



Date: October 20, 2022

Memorandum to: Georgina Dopico, Interim Provost

From: David K Irving
Chairperson, T-Faculty Senators Council
A/Y 2022-2023

Subject: T-Faculty Senators Council Review: Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Guidelines for the Courant Institute

The T-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached recommendations regarding the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Guidelines for the Courant Institute. These recommendations were approved by the Council at the October 20, 2022 meeting.

cc: Russel Cafilisch, Director, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences
Kristen Day, Vice Provost
Peter Gonzalez, Associate Provost for Academic Appointments

Marilyn Nonken, T-FSC Vice Chairperson
Christopher Park, T-FSC Secretary
Darcey Merritt, T-FSC Immediate Past Chair
Nicola Partridge, T-FSC Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Co-Chair
Judith Zelikoff, T-FSC Personnel Policies & Tenure Modifications Co-Chair
Karyn Ridder, Manager of Faculty Governance

From: NYU T-FSC Senate, Personnel Policies and Tenure Modifications Committee (PPTM), Judith T. Zelikoff, MS, Ph.D. and Nicola C. Partridge, BSc, PhD, Co-Chairs, Janet H. Van Cleave, PhD, RN, FAAN presenting member

Date: 10/10/22

Re: Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines For Courant Institute

The PPTM Committee, Co-Chaired by Drs. Judith Zelikoff and Nicola Partridge, have thoroughly reviewed the submitted Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines approved April 13, 2022. The PPTM Committee met by Zoom to review and discuss (at length) the revised Guidelines document. As a Committee, we recognized the considerable thought and deliberation that the Courant Faculty have invested in this Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. We reviewed the document and unanimously agreed on the edits and comments being presented to the T-FSC for discussion.

The PPTM presents these five major considerations for the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The statements and comments below are not meant to capture all of the PPTM comments found (in detail) in the Courant Institute Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document included in the packet.

1. Promotion and tenure guidelines as independent, free-standing documents that provide a guideline for tenured/tenure track faculty as they pursue promotions and tenure.

The PPTM suggested the following to help with the clarity of the document:

- *Define terms (i.e., "Director," "Department," "APTC," "Chair," and "Unit") and committees (i.e., APTC and FRC) at the beginning of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for clarity and readability of the document;*
- *Provide a figure of the promotion and tenure timeline for the Computer Science and Mathematics Department since the Departments' processes differ.*

2. A need for updates in language. The Courant document followed the New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines by stating: "An assessment must not ignore candidates' defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure, and "advocacy" assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration."(Page 2, Section 4. Guidelines and Procedures, Stages I, II, III: Departmental Review: Stage I).

The PPTM, continues to recommend updating these terms and use terms that may be perceived to have less derogatory intent, such as "weaknesses." Please note our previous call for an update of the NYU Faculty Handbook, particularly to address these antiquated phrases.

3. Elections of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committees when appropriate.

The Courant Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee is composed of "a standing committee of tenured faculty that is appointed at the beginning of the academic year by the Department Chair in consultation with the Director." (Page 2, Section 4. Guidelines and Procedures, Stages I, II, III: Departmental Review: Stage I – Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee).

The PPTM recognizes that the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide schools/colleges the option to appoint or elect the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APTC) (See the New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines page 3, Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, 2nd paragraph). However, the PPTM suggests

elections should be considered when possible to ensure appointment, promotion, and tenure committee is broadly representative of tenured faculty members.

4. Privacy of the promotion and tenure evaluation process. Eligible members of the Courant Departments of Mathematical Science and Computer Science review external letters from outside evaluators, candidate's materials, and other relevant documents as part of their evaluation process (See Section 4. Guidelines and Procedures, Stages I, II, III: Departmental Review: Stage I – Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee and Pages 3 and 7).

