate authority for the decision on promotion and tenure.

II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW

A. Standards for Tenure

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

“All candidates for tenure should demonstrate a record of outstanding achievement and
recognition in scholarly research or creative work, with wide reputations for scholarly
excellence and the commitment and capacity to stay at the forefront of their fields.
Candidates for tenure also must have distinguished records as teachers and mentors of
students. Where appropriate to their discipline, they are expected to conduct research or
creative work that has demonstrated a potential impact on policy and practice in their field.
Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must
have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research together
with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship or creative work. In
the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

The successful implementation of the Guidelines to achieve and maintain high academic
standards depends on the leadership of the Deans, the Provost and the President working in
conjunction with the tenured faculty. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an
inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in the candidate’s field, in
comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking
into consideration the goals of the...school.

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

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

B. Procedures For Tenure Review

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

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

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

2. Annual Reviews

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

- Scholarship/research to date (attaching publications/manuscripts under review from the current year) and a description of future plans including:
  - A description of the candidate’s field(s) scholarship and research;

---

3 A “primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty,” as such term is used herein, is a distinction that is made at hire or at some later point by agreement with the Dean.
4 This document contains special provisions for the Master of Urban Planning program to comply with accreditation standards of the Planning Accreditation Board.
A list of leading scholars/researchers in the field(s) of interest;
A list of journals targeted for current and future publication; and
Other information related to the candidate’s goals during the probationary period outlined below:
  ▪ Teaching activity at Wagner, with course syllabi and full student course evaluations including student comments (and any response by the candidate to those comments) attached; and
  ▪ Service at Wagner, at NYU, in his/her/their scholarly field(s) of interest, and to the public; and
  ▪ How/whether COVID has impacted the candidate’s performance, including teaching, research, and service5.

For candidates with a seven- or five-year probationary period, the review in the first year is primarily intended to:
  ▪ Familiarize the candidate with the tenure review process; and
  ▪ Set goals for the candidate for the probationary period6, including
    – Research productivity and other scholarly activity;
    – Research and professional visibility, including presentations at conferences, public meetings, and seminars at peer schools and departments;
    – The number, type, and quality of peer-reviewed articles, including consideration of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship;
    – Peer-reviewed journal types and journal ranking source(s);
    – Peer-reviewed books and monographs, if any, including consideration of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship;
    – Non-peer-reviewed articles, books, and monographs, if any, including consideration of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship;
    – Grant funding, if any, including consideration of visibility and standing in the candidate’s field;
    – Opportunities for influence on public policy, management, and planning;
    – Teaching activity at Wagner and NYU, including development of any new courses and major revisions of existing courses; and
    – Service activity at Wagner and NYU, including participation on standing, ad hoc, and doctoral committees.

These goals are expected to differ among candidates and scholarly disciplines and fields. While achieving these goals cannot assure granting of tenure, they are intended to provide general guidance on minimum expectations for the candidate for consideration of tenure and to assist subsequent annual and intensive reviews in assessing progress towards tenure.

---

5 The University recognizes that COVID may have had an adverse impact on faculty members’ teaching, research, and service performance. To ensure that the review for promotion and tenure reflects the impact of COVID, faculty are being provided an opportunity to describe whether and how COVID has affected their performance. The information provided will not negatively affect the tenure or promotion review – at a minimum, the information will be treated neutrally and, at a maximum, it may positively impact the review.

6 While these goals are for publications and activities during the probationary period at Wagner, they should take into account publications and activities prior to appointment at Wagner, and, during the review for tenure, the candidate’s full record of achievement shall be considered.
In subsequent years, except for the intensive review and tenure review described below, an annual review will be conducted by a subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee. The goal is to provide guidance to the candidate in his/her/their academic career and to monitor continuing progress towards tenure and may include revisions in the goals described above.

