



Date: September 16, 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: Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures in the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service

The T-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached recommendations regarding the Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures in the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service. These recommendations were approved by the Council at the September 15, 2022 meeting.

cc: Sherry Glied, Dean, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
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.
To: T-FSC

Date: 9/15/2022

Re: Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures

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

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

Number and letter sections of the document:

1. The Wagner document included numerous quotes from the Faculty Handbook and it is clear from those quotes, that there is an urgent need for an update of the Handbook, particularly to address antiquated and disparaging phrases. There are several phrases that brought this to our attention, for example: *a) Introduction, Line 26, "An assessment must not ignore a candidate's **defects**;" b) Introduction, Lines 27-28, "Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure or promotion, and "advocacy" assessments that attempt to gloss over **imperfections** are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration.*
2. **Section II. Standards and Procedures for Tenure Review, A. Standards for Tenure:** *Line 3, Page 5: As the subcommittee appointed by the Wagner P&T Committee and consisting of 2 tenured members appears more like a mentorship committee than a separate P&T subcommittee, we suggest it be renamed/reformatted to reflect the procedures of a Mentoring Committee, which will also be more in line with many of the other NYU schools.*
3. **B. Procedures for Tenure Review, #4, Tenure Review:** Line 20, We suggest a timeline that considers the actual amount of time for which a colleague is considered to be too "closely associated" to serve as an evaluator; such a timeline is used by NIH in its Conflict of Interest documents.
4. **Content of Subcommittee Report,** Line 3: *".....views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the vote of the full committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket will be made available to all tenured Wagner faculty. It is suggested that for the sake of privacy and confidentiality that this process of sharing with all Wagner tenured faculty, be reconsidered.*
5. **Content of Subcommittee Report, Sixth bullet,** Lines 28-30: *"The NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide that the Dean is generally expected to solicit at least three additional letters of evaluation." While this is a direct quote from the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guideline documents, we strongly feel that solicitation of an additional three letters are unnecessary (given the 6-10 evaluation letters previously requested and*

acquired earlier) and would add substantial time to the process. The PPTM Committee recognizes this comment would require a change to the NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, but as stated above in Point 1 it appears such action could be considered for a more up-to-date document.

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

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

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

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

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

Annual Reviews, (Page 4, Lines 19-24): “Research and professional visibility, including presentations at conferences, public meetings, and seminars at peer schools and departments;

- The number, type, and quality of peer-reviewed articles, including consideration of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship;
- Peer-reviewed journal types and journal ranking source(s); Peer-reviewed books and monographs, if any, including consideration of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship.”

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

Annual Reviews, (Page 5, Lines 2-3): “In subsequent years, except for the intensive review and tenure review described below, an annual review will be conducted by a subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee.” *As the subcommittee seems more reflective of a mentoring committee, we suggest that it is referred to as such and the format be adjusted to meet the criteria of a Mentoring Committee.*

Intensive Review, (Page 6, Lines 23-25): “The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any issues or concerns raised in the report. The report shall also be made available to all tenured faculty members.”-*We suggest that any options open to the candidate to rebut/refute/grieve the decision be explained in this section. Moreover, The PPTM Committee suggests that this process of providing documents to all tenured faculty members be reconsidered for the sake of privacy.*

Content of Subcommittee Report, (Page 10, Line 3): “..... views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the vote of the full committee) replaces the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket will be made available to all tenured Wagner faculty.” *The PPTM Committee suggests that this process be reconsidered for the sake of privacy.*

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

3 As Adopted December 1, 2021
4

5
6
7 **I. INTRODUCTION**
8

9 This document sets forth standards and procedures for tenure and promotion at the Robert F.
10 Wagner Graduate School of Public Service (Wagner). It is intended to support a comprehensive
11 and fair review of candidates, while ensuring high academic standards in awarding tenure and
12 promotion. Standards and procedures for promotion with tenure are detailed in Section II, with
13 standards and procedures for promotion to full professor described in Section III, and for
14 external (lateral) hires with initial appointment with tenure (associate or full professor) in Section
15 IV.
16

17 The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines¹ include the following:
18

19 “The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is perhaps
20 their highest responsibility. The process begins with their review, and it is highly dependent
21 upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor. To give weak advice to the...School P&T
22 Advisory Committee or to the Dean on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be
23 made at a later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an
24 abdication of responsibility...
25

