



Date: May 23, 2019

Memorandum to: Katherine Fleming, Provost

From: Wen Ling
Chairperson, T-Faculty Senators Council
A/Y 2018-2019

Subject: T-Faculty Senators Council Review: CGPH Policies and Procedures for the Appointment, Promotion and Review of Tenure for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

The T-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached recommendations regarding the CGPH Policies and Procedures for the Appointment, Promotion and Review of Tenure for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty. These recommendations were approved by the Council at the May 9, 2019 meeting.

cc: Cheryl Heaton, Dean, College of Global Public Health
Ana Abraido, CGPH Senior Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs
Carol Morrow, Vice Provost
Peter Gonzalez, Associate Provost, Faculty Appointments

Nicholas Economides, T-FSC Vice Chairperson
Amanda Watson, T-FSC Secretary

Phyllis Frankl, T-FSC Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications Committee Co-Chair
Robert Lapiner, T-FSC Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications Committee Co-Chair

Mary Killilea, C-FSC Chairperson

On behalf of the T-FSC, we are herewith forwarding the evaluations by our Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications (PPTM) Committee of the proposed policies submitted by NYU Abu Dhabi for Continuing Contract Faculty and by the College of Global Public Health for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty. The comments/questions/ recommendations for consideration are incorporated into the body of the documents. These were submitted for review and approval to the full T-FSC, and approved at our last meeting of the year.

Although we regret the length of time spent in the review process, we hope that our observations will prove of value to the respective schools.

(Please note that the PPTM committee also conferred with our counterparts in the C-FSC with respect to the Abu Dhabi proposals; in many areas, our comments align fully. Yet there were others where, as representatives of T-Faculty, though we may not have been in disagreement, we felt it was not in our purview to render a criticism or a recommendation.)

It is our strong belief that the consultations with our faculty councils represent a necessary obligation of shared governance. Because we recognize the foundational importance of these reviews, we strive to approach the review process with keen attention to and respect for the diversity of our schools and the governing framework of the Faculty Handbook. From an "editing" perspective, we are also particularly attentive to the need for clarity, internal consistency, and the avoidance of ambiguity which could lead to arbitrary applications of policies or simply conflicting interpretations of intent.

From our experience over the last few years, we would like to address some general issues that have emerged in our fulfillment of our obligations.

We honor the fact that there is no "template" that imposes strict adherence to one non-negotiable model at NYU. That would not be consistent with NYU's prized culture of academic excellence expressed through the diversity of academic missions embodied within our schools.

This said, the efforts of the standing committee over time, with different members and different chairs, are challenged by several factors. One is of course the inherent discontinuity of membership and resultant institutional memory. So in each academic year there is both a learning curve and a search for precedents from what has been reviewed in the past by our predecessors. These are necessary, however much they contribute to our efforts being less expeditious than we would like.

But there are also other factors that derive from the autonomy of the schools, and a lack of clarity with respect to the extent that individual schools may have benefitted from consideration of the efforts of other schools—whose policies have already been approved. Further we are not aware of the guidance provided by the Provost's Office prior to the elaboration of the proposed policies--and whether the concerns we occasionally raise are consistent with that guidance.

With these considerations in mind, we respectfully offer some modest suggestions that might greatly facilitate the efforts of the schools—and the responsible execution of the review process by the T-FSC: namely to provide the schools with examples of specific best practices, or at the least, Q & A guidelines that lead to greater consistency among like academic programs. Ideally, these could take the form of model policies for tenure-promotion and for continuing contract

faculty appointments and reappointments, distributed in a form that allows easy change-tracking. These models could distinguish clearly between a) those aspects of the policy that are governed by NYU as a whole, and therefore cannot be modified, and b) those that are under the jurisdiction of individual schools. For policies of type (a), details could be provided via links to other relevant documents, enabling individual school policies to be more succinct and making it much easier to maintain consistency should university-wide policies change in the future. For policies of type (b), one or two representative school policies could be listed, along with links to any relevant general policy constraints; individual schools could specify how they are satisfying those general constraints if they choose to justify their needs to deviate from the norms provided.

These are some case examples that our committee co-chairs have observed over the past several years: What happens should a tenure-track faculty not be accorded tenure, or the program in which an accomplished contract faculty member has been teaching admirably for years experiences dramatic enrollment decline which results in an academic reorganization that leads to non-renewal? In these hypotheticals, some schools affirm that once “terminated,” the candidate cannot be considered for any other position—academic or administrative—within the school. Others are silent on the issue. In view of the number of extraordinarily effective members of the university community made up administrators who had begun their NYU careers as tenure-track or tenured faculty, one could argue that closing the door altogether for further employment is short-sighted. And it’s also conceivable that a promising young tenure-track faculty member proves to be an outstanding teacher and departmental/school citizen, but falls short on expectations of research productivity. Should it be ruled out that that such an individual might become a contributing member of the clinical faculty, subject of course to the strict expectations of appointment in that capacity?

In a similar vein, in some schools, references for a promotion review exclude “in perpetuity” the usual suspects like the candidate’s thesis advisor. But some also exclude the possibility of references from individuals who collaborated in joint research projects or publications with the candidate—at any point in the past. Other policies are more accommodating, and allow letters of support from previous collaborations—provided that there has been a significant interceding lapse of time (5-10 years). (This is consistent with NSF guidelines for who may be invited to conduct reviews of major research proposals.)

Our concerns in flagging such issues is not just about reducing the likelihood of unnecessary or predictable editorial comments on future policy reviews from us. That would be nice! At the heart of our concern is the potential risks for the university, should wide disparities in practice from school to school appear arbitrary—and result in contentious grievances, not easily or favorably resolved for any party.



NYU

**COLLEGE OF GLOBAL
PUBLIC HEALTH**

**Policies and Procedures for the Appointment, Promotion, and Review
of Tenure for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**

December 4, 2018

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction

4

Section 1. Standards for Tenure

- 1.1 University Standards for Tenure
- 1.2 GPH Criteria for Appointments, Promotions, & Tenure
 - (1) Teaching
 - (2) Service
 - (3) Scholarship
- 1.3 Departmental and Program Responsibilities

5

5

Section 2. Review Process and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

- 2.1 The Review Process
- 2.2 Eligibility of Members to Vote
- 2.3 Departmental Review
- 2.4 Solicitation of Letters from Outside Evaluators
- 2.5 Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators
- 2.6 Presenting the Committee Report for a Vote
- 2.7 Recommendation of the Chair
- 2.8 Effective Departmental Reviews
- 2.9 The Dean
- 2.10 Notification of Decision
- 2.11 The Provost
- 2.12 Materials
- 2.13 The Docket
- 2.14 Guidelines for Appeal

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Section 3. Faculty Titles and Criteria for Promotions and Tenure

- 3.1 Faculty Titles and Promotions
 - (1) Assistant Professor of Global Public Health
 - (2) Associate Professor of Global Public Health
 - (3) Professor of Global Public Health

17

18

Section 4. Policies of Administration

19

- 4.1 Rank of Initial Appointment
- 4.2 Tenure Clock
- 4.3 Third Year Review
- 4.4 Reappointment
- 4.5 Cross Appointment
- 4.6 Acceleration of Schedule
- 4.7 Grieving Non-Tenure Decisions