The annual review is pegged to the tenure clock. This has implications for the occurrence of a review under the three following scenarios:

a) If a faculty is on official (paid or unpaid) leave for the entire academic year or a portion thereof, no formal annual review shall take place.

b) If a faculty member is on workload relief with a tenure clock stoppage, an abridged review shall be conducted. The assigned P&T subcommittee will reach out to the candidate early in the year to determine and put in writing the appropriate format and requirements for the abridged review, so that this process takes into account the circumstances giving rise to the workload relief.

c) If a faculty member is on workload relief without a tenure clock stoppage, a full annual review will take place, adapting its timing to take into account the circumstances giving rise to the workload relief.

The review process typically involves one or more meetings of the candidate with the subcommittee, and the subcommittee makes a written report to the full P&T Committee characterizing its findings, including a recommendation on reappointment. The first year subcommittee report shall include a listing of the goals described above, and subsequent annual reviews shall document any changes in the goals during the review period.

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

3. Intensive Review

A special, more intensive, review is conducted by a three-member subcommittee in the third year for faculty with a seven-year probationary period, in the second year for faculty with a five-year probationary period, and in the first year for faculty with a four-year probationary period. The

---

7 In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, if the subcommittee does not recommend reappointment, the matter shall first be referred to the Urban Planning Program for consideration by Urban Planning faculty members of appropriate rank, who shall make a recommendation to the full P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall consider, but not be bound by, the recommendation of the Urban Planning faculty.
goal of the review is to assess whether the candidate’s progress toward tenure is satisfactory. The candidate’s field(s) of scholarship/research are expected to be well defined, publications to date and in progress strong, teaching and service at Wagner/NYU satisfactory, and any potential influence on public policy, management, and planning described.

The candidate will submit an updated CV and personal statement that includes the material detailed above for annual review for discussion with the subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee and meet with the subcommittee. The personal statement a description of how/whether COVID has impacted the candidate’s performance, including teaching, research, and service. The subcommittee will submit a written report to the full P&T Committee assessing progress to date and likelihood of the candidate achieving tenure status, including a recommendation on reappointment. The subcommittee shall review the probationary period goals described above and report on progress to date and on possible revisions, if any. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A brief memo (generally an amended version of the memo received by the Committee incorporating any discussion or additional views from the full P&T Committee) summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and progress towards tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is forwarded to the Dean and the candidate. The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns raised in the report. The report shall also be made available to all tenured faculty members.

4. Tenure Review

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

First, the candidate submits by September 15th of the penultimate probationary year materials required for inclusion in the tenure docket including a CV, personal statement, all publications, academic book reviews (if any), citation analysis, a list of doctoral advisees and committees, course syllabi, and full teaching evaluations for all NYU courses (including student comments, as well as aggregate rankings). The candidate’s personal statement must narrate the trajectory of the candidate’s career, including a description of the relationships among works already published, distributed or performed, a description of new projects planned or under way, and a description of the place teaching, including particular courses, occupies in the career. The personal statement should include:

- Detailed description of the candidate’s scholarship and research accomplishments, including journal rankings and citation analysis for peer reviewed publications;

---

8 See footnote 5 above.
9 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.
• Summary of teaching activity at Wagner and student evaluations;
• Description of service at Wagner and NYU (including participation on standing, ad
t hoc, and doctoral committees), as well as service in his/her/their scholarly field(s) of
interest and the public;
• Any evidence of potential influence on and involvement with public policy,
management, and planning;
• A planned research and scholarly trajectory for the future;
• A description of how/whether COVID has impacted the candidate’s performance,
including teaching, research, and service\(^\text{10}\); and
• A statement of teaching philosophy (which can be included in a separate document).

Second, the P&T Committee will appoint a subcommittee to assemble the tenure review
docket, review the docket material, and prepare a report to the full P&T Committee
assessing the candidate’s scholarly work/research, teaching, and service, and providing a
recommendation on tenure. The subcommittee shall include at least three tenured Wagner
faculty members of appropriate rank (i.e., associate professors and full professors). The
subcommittee may also include one non-voting NYU faculty member of appropriate rank
with a tenured appointment in a unit outside of Wagner and having substantive expertise in
the candidate’s field of study.\(^\text{11}\) Subcommittee members will not include scholars with
whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other
close associate, however such individuals are eligible to participate in tenure discussion and
vote.