26 An assessment must not ignore candidates’ defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to tenure
27 or promotion, and “advocacy” assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more
28 likely to arouse suspicion than admiration. It is far more helpful to the candidate...and the
29 Dean to have a balanced discussion of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses.
30

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

37 Pursuant to the Wagner Governance Bylaws, an Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee
38 (hereinafter referred to as “P&T Committee”) is appointed by the Dean with the advice of the
39 Faculty Advisory Committee which is elected by the faculty. As is detailed below, in
40 conducting promotion and tenure reviews, the P&T Committee will prepare a docket, including a
41 report from the P&T Committee with a recommendation on promotion or tenure, which is then
42 provided to tenured faculty of appropriate rank² who make a recommendation to the Dean. The

¹ The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are available at <https://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-and-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html>.

² That is, associate professors and full professors for promotion to associate professors and conferral of tenure, and full professors for promotion to full professor.

1 Dean reviews the docket and recommendation of the faculty, and makes a recommendation to
2 the Provost who has ultimate authority for the decision on promotion and tenure.
3
4

5 **II. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE REVIEW** 6

7 **A. Standards for Tenure** 8

9 The New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines include the following general
10 standards:
11

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

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

28 It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of
29 measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by
30 delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context may be a
31 criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. All these factors must be carefully
32 discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure”.
33

34 At Wagner, we recognize that both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued.
35 Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s field may
36 cut across several disciplines and sectors. Engagement in public service is encouraged at
37 Wagner, and we value faculty scholarship and research that has the potential to influence public
38 policy, management, and planning. In making appointments and decisions on promotion and
39 tenure, Wagner will attempt to balance its collective needs and talents, and, accordingly, the
40 weighting of these standards may differ among individual candidates. At Wagner we also
41 recognize that the tenure process is one of mutual responsibility, with the candidate assembling a
42 record of accomplishment and tenured faculty providing support and guidance throughout the
43 process.
44

45 **B. Procedures For Tenure Review** 46

47 **1. Introduction**

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

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

15
16 All non-tenured tenure track faculty are reviewed annually during their probationary period by
17 the P&T Committee (or a subcommittee thereof) to assess performance at Wagner and progress
18 toward tenure, and to make a recommendation to the Dean on reappointment. A special, more
19 intensive, review is conducted in the third year for faculty with a seven-year probationary period,
20 the second year for faculty with a five-year probationary period, and early in the first year for
21 faculty with a four-year probationary period. Reviews are typically conducted in the spring of
22 the academic year, except for the tenure review which commences in the fall of the penultimate
23 year of the probationary period. These annual reviews leading up to tenure review are intended
24 as a mentoring process to help support and guide the candidate in development of his/her/their
25 /academic career and to prepare the candidate for tenure review. The reviews are also intended
26 to advise the candidate on adequacy of progress towards tenure, with a goal of providing early
27 notice to the candidate if tenure appears unlikely.

28 29 2. Annual Reviews

30
31 Each year, a subcommittee will be appointed by the P&T Committee to conduct the review and
32 make recommendations to the full P&T Committee. The subcommittee typically includes two
33 tenured faculty members (except for the intensive review which will typically include three
34 members). To provide continuity, it is the intent that the subcommittee chair serve on all
35 subsequent reviews of said junior faculty member during his or her probationary period (except
36 when on sabbatical or leave). In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the
37 Urban Planning faculty³, the subcommittee chair shall be a faculty member with a primary
38 appointment on the Urban Planning faculty.⁴ The candidate shall submit a CV and a memo for
39 discussion with the subcommittee that includes a description of:

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

³A “primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty,” as such term is used herein, is a distinction that is made at hire or at some later point by agreement with the Dean.

⁴ This document contains special provisions for the Master of Urban Planning program to comply with accreditation standards of the Planning Accreditation Board.

- 1 – A list of leading scholars/researchers in the field(s) of interest;
- 2 – A list of journals targeted for current and future publication; and
- 3 – Other information related to the candidate’s goals during the probationary period
- 4 outlined below;
- 5 ▪ Teaching activity at Wagner, with course syllabi and full student course evaluations
- 6 including student comments (and any response by the candidate to those comments)
- 7 attached; and
- 8 ▪ Service at Wagner, at NYU, in his/her/their scholarly field(s) of interest, and to the
- 9 public; and
- 10 ▪ How/whether COVID has impacted the candidate’s performance, including teaching,
- 11 research, and service⁵.

