



Date: April 7, 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 Guidelines and Standards for Promotion and Tenure in the NYU Division of Libraries

The T-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached recommendations regarding the Revisions to the Guidelines and Standards for Promotion and Tenure in the NYU Division of Libraries. These recommendations were approved by the Council at the April 7, 2022 meeting.

cc: H. Austin Booth, Dean, Division of Libraries
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), Jill Conte, Member

To: T-FSC

Date: 4/1/2022

Re: Guidelines and Standards for Promotion and Tenure NYU Division of Libraries

The PPTM Committee, Co-Chaired by Drs. Judith Zelikoff and Nicola Partridge, have thoroughly reviewed the submitted NYU Division of Libraries' *Guidelines and Standards for Promotion and Tenure*. The PPTM Committee met several times by Zoom to review and discuss (at length) the *Guidelines* document. As a Committee, we unanimously agreed on the edits and comments being presented to the T-FSC for discussion. Please find below a summary of our added, deleted, or questioned text highlighted in yellow and our rationale for such changes in *italics* for each section. Please note that this summary primarily reflects substantive changes. For expediency, smaller editorial suggestions regarding typos, punctuation, use of acronyms, etc. are marked in the accompanying PDF file of the guidelines document, but are not reflected in this cover letter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (p. 1)

Suggest numbering sections of the document for ease of navigation and reference.

INTRODUCTION (p. 1)

a. "This Guidelines document supplements the NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws, Libraries Faculty Handbook, the NYU Faculty Handbook, and the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines." *Broken link embedded in document. Consider linking to the website instead of the PDF: <https://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook.html>*

b. "As with all NYU and Division of Libraries policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action." *Suggest spelling out in this introduction which libraries at NYU sit within the Division of Libraries and whose faculty members are subject to these guidelines.*

APPOINTMENT (p. 2)

Academic Preparation for Probationary Initial Appointment to the Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty

a. "The academic preparation for a probationary initial appointment to the Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty is normally established on the basis of a master's degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and a second graduate degree." *Are these the criteria for appointment and promotion to this rank, or just initial appointment? Suggest clarifying the difference between the two.*

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Associate Curator

b. “Full-time **service** in the rank of Library Associate will not be counted toward the attainment of tenure.” *Does reference to "service" in this rank cover job performance, service, and scholarship/publications? Consider spelling out more fully what aspects of the job will or won't count toward the attainment of tenure during the period of employment in this rank.*

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Curator

c. “The candidate must also demonstrate outstanding achievements in **bibliographical activities**, in research, in education, and in other professional activities.” *This is the only place where the phrase "bibliographical activities" appears in the document. Consider aligning the criteria in this section with those outlined in the Promotion to Curator section of these guidelines, which better reflect the language of the NYU P&T Guidelines. Also consider aligning this section with the criteria outlined in the NYU Faculty Handbook: "The rank of Professor should be granted only after careful consideration of the individual's character, scholarship, productivity, teaching ability, and reputation among peers in [their] own field, as well as [their] capacity for inclining students toward noteworthy attainments. It should be granted only to [faculty members] who have been so tested that there is reasonable certainty of their continuing usefulness throughout the remainder of their working years. It should never be granted as the reward of seniority and should be reserved as a mark of distinction in the field of scholarship and instruction. It should never be granted as a recognition of usefulness in administration."*

d. “The candidate must also demonstrate outstanding achievements in bibliographical activities, in **research**, in education, and in other professional activities.” *Consider reconciling the language of "research" here with the aforementioned language of "scholarship or creative or artistic work" for Associate Curator.*

e. “The candidate must also demonstrate outstanding achievements in bibliographical activities, in research, in **education**, and in other professional activities.” *Is this a reference to the candidate's educational attainment(s) or the candidate's achievements as an educator? Consider aligning the language in this section with the criteria outlined in the Promotion to Curator section of these guidelines, which better reflect the language of the NYU P&T Guidelines.*

STANDARDS (pp. 2-5)

Overview

a. “The process for the election and responsibilities of the ARP are defined in the **NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws and Handbook**.” *As these are separate documents, consider unlinking and referring to them separately as "NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws and Libraries Faculty Handbook" (as they were in the Introduction).*

b. “The tenure vetting process also includes review by **the Libraries** Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC), and it is informed by independent external evaluations and such other information as deemed appropriate by the ARP Panel, TAC, and ultimately the Provost.” *Consider inserting "by the elected members of the Libraries Tenure Advisory Committee."*

c. “The tenure vetting process also includes review by the Libraries **Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC)**, and it is informed by independent external evaluations and such other information as deemed appropriate by the ARP Panel, TAC, and ultimately the Provost.” *Consider explaining this group earlier in the document along with ARP and define the purpose of TAC. See additional comments later in the document suggesting information be moved up for context.*

d. “...and it is informed by independent external evaluations and such other information as deemed appropriate by the ARP Panel, TAC, and ultimately the Provost.” *Suggest adding a sentence here: “For additional details on this process, see Tenure Review section.” Or better, give the section and number and refer to that in the text.*

e. “In the case of significantly divergent recommendations, the Dean may choose to seek additional information, **but has no obligation to do so.**” *Suggest deleting the phrase “but has no obligation to do so.”*

Conferring of Tenure

f. “The process of **evaluating a candidate for tenure** in the Division of Libraries is an inquiry...” *Suggest stating explicitly somewhere in this document that this is a 6-year tenure track where candidates apply for tenure at the end of their fifth year, and that the promotion and tenure process is “up or out.”*

g. “Each case must be examined in **some** detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths and acknowledging limits or weaknesses.” *Suggest deleting the word “some.”*

Criteria for Tenure

h. “**A high standard of excellence in job performance is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU.**” *Is job performance weighted heavier than the other two criteria for tenure? If not, consider moving this sentence to the job performance section, below.*