The PPTM recognizes that this work aligns with the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and is in keeping with some of the department's traditions. Therefore, we suggest:

- *The faculty eligible for these reviews are clearly defined in the Courant Institute Promotion and Tenure Guidelines;*
- *The review processes are undertaken with careful consideration of the balance between representative faculty participation and protecting the candidate's privacy.*

5. Clarity of the committee(s) that are instrumental in the evaluation of tenure or promotion. The Courant Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines specify that for each tenure and/or promotion case, the Department Chair, in consultation with the chair of the APTC, appoints at least three tenured faculty members to comprise a Faculty Review Committee (FRC). This committee is responsible for preparing the initial review of the candidate (Page 3, Section 4. Guidelines and Procedures, Stages I, II, III: Departmental Review: Stage I – Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee).

The PPTM suggests providing clarity regarding committees such as the Faculty Review Committee by specifying the composition of the committee and rank of the committee members appointed to this committee. For example, is a prespecified number of Full Professors, Associate Professors, or both appointed to this committee?

Other recommendations include:

The Guidelines prescribe that members of the Faculty Review Committee and external evaluators should not be scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis or postdoctoral advisor, co-authors or other close associates. (See Section 4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III: Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committees (Page 2) and External Evaluators (Page 6)).

The PPTM suggests greater specificity in defining the term “close associates.” An example is the National Institutes of Health criteria that prohibits a study section member from reviewing a proposal from a colleague they have collaborated with or had any other professional relationship (e.g., served as mentor) within the past three years (See <https://grants.nih.gov/policy/peer/peer-coi.htm>).

In the Assessment of Research Contributions, the Guidelines state that the assessment of a candidate's scholarly research must address issues of quality, significance, impact, and future development, including the quality and significance of the journals or conferences in which the candidate's work has appeared and the relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received by the candidate (See Section 4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III: Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure, Assessment of Research Contributions, Page 5).

The PPTM suggests providing examples of journals and conferences that are considered "quality" and have "significance" and examples of external grants considered "reasonable" and "competitive" to help tenure track/tenured faculty focus on the critical activities needed to

achieve promotion.

In the Assessment of Service, the Guidelines propose the assessment of a candidate's service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the department, the University and the candidate's research community, or broader scientific community (See (See Section 4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III: Departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure, Assessment of Service, Page 6).

The PPTM suggests providing examples of criteria that define "quality and significance of service" and examples of "the candidate's research community or broader scientific community."

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES PROPOSED FOR COURANT INSTITUTE

1. INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth the core principles and procedures for tenure and promotion at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University. They are designed to support high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotion, and to ensure a comprehensive, rigorous, and fair review of the candidates.

2. UNIVERSITY APPROVAL

Any subsequent material changes to these guidelines will be presented to the Provost of New York University for approval. The Provost shall consult with the Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Senators Council (T-FSC) prior to making the final decision about subsequent material changes. In the absence of school guidelines or if school guidelines are inconsistent with University policies, the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines will control. As with all NYU policies, this Policy is subject to change and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action.

3. STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

All candidates for tenure should demonstrate a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research, with strong reputations for scholarly excellence and the commitment and capacity to stay at the forefront of their fields. Candidates for tenure also must have distinguished records as teachers and mentors of students and they are expected to have conducted research that has had substantial impact on their discipline. Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research together with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship. 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 in the candidate's field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the Department and the Institute?

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

The inquiry for promotion to full professor is similar: is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in her/his field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers? In addition, the candidate must have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The expectation is that the new work marks significant new scholarly research since the conferring of tenure.

The standards for tenure apply both to internal promotion cases and to external appointments with tenure. Many of the details given in the next part of this document are specific to internal promotion cases. Tenured external appointments are discussed further at the end of this document.

4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES, STAGES I, II, III

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: STAGE I

The Director makes recommendations to the Provost regarding tenure and promotion in the Computer Science (CS) Department and the Mathematics (Math) Department.¹ The recommendation of the Director must be informed by the department, the faculty, and experts in the candidate's field.