20

21

Appendices

Appendix A: GPH CV Template	23
Appendix B: Sample Solicitation Letters – Tenure and Promotion Review	25
Appendix C: Sample Solicitation Letters – Recruitment of External Senior Faculty	27
Appendix D: Sample Solicitation Letters – Promotion Review	29
Appendix E: Timeline & Deadlines	31

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION A:

The term “docket” is used at multiple points in the document. It first appears before it is described. Later, there is some ambiguity about exactly what is in the docket at various points in the process. It initially just has documents assembled by the candidate, then later also has confidential letters from outside reviewers, then later also has a committee report, etc. We recommend adding a reference to assembly and review of a docket in the introduction, including as an appendix, a list of elements of the document broken into labelled sections, and a clarification of which sections are being reviewed by whom at each step of the process. Several subsections of these guidelines that list various parts of the docket could then be replaced by references to the appropriate sections of the list.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION B:

The organization of the document could, perhaps, be improved by restructuring section 2 to start with an overview of the process, i.e. D-PAT review, Department review, schoolwide FAP-T review, etc. The composition of the various committees (see 2.2.2 -- 2.2.4 and analogous sections on FAP-T composition) could be included at that point, allowing smoother flow through the procedure, later. This might also make it easier to refer to exceptions from the normal committee composition, e.g. those for departments with few members at the appropriate rank for review committee membership.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION C: *All votes should be by written secret ballot. This could be stated once in a section on general procedures (perhaps along with conflict of interest rules). The procedure for dealing with eligible voters who are not able to attend the meeting at which the vote is held can also be specified there.*

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION D: *A timeline including deadlines for each step of the process, including how much time each committee and each individual should have to review materials before votes, would be useful.*

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION E: *At several points in the document, expectations are expressed that Professors of a particular rank must be “recognized” nationally or internationally for their research contributions to the advancement of their disciplines. It might be useful to list in one place various forms of recognition (e.g. publication in top venues of one’s field, citations of work, impact of research results on public health practice, etc), along with a note that the specific forms of recognition considered relevant could vary for each discipline. The report of the D-PAT could then specify which forms of recognition are appropriate for the candidate’s discipline, how they are being measured, and what benchmarks are used to evaluate the candidate’s achievements on attaining such recognition.*

Introduction

This document establishes the policies and procedures for the appointment, promotion, and review of tenure for tenured and tenure-track faculty (T-Faculty) at NYU College of Global Public Health (GPH). These policies supplement applicable NYU policies. If there is any conflict between these policies and other NYU policies, the conflict shall be resolved in favor of the provisions found in NYU policies. As with all NYU and GPH policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply.

Section 1: Standards for Tenure

Section 1.1 The [NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#) address standards of tenure as follows:

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

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest within the field of interest, in comparison with other individuals at similar points in their careers?

“The inquiry for promotion to full professor is essentially the same as for tenure: is the candidate for promotion among the strongest within field of interest, 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 or artistic achievement since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate’s achievements since the last review for promotion.

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

Section 1.2 In keeping with University policy, the following are specifications of University standards for appointments, promotions, and tenure at the GPH with respect to teaching, service, and scholarship. Specific standards for tenure and promotion are discussed below (See Section 3.1).

1.2.1 Teaching

All faculty members are expected to excel at teaching at the GPH, and evidence of high quality teaching is necessary for advancement. Specifically, faculty members are required to participate in, and demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in classroom teaching, which includes lectures and seminars. Faculty members are also expected to excel at mentorship, including the supervision or advisement of undergraduate, graduate, predoctoral students, and postdoctoral trainees (where applicable). As such, every faculty member should maintain a teaching portfolio that contains information regarding this aspect of their career, which can include participation in extramural teaching activities at regional, national, and international levels.

1.2.2 Service

Faculty members are expected to provide service to their profession and community, as well as to the GPH through activities such as participation in internal governance at the College and University; engagement with community service; leadership roles and active participation in professional organizations; leadership roles and active participation on boards of organizations; and service on scientific review panels or other panels such as workshop committees of scientific societies.

1.2.3 Scholarship

Faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly research such as the publication of major peer-reviewed papers; academic books and chapters that integrate, synthesize, and extend the existing literature; the receipt of government, foundation, or other sources of funding as may be needed for the individual's research program (e.g., lab and survey costs); invited lectures on the national or international level; contributions to major scientific meetings; and editorial service on the editorial boards of prominent journals and other materials that are discipline specific.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 1 : *While the expectations of research productivity will vary according to the candidate's department and program, it would be desirable to indicate that the candidate's research should advance knowledge and/or practice in public health or some specific subdiscipline of public health.*

More information on University criteria for appointments, reappointments, promotion, tenure, and review can be found in the [NYU Faculty Handbook](#).

Section 1.3 Departmental and Program Responsibilities

- 1.3.1 A tenured faculty's power to offer recommendations and advice regarding tenure decisions is one of their highest responsibilities at the GPH.

Indeed, the integrity of the entire process (*See infra Section 2.1*) depends on the tenured faculty's thoroughness, fairness, and rigor. To give weak advice to the Dean on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance, and it is an abnegation of departmental responsibility. Departmental reports that are submitted to the Dean and the College's Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (FAP-T) Committee that fall into this category will be returned to the department with a request that the problem be corrected.

- 1.3.2 When considering a candidate for promotion or tenure, reasonable doubt precludes a favorable recommendation. Common indicators of reasonable doubt include a highly split vote, or a Departmental Promotion and Tenure (D-PAT) evaluation that fails to achieve consensus. If reasonable doubt exists, the department should indicate as much to the Dean and the College's FAP-T Committee.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 2: *Since "consensus" can be interpreted as "unanimity", we recommend removing that word. We recommend replacing 1.3.2 by, "When considering a candidate for promotion or tenure, reasonable doubt **may preclude** a favorable recommendation. Common indicators of reasonable doubt include a highly split vote at the department or Departmental Promotion and Tenure (D-PAT) committee level. If reasonable doubt exists, the department should indicate as much to the Dean and the College's FAP-T Committee."*

- 1.3.3 By right, the Dean has authority to recommend tenure decisions that are contrary to faculty advice; this power is usually used sparingly, and in a properly functioning tenure review process it should never be used.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 3: *The phrase "it should never be used" may be overly constraining. We recommend replacing it by "there should never be need for its use".*

Section 2: Review Process and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

Section 2.1 The Review Process

The review process for tenure begins at the department level. Each department at the GPH will include its own traditions and practices for making personnel and other decisions. Such practices may be followed in promotion and tenure reviews providing they conform to the review process outlined below. If not, the departmental procedures must be adapted to align with these guidelines. For example, departments with too few eligible faculty to constitute a Departmental Promotion and Tenure (D-PAT Committee) should convene an ad hoc committee, which includes

their department's entire body of eligible faculty supplemented with other eligible faculty from the College (*See infra Section 2.2.2*). If there are questions of interpretation, the department chair or program director (hereinafter referred to collectively as "department chair") should consult in advance with the Dean. At GPH, a "program" follows the same process for tenure and has governance as a department.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 4: *We recognize that the composition of the GPH draws upon departments and programs that were formerly parts of several different schools with different procedures, traditions, practices, and expectations. However, it is not clear what departmental traditions and practices that conform to the guidelines herein would be allowed. We are concerned that, as currently worded, this paragraph opens the door to department / program level procedures that conform to the letter of these guidelines, without conforming to their spirit. We request clarification.*