Promotion to Curator

i. “In addition, it is required that the candidate provide evidence of **significant academic achievement** beyond the work considered at the point of having been awarded tenure.” *This language isn't found in the NYU P&T Guidelines or Faculty Handbook. Would “significant scholarly or creative or artistic achievements” be a more accurate description based on previous language in these guidelines? And if so, how is this requirement distinct from the publication of new research and professional advancement, referenced in the sentence that follows? Consider clarifying.*

GUIDELINES (pp. 6-7)

Lateral Appointments

a. “The Provost’s Office has established a timeline for the review of tenure dockets, including new hires with tenure. In such cases, the Libraries must facilitate an accelerated review of the candidate’s materials and submit completed dockets to the Provost Office **no later than April 15 for a September 1st start date.**” *Both NYU P&T Guidelines and Faculty Handbook*

give June 1 as the date by which tenure dockets must be submitted to the Provost.

b. "Preliminary materials (e.g. CV, statement of service and research interests, **list of evaluators**, and publications) will be needed as soon as possible for the ARP Panel." *Per NYU and Libraries P&T guidelines, candidates cannot identify or suggest evaluators. The ARP Panel generates this list itself and thus it is not supplied as "preliminary material." Consider deleting.*

Role of Division of Libraries Human Resources in Evaluation

c. "**All aspects of Tenure and Promotion procedures fall under the purview of faculty governance and are to be carried out by Libraries faculty, including the Dean, tenured elected members of the ARP and TAC.**" *Consider creating and including in these guidelines a flow diagram of the review process, which outlines all the participants and stages of review. See GSOM and LISOM guidelines for reference.*

PROCEDURES (p. 7)

Third Year Review

a. "**After an Assistant Curator has completed their third year in that rank**, the Dean of Libraries shall consult the Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Committee to assess the individual's progress toward achieving the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Curator." *Because third year review materials are due March 1 during a candidate's third year of service, consider rewording this sentence to read: "As an Assistant Curator nears completion of their third year in that rank ...".*

Third Year Review Process

b. "The process for soliciting external letters is outlined below in the **Review** section." *Consider numbering sections of this document and then clarifying which section this refers to using its number designation and correct title/sub-title.*

MATERIALS FOR CANDIDATE DOSSIERS (pp. 8-9)

a. "A list of committees and other formal groups **that the candidate served.**" *Suggest changing to "...on which the candidate has served."*

b. "In addition to the required materials, candidates may also include in their dossiers evidence of the quality of their scholarly, creative or artistic work, as appropriate. **For example:**" *Suggest including as examples in this list: competitive grant funding; evidence that demonstrates one's national or international reputation.*

TENURE REVIEW (pp. 9-13)

a. **Composition of ARP, ARP Panels, and the TAC** *Suggest contextualizing ARP/P&T Panel and defining TAC earlier in the document. Consider incorporating more fully the language about these bodies from the Libraries bylaws to create a stand alone document (i.e., linking guidelines and bylaws may create confusion down the road). Again, create and include a flow diagram of the process.*

b. "Dossiers are assigned to a Panel composed of the **eligible** tenured members of the ARP." *Suggest spelling out explicitly what constitutes eligibility.*

c. "In cases in which there is not the requisite number of Curators to consider an application from Associate Curator to Curator, **the Dean will** assemble a panel of tenured faculty of appropriate rank (e.g., Full Professor) from other schools." *Consider adding "...the Dean will, in consultation with the Panel Chair or, if the Panel Chair is an Associate Curator, with Curators who are members of ARP,..." to align with language in NYU P&T Guidelines.*

d. **ARP Responsibilities and Process** *Consider moving the information in this section so it appears earlier in the document for context.*

Structure and Requirements of ARP Panel Report

e. "Although the ARP Panel may choose how to structure its report, the final version should contain five primary components: Assessment of Work Performance; Assessment of Research and Scholarship, and Assessment of Service; **Summary of Solicited letters**; and the Recommendation of the Panel." *Consider clarifying this heading. Is it to summarize the content of the letters or to summarize the evaluators' qualifications and their reasons for being chosen (per pp. 12-13 of this document and in the NYU P&T Guidelines)? Also, suggest spelling out how and where in the report the panel should incorporate feedback from evaluators; would this be in a sixth section?*

Solicitation of Letters from External and Internal Evaluators

f. "A complete ARP Panel docket for cases that involve the conferral of tenure or the promotion to Curator must include a minimum of five letters from **highly qualified external evaluators**." *Suggest adding a note about conflict of interest, per the NYU Faculty Handbook.*

g. "The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at U.S. institutions; if appropriate, evaluations **should** be solicited from abroad." *Suggest changing "should" to "could."*

h. "If there is unpublished work to be considered, the **ARP Panel should ask external evaluators to comment on the quality of the unpublished work**." *Consider specifying somewhere explicitly in the document that the ARP panel identifies and solicits evaluators.*

i. "As a professional courtesy, evaluators should be given six weeks **to return their evaluations**." *Suggest spelling out to whom the letters should be returned.*

j. "The ARP Panel should take special care to anticipate **potential conflicts of interest** when soliciting letters." *Suggest reiterating here what constitutes a conflict of interest.*

k. "**Candidates have the right to specify the names of up to two individuals whom they do not want to be solicited and provide a rationale**." *Suggest clarifying what the process is for relaying this info and to whom.*

l. "The evaluator must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been **closely associated, such as a thesis advisor or co-author. Co-authors will be acceptable reviewers only in certain fields**, such as fields with very small membership or fields in which papers typically have a large number of authors." *Consider providing a timeframe for when two scholars are no longer considered "closely associated." For example, see GSOM and LISOM guidelines.*

m. "In all communications with evaluators, they should be assured that their letters will be held in strictest confidence and that the letters will be seen only by the ARP Panel, the Dean, the TAC, and the Provost's Office." *Suggest adding language here to communicate that each group with access to the materials must maintain confidentiality as well.*

