



**Date:** February 4, 2022

**Memorandum to:** Katherine Fleming, Provost

**From:** Darcey Merritt  
Chairperson, T-Faculty Senators Council  
A/Y 2021-2022

**Subject:** T-Faculty Senators Council Review: Revisions to the Grossman School of Medicine Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The T-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached recommendations regarding the Grossman School of Medicine Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. These recommendations were approved by the Council at the February 3, 2022 meeting.

**cc:** Steven Abramson, EVP and Vice Dean for Education, Faculty and Academic Affairs  
Joan Cangiarella, Associate Dean for Education, Faculty and Academic Affairs  
Kristen Day, Vice Provost  
Peter Gonzalez, Associate Provost for Academic Appointments

David Irving, T-FSC Vice Chairperson  
Marilyn Nonken, T-FSC Secretary

Nicola Partridge, T-FSC Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Committee Co-Chair  
Judith Zelikoff, T-FSC Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Committee Co-Chair

**From:** NYU T-FSC Senate, Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications Committee (PPTM), Drs. Judith T. Zelikoff and Nicola Partridge, Co-Chairs

**To:** T-FSC

**Date:** 1/17/2022

**Re:** New York University Grossman School of Medicine (NYUGSoM) *Guidelines for Promotion on the Tenure Track or Tenure*

The PPTM Committee, Co-Chaired by Drs. Zelikoff and Partridge have thoroughly reviewed the submitted NYU Grossman School of Medicine *Modifications for Promotion on the Tenure Track or Tenure*. The PPTM Committee met several times by Zoom to review and discuss (at length) the *Modifications* document. As a Committee, we unanimously agreed on the edits and comments being presented to the T-FSC for discussion. Please find our added text highlighted in yellow and our rationale for such changes in *italics* in each section.

## **2. TENURE STANDARDS:**

a. “Candidates are expected to publish their work in peer-reviewed journals, obtain extramural funding for their research from national granting agencies, and ultimately achieve national or international peer recognition in their fields.” **Taken into account with other variables**, “in the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.” *We suggest adding the phrase “taken into account with other variables,” as any extenuating circumstances or variables that could contribute to such a decision, should be considered.*

b. “It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined” **in total** “by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. *We suggest adding the word ‘total’ or ‘as a whole,’ as many components go into making such decisions on strengths and weaknesses.*

## **3. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III**

### **A. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: STAGE 1**

#### **A.1. Annual Review**

a. “If the decision is to not reappoint a tenure eligible faculty member the Department chair will meet with the faculty member and notify them in writing, with the appropriate required notice of non-reappointment” **not later than March 1 of the first year of academic service, if the appointment is to be terminated on August 1; not later than Dec. 15 of the second year of academic service, if the appointment is to be terminated on Aug. 31. In all other cases, not later than August 31, if the appointment is to be terminated on the following Aug. 31, or not later than 1 year before the termination of the appointment.** “A copy of the letter will be shared with the Dean or the Dean’s designee.” *We suggest adding specific timelines that are closely aligned with the Faculty Handbook.*

#### **A.2. Third- and Sixth- Year Reviews**

a. “The Chair of the Department and the DAPC will complete a formal review of tenure prospects in the third and sixth year of service for all assistant professors and associate professors in tenure tracks.” **Since the Library is on a 6-yr time clock, Curators will only have a**

3-year review as they will be considered for tenure in the sixth year. We modified the language of this paragraph as Library Curators only have a 3-year review as they come up in 6-years for tenure consideration.

### A.3. Secondary Appointments

a. “A recommendation from both Department Chairs must then be submitted to the Dean as part of the process outlined in these Guidelines. Should the secondary Department at GSOM disagree with the primary GSOM Department’s recommendation for promotion or tenure, the process can continue; however, the faculty member will no longer continue to maintain his or her secondary appointment in the secondary department at GSOM” **until the conflict between departments is resolved and a final decision is made.** *We suggest adding this phrase so as to assure the faculty member that if a favorable agreement can be reached between both primary and secondary departments, he/she would have the opportunity to return as a member of his/her secondary department.*