12
13 For candidates with a seven- or five-year probationary period, the review in the first year is
14 primarily intended to:

- 15 ▪ Familiarize the candidate with the tenure review process; and
- 16 ▪ Set goals for the candidate for the probationary period⁶, including
 - 17 – Research productivity and other scholarly activity;
 - 18 – Research and professional visibility, including presentations at conferences,
 - 19 public meetings, and seminars at peer schools and departments;
 - 20 – The number, type, and quality of peer-reviewed articles, including consideration
 - 21 of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship;
 - 22 – Peer-reviewed journal types and journal ranking source(s);
 - 23 – Peer-reviewed books and monographs, if any, including consideration of issues
 - 24 related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship;
 - 25 – Non-peer-reviewed articles, books, and monographs, if any, including
 - 26 consideration of issues related to first-listed authorship and co-authorship;
 - 27 – Grant funding, if any, including consideration of visibility and standing in the
 - 28 candidate’s field;
 - 29 – Opportunities for influence on public policy, management, and planning;
 - 30 – Teaching activity at Wagner and NYU, including development of any new
 - 31 courses and major revisions of existing courses; and
 - 32 – Service activity at Wagner and NYU, including participation on standing, ad hoc,
 - 33 and doctoral committees.

34
35 These goals are expected to differ among candidates and scholarly disciplines and fields. While
36 achieving these goals cannot assure granting of tenure, they are intended to provide general
37 guidance on minimum expectations for the candidate for consideration of tenure and to assist
38 subsequent annual and intensive reviews in assessing progress towards tenure.

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

⁶ While these goals are for publications and activities during the probationary period at Wagner, they should take into account publications and activities prior to appointment at Wagner, and, during the review for tenure, the candidate’s full record of achievement shall be considered.

1
2 In subsequent years, except for the intensive review and tenure review described below, an
3 annual review will be conducted by a subcommittee appointed by the P&T Committee. The goal
4 is to provide guidance to the candidate in his/her/their academic career and to monitor continuing
5 progress towards tenure and may include revisions in the goals described above.
6

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

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

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

16 c) If a faculty member is on workload relief without a tenure clock stoppage, a full annual review
17 will take place, adapting its timing to take into account the circumstances giving rise to the
18 workload relief.
19

20 The review process typically involves one or more meetings of the candidate with the
21 subcommittee, and the subcommittee makes a written report to the full P&T Committee
22 characterizing its findings, including a recommendation on reappointment.⁷ The first year
23 subcommittee report shall include a listing of the goals described above, and subsequent annual
24 reviews shall document any changes in the goals during the review period.
25

26 The vote by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for
27 reappointment shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous
28 consent to a voice vote. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near
29 consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A brief report (generally an amended
30 version of the memo received by the Committee incorporating any discussion or additional views
31 from the full P&T Committee) summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance
32 and progress toward tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the
33 candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is
34 forwarded to the Dean and to the candidate. The candidate shall then submit a memo to the
35 P&T Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any
36 issues or concerns identified in the report. The report shall also be made available to all tenured
37 faculty members.
38

39 3. Intensive Review

40

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

⁷ In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, if the subcommittee does not recommend reappointment, the matter shall first be referred to the Urban Planning Program for consideration by Urban Planning faculty members of appropriate rank, who shall make a recommendation to the full P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall consider, but not be bound by, the recommendation of the Urban Planning faculty.

1 goal of the review is to assess whether the candidate's progress toward tenure is satisfactory.
2 The candidate's field(s) of scholarship/research are expected to be well defined, publications to
3 date and in progress strong, teaching and service at Wagner/NYU satisfactory, and any potential
4 influence on public policy, management, and planning described.