All tenure dossiers must be submitted by the Department Chair to the Director's office no later than March 1, and by the Director to the Provost's office no later than June 1. In order to meet these deadlines, the candidate should normally submit their materials by October 15 of the previous year; exceptional cases should be discussed with the Chair. Earlier submissions are encouraged.

Faculty Responsibilities

The duty of the tenured faculty to deliberate and give advice on tenure decisions is one of their highest responsibilities. The process begins with their review, and it is highly dependent upon the thoroughness, fairness, and rigor of their review. To give weak advice on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at a later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an abdication of departmental responsibility. Thus, a department report that is considered by the Director to fall into this category will be returned to the department with a request that the problem be corrected.

An assessment must not ignore candidates' defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure, and "advocacy" assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration. It is far more helpful to the candidate, the departmental committees and faculty, and the Director to have a balanced discussion of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

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

DEPARTMENTAL APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEES

There is a long tradition at Courant of one committee in each of the CS and Math departments holding the primary departmental responsibility for appointments, promotion and tenure. Traditionally, this committee has been called the Appointments Committee, but, to reflect its responsibility for promotion and tenure as well as initial appointments, henceforth its name will be the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APTC). This is a standing committee of tenured faculty that is appointed at the beginning of the academic year by the Department

¹ Prior to 2020, CS Department cases were also reviewed by the Faculty of Arts and Science Promotion and Tenure Committee and its Dean.

Chair in consultation with the Director. Associate professors may serve on the committees, but they do not participate in discussions about promotion to full professor. The CS Department APTC consists of at least 6 members; the Math Department APTC consists of at least 12 members. Department chairs may attend the APTC meetings of their department, as ex officio non-voting members, but they do not count toward the minimum number of members.

For each tenure and/or promotion case, the Department Chair, in consultation with the chair of the APTC, appoints at least three tenured faculty members to comprise a Faculty Review Committee (FRC) responsible for preparing the initial review of the candidate. It is not required that members of the FRC serve on the APTC. The candidate's thesis advisor, postdoctoral adviser and other close collaborators may not serve on the FRC and must recuse themselves from the APTC discussion and vote. When relevant, the candidate's spouse or partner or other close family member must be recused from the entire promotion and tenure process.

Once appointed, the first responsibility of the FRC is to review the materials provided by the candidate (the list of required documents is included below) and to select a list of external evaluators to consult with a request to review the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. When the external letters have been received, the FRC prepares a detailed written report on the candidate's research, teaching and service (see below for more details), and makes a recommendation in favor of or against tenure and/or promotion.

After the FRC review is completed, the chair of the FRC should present its report and the FRC's recommendation to the departmental APTC. It is the responsibility of the APTC to verify the completeness of the candidate's materials and of the FRC's written report, to review them in detail, and to make its own recommendation in favor of or against the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate. If the APTC has concerns about the report it may ask the FRC to address these before making its recommendation. A split vote in the APTC indicates some doubt on the recommendation. Re-voting must not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity, or to avoid reporting a split vote. The Chair and all members of the APTC must (physically or electronically) 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 next stage of the review differs in the two departments of Courant. In the Math Department, the APTC's recommendation is transmitted directly to the Chair of the Department.² In the CS Department, the APTC recommendation undergoes a subsequent review and vote by the faculty.³ The FRC's written report, along with the APTC's recommendation, the candidate's materials, external letters and other relevant documents, must be made available for inspection at least a week before a meeting of eligible CS faculty takes place. The eligible CS faculty consist of all tenured faculty for tenure cases and all full professors for cases of promotion to full professor. After the meeting, a vote on the case will be taken by electronic secret ballot. A reasonable effort must be made to enable all eligible CS faculty, including faculty on leave, to have access to all relevant materials and to participate in the discussion and vote.

Cross Appointments⁴

² This procedure has been used successfully by the Math department for decades.