Section 2.2 Eligibility of Members to Vote
2.2.1

The whole tenured faculty of a department is authorized to vote and to collectively make a recommendation for or against tenure at the rank of associate professor. For appointments at the rank of full professor with tenure or for promotions to full professor, the vote and authority resides with the full professors of the department. Formal committee votes by the eligible faculty must be by a closed (secret) vote.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 5: *Slight rewording of the above paragraph to read as follows:* "The whole tenured faculty of a department is authorized to vote and to collectively make a recommendation for or against tenure at the rank of associate professor. For appointments at the rank of full professor with tenure or for promotions to full professor, the vote and authority resides with the full professors of the department. Formal committee votes by the eligible faculty members shall be by closed (secret) ballots.

- 2.2.2 The departmental review for promotion and tenure may be conducted by a committee formed by the department or by all departmental faculty eligible to vote. In large departments, it is usual for the department to establish a Departmental Promotion and Tenure (D-PAT) Committee to carry out the review. This committee may be appointed by the department chair, or it may be elected, following traditional practice in the department. Alternatively, departments with too few eligible voting faculty may establish ad hoc committees for each promotion and tenure case, or the department may establish a single committee to review all cases each academic year. In either case, the committee should consist of at least

three (3) members who are eligible to vote, as described above (See *supra* Section 2.2.1).

2.2.3 Departments with fewer than three (3) tenured full professors (for a candidate being considered for promotion to full professor) or with fewer than five (5) tenured full and associate professors (for a candidate being considered for tenure or promotion to associate professor) should consult in advance with the Dean about drawing upon tenured faculty of appropriate rank from other departments at GPH to form an ad hoc committee of at least three (3) members. GPH-affiliated faculty are also eligible to serve on the ad hoc committee.

2.2.4 The D-PAT committee should not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate (e.g., Co-PIs). Such individuals are, however, eligible to participate in the full departmental discussion and vote on the D-PAT Committee report. Spouses and partners of the candidate must recuse themselves from the entire promotion and tenure process.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 6: See General recommendation A. Also consider modifying the conflict-of-interest criteria here (and elsewhere) to allow other scholars who have collaborated with the candidate in the past (e.g. over 48 months ago, as per NSF COI guidelines) to participate. We also wonder whether the COI restriction on co-authors and co-PIs is practical at the level of the department / program review, where, one might expect the candidate to be closely involved on joint projects with colleagues.

2.2.5 The eligible voting members of the department and any other eligible faculty members involved in departmental votes (See *supra* Section 2.2.2), must be presented with the candidate's preliminary materials (See Section 2.3.1). The candidate's department chair may serve on the D-PAT Committee, but should not serve as the chair of the committee.

2.2.6 It is the responsibility of the D-PAT Committee to assemble the relevant review materials (See *infra* Section 2.3.1), to review these materials in detail, and to prepare a written evaluation for presentation to the eligible departmental faculty. The file and the written evaluation (See *infra* Section 2.3.3) should be made available for inspection well in advance of the meeting of eligible faculty at which the case will be discussed and the vote taken.

2.2.7 A reasonable effort must be made to enable eligible departmental faculty on leave to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote (See [GPH Faculty Bylaws Article I, Section 2.92](#)). When faculty members are unable to attend the meeting because of a leave or other absence, that faculty member shall be invited to make their views and opinions known to the other eligible members through written or electronic communication. No proxy voting is permitted, however. Any vote by an absent eligible faculty member regarding tenure must be recorded separately to distinguish them from votes by individuals made with the benefit of the open discussion of the case. Oral voting by an absent faculty member is not permissible, and this vote must be supported by written or electronic communication.

Section 2.3 Departmental Review

2.3.1 Materials for the D-PAT Committee

The D-PAT Committee (or ad hoc committee) must prepare a promotion and review file for examination by eligible departmental voters. It should include the following:

- (1) Candidate's current CV (See Appendix A. GPH CV template);
- (2) Candidate's statement of teaching, service, and scholarship;
- (3) Copies of candidate's key publications and other writings (up to 5);
- (4) A copy of the candidate's course listings and syllabi;
- (5) Letters from at least five (5) external evaluators (See *infra* Section 2.4);
- (6) A list of evaluators who were solicited;
- (7) Other supporting documentation (e.g., published academic book reviews of the candidate's work, videos and clinical trial protocols);
and
- (8) A copy of the candidate's Third Year Review (if applicable) (See *infra* Section 4.3).

2.3.2 The candidate's statement of teaching and research interests should narrate the trajectory of their career, and should include a description of the relationship among works already published or distributed, a description of new projects planned or under way, and should address the role that teaching (including a list of particular courses) plays in the candidate's career. The candidate's research statement should open with a one or two paragraph introduction that describes their research and scholarship in a manner that would enable a non-expert (e.g. a member of the FAP-T Committee) to understand the work of the candidate in an informative and jargon free style.

2.3.3 The D-PAT Committee will evaluate the candidate's preliminary materials, and provide a recommendation. The evaluation by the D-PAT Committee should not be an advocacy document; it should strive to

provide a fair

assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The evaluation should indicate, with specific reasons, the basis for the departmental recommendation. The evaluation should include: (1) Assessment of Teaching Performance; (2) Assessment of Research and Scholarship; and (3) Assessment of Service.

- 2.3.4 The “Assessment of Teaching Performance” report should document and appraise the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching. The appraisal of teaching effectiveness should include an analysis of the candidate's teaching strengths and any weaknesses. In the case of the latter, some indication should be given of how the department and candidate are addressing these weaknesses. The appraisal should address both undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and should include not just an assessment of teaching performance in specific courses but also an evaluation of the overall significance of the candidate's contributions to the undergraduate and graduate teaching programs of the department. The appraisal should be provided in narrative form; raw data, such as copies of an entire class's student evaluations, which is not accompanied with any analysis or explanation, is not acceptable to the D-PAT or FAP-T Committee.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 7: If the GPH has a practice of faculty observations, or another standing expectation of peer-review of teaching, it might be prudent to specify their use in this process to assure consistency of methodology and/or to identify other tools in place for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

- 2.3.5 The above instructions for what information is necessary for a candidate's teaching evaluation file apply to external candidates as well as internal candidates. External candidates are expected to submit teaching evaluations from their current institutions and should be encouraged to address teaching in their personal statements. If evaluations are not available, alternative documentation of likely teaching effectiveness must be provided by the chair of the candidate. In addition, the docket must include a description of what the candidate's graduate and undergraduate teaching contributions are expected to be and the significance of these contributions for the department.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 8: Since it is widely known that most standardized “teaching evaluations” contain inherent bias, especially for women and faculty of color and non-native speakers of English, perhaps “documentation and other evidence of teaching effectiveness” at their current institutions would suffice. In addition, some exclusion for external candidates who do not come from academia should be crafted.