The tenure docket prepared by the subcommittee should include:
• The materials submitted by the candidate as described above;
• Letters from the director of the candidate’s program and specialization at Wagner
  assessing the candidate’s teaching and service engagement;
• Letters from external reviewers as described below (including their CVs);
• Copies of prior annual reviews, including the third-year intensive review and any
  response from the candidate on the reviews;
• The subcommittee report;
• Such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate.

The docket provided to the P&T Committee shall include individual student teaching
evaluation comments, but a summary only of comments shall be included in materials
provided to outside evaluators or the full faculty

With respect to external letters, the New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
provide that:

The…[subcommittee] will solicit letters from a sufficient number of outside evaluators
who are recognized leaders in the candidate’s discipline, to secure at least five such
letters. These five letters must be from evaluators who are not scholars with whom the
candidate has been closely associated, such as a dissertation or thesis advisor, co-author
or other close associates. Co-authors will be acceptable reviewers only in certain fields,

\(^\text{10}\) See footnote 5 above.

In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, the subcommittee shall be
chaired by a faculty member with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty and the majority of its voting
members shall be Urban Planning faculty members.
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. Nor can they be scholars that have been suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators. If the [subcommittee] inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate, this must be noted in [its] report. The [subcommittee] may also choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the docket. These letters may be included in addition to, but not instead of, the five letters from external evaluators not identified by the candidate.

It shall be the goal of the subcommittee to receive 6-10 external review letters.

Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators - Evaluators selected normally will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory or research institute). 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; where appropriate, evaluates must be solicited from abroad.

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

The suitability of the evaluators with respect to rank, appropriateness or fit with the candidate’s field, level of expertise and leadership in the field, and absence of conflict of interest will be a consideration in review by the chair of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean and the Provost.

The letter of solicitation for external evaluation should generally come from the subcommittee chair or the Dean of the Wagner School, and must follow the prototype attached in Appendix A. 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. All evaluators must be provided with the same C.V., personal statement, and copies or descriptions of the candidate’s work. If unpublished work is part of the docket, the …[School] must ask all evaluators to comment on its quality. The docket provided to outside evaluators should include a summary of teaching evaluation including any student comments, but shall not include individual student comments.
Confidentiality of Evaluations: It is University policy to treat as confidential all evaluations of University faculty, making only such limited exceptions as are necessary to permit informed review of promotion and tenure decisions by the appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University.\textsuperscript{12}

The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; only eligible voters (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner) may be allowed access to the letters. Neither the names of writers, nor the content of the letters may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond faculty eligible to vote (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner), not even in summary form. In all communications with them, external reviewers must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, to the extent allowed by law, and that they will be seen only by faculty members entitled to vote, the Dean, and the Provost's Office.

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

The report of the subcommittee should provide a detailed summary and assessment of the candidate’s scholarship/research, teaching, service, including engagement with public policy, management, and planning. The report should address the field of expertise of the candidate and its significance to the school. 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 at similar stages in their careers in the discipline at large.

The report should not be an advocacy document, but should strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The report will generally include an explicit recommendation on whether tenure should be granted, with a detailed rationale for the recommendation. The vote by the subcommittee on any recommendation for tenure shall be by closed ballot, with a tally of the vote included in its report.

Third, the report of the subcommittee will then be reviewed by the full Wagner P&T Committee.\textsuperscript{13} The vote by the P&T Committee on whether tenure should be granted shall be by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a voice vote. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A report from the full P&T Committee (generally an amended version of the subcommittee report incorporating any discussion or additional

\textsuperscript{12}NYU policy regarding the confidentiality of external letters and other tenure decision materials is found in the Legal Protection for Faculty Members policy at http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/legal-protection-for-faculty-members.html.