³ This procedure is consistent with long-established procedures at FAS, which governed Computer Science policy before 2019.

⁴ A summary of Cross Appointments can be found at https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/provost/documents/OAA/Cross_Appointments_GNF_March2019.pdf

Reviews of faculty with appointments involving more than one unit of the University (“cross appointments”) shall ensure the input of all relevant units. The primary appointment unit leads the promotion or tenure process, according to the rules of the unit, with representation of secondary units.

All evaluations of individuals with joint appointments in more than one unit must include an discussion of the special circumstances of the appointment, expectations for the candidate's multi-disciplinary activities, perspective and position, and the judgment of how well the appointee has met these expectations. The composition of the FRC must include members of both units. Both units must vote on the report, and follow their individual guidelines on procedures. If the joint appointment is between the two departments of Courant, both Chairs must consult together on the case and forward both departments’ recommendations to the Director. If the joint appointment is with a school or center outside Courant, the recommendation should also be sent to the relevant Dean or Director. If the units arrive at significantly different recommendations, the Director, Directors, or Director and Dean will ordinarily invite the Chairs together to discuss the case. When the joint appointment is with a unit outside Courant, the Director or Dean of the secondary school should send a letter to the Director or Dean of the primary school for inclusion in the docket.

In the cases when a secondary appointment does not involve tenure, the rules of continuation of the joint appointment are regulated by binding MOUs between units. These MOUs must be finalized at the time a faculty member is hired or the joint appointment is made, and the faculty member needs to be informed of the terms and procedure of continuing the joint appointment after tenure.

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

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

Materials to be Provided by the Candidate

- an up-to-date curriculum vitae, including:
 - list of publications, including links to a representative set of publications or to a web page which includes links to publications
 - list of courses taught by the candidate, with dates and with syllabi or links to web pages where syllabi may be found
 - list of postdoctoral advisees, if any
 - list of Ph.D. dissertations supervised and master’s and undergrad students advised, including actual or expected graduation dates
 - list of Ph.D. committees on which the candidate has served
 - list of all external grants obtained, with dates, funding amounts, and the candidate’s role (PI, co-PI, etc.)
 - list of service to the Department and to the candidate’s research community.

--- statements of the candidate's teaching philosophy and research interests and accomplishments, including a description of the relationships among works already published, a description of new projects planned or under way, and a description of the place teaching occupies in the candidate's career.

--- any other information the candidate wishes to provide, such as a statement on the candidate's effort to promote diversity, equity and inclusion.

Faculty Review Committee (FRC) Report

Properly prepared, detailed, and well-documented dockets are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the department's evaluation of the candidate. The report of the FRC must not be an advocacy document; it must strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. It must indicate, with reasons, the basis for a recommendation in favor of or against tenure and/or promotion of the candidate. If the FRC cannot achieve a consensus on the recommendation, this should be indicated in the report. If there is a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, the FRC should share that information in its report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation. The report must be a balanced assessment of the candidate's performance. Documents 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, are not acceptable.

a. Field of Expertise

The FRC report must explain the importance of the candidate's field of expertise. 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?

b. Assessment of Research Contributions

The assessment of a candidate's scholarly research must address issues of quality, significance, impact, and future development, taking into account the external letters that were received. The quality and significance of the journals or conferences in which the candidate's work has appeared should be appraised. The assessment of the candidate's research should include comparisons with other scholars at similar stages in their careers in the discipline at large.

The candidate's success at securing external grants should be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development. The relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received by the candidate should be appraised. When evaluating candidates engaged in interdisciplinary research, the record should be considered as a whole, rather than separately in each field.

c. Assessment of Teaching Performance

The assessment of a candidate's teaching performance must appraise the quality and pertinence of courses developed (if any), provide an assessment of teaching performance, and evaluate the candidate's contributions to the undergraduate and graduate teaching program of the department. Specific evaluation and an analysis of the effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate teaching must be provided in narrative form. Evidence may include a written evaluation of a class session observed by a member of the FRC and an assessment of course evaluations

carried out by the department or by the college (or school). A list of courses taught by the candidate should be included, with links to web pages where syllabi may be found. An assessment of the candidate's record of advising Ph.D. students, as well as master's and undergraduate students, and postdoctoral fellows if relevant, should also be given.

d. Assessment of Service

The assessment of a candidate's service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the department, the University and the candidate's research community, or broader scientific community. The assessment may include a discussion of participation in professional organizations in the candidate's field.