Recommendation of the ARP Panel

n. "The Panel's letter must include a summary of its discussion preceding the vote, as well as a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate's work occupies in the relevant discipline or field." *Suggest adding more details about the voting process, e.g., closed vote, etc.*

TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROLE (pp. 13-14)

Suggest moving this section earlier in the document for context.

a. "This level of review by the TAC is intended to be the equivalent of the vote of the full faculty that other Departments at the University conduct." *Suggest changing from "other" to "some" (e.g., medical, dental, and nursing faculties don't conduct a faculty-wide vote).*

b. "In the event that a Dean's recommendation is contrary to that of the Panel and/or the TAC, the Dean will provide the respective committee(s) with their reasons. The committee(s) will then have ten business days in which to provide further information or counter-argument(s) before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost." *Suggest specifying these committee(s) as the ARP Panel and TAC explicitly.*

c. "The Dean will ordinarily make a final recommendation to the Provost by April 15." *Consider adding language from NYU P&T Guidelines that outlines what the Dean submits to the Provost: "The Dean's recommendation to the Provost constitutes the definitive recommendation of the department and will be accompanied by the docket, the ARP recommendation, and the TAC recommendation." Also consider adding language about who will receive copies of the submission and correct the deadline, per the NYU Faculty Handbook: "The dean shall forward his or her recommendation by June 1 to the Provost, with a copy to the department head or chairperson and to the advisory body or, in schools without departmental organization, to the dean's advisory body. The dean's recommendation shall be accompanied by the recommendations he or she has received from the department head or chairperson and the advisory body."*

GUIDELINES FOR APPEAL (p. 14)

a. "Grievance procedures are explained in The Faculty Handbook." *Is this the NYU Faculty Handbook or the Libraries? Consider clarifying.*

REVIEW SCHEDULE FOR GUIDELINES

a. "Once changes to policy are identified, they are sent to the Office of the Provost for initial consultation, then sent to faculty for review and vote for adoption, and finally returned to the Office of the Provost and to other bodies as appropriate for formal review." *Consider incorporating text from NYU P&T Guidelines that explicitly calls out T-FSC review: "Any newly created school guidelines, and any subsequent material changes to them, must 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 material changes."

SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS (pp. 15-18)

Sample Solicitation Letter, External Reviewer, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion

a. "Please note that evaluators must not be a scholar **with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.**" *Suggest spelling out here what constitutes a "close associate." Refer to previous comments of this nature, above.*

Sample Solicitation Letter, Promotion Review for Promotion to Curator

b. "The normal expectation will be the publication of significant new research, professional advancement, and **impactful service to the university and/or profession since the conferring of tenure.**" *Service is never mentioned as a criterion for promotion to Curator in these P&T guidelines, other than a passing mention to "professional activities" in the criteria outlined on p. 2. NYU P&T Guidelines only make mention of "work" in the form of "new scholarly research or artistic achievement." NYU Faculty Handbook calls out "the individual's character, scholarship, productivity, teaching ability, and reputation among peers in his or her own field, as well as his or her capacity for inclining students toward noteworthy attainments." Consider reconciling language in letter with these guidelines as (re)written. Refer back to a previous comment regarding revisions to criteria for promotion to Full Curator.*

c. "Please note that evaluators must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been **closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.**" *Refer to previous comments regarding "close associates." Consider clarifying this concept further.*

Sample Solicitation Letter, Internal Reviewer, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion

d. "**The most important criterion for tenure is the effectiveness of performance as a librarian,** which is evidenced by the candidate's continuing ability to perform at the highest professional level in areas that contribute to the educational and research mission of the University." *Is one criterion weighted more than the other two? Consider reconciling or deleting this sentence altogether. (See related comment in "Criteria for Tenure" section, opening sentence.)*

e. "Please note that evaluators must not be an individual **with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.**" *Refer to previous comments regarding "close associates." Consider clarifying this concept further.*

Guidelines and Standards for Promotion and Tenure NYU Division of Libraries

Table of Contents

- Introduction
- Appointment
- Standards
- Guidelines
- Procedures
 - Third Year Review
 - Third Year Review Process
 - Third Year Review Report
 - Delivery of Feedback on Third Year Review
- Materials for Candidate Dossiers
- Tenure Review
- Dean of Libraries Role
- Tenure Advisory Committee Role
- Provost's Role
- Notification of Decision
- Guidelines for Appeal
- Pausing Tenure Clock
- Review Schedule for Guidelines
- Sample Solicitation Letters

Date of faculty vote: October 15, 2021

Introduction

This *Guidelines* document supplements the *NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws*, *Libraries Faculty Handbook*, the *NYU Faculty Handbook*, and the *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*. If any part of this document is inconsistent with NYU policies, the NYU policies then in effect will control. As with all NYU and *Division of Libraries* policies, this document is subject to change, and the policies in effect at the time of an action will apply to that action. This document addresses processes related to the appointment of Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty, the conferral of tenure (including initial appointment), processes related to promotion from Assistant Curator to Associate Curator, and promotion from Associate Curator to Curator.

Appointment

Academic Preparation for Probationary Initial Appointment to the Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty

The academic preparation for a probationary initial appointment to the Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty is normally established on the basis of a master's degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and a second graduate degree.

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Assistant Curator

A library faculty appointment as Assistant Curator is granted to one possessing a master's degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association or a recognized foreign equivalent, and an additional graduate degree. In addition to this educational requirement, criteria for this rank include evidence of significant professional contributions and at least two years of successful library experience.

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Associate Curator

A library faculty appointment as Associate Curator is granted to one possessing a master's degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and an additional graduate degree. Criteria for this rank includes a record of at least six years of outstanding job performance in professional library experience; service to the Libraries, the university, and the profession; and scholarship or creative or artistic work. An appointee at the Associate Curator rank must also possess the same qualifications as a person promoted to the rank. Full-time service in the rank of Library Associate will not be counted toward the attainment of tenure.