- 2.3.6 The candidate should provide a list of all Ph.D. dissertations and masters students for which the candidate has been the primary advisor along with a list of other dissertation and thesis committees on which the

candidate has served. This information can be included in the candidate's CV.

- 2.3.7 The "Assessment of Research and Scholarship" must address issues of quality, significance, coherence, and future development. The candidate's written published work should be carefully read by members of the D-PAT Committee, who must jointly sign this portion of the Report to indicate their review. The quality and significance of the venues in which the candidate's peer-reviewed work has appeared (e.g. journals) should be appraised in addition to the number of publications. In the case of a book, the quality of the publisher of the candidate's book(s) should be appraised as well as the stature of the book reviews. Other important indicators of peer-review

scholarship include receipt of NIH or other similar funding to support the research trajectory.

- 2.3.8 The “Assessment of Service” should indicate the quality and significance of service to the department and the university. Specific comments, including testimony from fellow committee members and specification of authorship of particular reports are helpful. The Assessment of Service can include a discussion of participation in professional organizations in the candidate's field.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 9: *Given the administrative responsibilities that many faculty shoulder, some assessment of the impact of administrative leadership service on the candidate's level of scholarly productivity, in comparison to his or her peers, would be warranted.*

- 2.3.9 As part of their evaluation, the D-PAT should explain the importance of the candidate's field of expertise. The candidate's position in the field and the discipline as a whole should be described as precisely as possible. For example, in what ways does the strength the candidate offers in that field advance the department's current ambitions? How does the candidate's field supplement other strengths in the department, and vice versa? How does the candidate's field and performance affect the standing of the department?

- 2.3.10 In the case of new appointments to tenure (e.g. new hires, initial appointments), it is helpful for the report to include the justification for establishing a tenured position within the department in the candidate's field of expertise. The report must also include a summary of the recommendations of the search committee and must identify the external referees consulted by the department in the search process, indicating which were selected by the candidate and which were selected by the Associate Dean of Academic and Faculty Affairs in consultation with the candidate's department chair.

Section 2.4 Solicitation of Letters from Outside Evaluators

- 2.4.1 A complete docket must include a minimum of five (5) letters from outside evaluators. The letter of solicitation should come from the Associate Dean of Academic and Faculty Affairs in consultation with the candidate's department chair (See Appendices B, C, and D for sample solicitation letters). All outside letters of evaluation must be current (written within one year of the candidate's review for promotion and/or tenure).
- 2.4.2 All outside evaluators should be provided with the same published work, CV of the candidate, and statement of teaching, scholarship, and service. If there is unpublished work to be considered, the department should ask all evaluators to comment on the quality of the unpublished work.

2.4.3 The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; only eligible voters on the D-PAT Committee or FAP-T Committee should be allowed access to the letters. Neither the writers nor the content of the letters must be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond

eligible members of the department, not even in summary form. In all communications with them, writers of letters should be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence and that they will be seen only by eligible voting members of the College (e.g., D-PAT, FAP-T), the Dean, and the Provost's Office.

Section 2.5 Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators

- 2.5.1 Evaluators will normally hold a tenured position (as a full professor in the instance of cases of promotion to full professor) in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory, government agencies, or research institute).
- 2.5.2 Evaluators should be recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline. Evaluators should be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not drawn exclusively from extremely narrow interest groups or specializations. At least one (1) of the five (5) 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; if appropriate, evaluations should be solicited from abroad. External reviewers should not be solicited from colleagues of the candidate.
- 2.5.3 Evaluators cannot be suggested by the candidate; nor can the suitability of potential evaluators be discussed with the candidate. The evaluator must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or another close associate. Individuals listed on the candidate's CV as personal or professional references, are not eligible to serve as outside evaluators. If the department should inadvertently solicit an opinion from someone it later learns was close to the candidate or whom the candidate independently suggested, note of that fact must be made in the departmental report.
- 2.5.4 The candidate may identify one (1) or two (2) scholars whom they believe would not – for professional or personal reasons – provide a balanced evaluation. The candidate must state in writing the reasons for this belief. The department chair and Dean are not required to accept the candidate's request to exclude a scholar as an evaluator.
- 2.5.5 As a professional courtesy, evaluators should be given six (6) weeks to send their evaluations.
- 2.5.6 The preliminary materials submitted to the D-PAT Committee must include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined, and those, if any, identified by the candidate as inappropriate. All departmental communications (e.g.

solicitation letter to evaluators) with potential evaluators should be documented and included in the docket.

Section 2.6 Presenting the Committee Report for a Vote

The chair of the D-PAT Committee should present the case to departmental members eligible to attend and vote. After a discussion, a vote must be taken. The vote must be tallied following departmental custom or departmental decision in advance of the presentation of the report. The tally of the vote shall be included in the D-PAT report. In cases where an ad hoc committee exists in lieu of a D-PAT committee, the same process is followed.

Section 2.7 Recommendation of the Chair

- 2.7.1 The D-PAT Committee report and the vote by eligible faculty are advisory to the department chair. The department chair must forward the D-PAT report to the Dean with a copy of the department chair's own recommendation (See *infra* 2.7.2). The D-PAT report must be a balanced assessment of the candidate's performance. Dockets that do not deal with evident weaknesses, in the case of a positive recommendation, or that do not deal with evident strengths, in the case of a negative recommendation, will not be accepted. If the chair's recommendation differs in significant ways from the D-PAT evaluation, upon which the department voted, the chair must so inform the D-PAT Committee in writing. If the D-PAT Committee is not a committee-of-the-whole, **eligible** voting members of the department must also be individually informed.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 9: See general recommendation re summary of the process and contents of the dossier. Also we recommend inclusion of explanation of lacunae in the candidate's record, so they can be evaluated in the proper context at later stages of the process. We also recommend adding the qualifier "eligible" before "voting members" in the last sentence of 2.7.1.

- 2.7.2 The chair's letter 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 department 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). If the recommendation is for early tenure, the chair's letter must address the reasons or circumstances that designate it as "early" (e.g. if the candidate had prior service in the tenure track at another institution or extraordinary accomplishments) (See *infra* Section 4.6).
- 2.7.3 For external hires with tenure, the chair must provide a summary of the department search committee report including size and composition of

the candidate pool.

- 2.7.4 If the department chair is an associate professor, the D-PAT Committee report for promotion only cases must be forward to the Dean. If the department chair is the candidate for promotion, the report of the

committee should be submitted by the chair of the D-PAT Committee directly to the Dean.

Section 2.8 Effective Departmental Reviews

- 2.8.1 The chair and all members of the D-PAT 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. The completed docket is then forwarded to the Associate Dean of Academic and Faculty Affairs to initiate the succeeding stages of the review process.
- 2.8.2 Properly prepared, detailed, and well-documented dockets are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the department's evaluation of the candidate. Indeed, it is the thorough and honest appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in each of the criteria (teaching, scholarship, and service) that is most useful to the FAP- T Committee and to the Dean, often more so than the final vote, for it gives substantive meaning and texture to the evaluation. Submission of dockets in a timely fashion is strongly urged in order to prevent delays from unforeseen complications that may arise, most especially for dockets received near the end of the academic year.