\textsuperscript{13}In 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.
views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the vote of the full committee) replaces
the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket will be made available to all
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tenured Wagner faculty.

Fourth, the chair of the P&T Committee will present the case to tenured faculty of
appropriate rank at a meeting with due notice as provided in the Wagner Governance
Bylaws. A reasonable effort must be made to enable eligible faculty, including faculty on
leave, to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote. After a
discussion, a vote will be taken and tallied. The vote shall be by closed ballot. A tally of the
number of absent members should be recorded and reported separately. The Chair of the
P&T Committee shall transmit the tally of the vote and a summary of the discussion to the
Dean as described in step five below and shall notify the candidate of the faculty’s decision.
Reasonable doubt for granting tenure precludes a favorable recommendation. If a reasonable
doubt exists, the Chair of the P&T Committee shall indicate as much to the Dean in the
Chair’s report to the Dean. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of
achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.

Fifth, the chair of the P&T Committee will prepare a letter, which will be appended to the
docket, outlining the case. The letter should include comments from the full faculty
discussion, where relevant to the strengths or weakness of the case, and not repeat the
content of the P&T Committee report. The chair and all members of the P&T Committee
must sign the signature page of the docket, attesting that they have read the docket and
that it represents the opinions of the committee clearly and fairly.

Sixth, the Dean will review the docket, the subcommittee report, and the report from the
P&T Chair, prepare a report with his or her own assessment of the case, and transmit the
report, docket, and recommendation on tenure to the Provost no later than June 1st. The
NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide that the Dean is generally expected to
solicit at least three additional letters of evaluation. If the Dean has a reasonable doubt about
the excellence of the docket, the Dean should share that information in the Dean’s report and
consider withholding a favorable recommendation.

Indicators of doubt may include a split vote within the P&T Committee or School. The
report should explain, in substantive terms, what was the basis for the positive and negative
votes in earlier stages of the review. The Dean will inform the full faculty entitled to vote
on tenure of his/her/their own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of
submission. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the faculty, the
Dean will provide the faculty entitled to vote on tenure with a statement of the reasons. The
faculty will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument
before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost. Upon notification of the
Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the full faculty eligible to vote on tenure and to the
candidate informing them of the decision.

In the event of a negative decision on tenure, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in
accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedures as specified in
the NYU Faculty Handbook.
Any time on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review year, an untenured faculty member may tender a letter of resignation, effective on or before August 31 of the final probationary year. The letter of resignation must state explicitly that the resignation was freely tendered without duress. However, such faculty member shall not be eligible for a full-time appointment or position at NYU any time beyond his/her/their probationary period, as provided in Title I, Section V, Article 3 of the Statement in Regard to Academic Freedom and Tenure as set forth in the NYU Faculty Handbook.

5. Tenure Clock Stoppage

The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal University rules adopted by the Board of Trustees, and may be extended in accordance with standard University policy as set forth in the Faculty Handbook. For those candidates who have been granted an extension, NYU policy is to evaluate the productivity of the candidate as if he or she had been in probationary status for the normal duration, so that the candidate is not penalized for having received the extension.

6. Early Tenure Review

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

III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

A. Standards for Promotion

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

The inquiry for promotion to full professor is essentially the same as for a tenure candidate: Is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in the candidate’s field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers? In addition, the candidate must have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be that the new work mark significant new scholarly research or artistic achievement since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which work distinguish the candidate’s achievements since the last review for promotion.

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

B. Procedures for Promotion

The process for promotion to full professor parallels that for tenure review, with the following exceptions.

After materials have been submitted by the candidate, Wagner P&T Committee members of appropriate rank will meet to review the promotion docket to make a determination on whether to proceed with the case and seek external review of the candidate. The vote by the P&T Committee on whether to seek external review shall be conducted by closed ballot. Re voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. If the decision is not to proceed with external review, the Committee will prepare a report documenting the rationale for its decision that will be provided to the Dean and the candidate. If the decision is positive, the process will continue with the appointment of a subcommittee and the solicitation of external letters.