## B. Departmental Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (DAPC)

a. “The DAPC will consist of a minimum of three, tenured members of the departmental faculty of appropriate rank appointed by the Department Chair” **or elected** “for renewable three year terms; the Department Chair will select one of the members to serve as chair of the DAPC. If there are less than three tenured faculty members in a department, the Department Chair will consult with the Dean about drawing on”/electing tenured faculty **with appropriate backgrounds** “from other departments of the NYU Grossman School of Medicine to form an ad hoc committee consisting of three or more members<sup>1</sup>.” *We suggest including an option of election to be more closely aligned with the Faculty Handbook which states that “members of the departmental faculty of appropriate rank can be appointed or elected”...for renewable three year terms. We also suggest adding the phrase, with appropriate backgrounds to assist in the selection process.*

b. “The DAPC should not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated. For example,” **within the preceding 3 years,** “the reviewer has not collaborated with, co-authored a publication with, served on a grant in a major professional role, and/or mentored or trained the faculty member under consideration for promotion or tenure.” *We suggest including a specific timeframe (i.e., 3-years) adapted from NIH Guidelines for Conflict of Interest. We also suggest that the phrase, “closely-associated” be explained in greater detail which could be adapted from the NIH Guidelines for Conflict of Interest document. .*

## C. Preparation of the Initial Docket

a. “As evidence of outstanding achievement, the initial docket must include:..... “Copy of the written report to the candidate from the Third Year Review and from the Sixth Year Review (or reviews at an adjusted timetable as set forth herein), when appropriate, **with the exception of the Library Curator who will have only a 3-year review due to their 6-year timeframe for promotion.** *We recommend adding the highlighted sentence based on the Library Curator’s 6-year timeframe for promotion.*

### C.1. Discussion of Items in the Docket

#### C.1.1. Third and Sixth Year Review

a. “All tenure dockets, except for lateral hires, must include a copy of the written report to the candidate from the Third-Year Review and the Sixth-Year Review (or, in the case of faculty members whose probationary timetable is shortened due to qualifying previous service, the reviews completed on the adjusted timetable)” **with the exception of the Library Curator who will submit only a Third-Year Review.** *This phrase was added for*

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of these Guidelines, the processes and procedures applicable to the DAPC shall also apply to any ad hoc tenure committee that may be formed within the Grossman School of Medicine.

consistency throughout the document and for highlighting the Library Curators 6-year timeframe for promotion.

#### C.1.2. External Evaluators

a. “Referees should not be collaborators or co-investigators or those with whom the candidate is closely associated. For example”, **over the past 3-years** the reviewer has not collaborated with, co-authored a publication with, served on a grant in a major professional role and/or mentored or trained the faculty member under consideration for promotion or tenure. Moreover, any person that could raise questions regarding the **impartiality** of the reviewer should not be considered. *We suggest a specific timeline for consideration of conflict based on NIH Guidelines for Conflicts.*

*Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators:* “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.** *We suggest the added words for greater clarity of the sentence.*

### 4. DEAN’S REVIEW: STAGE II

#### A. The APT Committee

a. The APT Committee shall consist of at least ten **tenured** full professors in the NYU Grossman School of Medicine representing diverse departments across the School appointed by the Dean or the Dean’s designee for three-year terms that are renewable. *We suggest the use of the word ‘tenured’ throughout the document when referring to full professors to avoid any confusion.*

b. ““The APT Committee” **who shall be either appointed or elected** “by the faculty shall make its recommendation with respect to the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate to the Dean.” We suggest as stated above (c.f., **B. Departmental Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee [DAPC]**) *that the option of election be considered to more closely reflect the Faculty Handbook which states that “members of the departmental faculty of appropriate rank can be appointed or elected”...for renewable three year terms.*

#### A.1. Decision of the Dean

a. “The Dean will review the submitted materials and propose a recommendation to the Provost, and also inform the Department Chair of his/her recommendation. In the case that the Dean’s recommendation is contrary to that of the APT Committee, the Dean will also provide the APT Committee and the Department Chair with the reasons” **within 10 business days.** *We suggest a time period of 10 business days, based on the description in the Faculty Handbook.*

b. “The Dean will ordinarily make the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost” **within 15 business days** “in a timely manner”. *We suggest that a more prescribed amount of time be included to ensure efficiency of the process.*

#### B. Additional or Alternative Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor

a. “For promotions to **tenured** full professor, the vote resides with the full” **tenured** “professors on the DAPC and the APT Committee.” *We suggest inclusion of the word ‘tenured’ to describe a full professor throughout the document, as also suggested above for continuity (c.f., 4A.a.).*