5
6 The candidate will submit an updated CV and personal statement that includes the material
7 detailed above for annual review for discussion with the subcommittee appointed by the P&T
8 Committee and meet with the subcommittee. The personal statement a description of
9 how/whether COVID has impacted the candidate's performance, including teaching, research,
10 and service⁸. The subcommittee will submit a written report to the full P&T Committee
11 assessing progress to date and likelihood of the candidate achieving tenure status, including a
12 recommendation on reappointment.⁹ The subcommittee shall review the probationary period
13 goals described above and report on progress to date and on possible revisions, if any. The vote
14 by the P&T Committee on whether the candidate should be recommended for reappointment
15 shall be conducted by closed ballot unless the Committee agrees by unanimous consent to a
16 voice vote. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus
17 or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote. A brief memo (generally an amended version of
18 the memo received by the Committee incorporating any discussion or additional views from the
19 full P&T Committee) summarizing the information gathered, assessing performance and
20 progress towards tenure, delineating any actions recommended by the Committee to the
21 candidate, and providing a recommendation on reappointment with a tally of the vote is
22 forwarded to the Dean and the candidate. The candidate shall then submit a memo to the P&T
23 Committee and the Dean acknowledging receipt of the report, and may also respond to any
24 issues or concerns raised in the report. The report shall also be made available to all tenured
25 faculty members.

26 27 4. Tenure Review

28
29 The process of reviewing candidates requesting consideration for tenure by the P&T Committee
30 in the penultimate probationary year involves six steps:

31
32 First, the candidate submits by September 15th of the penultimate probationary year
33 materials required for inclusion in the tenure docket including a CV, personal statement, all
34 publications, academic book reviews (if any), citation analysis, a list of doctoral advisees
35 and committees, course syllabi, and full teaching evaluations for all NYU courses(including
36 student comments, as well as aggregate rankings) The candidate's personal statement must
37 narrate the trajectory of the candidate's career, including a description of the relationships
38 among works already published, distributed or performed, a description of new projects
39 planned or under way, and a description of the place teaching, including particular courses,
40 occupies in the career. The personal statement should include:

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

⁸ See footnote 5 above.

⁹ In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, if significant uncertainties or deficiencies are noted or if the subcommittee does not recommend reappointment, the matter shall first be referred to Urban Planning faculty members of appropriate rank, who shall make a recommendation to the full P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall review and consider, but not be bound by, any recommendation of Urban Planning faculty.

- 1 ▪ Summary of teaching activity at Wagner and student evaluations;
- 2 ▪ Description of service at Wagner and NYU (including participation on standing, ad
- 3 hoc, and doctoral committees), as well as service in his/her/their scholarly field(s) of
- 4 interest and the public;
- 5 ▪ Any evidence of potential influence on and involvement with public policy,
- 6 management, and planning;
- 7 ▪ A planned research and scholarly trajectory for the future;
- 8 ▪ A description of how/whether COVID has impacted the candidate's performance,
- 9 including teaching, research, and service¹⁰; and
- 10 ▪ A statement of teaching philosophy (which can be included in a separate document).

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

23 The tenure docket prepared by the subcommittee should include:

- 24 ▪ The materials submitted by the candidate as described above;
- 25 ▪ Letters from the director of the candidate's program and specialization at Wagner
- 26 assessing the candidate's teaching and service engagement;
- 27 ▪ Letters from external reviewers as described below (including their CVs);
- 28 ▪ Copies of prior annual reviews, including the third-year intensive review and any
- 29 response from the candidate on the reviews;
- 30 ▪ The subcommittee report;
- 31 ▪ Such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate.

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

35
36 With respect to external letters, the New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
37 provide that:

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

¹⁰ See footnote 5 above.

In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty, the subcommittee shall be chaired by a faculty member with a primary appointment on the Urban Planning faculty and the majority of its voting members shall be Urban Planning faculty members.

1 such as fields with very small membership or fields in which papers typically have a
2 large number of authors (i.e. multicenter clinical trials, large epidemiology studies, etc.),
3 and then only acceptable with permission of the Dean. Nor can they be scholars that have
4 been suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators. If the [subcommittee]
5 inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate,
6 this must be noted in [its] report. The [subcommittee] may also choose to include
7 additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or
8 who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is
9 clearly noted in the docket. These letters may be included in addition to, but not instead
10 of, the five letters from external evaluators not identified by the candidate.

11
12 It shall be the goal of the subcommittee to receive 6-10 external review letters.

13
14 Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators - Evaluators selected normally will hold a tenured
15 position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of
16 equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent
17 rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory or research institute). Evaluators must be
18 recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline. Evaluators must be representative of their
19 subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations. At least
20 one of the evaluators must be a scholar identified with broader sectors of the discipline in
21 question. The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at United States institutions;
22 where appropriate, evaluators must be solicited from abroad.

