



Date: May 12, 2020

Memorandum to: Katherine Fleming, Provost

From: Nicholas Economides
Chairperson, T-Faculty Senators Council
A/Y 2019-2020

Subject: T-Faculty Senators Council Review of Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The T-Faculty Senators Council submits the attached review, approved by the Council at the May 7, 2020 meeting.

cc: Kristen Day, Vice Provost
Ellen Schall, Senior Presidential Fellow

Darcey Merritt, T-FSC Vice Chairperson
David Irving, T-FSC Secretary
Wen Ling, T-FSC Immediate Past Chair

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

P&T policy:

1. Section 3, paragraph 1: the PPTM committee prefers the original wording that was replaced. If revised wording is kept, suggest:
 - a. Replace vague phrase “outstanding achievement”
 - b. Replace “wide reputations” with “strong reputations”(?) or “national recognition” or some such
 - c. Mention service here, as well, since it is expected
 - d. Clarify that impact on policy is only expected in certain fields; overall clarify that there are different measures of scholarly success in different fields and that the candidate will be evaluated according to appropriate measures.
2. Section 4, Departmental Review Stage 1:
 - a. Need clarification for schools that don't have a department structure or other cases where pre-tenure faculty report directly to Dean. Similarly other situations where hierarchy is compressed (dean who is acting as dept head, etc)
 - b. “The committee must not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, including but not limited to a thesis advisor, co-author or other close associate; such individuals are, however, eligible to participate in the full departmental discussion and vote on the committee report. “ -- this may be problematic for candidates who collaborate widely with colleagues in their department. In addition, here and elsewhere, perhaps there should be a “sunset” on old collaborations, similar to the rules NSF has for conflicts, e.g. no collaborations in the last 4 years. More generally, there are other kinds of conflicts of interest as well. It might be better to have a separate section defining conflicts of interest and refer to it here and elsewhere.
 - c. “Depending on the P&T rules of the department or the school, the **formal written report** and recommendation of the Department P&T Committee may be ...” Need to clarify what is in the formal written report. What artifacts should (or cannot) be evaluated in order to make a recommendation (e.g. scholarly works, letters of recommendation, etc.).
 - d. Depending on the P&T rules of the department or the school, the formal written report and recommendation of the Department P&T Committee **may be presented** to the tenured department faculty of appropriate rank for a vote,” Suggest changing “may be presented” to “shall be presented”
 - e. Materials for the Departmental Promotion & Tenure Committee: Suggest moving description of the docket at various stages of the process to before description of the process (or making a reference earlier to section containing these details.) This could be organized into different parts that are added at different stages of the process
3. Committee report
 - a. Assessment of service: May want to minimize this component for Assistant professors up for tenure
4. External evaluators
 - a. “The Department will **solicit** at least five (5) letters from outside evaluators who are recognized leaders in the candidate’s discipline.” Department should submit at least five letters, not just solicit them. [Suggest consideration of this formulation to clarify expectations: “*The Department shall **solicit** letters from a*

sufficient number of outside evaluators who are recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline, to secure at least five letters constituting external testimony for the docket....”]

- b. Co-authors: see comment above re co-authors from sufficiently distant past and other forms of conflict of interest
 - c. “In exceptional cases, the Department may also choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co- authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the docket. These letters may be included in addition to, but not instead of, the five letters from external evaluators not identified by the candidate. “ What kind of exceptional cases and how is it determined whether this will be permitted?”
5. Dean’s Review : Stage II
- a. “Such a committee may be either appointed by the Dean or elected by the school faculty or may be a combination of the two”. Suggest mandating that some portion of the committee (a majority of members?) be elected by the faculty.
 - b. It is unclear whether this section refers to the school-wide committee or some additional advisory committee that the Dean may form.
 - c. “The Dean will inform the Department Chair of the advice provided by the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure, as well as of his/her own proposed recommendation to the Provost. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the Department, the Dean will also provide the dean's advisory committee and the Department Chair with the reasons. The Department Chair will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the Dean's final recommendation is made to the Provost.” Does “contrary to that of the department” mean contrary to the department chair or contrary to the department PTC ? What about feedback and chance for further info for other kinds of disagreements, e.g. Dean disagreeing with advisory committee, advisory committee disagreeing with dept P&T or dept head, etc ?
 - d. “If the Dean has a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, the Dean should share that information in his or her report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation. Indicators of doubt may include a split vote within the Department or School-Wide Committee, or a clear difference of opinion between the Department Committee and School-Wide Committee. The report should lay out, in substantive terms, the basis for the positive and negative votes.” Clarify. Distinguish between positive and negative recommendations and/or between Dean agreeing/disagreeing w/ recommendation from prior stages. [Suggest consideration of possible alternative language for the opening statement: *“If the Dean has some reservations about aspects of an otherwise excellent docket,...”*]

Handbook:

1. Section V.3: “A full-time assistant professor in any school, college, division, or department except the School of Medicine and its departments, the Leonard N. Stern School of Business and its departments, the College of Dentistry and its departments, and the Rory Meyers College of Nursing and its departments, who is not promoted at the expiration of seven years as full-time assistant professor shall be ineligible for further full-time appointment in the University. ... [goes on to say something similar for Stern, Langone, etc]”

Suggest striking this section, thereby allowing faculty who are denied tenure to apply for open contract faculty or administrative positions.

2. “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.”
 - a. Consider rewording, changing “pending completion of the tenure review” to “contingent on a positive outcome of the tenure review”
 - b. Similar issue later in document for full prof appointments