Section 2.9 The Dean

- 2.9.1 The Faculty Appointments and Promotions for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (FAP-T) Committee
- 2.9.2 The FAP-T Committee is composed of eleven (11) to thirteen (13) tenured members of the faculty, representing the College's eight (8) departments and programs. Six (6) to eight (8) members of the FAP-T Committee are elected by the Faculty; the other 5 to 7 members are appointed by the Dean (*See Faculty Bylaws Article II, Section 2.4*).

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 10: *The large number of members of this committee may make it difficult for the committee to deliberate. We suggest that you consider whether a smaller committee would suffice. We are concerned that the proportion of members appointed by the dean seems high. More clarity is needed regarding how the elected members are chosen: do they represent individual departments / programs or are they elected by the GPH faculty at large? If the former, how is the variation in sizes of departments / programs handled?*

- 2.9.3 The Dean or the Senior Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs serves as an ex officio member on the FAP-T Committee without vote and with voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the FAP-T Committee.

2.9.4 If there are questions in any particular promotions or tenure case, the chair of a department may be asked to attend a meeting of the FAP-T to clarify the docket or to provide additional information. The FAP-T Committee may also invite the chair of the D-PAT Committee to attend the meeting.

2.9.5 The FAP-T Committee makes its recommendation to the Dean. After receiving the FAP-T Committee's advice, the Dean will inform the department chair of the advice provided by the FAP-T Committee as well as of the Dean's own proposed recommendation to the Provost. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the department, the Dean will provide the chair of the department with the reasons. The department chair will then have ten (10) days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 11: *The case where the Dean's recommendation is at odds with the FAP-T should also be addressed. Also see general recommendation, re putting the timetable in one place.*

2.9.6 The Dean will ordinarily make this recommendation by May 15th.

Section 2.10 Notification of Decision

After receiving the recommendation of the FAP-T Committee, the Dean will forward a recommendation to the Provost and notify the department chair of the recommendation. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the department chair and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

2.11.1 Section 2.11 The Provost. **University Procedural Requirements and Process.** The Provost shall evaluate each tenure and promotion docket and recommendation submitted by the Dean. In evaluating a promotion or tenure recommendation submitted by the Dean, the Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation, and may appoint an *ad-hoc* advisory committee composed of tenured faculty to seek further counsel. The Provost shall support or oppose the Dean's recommendation in his/her final decision. The Provost will inform the Dean of the pending decision.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 11: *Add "University Procedural Requirements and Process" to the heading to emphasize that the section includes overarching University practices, not only the Provost's review.*

2.11.2 In those cases in which the Provost's decision is contrary to the recommendation of the Dean, the Provost will provide the Dean with the reasons and give the Dean an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost's final decision. The Provost shall notify the Dean of the final decision, along with reasons thereof if the Dean's recommendation is disapproved.

Section 2.12 Materials

2.12.1 Internal promotion and tenure and new hires with tenure

The submission must include the following papers in pdf format, except for books:

- (1) Candidate's current CV (*See Appendix A. CV Template*);
- (2) Candidate's statement of teaching, service, and research interests;
- (3) Copies of the candidate's key publications and other writings (up to 5), along with other supporting documentation (e.g., published

academic book reviews of the candidate's work, videos, and clinical trial protocols), which was sent to evaluators and/or reviewed by the D-PAT Committee;

- (4) A copy of the candidate's course listings and syllabi;
- (5) A copy of the candidate's Third Year Review (if applicable);
- (6) Letters from at least five (5) external evaluators;
- (7) A copy of the solicitation letter sent to evaluators (Note: Solicitation letters require Dean's approval before sending);
- (8) A list of evaluators (e.g. name, title) solicited by the department, along with rationale for choices and reasons for any who declined

2.12.2 Promotion Only Cases

The submission must include papers in pdf format.

- (1) Candidate's current CV (*See Appendix A. CV Template*);
- (2) Candidate's statement of teaching, service, and research interests;
- (3) Copies of the candidate's key publications and other writings (up to 5), along with other supporting documentation (e.g., published academic book reviews of the candidate's work, videos, and clinical trial protocols), which was sent to evaluators and/or reviewed by the D-PAT Committee;
- (4) A copy of the candidate's course listings and syllabi;
- (5) A copy of the candidate's Third Year Review (if applicable).

Section 2.13 The Docket

The submission to the Provost's Office must include the original set of docket papers and those same papers in pdf format. The docket consists of the following items:

- (1) Candidate's current CV (*See Appendix A. CV Template*);
- (2) Candidate's statement of teaching, service, and research interests;
- (3) Copies of the candidate's key publications and other writings (up to 5), along with other supporting documentation (e.g., published academic book reviews of the candidate's work, videos, and clinical trial protocols), which was sent to evaluators and/or reviewed by the D-PAT Committee;
- (4) A copy of the candidate's course listings and syllabi;
- (5) A copy of the candidate's Third Year Review (if applicable);
- (6) Letters from at least five (5) external evaluators;
- (7) A copy of the solicitation letter sent to evaluators (Note: Solicitation letters require Dean's approval before sending);
- (8) A list of evaluators (e.g., name, title) solicited by the department, along with rationale for choices and reasons for any who declined;
- (9) The recommendation of the department chair (or chairs for joint or associated appointments);
- (10) Evaluation of the D-PAT Committee, including:

- Assessment of the candidate's teaching performance (e.g., student evaluations, faculty evaluations, etc.)
- Assessment of the candidate's research and scholarship
- Assessment of the candidate's service record;
- (11) Copy of candidate's Third-Year Review (if applicable);
- (12) A list of evaluators (e.g., name, title) with rationale for choices and reasons for any who were asked and declined;
- (13) A copy of the solicitation letter sent from the Associate Dean of Academic and faculty Affairs;
- (14) Letters of evaluation of external evaluators (minimum of 5);
- (15) The recommendation of the chair of the department (or chairs if joint or associated appointments); and
- (16) Dean's letter.

Section 2.14 Guidelines for Appeal

2.14.1 In the event of a negative decision by the Dean, the candidate has the right of appeal.

In the case of all grievances, the candidate should first confer with their department chair or the Dean to seek an informal resolution or explanation of the decision. If not settled informally, the candidate may appeal to the Dean to convoke the GPH Grievance Committee, which is a standing committee of elected faculty members. Only tenured faculty who serve on the Grievance Committee shall hear grievances related to tenure. The Grievance Committee, after reviewing the case, will advise the Dean of their recommendation. After reviewing the recommendation of the GPH Grievance Committee, the Dean shall decide the case, and will notify the candidate in writing.

2.14.2 Should the Dean's decision not be satisfactory to the candidate, the candidate may appeal to the Provost within fifteen (15) days after receiving written notification from the Dean. Appeals to such decisions can be made only on the following grounds:

- (1) That the procedures used to reach the decision were improper, or that the case received inadequate consideration;
- (2) That the decisions violated the academic freedom of the person in question, in which case the burden of proof is on that person.