23
24 To emphasize the point, the docket must include specific explanations for the choice of
25 particular referees contacted. The explanations must consist of more than the CVs of the
26 referees. They must state why this particular referee's opinion matters (e.g., she/he/they is
27 the most widely published author in the candidate's field; he is in a different discipline but
28 edits the premier journal in the candidate's field, etc.). It is particularly important to exclude
29 referees, such as former advisors or collaborators, who have a personal or professional
30 connection to the candidate – such letters cannot be accepted and the time needed to obtain
31 replacement letters can significantly delay consideration of a case.

32
33 The suitability of the evaluators with respect to rank, appropriateness or fit with the
34 candidate's field, level of expertise and leadership in the field, and absence of conflict of
35 interest will be a consideration in review by the chair of the Departmental Promotion and
36 Tenure Committee, the Dean and the Provost.

37
38 The letter of solicitation for external evaluation should generally come from the
39 subcommittee chair or the Dean of the Wagner School, and must follow the prototype
40 attached in Appendix A. The letter must explicitly request comparative rankings with the
41 candidate's peers, and it must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from
42 the evaluator is desired. All evaluators must be provided with the same C.V., personal
43 statement, and copies or descriptions of the candidate's work. If unpublished work is part of
44 the docket, the ...[School] must ask all evaluators to comment on its quality. The docket
45 provided to outside evaluators should include a summary of teaching evaluation including
46 any student comments, but shall not include individual student comments.

1
2 Confidentiality of Evaluations: It is University policy to treat as confidential all evaluations
3 of University faculty, making only such limited exceptions as are necessary to permit
4 informed review of promotion and tenure decisions by the appropriate decision makers and
5 review panels within the University.¹²
6

7 The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; only eligible voters
8 (and subcommittee members from outside Wagner) may be allowed access to the letters.
9 Neither the names of writers, nor the content of the letters may be communicated to the
10 candidate or anyone else beyond faculty eligible to vote (and subcommittee members from
11 outside Wagner), not even in summary form. In all communications with them, external
12 reviewers must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, to the extent
13 allowed by law, and that they will be seen only by faculty members entitled to vote, the
14 Dean, and the Provost's Office.
15

16 Content of Subcommittee Report - The report of the subcommittee should include a list of all
17 potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who
18 declined. All communications with potential evaluators should be documented and included
19 in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written should
20 be included with the docket, as well as an explanation for any declinations.
21

22 The report of the subcommittee should provide a detailed summary and assessment of the
23 candidate's scholarship/research, teaching, service, including engagement with public
24 policy, management, and planning. The report should address the field of expertise of the
25 candidate and its significance to the school. The candidate's position in the field and the
26 discipline as a whole must be described as precisely as possible. This appraisal must include
27 comparisons with other scholars at similar stages in their careers in the discipline at large.
28

29 The report should not be an advocacy document, but should strive to provide a fair
30 assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. The report will generally
31 include an explicit recommendation on whether tenure should be granted, with a detailed
32 rationale for the recommendation. The vote by the subcommittee on any recommendation
33 for tenure shall be by closed ballot, with a tally of the vote included in its report.
34

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

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

¹³ In the case of a candidate with a primary appointment in the Urban Planning Program, the subcommittee report shall first be reviewed by the Urban Planning faculty of appropriate rank, and a recommendation made to the full P&T Committee on tenure. The P&T Committee shall review, but not be bound by, any recommendation of Urban Planning faculty.

1 views from the full P&T Committee and a tally of the vote of the full committee) replaces
2 the subcommittee report on the docket, and the full docket will be made available to all
3 tenured Wagner faculty.
4

5 Fourth, the chair of the P&T Committee will present the case to tenured faculty of
6 appropriate rank at a meeting with due notice as provided in the Wagner Governance
7 Bylaws. A reasonable effort must be made to enable eligible faculty, including faculty on
8 leave, to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote. After a
9 discussion, a vote will be taken and tallied. The vote shall be by closed ballot. A tally of the
10 number of absent members should be recorded and reported separately. The Chair of the
11 P&T Committee shall transmit the tally of the vote and a summary of the discussion to the
12 Dean as described in step five below and shall notify the candidate of the faculty's decision.
13 Reasonable doubt for granting tenure precludes a favorable recommendation. If a reasonable
14 doubt exists, the Chair of the P&T Committee shall indicate as much to the Dean in the
15 Chair's report to the Dean. Re-voting shall not be undertaken for the sole purpose of
16 achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.
17