External Evaluators

The FRC report should include a list of the external evaluators who were consulted, including those who declined (along with the reasons given for declining, if any), a brief description of their qualifications, and a summary of their letters. The evaluators' CVs should be provided as part of the docket.

The docket must include at least five letters from outside evaluators who are recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline. These five letters must be from evaluators who are not scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis or postdoctoral advisor, co-authors or other close associates. Furthermore, the evaluators must not be suggested by the candidate. If the department inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate, this must be noted in the report.

The department may also choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the docket. These letters may be included in addition to, but not instead of, the five letters from unconflicted external evaluators not identified by the candidate.

Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators: Evaluators normally will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory or research institute). Evaluators must be recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline. Evaluators must be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations. The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at United States institutions. For each evaluator, the docket should include a statement of the evaluator's expertise and the reason they were chosen as an evaluator, as well as an explicit statement as to whether or not the evaluator has a conflict of interest with the candidate.

Solicitation of Letters from Outside Evaluators: The letter of solicitation must be sent by the office of the APTC Chair, Department Chair or the Director, and it must follow the prototype attached as an Appendix. The letter must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate's peers, and it must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. All evaluators must be provided with the same C.V., candidate statement or statements, and links to web pages where some of the candidate's published work is available to the evaluator.

Confidentiality of Evaluations: It is University policy to treat as confidential all evaluations of

University faculty, making only such limited exceptions as are necessary to permit informed review of promotion and tenure decisions by the appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University.⁵ The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved. Neither the names of writers nor the content of the letters may 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 must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, except as required by law, and that they will be seen only by eligible tenured faculty in the department, appropriate decision makers within the university, and their administrative staff.

Third Year Review

All tenure dockets, except for lateral hires, must include a copy of the Third-Year Review of the candidate and of the formal letter written to the candidate by the Department Chair at its completion. This formal early review on tenure prospects should have been completed in the third year of service in the probationary period for assistant professors whose probationary timetable is not shortened due to qualifying previous service.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The Chair must forward the case docket, the FRC report, the recommendation of the APTC, and, in CS, the number of eligible faculty votes for and against tenure and/or promotion, along with the Chair's recommendation on the case, to the Director of Courant, and should inform the APTC of the recommendation.

The Chair's letter must include a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate's work occupies in the relevant discipline and explain why it is important to the Department that this field be represented on its faculty.

DIRECTOR'S REVIEW: STAGE II

The Director of Courant is responsible for evaluating the docket prepared by the department and making a recommendation to the Provost. The Director may, but is not obliged to, solicit additional letters of evaluation. If there are questions in any particular case, the Department Chair and/or the chair of the APTC may be asked to clarify the docket or to provide additional information.

Before submitting the recommendation to the Provost, the Director will inform the Department Chair of the proposed recommendation. In the case of a Director's recommendation contrary to that of the Department Chair, the APTC and/or (in CS) the eligible tenured faculty vote, the Director will provide the Department Chair with the reasons. The Department Chair, in consultation with the APTC, will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Director's final recommendation is made to the Provost.

If the Director has a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, that information should be clearly expressed in the Director's letter to the Provost. Indicators of doubt may include (but are not limited to) a split vote within the FRC or the APTC, or a clear difference of opinion between the FRC and the APTC, or (in CS cases) a split vote among the eligible faculty voting on the case.