Where such an appeal is made, the Dean shall transmit to the Provost a report of the proceedings at the outset of the process of the appeal. The Provost shall in each case obtain the advice of a standing committee of no less than three (3) tenured faculty members selected by the Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council but not necessarily members of that body. This committee shall be called the Tenured/Tenure

Track Faculty Senators Council Grievance Committee. Further information can be found in the [NYU Faculty Handbook](#).

Section 3: Faculty Titles and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Section 3.1 Faculty Titles and Promotions

T-Faculty will carry one of the following titles:

- (1) Assistant Professor of Global Public Health;
- (2) Associate Professor of Global Public Health; or
- (3) Professor of Global Public Health.

These faculty members will expend major efforts in scholarly activity including teaching (*See supra Section 1.2.1*) and investigator-initiated research. All T-Faculty must also demonstrate effective contributions to the teaching programs, and to the College's responsibilities to the University and provide service to their respective communities (*See supra Section 1.2.2*). Finally, these faculty are expected to produce high quality scholarship (*See supra Section 1.2.3*), such as publishing in leading peer-reviewed journals, obtaining extramural funding as needed for their research, and achieving national or international recognition in their fields.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 12: Consider whether the titles should include "of Global Public Health". Other titles are generally at the level of the faculty members particular discipline or do not contain a qualification indicating the discipline.

3.1.1 Assistant Professor of Global Public Health

- (1) Rank of Assistant Professor maybe granted to those who have earned a terminal degree (or its equivalent) appropriate to the field of public health or related discipline. Assistant Professors are expected to show promise of continuing development with clear evidence of future potential to advance significantly their field of research. This may include, but is not limited to, quality first authored or co-authored publications and early career awards and funding. They should be qualified to teach in GPH and its programs.
- (2) Appointment as Assistant Professor carries with it the possibility, but no presumption of annual reappointment or the right to permanent tenure, or to further appointment or promotion at a higher rank. Although the promotion and tenure process may be initiated at any time during the probationary period, a full-time Assistant Professor in GPH who is not promoted and granted tenure at the end of the sixth year must be removed from tenure-track (with the seventh year serving as a terminal appointment); and will be ineligible for any future full-time appointment in GPH.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 13: *This would exclude the possibility that a candidate whose teaching record and service were superlative, but who might not have been productive in scholarship, could be considered for a continuing contract faculty appointment—or even a role as a highly effective administrator. Is such a categorical exclusion intended?*

3.1.2 Associate Professor of Global Public Health

- (1) The rank of Associate Professor shall be granted to those who, in addition to all the qualification for assistant professorship, have

continued to demonstrate productivity, scholarship, and research excellence as independent investigators. This may be documented by accomplishments such as significant, first or senior authorship of high quality papers in leading peer-reviewed journals, academic books and chapters that integrate, synthesize, and extend the existing literature, and success in obtaining extramural funding from government, foundation, or other sources of funding as may be needed for the individual's research program. Further evidence can include editorial boards, national/ international invited lectures, and appointments to national/ international funding reviewing panels. Associate Professors must be recognized nationally for their research contributions to the advancement of their disciplines. They must demonstrate effective contributions to the undergraduate, graduate, or postgraduate teaching programs and to the service responsibilities of GPH and to the profession.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 14: *We suggest changing the wording around, "Associate Professors must be recognized nationally ..." to indicate that in some disciplines, especially those involving international work, an international reputation might be equally germane.*

- (2) Appointment as Associate Professor carries with it the possibility, but no presumption of annual reappointment or the right to permanent tenure, or to further appointment or promotion to any higher rank. Although the promotion and tenure process may be initiated at any time, a full-time associate professor in GPH who is not granted tenure at the end of the fourth year as Associate Professor or the end of the sixth year if initially appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, must be removed from the tenure track with the fourth and seventh year respectively serving as a terminal appointment and will be ineligible for any future full-time appointment in GPH.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 15: *See recommendation 13*

3.1.3 Professor of Global Public Health

- (1) The rank of Professor may be granted to those who, in addition to all of the qualifications for Associate Professorship, have continued to demonstrate significant, outstanding productivity and research excellence as independent investigators. This must include achievements since attaining the rank of Associate Professor and may include accomplishments such as continued first or senior authorship of high quality papers in leading peer-reviewed journals, other types of achievement as outlined under "Scholarship," and success in obtaining external funding from national or other highly competitive funding agencies as needed to support their research.

Professors must be recognized nationally/ internationally for their research contributions to the advancement of their disciplines. They must demonstrate continued effective contributions to the teaching programs and to the service responsibilities of GPH and of the profession.

- (2) The rank of Professor should be granted only after careful consideration of the individual's scholarship, productivity, teaching ability, and national or international reputation among peers in the candidate's field. The rank of Professor should be granted only to faculty members who have made significant and innovative original contributions and for whom there is reasonable certainty that they will continue to make outstanding contributions throughout the remainder of their working years. The rank should never be granted as a reward of seniority and should be reserved as a mark of distinction in the field of scholarship and instruction. Notable academic achievements such as awards and prizes and membership in prestigious scientific professional societies and advisory groups can attest to this distinction. Professorial rank should never be granted solely as recognition of usefulness in administration.

DETAILED RECOMMENDATION 16: *We suggest a shift in emphasis and more positive wording, replacing "The rank should never ... instruction", by the following: "While longevity and quality of contributions in service to the school or department or university are highly valued, appointment to the rank of professor. should not consider seniority as a criterion for that recommendation. The rank may only be bestowed on the bases of evidence of the highest distinction in scholarship and instruction". Also "Professional" in the last sentence should be "Professorial" and we recommend replacing "usefulness" by "superior performance".*

- (3) For new hires who have gained the rank of Professor with tenure at another institution prior to coming to NYU, a tenure review will be conducted as swiftly as possible, ideally prior to the appointment start date or immediately thereafter.

Section 4: Policies of Administration

Section 4.1 Rank of Initial Appointment

Appointment as a member of the faculty, regardless of rank, is considered a mark of distinction and a privilege. As such, all faculty members are entitled to the respect afforded by their appointment, and all faculty members are expected to teach and contribute to the GPH community of scholars. A newly hired, full-time, T-Faculty member's title is conferred by the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs, pending a full review of their academic credentials by the following University committees and administrators:

- (1) D-PAT Committee;
- (2) FAP-T Committee; and
- (3) The Dean of the College of Global Public Health.

Section 4.2 Tenure Clock

4.2.1 The tenure clock for faculty, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees, is set forth in the NYU Faculty Handbook. The current rules can be found in the University's statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure (See [Titles I & II, NYU Faculty Handbook](#)). A faculty member may be proposed for tenure (as appropriate) at any time during the probationary period, which includes anytime from hire through the sixth year of continuous full-time service. Awarding of tenure at the College must be considered and made for a member of the T-Faculty by the sixth year for the rank of

Assistant Professor or by the third year for the rank of Associate Professor. Further information on tenure, including exceptions to this rule (i.e., extensions) can be found in the [NYU Faculty Handbook](#).