18 Fifth, the chair of the P&T Committee will prepare a letter, which will be appended to the
19 docket, outlining the case. The letter should include comments from the full faculty
20 discussion, where relevant to the strengths or weakness of the case, and not repeat the
21 content of the P&T Committee report. The chair and all members of the P&T Committee
22 must sign the signature page of the docket, attesting that they have read the docket and
23 that it represents the opinions of the committee clearly and fairly.
24

25 Sixth, the Dean will review the docket, the subcommittee report, and the report from the
26 P&T Chair, prepare a report with his or her own assessment of the case, and transmit the
27 report, docket, and recommendation on tenure to the Provost no later than June 1st. The
28 NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines provide that the Dean is generally expected to
29 solicit at least three additional letters of evaluation. If the Dean has a reasonable doubt about
30 the excellence of the docket, the Dean should share that information in the Dean's report and
31 consider withholding a favorable recommendation.
32

33 Indicators of doubt may include a split vote within the P&T Committee or School. The
34 report should explain, in substantive terms, what was the basis for the positive and negative
35 votes in earlier stages of the review. The Dean will inform the full faculty entitled to vote
36 on tenure of his/her/their own proposed recommendation to the Provost within 10 days of
37 submission. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the faculty, the
38 Dean will provide the faculty entitled to vote on tenure with a statement of the reasons. The
39 faculty will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument
40 before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost. Upon notification of the
41 Provost's decision, the Dean will write to the full faculty eligible to vote on tenure and to the
42 candidate informing them of the decision.
43

44 In the event of a negative decision on tenure, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in
45 accordance with the provisions of the University's Faculty Grievance Procedures as specified in
46 the NYU Faculty Handbook.
47

1 Any time on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review year, an untenured
2 faculty member may tender a letter of resignation, effective on or before August 31 of the final
3 probationary year. The letter of resignation must state explicitly that the resignation was freely
4 tendered without duress. However, such faculty member shall not be eligible for a full-time
5 appointment or position at NYU any time beyond his/her/their probationary period, as provided
6 in Title I, Section V, Article 3 of the Statement in Regard to Academic Freedom and Tenure as
7 set forth in the NYU Faculty Handbook.

8 9 5. Tenure Clock Stoppage

10
11 The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal University rules adopted by the Board of
12 Trustees, and may be extended in accordance with standard University policy as set forth in the
13 Faculty Handbook.¹⁴ For those candidates who have been granted an extension, NYU policy is
14 to evaluate the productivity of the candidate as if he or she had been in probationary status for
15 the normal duration, so that the candidate is not penalized for having received the extension.

16 17 6. Early Tenure Review

18
19 Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure are considered extraordinary
20 actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution to
21 propose candidates for tenure ahead of schedule. The Dean must be consulted prior to the
22 preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of
23 extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. It must be
24 noted that external letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds
25 for an early decision. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not
26 recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already
27 high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

28 29 30 **III. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

31 32 **A. Standards for Promotion**

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

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

¹⁴ 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>.

1
2 In applying these standards, Wagner values both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship.
3 Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate’s “field” may
4 cut across several disciplines and sectors. The standards cited in the University’s Promotion and
5 Tenure Guidelines for tenure are also applied when promotion is considered. Wagner recognizes
6 the importance of public service and the potential for scholarship and research to have in an
7 influence on public policy, management, and planning, and a candidate’s contributions in these
8 areas may also be considered. There is an expectation that the candidate is fully engaged at
9 Wagner to help build and strengthen Wagner’s academic programs and scholarly community,
10 including significant effort in mentoring junior faculty.

11
12 **B. Procedures for Promotion**

13
14 The process for promotion to full professor parallels that for tenure review, with the following
15 exceptions.

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

25 At every state of the process, authority to vote resides with the full professors in the school.

26

1 Any time prior to the Dean’s recommendation to the Provost, the candidate may voluntarily
2 withdraw his/her/their candidacy for promotion from Associate to full Professor.

3 4 **IV. INITIAL APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE (LATERAL HIRES)**

5
6 NYU practice at all schools is for explicit written arrangements to require a tenure review at the
7 Department, School, and University levels; their appointments are made pending completion of
8 the tenure review and this shall be recorded in their appointment letters.¹⁵ Any exception to this
9 practice requires the written consent of the Provost.