⁵ NYU policy regarding the confidentiality of external letters and other tenure decision materials is found in the Legal Protection for Faculty Members policy at <http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-andguidelines/legal-protection-for-faculty-members.html>.

PROVOSTIAL REVIEW: STAGE III

The Provost evaluates every tenure and promotion docket and recommendation. In doing so, the Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation and may appoint an ad hoc committee composed of tenured faculty to seek further counsel. Before making a final decision, the Provost will inform the Director of the pending decision. In those cases in which the Provost's pending decision is contrary to the recommendation of the Director, the Provost will provide the Director with the reasons and give the Director an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the Provost's final decision. The Provost shall notify the Director of the final decision, along with reasons thereof if the Director's recommendation is disapproved.

Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Director will write to the Department Chair and to the candidate informing them of the decision.

5. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

Mandatory Review for Tenure

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

Tenured External Appointments (Lateral Hires)

At the Courant Institute, the departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APTC) is, as noted earlier, responsible for recommendations on initial appointments at all ranks as well as for promotion and tenure. A tenure review is required for all lateral hires at the tenured level. When the APTC is considering recommending a tenured position for an external candidate, a Faculty Review Committee (FRC) will be appointed as described earlier, with the same responsibilities for collecting at least five letters from unconflicted, qualified external evaluators and writing a detailed report assessing the candidate's scholarly research. The FRC should include evidence of teaching performance, such as course evaluations where available. If teaching evaluations are not available, the report should include an indication of how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the Department and reasons for why the Department expects that the candidate will meet NYU's teaching standards. The FRC's report will be reviewed by the APTC. If the APTC wishes to proceed with the appointment, the case will then be reviewed in CS cases by the eligible faculty, and in all cases by the Chair, and by the Director, as described earlier.

The docket submitted to the Provost should include the following

- A memo from the Director describing why the candidate is an important hire for the Institute and a justification for establishing a tenured position within the department in the candidate's field of expertise.
- The candidate's most current CV

- Five external evaluations from qualified individuals not associated with the candidate nor identified/suggested by the candidate, with a list stating the credentials of these individuals. Letters solicited from individuals selected by the candidate can be included as supplementary information as long as their provenance is clearly identified.
- The written report of the FRC, as described earlier.
- A summary of the recommendation of the APTC.
- A description of the candidate's teaching and an indication of how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the Department. If evaluations are not available, alternative assessment of teaching ability must be provided by the Chair.

If a letter of appointment is sent to the external candidate before the tenure review has been completed by the Provost, it should state that the appointment is pending completion of the tenure review.

Tenure Clock Stoppage

The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal University rules adopted by the Board of Trustees, and may be extended in accordance with standard University policy as set forth in the Faculty Handbook.⁶ For those candidates who have been granted an extension, NYU policy is to evaluate the productivity of the candidate as if the candidate had been in probationary status for the normal duration, so that the candidate is not penalized for having received the extension.

Acceleration of Schedule

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

Appeal

In the event of a negative decision, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedure.⁷

⁶ See Faculty Handbook, Tenure Clock Stoppage for Personal Reasons, at http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance_policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/policies-applicable-to-tenured-and-tenure-track_faculty/additional-faculty-policies-applicable-to-tenured-and-tenure-tra/tenure-clock-stoppage-for-personal_reasons.html.

⁷ See Faculty Handbook, Faculty Grievance Procedures at <http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/policies-applicable-to-tenured-and-tenure-track-faculty/additional-faculty-policies-applicable-to-tenured-and-tenure-tra/faculty-grievance-procedures.html>.

Appendix: Sample Letter for Soliciting External Evaluations for Mandatory Tenure and Promotion Review of Internal Candidates

Dear,

Y X, currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Computer Science/Mathematics, is being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. We would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research and potential for future success and your recommendation as to whether or not Professor X should be promoted and receive tenure. You will find Professor X's curriculum vitae, research and teaching statements attached to this email. A selection of his/her published work is available at [THIS LINK]. If you need any additional materials, we will forward them upon your request.