At every state of the process, authority to vote resides with the full professors in the school.
Any time prior to the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost, the candidate may voluntarily withdraw his/her/their candidacy for promotion from Associate to full Professor.

IV. INITIAL APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE (LATERAL HIRES)

NYU practice at all schools is for explicit written arrangements to require a tenure review at the Department, School, and University levels; their appointments are made pending completion of the tenure review and this shall be recorded in their appointment letters. Any exception to this practice requires the written consent of the Provost.

In the case of initial appointment of a faculty member with tenure as an associate or full professor, reports of any Ad Hoc Faculty Search Committee shall be considered in an executive session of the faculty meeting, with attendance limited to the Wagner School Tenured/Tenure Track and Continuing Contract Faculty and a vote shall be conducted. This vote is to recommend initial appointment, not tenure, with all tenured and tenure-track faculty eligible to vote, in accordance with Section III.B.2.d of Wagner’s Governance Bylaws. The Dean will then review the faculty’s recommendation and determine whether to pursue the hire with tenure, and, if positive, refer the tenure review to the P&T Committee.

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

For lateral hires, docket submitted to the Provost must also include a memo from the Dean describing why the candidate is an important hire for the school and a justification for establishing a tenured position in the candidate’s field of expertise.

V. CROSS APPOINTMENTS

Tenure review and third year review for faculty with appointments involving more than one unit of the University (“cross-appointments”) shall ensure the input of all relevant units.

15 See Faculty Handbook, Title II, Statement in Regard to Academic Freedom and Tenure, Section (V) (4), second paragraph: “A candidate for his or her first appointment in the rank of associate professor at New York University who has formally gained permanent or continuous tenure in another institution of higher education is subject to a tenure review at New York University at the department, school and university levels; a formal offer of an appointment with tenure can be made pending completion of the tenure review, and this condition shall be recorded in the appointment letter.” Also see Section (V) (5), third paragraph: “A candidate for his or her first appointment in the rank of professor at New York University who has formally gained permanent or continuous tenure in another institution of higher education is subject to a tenure review at New York University at the department, school and university levels; a formal offer of an appointment with tenure can be made pending completion of the tenure review, and this condition shall be recorded in the appointment letter.”

16 A summary of Cross Appointments can be found at https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/provost/documents/OAA/Cross_Appointments_GNF_2020.pdf
Evaluations of individuals with Joint appointments in more than one unit, as part of an intensive review or preparatory to a recommendation for promotion or tenure, must include an explicit discussion of the special circumstances of the appointment, expectations for the candidate's multi-disciplinary activities, perspective and position, and the judgment of how well the appointee has met these expectations. The composition of the…P&T Committee in the primary unit (division, department or program) must include members of both units. Both units must vote on the report, with the guidelines outlined above concerning procedures and reporting applying to both. Each unit must forward its recommendation to the Dean of each school only after consultation with the other unit. If the units arrive at significantly different recommendations, the Dean (where joint appointments are between schools, the Deans) will ordinarily invite the Chairs together to discuss the case. Where joint appointments are between schools, the Dean of the secondary school forwards that Dean’s letter to the Dean of the primary school, for inclusion in the docket.

Where the candidate has an Associated Appointment in a secondary unit, the School’s review must include a written evaluation from the secondary unit explaining, among other matters thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that unit’s mission. This evaluation may be written by the Chair of the secondary unit after formal consultation with the faculty members of the unit.

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

VI. PARTICIPATION AND VOTING

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

TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

Dear xxxx:

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

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

To assist in your review, we draw attention to the fact that this candidate’s dossier includes work performed in one or more years in which COVID placed severe restrictions on all faculty members. [If appropriate] Also note that the tenure clock was automatically extended for all tenure-track faculty, including this candidate, for 1 year.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
EXTERNAL SENIOR APPOINTMENT

Dear xxxx:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,