4.2.2 Stopping Tenure Clock

Tenure clock stoppage may be granted in accordance with the NYU Policy on [Tenure Clock Stoppage for Personal Reasons](#).

Section 4.3 Third Year Review

4.3.1 A mandatory, formalized review by the DAP-T Committee is to be completed in the third year of service for all Assistant Professors. This review typically is completed by the summer between the candidate's third and fourth year of service, and a copy of the full report shall be sent to the Dean. All T-Faculty members whose formal reviews are mandated by this policy shall be notified in writing, typically in March, by their department chair or program director with a copy of the letter also sent to the Dean. For those T-Faculty members whose probationary period is shortened because of qualifying previous service, the review timetable will be adjusted accordingly. If a candidate resigns by the second week of November of a given year, effective August 31st of the following year, the department need not make a submission for review. In this instance, the department chair or program director must forward a letter by November 30th, stating explicitly that the resignation was freely given without duress.

4.3.2 After the third-year review is completed by the D-PAT Committee, the Dean will meet with the T-Faculty member to discuss their chances of being recommended for tenure or promotion. If the D-PAT Committee considers the candidate's prospect of being recommended for tenure unlikely, the Dean will apprise the T-Faculty member of the D-PAT Committee's decision and will discuss the options that are available to the candidate over the remaining three years of their probationary period. For T-Faculty members whose third-year reviews are not favorable, the Dean will meet with the candidate to discuss their options. The Dean will write to the candidate within thirty (30) days after the meeting, summarizing the outcome of the D-PAT third-year review and discussions with the Dean.

Section 4.4 Reappointment

Reappointment is an annual process that takes place as indicated in the [NYU Faculty Handbook](#). Input from the FAP-T Committee with regard to reappointment at the same rank shall be limited to the first and third year reappointments.

Section 4.5 Cross Appointments

Cross-appointments may be made in one of three University approved categories: (1) Joint, (2) Associated and (3) Affiliated. Annual evaluations

of cross-appointed tenure-track faculty, particularly during Third Year Review, must be made with particular attention to the guidelines above. All evaluations of individuals appointed to more than one unit must include an explicit discussion of the special circumstances of the appointment, expectations for the candidate's multidisciplinary activities, perspective and position, and the judgement of how well the appointee has met these expectations.

- 3.4.1 Evaluation of Joint appointees in their third year of a tenure-track position must be made by an ad hoc committee consisting of eligible faculty from each unit in proportion to the commitment of the appointee to each unit. Results of this evaluation must be reported back to each unit for further evaluation and final recommendation to the Dean, in accord with GPH promotion and tenure guidelines above (*See supra Section 2. Review Process and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure*).
- 3.4.2 Third Year Review for Associated appointees must be carried out by the primary department, using its standard procedures and must include representation of the secondary unit on the review committee (typically 1/3 of its membership). The departmental review (*See supra Section 2*) from the candidate's primary unit must include a written evaluation from the secondary department explaining, among other matters thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that program's teaching and research mission and to its administration. This evaluation may be written by the department chair of the secondary unit after formal consultation with other departmental members, who are eligible to vote.
- 3.4.3 Third Year Review of Affiliated appointees must be carried out by the primary department, and may include and give consideration to written evaluation from the secondary unit.

Section 4.6 Acceleration of Schedule

Proposals for early promotion and 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 promotion and/or tenure ahead of schedule unless the case is very well justified. The Dean should 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 should be noted that external experts whose evaluations of the candidate are sought in these cases should be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. Chairs and departmental committees (e.g., D-PAT) must also specifically address this issue in the chair's recommendation and in the report of the departmental committee respectively. However, even with these affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary

and compelling, particularly in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

Section 4.7 Grieving Negative Tenure Decisions

In the event of a negative tenure decision, the faculty has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedures as described in Title IV of the [NYU Faculty Handbook](#).

APPENDIX A. NYU College of Global Public Health CV Template

CURRICULUM VITAE

1. NAME

2. DATE OF PREPARATION

3. PERSONAL DATA

Business Address and

Phone Home Address

(optional)

4. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

*Degree/Year, Institution and field of
study Postdoctoral Training*

Professional Licensure (Medical Board or Other Certification)

5. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Beginning and ending year for each previous position

(academic appointments, work, etc.)

6. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES (e.g., Society Membership and Leadership;

*Participation on Advisory Panels; Program or Project Development; Consultations;
Testimony)*

7. EDITORIAL ACTIVITIES

Peer Review Activities

Editorial Board

Membership Ad Hoc

Review of Proposals

8. HONORS AND AWARDS

Honor, Awards, Named Lectureships

9. PUBLICATIONS (list separately)

*Journal Articles (signifies peer
review) Books or Monographs*

*Articles and Editorials (not peer
reviewed) Chapters*

Other

10. TEACHING

Classroom Instruction

*Title, Course Enrollment (if Principal
Instructor) Other Significant Teaching
Advisees*

Name, Degree and Dates

Thesis Title (if applicable)

Preliminary Oral

Participation Final Oral

Participation

11. RESEARCH GRANT PARTICIPATION

Title of Grant, Dates and Sponsoring Agency

Principal Investigator and Funding Level

Main Grant Objective

Principal Responsibilities of Individual

12. ACADEMIC SERVICE

Division and/ or

Department School

University

13. PRESENTATION

S Invited

Seminars Grand

Rounds Hospital

Lectures

Moderato

r Panelist

Presentations at Professional

Meetings Scientific Meetings

Seminar Meetings

14. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Personal statement of research and research

objectives

Keywords (for sorting)

Report of Clinical and Public Health Activities and Innovation

APPENDIX B. SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS - TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

Dear XXXX:

Joanna Smith, currently an Assistant Professor at NYU College of Global Public Health (GPH), is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. At NYU, assistant professors are typically reviewed in the penultimate year of their probationary service, and successful candidates are awarded promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. The promotion and tenure guidelines at the GPH emphasize extramural evaluations of all candidates by leading scholars and professionals outside of the University. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of Professor Smith's scholarly and professional contributions, including her published and unpublished research.

Please note that in addition to research, tenured and tenure-track faculty at NYU College of Global Public Health are required to teach four (4) courses each year, and may buy-out of those courses through the collection of grant monies. In addition to their research and scholarship responsibilities, GPH faculty advise and mentor students, as well as participate in faculty governance.

I am enclosing Professor Smith's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies and descriptions of her work. It will be of 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. Evidence of scholarly achievement includes a strong and established record of high-quality, peer-reviewed publications, and externally funded research. 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. Please include in your letter a statement of how long, and in what specific capacities, you have known the Professor Smith.

Any additional comments you consider pertinent are welcome. For example, if you have knowledge of Professor Smith's teaching ability or service to the university or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well. The GPH also places an emphasis on academic integrity, collegiality, and shared governance. As such, we encourage you to share any information you may have about the candidate regarding her commitment to sustaining a positive and productive environment, which is critical for success in a university community.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether Professor Smith would be considered a strong candidate for promotion and tenure in other leading departments or schools in the field. At NYU, the process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers? Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multidisciplinary nature

of public health scholarship, please remember that a candidate's "field" may cut across several disciplines and sectors. This information should also be included in your letter, if appropriate.