Criteria for Appointment and Promotion: Curator

A library faculty appointment to Curator is granted to one possessing a master's degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and an additional graduate degree. The candidate must also demonstrate outstanding achievements in bibliographical activities, in research, in education, and in other professional activities. The appointee must also possess the same qualifications as a person promoted to the rank.

Standards

Overview

Tenure and promotion are granted at NYU Libraries on the basis of high achievement and recognition for excellent job performance, scholarship, and service. All candidates for tenure should demonstrate a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research or creative work, 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. Where appropriate to their role as a librarian, they are expected to conduct research or creative work that has demonstrated a potential impact on policy and practice in their field. Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research or creative work in the arts together with a record of effective job performance integrally influenced by scholarship or creative work. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

Successful candidates demonstrate clearly and objectively that their accomplishments merit tenure and promotion. In the Division of Libraries, tradition and faculty-approved policy hold that tenure vetting occurs through a multilevel process, which involves detailed evaluation by a Panel formed from the tenured members of the Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Committee (ARP). The ARP Committee is elected each year by the library faculty. The process for the election and responsibilities of the ARP are defined in the [NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws and Handbook](#). The tenure vetting process also includes review by the [Libraries Tenure Advisory Committee \(TAC\)](#), and it is informed by independent external evaluations and such other information as deemed appropriate by the ARP Panel, TAC, and ultimately the Provost.

For the purposes of the review of candidates for tenure and promotion, the Division of Libraries is without a departmental organization. The term “department” as used in this document refers only to an operational unit of the Division of Libraries, which functions as a single academic department. In this configuration, the Panel from the ARP Committee is tantamount to departmental promotion and tenure (P&T) committees that exist in other schools at NYU. The ARP Panel Chair (like all members of the Panel) is a tenured member of the Library faculty, who functions as the equivalent of a Departmental Chair for those processes dictated by NYU’s *Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure*.

Upon receiving a report from the ARP Panel and TAC, the Dean of the Division of Libraries in turn makes recommendations to the Provost of the University regarding promotion and the conferring of tenure. While there is often a remarkable degree of unanimity in the recommendations made at the various levels of review, it is not unusual for there to be divergent opinions. Disagreement may occur because of differences in perspective, differences in the weighing of strengths and weaknesses in the candidate’s case, additional information not evident in the preceding stages of the evaluation, and so on. In the case of significantly divergent recommendations, the Dean may choose to seek additional information [but has no obligation to do so](#).

Purpose of Guidelines and Standards for Tenure and Promotion

The professional roles and responsibilities of academic faculty librarians differ widely from faculty in other disciplines. For instance, librarians do not generally teach credit-bearing courses, and their work roles cover responsibilities that often depart from traditional divisions of faculty labor in higher education. Furthermore, contributions to knowledge in librarianship may not take the form or extent of scholarly research and publication expected in other academic fields; consequently, many tenured and tenure track librarians

engage in modes of creativity and innovation that require deep expertise in information studies, knowledge architecture and preservation, and related fields in order to be evaluated critically. These guidelines acknowledge this uniqueness and intend to inform the process of evaluating the job performance and academic contributions of faculty librarians in order to facilitate the process of evaluation, promotion, and the conferral of tenure.

Statement of Academic Freedom

The **New York University** Faculty Handbook states, “Academic freedom is essential to the free search for truth and its free expression. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Freedom in teaching is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student in learning” (Title I.ii). Academic freedom is essential for librarians, in research and in work supporting teaching and learning in the University. In 2006 the American Library Association passed a resolution in support of academic freedom stating that academic freedom is “indispensable to librarians, because they are trustees of knowledge with the responsibility of ensuring the availability of information and ideas, no matter how controversial, so that teachers may freely teach and students may freely learn” (ALA IR B.2.5). Tenured and tenure-track librarians at **New York University** must have the freedom to research, develop collections, and provide access to information without fear of censorship or professional repercussions. They hold each of the rights and obligations as stipulated in the **New York University** Faculty Handbook.

Conferring Tenure

The process of **evaluating a candidate for tenure** in the Division of Libraries is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in their field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers at NYU, nationally, and, if relevant, abroad? It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement, and context becomes a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. Each case must be examined in **some** detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths and acknowledging limits or weaknesses. These factors must be carefully and openly weighed.

In order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, candidates must have a record of outstanding scholarly achievement and recognition for it within their field; they must be able to demonstrate that they are effective library professionals; and they should have made substantial contributions, in their research and core job responsibilities, to the work of the Division of Libraries, the life of the University, and their professional organization(s). In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be awarded.

Educational Requirements for Tenure

The educational requirements to be awarded tenure are that the candidate holds a master’s degree in library science from an institution accredited by the American Library Association, or a recognized foreign equivalent, and an additional graduate degree.

Criteria for Tenure

A high standard of excellence in job performance is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU. The criteria for tenure include:

- a. **Job Performance:** Effectiveness of performance as a librarian evidenced by the continuing ability to perform at the highest professional level in areas that contribute to the educational and research mission of the University is a criteria for tenure. Candidates who do not have a record of excellent job performance will not receive tenure.
- b. **Service to the Libraries, the University, the Community, and the Profession:** Effectiveness of service as evidenced by successful service on committees, participation in institutional governance, research workshops for students or faculty, advisement of students and student groups, and/or participation in professional and learned societies is the second requirement for tenure. Such service should evidence active participation, not merely tacit membership in committees or other groups. Candidates who do not have a record of significant service will not receive tenure.
- c. **Scholarly, Creative or Artistic Activity:** Significant scholarship or creative or artistic work is essential for tenure. Scholarly, creative or artistic activity is evidenced by publication or the execution of significant research in librarianship or other academic areas, or by outstanding creative or artistic work. Scholarship, like creative work and contributions to descriptive standards, is the foundation of academic pursuits and is essential for tenure at a research library. Tenure will not be granted without significant contributions to scholarship or creative or artistic work.

In order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement in these categories.