10
11
12 In the case of initial appointment of a faculty member with tenure as an associate or full
13 professor, reports of any Ad Hoc Faculty Search Committee shall be considered in an executive
14 session of the faculty meeting, with attendance limited to the Wagner School Tenured/Tenure
15 Track and Continuing Contract Faculty and a vote shall be conducted. This vote is to
16 recommend initial appointment, not tenure, with all tenured and tenure-track faculty eligible to
17 vote, in accordance with Section III.B.2.d of Wagner’s Governance Bylaws. The Dean will then
18 review the faculty’s recommendation and determine whether to pursue the hire with tenure, and,
19 if positive, refer the tenure review to the P&T Committee.

20
21 The P&T Committee may conduct the review on an expedited basis in a manner consistent with
22 the process and intent of the guidelines and procedures set forth above. The docket and
23 committee report shall be presented at a meeting of the full faculty entitled to vote and the
24 process for faculty vote and review by the Dean shall be conducted as provided above and in a
25 manner consistent with Wagner Governance Bylaws.

26
27 For lateral hires, docket submitted to the Provost must also include a memo from the Dean
28 describing why the candidate is an important hire for the school and a justification for
29 establishing a tenured position in the candidate’s field of expertise.

30 31 32 **V. CROSS APPOINTMENTS¹⁶**

33
34 Tenure review and third year review for faculty with appointments involving more than one unit
35 of the University (“cross-appointments”) shall ensure the input of all relevant units.
36

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

¹⁶ A summary of Cross Appointments can be found at
https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/provost/documents/OAA/Cross_Appointments_GNF_2020.pdf

1 Evaluations of individuals with Joint appointments in more than one unit, as part of an intensive
2 review or preparatory to a recommendation for promotion or tenure, must include an explicit
3 discussion of the special circumstances of the appointment, expectations for the candidate's
4 multi-disciplinary activities, perspective and position, and the judgment of how well the
5 appointee has met these expectations. The composition of the...P&T Committee in the primary
6 unit (division, department or program) must include members of both units. Both units must
7 vote on the report, with the guidelines outlined above concerning procedures and reporting
8 applying to both. Each unit must forward its recommendation to the Dean of each school only
9 after consultation with the other unit. If the units arrive at significantly different
10 recommendations, the Dean (where joint appointments are between schools, the Deans) will
11 ordinarily invite the Chairs together to discuss the case. Where joint appointments are between
12 schools, the Dean of the secondary school forwards that Dean's letter to the Dean of the primary
13 school, for inclusion in the docket.

14
15 Where the candidate has an Associated Appointment in a secondary unit, the School's review
16 must include a written evaluation from the secondary unit explaining, among other matters
17 thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that unit's mission. This
18 evaluation may be written by the Chair of the secondary unit after formal consultation with the
19 faculty members of the unit.

20
21 In the case of an Affiliated Appointment, written evaluations on the secondary appointment are
22 recommended but are not required.

23
24
25

26 **VI. PARTICIPATION AND VOTING**

27

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

35
36

1 **EXTERNAL SENIOR APPOINTMENT**

2
3 Dear xxxx:

4
5 Professor X of the University West at East is being considered for a tenured appointment at the
6 rank of full professor at the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service. Because of your
7 knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her/their research.
8

9 I am enclosing Professor X's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies or
10 descriptions of his/her/their work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid
11 assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor X's research with respect to intellectual
12 quality, originality, scope, and significance. We also request an explicit comparison of her work
13 with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable
14 points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If
15 you have knowledge of Professor X's teaching ability or service to the university and/or the
16 professional community, we would appreciate your comments on these matters as well. Please
17 indicate in your letter how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.
18

19 Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor X would be considered
20 a strong candidate for appointment as a full professor in other leading departments and schools in
21 the field. The process of evaluating a candidate for appointment at Wagner is an inquiry: Is the
22 candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals
23 in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the
24 School? Both high quality applied and theoretical scholarship are valued. Because of the multi-
25 disciplinary nature of public service scholarship, a candidate's "field" may cut across several
26 disciplines and sectors.
27

28 We would like your letter by [insert date], sooner if possible. The University's promotion and
29 tenure procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a current curriculum vitae.
30

31 Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the full
32 professors [and associate professors if hiring is at the associate level] of the School, and
33 appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University, to the extent allowed by
34 law.
35

36 Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you know,
37 it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review.
38

39 Sincerely,
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 .