We would like your letter within six (6) weeks, sooner if possible. The University's promotion procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current copy of your curriculum vitae. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. The letter will not be shared with Professor Smith. Your letter will only be made available to the tenured professors of the College, 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,

Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs
NYU College of Global Public Health

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS - RECRUITMENT OF EXTERNAL SENIOR FACULTY

Dear XXXX:

Joanna Smith, currently a tenured full professor in the X department at of X University is being considered for a tenured appointment at the rank of full professor at NYU College of Global Public Health (GPH). Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of Professor Smith's scholarly and professional contributions, including her published and unpublished research.

Please note that in addition to research, tenured faculty at NYU College of Global Public Health are required to teach four (4) courses each year, and may buy-out of those courses through the collection of grant monies. In addition to their research and scholarship responsibilities, GPH faculty advise and mentor students, as well as participate in faculty governance.

I am enclosing Professor Smith's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies and descriptions of her work. It will be of 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. Evidence of scholarly achievement includes a strong and established record of high-quality, peer-reviewed publications, and externally funded research. 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 (i.e., Professors). Please remember to include in your letter a statement of how long, and in what specific capacities, you have known the Professor Smith.

Any additional comments you consider pertinent are welcome. For example, if you have knowledge of Professor Smith's teaching ability or service to the university or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well. The GPH also places an emphasis on academic integrity, collegiality, and shared governance. As such, we encourage you to share any information you may have about the candidate regarding her commitment to sustaining a positive and productive environment, which is critical for success in a university community.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether Professor Smith would be considered a strong candidate for appointment as a full professor in other leading departments or schools in the field. At NYU, the process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers? Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of public health scholarship, please remember that a candidate's

“field” may cut across several disciplines and sectors. This information should also be included in your letter, if appropriate.

We would like your letter within six (6) weeks, sooner if possible. The University's promotion procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current copy of your curriculum vitae. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. The letter will not be shared with Professor Smith. Your letter will only be made available to the tenured professors of the College, 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,

Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs
NYU College of Global Public Health

APPENDIX D: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS - PROMOTION REVIEW

Dear XXXX:

Joanna Smith, currently a tenured Associate Professor in X department at NYU College of Global Public Health (GPH), is being considered for promotion to full Professor. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of her published and unpublished research. I am enclosing Professor Smith's curriculum vitae and her teaching and research statement with this letter. Also enclosed are copies of her selected published and unpublished work. If you need copies of any other of her published or unpublished works to make your evaluation, please let me know immediately, and they will be sent. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor Smith's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, and rate of publication, with particular attention to significant academic achievement since receiving tenure. Your comments on the scope and significance of her research and interests would be valued. We also request an explicit comparison of her with the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Please note that at NYU College of Global Public Health, tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to teach four (4) courses each year, and may buy-out of those courses through the collection of grant monies. In addition to their research and scholarship responsibilities, GPH faculty advise and mentor students, as well as participate in faculty governance.

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. Also, please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate. The GPH also places an emphasis on academic integrity, collegiality, and shared governance. As such, we encourage you to share any information you may have about the candidate regarding her commitment to sustaining a positive and productive environment, which is critical for success in a university community.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor Smith would be considered among the strongest candidates for promotion in other leading departments in the field. We will need your letter within six (6) weeks, sooner if possible. The University's promotion and tenure committee expects the department to provide biographical information about referees. I would therefore be very grateful if you could forward with your letter current curriculum vitae.

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 full professors of this department, and appropriate

decision makers and review panels within the University.

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,

Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs
NYU College of Global Public Health

APPENDIX E: TIMELINE AND DEADLINES

Internal Promotion and Tenure or Promotion only, Cases

By the first week of October (i.e., October 7th), the department chair must forward the preliminary materials in pdf format for internal promotion and tenure or new hires with tenure; as well as for promotion to full professors only to the Office of the Associate Dean of Academic and Faculty Affairs.

By the first week of December (i.e., December 7th), the completed promotion and/or tenure docket (in pdf format) must be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs from the department chair (or their designee).

For faculty with mid-year tenure, the timeline is shifted by six (6) months. For example, the relevant deadline is within the first week of April (i.e., April 7th), for preliminary materials and by May 31st for submission of completed docket.

New Hires with Tenure

NYU typically offer appointments to faculty members who come to NYU with tenure from another institution with the understanding that NYU will carry out a review for tenure. Tenure review will be carried out as quickly as possible, ideally before the appointment start date or shortly after. Ideally, department chairs will submit completed dockets to the GPH Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs no later than the second week of May. With this in mind, the department chair must submit the completed tenure docket (original and those same papers in pdf format) no later than the second week of April (i.e., April 15th). Preliminary materials (e.g. CV; statement of teaching, scholarship and service; list of evaluators; and publications in pdf format) will be needed by February 28th.

New hires with tenure may choose to delay their start date until after the tenure process at NYU is complete. Alternatively, new hires can have an initial appointment in a non-tenured position as visiting professor or as professor without tenure, with the understanding that their status will be changed as soon as the tenure process is completed. It is important that in communicating with candidates for tenured positions that they be made aware of these restrictions in the timing of our tenure review process.

TIMELINE FOR TENURE PROCESS

YEAR	ACTIVITY
YEAR 1	
September 1	Tenure-track begins. The candidate works with the Chair and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs to assemble mentoring committee
YEAR 2	
	Candidate continues to meet with their mentoring committee, usually once a semester
YEAR 3	
March 1*	Candidate submits third-year review materials to D-PAT Committee, which oversees the departmental review process and makes recommendations to the Chair.
	The Chair will oversee the departmental review process and provide the Dean and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs a written assessment of the third-year candidate.
June-August	The candidate is informed of the assessment of their third-year review, and meets with the Dean or Chair to discuss the evaluation; successful candidates complete application for a Goddard Fellowship and submit to Chair and Senior Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs.
YEAR 4	
	Candidate continues to meet with the mentoring committee, usually once a semester
	Candidates with a successful 3 rd year review, and favorable review of Goddard application receive a Goddard Fellowship for one semester during this year
YEAR 5	
	Candidate continues to meet with their mentoring committee, usually once a semester.
YEAR 6	
September	The candidate and chair meet to begin assembling preliminary material for tenure docket (e.g. CV, statement of teaching, scholarship and service, publications in PDF format) for departmental review
November 1	The candidate submits materials to the D-PAT Committee
By November 15	In consultation with the Chair, Senior Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs solicits external letters. Letters are shared with D-PAT Committee as they arrive to be added to the tenure docket.
By February 15	The D-PAT Committee submits its assessment and recommendations to the Chair.

By February 28	The Chair adds his or her recommendation to the docket and forwards docket to FAPT-T Committee for vote
By March 21	FAPT-T reviews the docket and completes its vote, forwarding a formal record of the discussion and vote to the Dean.
By May 15	Dean adds recommendation regarding tenure to the docket and forwards to the provost.
By August 31	A final decision on tenure is made by the Provost. Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the Chair and advise the candidate of the decision.

* March 31 for 2017 -2018 academic year