Promotion to Curator

The inquiry for promotion to Curator is essentially the same as for promotion to Associate Curator: Is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in their field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers at NYU, nationally, and internationally? In addition, it is required that the candidate provide evidence of significant academic achievement beyond the work considered at the point of having been awarded tenure. The normal expectation will be the publication of significant new research and professional advancement since the conferring of tenure. In applications for promotion to Curator, the docket must clearly indicate which materials distinguish the candidate's achievements since the last review for promotion.

Resubmission of Materials for Promotion to Curator

If a candidate's application for promotion to Curator is not viewed favorably at any level of the review process, the candidate shall not reapply for promotion without additional relevant documentation that provides evidence of significant advancements or achievements required to achieve the rank of Curator.

Guidelines

Acceleration of Schedule

Applications for early promotion and early conferral of 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 clearly exceptional. The Dean and the candidate's immediate supervisor 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. The ARP Panel and the TAC, along with the letter writers these groups contact, must also specifically address the grounds for an early tenure and promotion application in their reports. However, even with affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure unless the case is truly exceptional and compelling, not least because the expectations and standards to which candidates are held in the ordinary course of review and promotion are already very high.

Lateral Appointments

In the case of lateral appointments, NYU practice at all schools is for explicit written arrangements to require a tenure review at the Department, School, and University levels; **their** appointments are made pending completion of the tenure review and this shall be recorded in their appointment letters. The Provost's Office has established a timeline for the review of tenure dockets, including new hires with tenure. In such cases, the Libraries must facilitate an accelerated review of the candidate's materials and submit completed dockets to the Provost Office **no later than April 15 for a September 1st start date.**

Preliminary materials (e.g. CV, statement of service and research interests, **list of evaluators**, and publications) will be needed as soon as possible for the ARP Panel. The full list of materials needed is within the [New York University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines](#) section, Tenured External Appointments (Lateral Hires). The ARP Panel must submit the completed docket to the Dean and TAC no later than April 1. The TAC will present their report to the Dean 10 days after receiving the ARP Panel docket. When the start date differs from September 1st and the established review cycle within the Division of Libraries, the timeline will be adjusted accordingly.

For external hires with tenure, the report must provide a summary of the department search committee report including size and composition of the candidate pool.

Role of Division of Libraries Human Resources in Evaluation

All aspects of Tenure and Promotion procedures fall under the purview of faculty governance and are to be carried out by Libraries faculty, including the Dean, tenured elected members of the ARP and TAC. See the NYU Libraries Bylaws for more information. However, it is acknowledged that Division of Libraries Human Resources (HR) plays an important supporting role in facilitating certain logistical elements of the application for tenure and promotion process, including the generation of reminder emails sent to

candidates, the generation and management of cases on a digital case management system, and the inclusion of candidates' annual Performance Evaluations, Third-Year Reviews, and letters of appointment in the candidate's dossier.

Procedures

Third Year Review

After an Assistant Curator has completed their third year in that rank, the Dean of Libraries shall consult the Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Committee to assess the individual's progress toward achieving the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Curator. The schedule for notification of the Third-Year Review is indicated by the Dean and communicated to candidates in letters of reappointment.

Third Year Review Process

Candidates undergoing a Third-Year Review will submit a dossier composed of the materials enumerated in the Materials for Candidate Dossiers section of this document. A Panel composed of at least three tenured members of the ARP Committee conducts the review. Only tenured members of the ARP may conduct a Third-Year Review.

In addition to the candidate's materials, the panel will consider the candidate's past two performance evaluations and reappointment letters (provided by Human Resources) and internal and external evaluations. After receiving the Third-Year Review dossier, the ARP panel will solicit at least two internal letters and three letters from external reviewers. The process for soliciting external letters is outlined below in the Review section. The internal evaluations should only concern the candidate's job performance and serve to augment the information provided in the Performance Evaluations and reappointment letters. The ARP panel will solicit a minimum of three external evaluations from highly qualified external evaluators. External evaluators will normally hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction, such as a research university library or equivalent rank in a research library or non-academic institution (e.g., library, laboratory, museum, or research institute).

Third Year Review Report

Upon review of a candidate's Third-Year Review dossier, the ARP panel will prepare a report summarizing the candidate's progress toward the requirements for conferral of tenure and promotion to Associate Curator. Appended to the report will be all the materials reviewed, the current curriculum vitae for each external reviewer, and a rationale for selecting each internal and external reviewer.

Delivery of Feedback on Third Year Review

Upon completion of the review, candidates will receive from the Dean a summary of the review deliberations. The report will redact specific names but will focus on synthesizing overarching themes, strengths, and weaknesses of the dossier that was submitted.

Materials for Candidate Dossiers

The materials compiled by candidates are referred to collectively as the **dossier**, while all elements assembled by the ARP Panel, which include the dossier, external review letters, and report, are referred to as the **docket**. Candidates for tenure and promotion submit a dossier that contains evidence of professional and scholarly accomplishments and demonstrates that their record is worthy of tenure. The dossier must consist of the following required materials:

- Current curriculum vitae (provided by candidate)
- A list of committees and other formal groups **that the candidate served**. The list should include dates of service, roles on the committee, and the chair's name(s)
- Candidate's personal statement (provided by candidate)
- Copies of the candidate's scholarly, creative or artistic work, or documentation when appropriate. Examples include monographs, peer-review published articles; vetted book chapters; published translations of literary works; scholarly or professional publications; or other significant works; video recordings; published artworks; published prose or poetry; screenplays; exhibition catalogues or descriptions; conference proceedings; workshop materials; course syllabi; digital projects; book reviews; conference or other programs (provided by candidate).

The candidate should indicate the review process (i.e., peer-review, solicited contribution, awards) that their scholarly work underwent.

Candidates are invited in their personal statement to narrate the ways in which work accomplishments, service, and research have shaped their career trajectory. The statement should address the candidate's effectiveness in core job responsibilities, including their impact on and service to the university and profession. The candidate statement can address the role of teaching in their career when applicable. Finally, the candidate's personal statement should adopt an informative, jargon-free style that establishes the context in which they wish their scholarship to be seen by a non-expert.