We would appreciate receiving

- a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of X's research record, including the intellectual quality and originality of his/her work and his/her rate of publication;
- your comments on the extent to which his/her record shows scientific vision and/or leadership; and
- your comments on the scope, significance, and impact of his/her work.

We also would be grateful for an explicit comparison of Professor X with the most prominent individuals working in the same field at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. **IF APPLICABLE:** [Please note that the University has extended the tenure clock for this faculty member, in accordance with University policy.] **IF APPLICABLE:** [comment on early tenure case].

If you have knowledge of Professor X's teaching ability, mentoring record, or service to the professional community, we would appreciate your comments on these matters as well. **[For CS candidates:** Likewise, if you know whether his/her work has influenced industrial practice, or is likely to do so in the future, we would appreciate your comments on this.] In addition, please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

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

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment as to whether or not Professor X would be considered a strong candidate for promotion and tenure in other leading departments in the field.

We would appreciate receiving your letter within six weeks, by **[GIVE DATE]** if possible. You may send it by email to [email address here]. As the University expects the department to provide biographical information about referees, we would be grateful if you could include a copy of your

current curriculum vitae with your letter.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the tenured professors of the [Computer Science/Mathematics] department, appropriate decision makers within the University, and our administrative staff.

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. The department and I will be very grateful for your help. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at [address here] or by phone at [phone number here].

Sincerely

Appendix: Sample Letter for Soliciting External Evaluations for Tenure Review for an External Appointment

Dear,

Y X, currently [**give current position**], is being considered for a tenured position with the rank of Professor [or Associate Professor] in the Department of Computer Science/Mathematics at the Courant Institute. We would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research and potential for future success and your recommendation as to whether or not Professor X should be appointed to a tenured position.

You will find Professor X's curriculum vitae, research and teaching statements attached to this email. A selection of his/her published work is available at [THIS LINK]. If you need any additional materials, we will forward them upon your request.

We would appreciate receiving

- a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of X's research record, including the intellectual quality and originality of his/her work and his/her rate of publication;
- your comments on the extent to which his/her record shows scientific vision and/or leadership; and
- your comments on the scope, significance, and impact of his/her work.

We also would be grateful for an explicit comparison of Professor X with the most prominent individuals working in the same field at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome.

If you have knowledge of Professor X's teaching ability, mentoring record, or service to the professional community, we would appreciate your comments on these matters as well. [**For CS candidates:** Likewise, if you know whether his/her work has influenced industrial practice, or is likely to do so in the future, we would appreciate your comments on this.] In addition, please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment as to whether or not Professor X would be considered a strong candidate for tenure in other leading departments in the field.

We would appreciate receiving your letter within six weeks, by [**GIVE DATE**] if possible. You may send it by email to [email address here]. As the University expects the department to provide biographical information about referees, we would be grateful if you could include a copy of your current curriculum vitae with your letter.

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 [or tenured professors] of the [Computer Science/Mathematics] department, appropriate decision makers within the University, and our administrative staff.

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. The department and I will be very grateful for your help. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at [address here] or by phone at [phone number here].

Sincerely,

Appendix: Summary of Documents to be submitted by the Director to the Provost

Materials submitted by the candidate, including CV, research and teaching statements.

Report of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC), including assessment of candidate's research, teaching and service contributions, as well as a list of external evaluators who were consulted, including those who declined (with reasons if provided), a brief description of their qualifications, and a summary of their letters.

External recommendation letters and CVs of the recommenders.

For internal tenure cases: Course evaluations, the candidate's third-year review and the letter written to the candidate by the Department Chair on completion of the review.

Department Chair's recommendation letter, describing the candidate's work and its importance to the department, and reporting the vote of the departmental Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APTC) and, in CS cases, the vote of the tenured faculty in the department (full professors only in the case of promotion to full professor).

Director's recommendation letter.