It is required that the candidate will augment their curriculum vitae or personal statement with information that indicates whether a publication is peer reviewed. If the candidate has produced co-authored or collaboratively written and researched scholarship, they should also provide a statement outlining their responsibility for the work and the role they had in each project or publication. In addition, candidates should not include or list any personal or professional references on the version of the curriculum vitae that they submit in their dossier.

In addition to the required materials, candidates may also include in their dossiers evidence of the quality of their scholarly, creative or artistic work, as appropriate. **For example:**

- Published reviews of the candidate's books, articles, or digital projects (provided by candidate)

- Readers' reviews of the candidate's unpublished books or articles (provided by candidate)
- Invited or peer-reviewed contributions (provided by candidate)
- Citation analysis (provided by the candidate)
- Published reviews of productions or performances, or other creative or artistic work (provided by candidate)

The University recognizes that COVID-19 may have had an adverse impact on faculty members' teaching and research performance. To ensure that the review for promotion and tenure reflects the impact of COVID-19, faculty have the option to include a COVID-19 impact statement in their promotion and/or tenure dossier. The impact statement should include a short description of the impact COVID-19 had on their performance of their duties, including teaching and research and creative work. The impact statement should be incorporated into the statements on teaching and research. Note that any external evaluators contacted by the department or the Dean's office will receive the statements of teaching and research as part of the materials to be reviewed. The information provided in this COVID-19 impact statement will not negatively affect the tenure or promotion review. At a minimum, the information will be treated neutrally and at a maximum, it may positively impact the review.

Candidates dossiers will be supplemented (by Libraries' HR) with the candidate's Third-Year Review materials, copies of the candidate's last three Performance Evaluations, provided by Human Resources, that are completed and on file at the due date of the dossier), letters of evaluation from highly qualified external evaluators (solicited by the ARP Panel at its discretion), and the ARP Panel report.

Tenure Review

Composition of ARP, ARP Panels, and the TAC

Dossiers are assigned to a Panel composed of the eligible tenured members of the ARP. The ARP Panel consists of four to eight faculty, depending on the total number of cases the ARP reviews each cycle. The Panel reviews the dossiers, solicits letters, votes and collectively makes a recommendation for or against tenure at the rank of Associate Curator. All formal votes of the Panel must be registered and recorded on the report to the Dean. In cases involving promotions to Curator, the vote and authority resides only with those on the ARP committee who hold the rank of Curator. The Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC) is an elected committee of five tenured faculty members. Only Tenured members of the faculty may vote to elect members of the TAC.

Any ARP Committee and TAC members who are closely associated with a candidate, as enumerated in the *NYU Faculty Handbook*, should recuse themselves for all immediate deliberations involving the candidate, including service on ARP Panels or the TAC.

In cases in which there is not the requisite number of Curators to consider an application from Associate Curator to Curator, **the Dean will** assemble a panel of tenured faculty of appropriate rank (eg., Full Professor) from other schools.

ARP Responsibilities and Process

It is the responsibility of the tenured members of the ARP Committee to form Panels that review the dossiers for individual cases. The duty of the members of the Panel is to give advice on promotion and tenure decisions. The process begins with their review, and it is highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor. To give weak advice to the Dean on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at a later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an abnegation of faculty responsibility. Reports that are considered by the Dean to fall into this category will be returned to the ARP Panel with a request that the problem be corrected.

Structure and Requirements of ARP Panel Report

The report of the ARP Panel is not an advocacy document; rather, it aims to provide a fair and thoughtful assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and should indicate, with reasons, the basis for the ARP Panel's recommendation. Properly prepared, detailed and well-documented dockets are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the ARP Panel'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 that is most useful to the TAC and to the Dean, often more so than the final vote, for such candor gives substantive meaning and texture to the evaluation. The Panel is strongly urged to complete deliberations in a timely manner in order to prevent delays from unforeseen complications that may arise.

Although the ARP Panel may choose how to structure its report, the final version should contain five primary components: Assessment of Work Performance; Assessment of Research and Scholarship, and Assessment of Service; **Summary of Solicited letters**; and the Recommendation of the Panel. All members of the ARP Panel must sign a Signature Page, attesting that they have read the docket and that it represents the opinions of the committee clearly and accurately. The completed docket is then forwarded to the Dean to initiate the subsequent stages of the review process.

The Assessment of Work Performance must document and appraise the effectiveness of the candidate's ongoing engagement with core job responsibilities in their role within the Libraries. Candidates must demonstrate excellence in their work performance and demonstrate how their work has had a substantive impact on Libraries programs and services. A precondition for tenure is effectiveness of performance as a librarian, which is evidenced by the candidate's continuing ability to perform at the highest professional level in areas that contribute to the educational and research mission of the University. In this section of the report, the ARP Panel should weigh the completed Performance Evaluations for the prior three years, as well as assess the candidate's work record by tenured colleagues (solicited by the Panel). The Assessment of Work Performance should cite

Performance Evaluations, and they may reference internal evaluations from colleagues about the candidate's role in committee and other group work.

The Assessment of Research and Scholarship addresses issues of quality, significance, coherence, and future development. The candidate's written work, published and unpublished, should be carefully read by all members of the ARP Panel. The quality and significance of the venues in which the candidate's work has appeared (e.g. monographs, journals, conference papers, websites, blogs, etc.) should be appraised. In the case of joint authorship, the report should include information about the norms of the field regarding order of authorship and an assessment of the candidate's contributions to the co-authored work.

The Assessment of Service must indicate the quality and significance of service to the Division of Libraries, University, and profession. Specific comments, including testimony from fellow Panel members, specification of authorship of particular reports and the like, are helpful. The Assessment of Service can include a discussion of participation in professional organizations in the candidate's field.

In the case of those who are being considered for tenure upon appointment, 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. A letter from a suitable evaluator selected by the search committee, which answers all the relevant questions of the tenure review process, may be used as one of the department's five required external letters for the Promotion and Tenure docket. The report may also include letters from other search committee referees as supplemental materials to the docket.

Solicitation of Letters from External and Internal Evaluators

A complete ARP Panel docket for cases that involve the conferral of tenure or the promotion to Curator must include a minimum of five letters from highly qualified external evaluators. The letters of solicitation, which are to follow the prototype attached in the Appendix, must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate's peers, and must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. All letters of evaluation must be current (written within one year of the review process).

External evaluators will normally hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction, such as a research university library, or a position of equivalent rank in a research library or non-academic institution (e.g., library, laboratory, museum, or research institute). External evaluators, similarly, should hold rank equivalent to that for which the candidate is applying, and 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 of the five 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 U.S. institutions; if appropriate, evaluations should be solicited from abroad.

All external evaluators should be provided with the same materials submitted in the candidate dossier, including published work, c.v., and statement of work performance, service, and research interests. If there is unpublished work to be considered, the ARP Panel should ask external evaluators to comment on the quality of the unpublished work. Documents relating to the candidate's Performance Evaluations and internal deliberations at NYU Libraries (e.g., appointment letters and Third-Year Reviews) are not to be circulated to external evaluators.

A complete ARP Panel docket must also include at least three letters from faculty who hold tenure at any school at New York University, including the Division of Libraries. The letters must explicitly request evaluation of the candidate's job performance and/or service, and it must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. Panels are expected to use the appropriate template to solicit letters (see Appendix). In soliciting letters, the Panel seeks perspectives from colleagues at NYU who have taken a leadership role on projects, working groups, or other endeavors in which the candidate has been involved. Such letters are meant to augment the candidate's application and speak to the effectiveness of job performance. Thus, these internal NYU tenured faculty evaluators are not furnished with any of the candidate's application materials. As a professional courtesy, evaluators should be given six weeks to return their evaluations. The ARP Panel should take special care to anticipate potential conflicts of interest when soliciting letters. Candidates have the right to specify the names of up to two individuals whom they do *not* want to be solicited and provide a rationale. However, the Panel is not beholden to these requests.

Evaluators (both external and internal) 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 or co-author. Co-authors will be acceptable reviewers only in certain fields, such as fields with very small membership or fields in which papers typically have a large number of authors. If the Panel should inadvertently solicit an opinion from someone it later learns had a conflict of interest, was close to the candidate, or whom the candidate independently suggested, note of that fact must be made in the ARP Panel report.

The letters from external and internal evaluators must remain confidential. Neither the names of the authors nor the content of the letters may be communicated, not even in summary form, to the candidate or anyone else who is not involved in the review process. In all communications with evaluators, they should be assured that their letters will be held in strictest confidence and that the letters will be seen only by the ARP Panel, the Dean, the TAC, and the Provost's Office.

The Report of the ARP Panel 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 ARP Panel communications with potential evaluators should be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written and why the particular referee's opinion

matters must be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for each of the declinations. CVs are required for all external evaluators.

Recommendation of the ARP Panel

The Chair of the ARP Panel forwards the completed docket, including the report and the vote of the ARP Panel to the Dean. 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, will not be accepted.

The Panel's letter must include a summary of its discussion preceding **the vote**, as well as a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate's work occupies in the relevant discipline or field. It may also be helpful for the report to include information about the usual criteria for excellence in the candidate's discipline (e.g., quality of venues within which the work appears).

Dean of Libraries Role

The Dean has *de jure* authority to recommend tenure decisions contrary to faculty advice, although that power is usually used sparingly, and in a properly functioning tenure process it may never be used.

Upon receiving a completed docket from the ARP Panel, the materials are conveyed to the **Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC)**. As an elected committee, the TAC shall advise the Dean on all individual tenure recommendations and on all individual promotion recommendations that involve a tenure decision. The Dean of the Faculty may solicit additional reviews that are treated as confidential and are for their own use, and that of the TAC. To ensure that the Dean does not solicit evaluators already contacted in the process, the **Panel** is required to provide the Dean with a list of all evaluators solicited or considered.

Tenure Advisory Committee Role

All tenured members of the library faculty can serve on the **Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC)**, and five members (who do not also currently serve on the ARP) are elected each year. The Dean sits with the TAC without a vote and with their voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the Committee. If there are questions in any particular case, the Chair of the ARP Panel or the full Panel may be asked to attend a meeting of the TAC to clarify the docket or to provide additional information.

The TAC, upon deliberating the case and considering the docket compiled by the Panel, makes its recommendation to the Dean in the form of a written response that includes its own evaluation of the candidate's docket as well as a report of further deliberations. This level of review by the TAC is intended to be the equivalent of the vote of the full faculty that **other** Departments at the University conduct. After receiving advice, the Dean will forward to the Provost the recommendation of the ARP Panel and TAC as well as their own recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. In the event that a Dean's recommendation is contrary to that of the Panel and/or the TAC, the Dean will provide the respective

committee(s) with their reasons. The committee(s) will then have ten business days in which to provide further information or counter-argument(s) before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost. If the Dean has a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, the Dean should share that information in the Dean's report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation. Indicators of doubt may include a split vote within the ARP panel, or a clear difference of opinion between the ARP panel and the TAC. The Dean will ordinarily make a final recommendation to the Provost by April 15.

Provost's Role

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 from NYU schools outside of the Libraries to seek further counsel. The Provost shall support or oppose the Dean's recommendation in their final decision. In those cases, in which the Provost's decision will be contrary to the recommendation of the Dean, the Provost will provide the Dean with the reasons in writing and will 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.

Notification of Decision

Immediately upon notification of the Provost's final decision, the Dean will inform the candidate, the ARP Panel and the TAC.

Guidelines for Appeal

In the event of a negative decision regarding tenure and/or promotion, the candidate may appeal to the Libraries Faculty Grievance Committee. Should the decision of the Libraries Grievance Committee not be satisfactory to the candidate, they may then further appeal to the President to convene the Faculty Council Grievance Committee, an advisory body made up of faculty from different schools within NYU. It makes its recommendations to the President. Grievance procedures are explained in *The Faculty Handbook*.

Pausing Tenure Clock

All policies and procedures regarding the stoppage of the tenure clock for faculty are detailed in the *University Guidelines*. Candidates who have had their tenure clock paused should be evaluated as if they had the tenure clocks of the normal duration (and not extended).

Review Schedule for Guidelines

NYU Libraries shall review the policies and procedures contained within this document every five years according to the governance structures established by the NYU Libraries Faculty Bylaws. To facilitate a review, the Library Council will charge a working group to

investigate the policies, suggest revisions (including revisions to the Library Bylaws, if applicable), and draft a report summarizing changes and recommendations. Once changes to policy are identified, they are sent to the Office of the Provost for initial consultation, then sent to faculty for review and vote for adoption, and finally returned to the Office of the Provost and to **other bodies** as appropriate for formal review.

Sample Solicitation Letters

Sample Solicitation Letter, External Reviewer, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion

Dear :

[Candidate name], [Job title] currently an Assistant Curator in the Division of Libraries, is being considered for tenure and promotion. This process is described in the NYU Division of Libraries Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure [[link to Guidelines](#)]. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of their published and unpublished research. The candidate's dossier (curriculum vitae, their statement, and copies of published or unpublished works) are available through Interfolio.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of [name]'s research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, and rate of publication. Your comments on the scope and significance of their research and service would be valued. We also request an explicit comparison of the candidate with their peers at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would also be welcome. When evaluating the candidate's scholarship, please consider the candidate's scholarly, artistic, or creative activities in the context of their overall responsibilities, as described in their personal statement. If you have knowledge of [name]'s service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well.

Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate. Please note that evaluators must not be a scholar **with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.**

To assist in your review, we draw your attention to the fact that this candidate's dossier includes work performed in one or more years in which COVID-19 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.

We will need your letter within six weeks, sooner if possible. We are expected to provide biographical information about referees and would be very grateful if you could submit a current curriculum **vita** with your letter.

Let us assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the members of the Promotion & Tenure Panel at NYU Libraries, and appropriate decision-makers and review panels within the University. We would

appreciate addressing your response to this request to The Promotion & Tenure Panel, NYU Libraries, and submitting via Interfolio.

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

Sincerely, XXXXXX Promotion & Tenure Panel Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Committee NYU Libraries

Sample Solicitation Letter, Promotion review for promotion to Curator

Dear :

[Candidate name], [Job title] currently an Associate Curator in the Division of Libraries, is being considered for promotion to the rank of Full Curator, a process described in the NYU Division of Libraries Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure [\[link to Guidelines\]](#). Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of their published and unpublished research.

The candidate's dossier (curriculum vitae, their statement, and copies of published or unpublished works) is available through Interfolio. If you need copies of any other of their published or unpublished works to make your evaluation, please let us 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 [name]'s research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, and rate of publication. Your comments on the scope and significance of their research and service would be valued. We also request an explicit comparison of the candidate with their peers at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. When evaluating the candidate's scholarship be mindful that the professional roles and responsibilities of academic faculty librarians differ widely from faculty in other disciplines. Contributions to knowledge in librarianship may not take the form or extent of scholarly research and publication expected in other academic fields.

For promotion to full Curator, the candidate for promotion must show evidence of significant academic achievement beyond the work considered at the point of having been awarded tenure. The normal expectation will be the publication of significant new research, professional advancement, and [impactful service to the university and/or profession since the conferring of tenure](#). The candidate was conferred tenure and Promoted to Associate Curator in [DATE here].

Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate. Please note that evaluators must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been [closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate](#).

We will need your letter within six weeks, sooner if possible. We are expected to provide biographical information about referees. We would, therefore, be very grateful if you could submit with your letter a current curriculum vita.

Let us assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the members of the Promotion & Tenure Panel at NYU Libraries, and appropriate decision-makers and review panels within the University.

We would appreciate addressing your response to this request to the Promotion & Tenure Panel, NYU Libraries, and submitting via Interfolio. We thank you for generously assisting us. We realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely, XXXXXX Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Committee Panel NYU Libraries

Sample Solicitation Letter, Internal Reviewer, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion

Dear :

[Candidate name], [Job title] is currently an Assistant Curator in the Division of Libraries and is being considered for tenure and promotion.

The process for tenure and promotion and the role of internal reviewers is described in the NYU Division of Libraries Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure [insert link].

Reviews from within NYU Libraries or from members of the NYU Faculty should evaluate work performance and the effectiveness of service to the university and the profession. Therefore, we ask that you, as a member of the NYU Faculty, provide your candid assessment of the candidates strengths and weaknesses in those two areas alone. [Attached to this request is a listing of the candidate appointment dates and titles, and a listing of all service and committee work for NYU.]

Candidates for Tenure must demonstrate excellence in their work performance and demonstrate how their work has had a substantive impact on Libraries programs and services. The most important criterion for tenure is the effectiveness of performance as a librarian, which is evidenced by the candidate's continuing ability to perform at the highest professional level in areas that contribute to the educational and research mission of the University.

Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate. Please note that evaluators must not be an individual with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.

To assist in your review, we draw your attention to the fact that this candidate's dossier includes work performed in one or more years in which COVID-19 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.

We will need to receive your letter by [DATE], sooner if possible.

Let us assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the members of the Promotion & Tenure Panel at NYU Libraries, and appropriate decision-makers and review panels within the University.

We would appreciate addressing your response to this request to The Promotion & Tenure Panel, NYU Libraries, and submitting via Interfolio. We thank you for generously assisting us. We realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.

Sincerely, XXXXXX Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Committee NYU Libraries