

The Leonard N. Stern School of Business Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Approved June 2019

I. INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth principles and procedures for tenure and promotion at NYU Stern. These principles support high academic standards and ensure a comprehensive and fair review of candidates. The successful implementation of these guidelines depends on the leadership of the Stern School's tenured faculty, department chairs and deans, and the provost of New York University. This document has been reviewed by the Office of the Provost and has been deemed to be in full compliance with the university's guidelines. Any changes to the guidelines in this document must be submitted to the Office of the Provost for approval.

II. STANDARDS FOR TENURE

A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching and service in the context of a research university is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU Stern, as is the promise of continued effective contributions toward the work and intellectual life of the individual's department, Stern, and the university. Once these prerequisites are met, outstanding scholarship is the requirement for tenure. Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research together with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship and an appropriate level of service. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the department?

It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context may be a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. The current and future shape of programs in the department and school may be relevant considerations. All these factors must be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure.

III. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION

Promotion to associate professor prior to the 8th year may come with or without tenure.

Promotion to associate professor *without tenure* signals to the candidate a good likelihood of a positive tenure recommendation by the eighth year of the individual's tenure clock, depending on continued evidence of the quality of the candidate's work and increasing evidence of its impact.

As indicated in Section II, promotion to associate professor *with tenure* indicates that the candidate has a record of outstanding research achievement and recognition, together with a record of effective teaching and service, and that the candidate is among the strongest in the field in comparison with others at a similar point in their careers.

The inquiry for promotion to full professor is essentially the same as for a tenure candidate: is the candidate for promotion among the strongest in her/his field, in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers at

other comparable prominent institutions or in other relevant settings? The candidate must have a record of effective teaching and service, as well as the promise of leadership within the individual's department, Stern, and the university. Beyond these prerequisites, the candidate must have achieved a significant academic milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be scholarly work that marks significant new research or achievement since the conferring of tenure. While active high-quality research remains the main criterion for promotion, exceptional service or teaching contributions to the school significantly beyond that normally expected of or performed by tenured associate professors may also be taken into account in the decision to promote to full professor. The compiled materials must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate's achievements since the last review for promotion.

IV. PROCEDURES & SCHEDULE

Promotion and tenure (P&T) review and recommendation occurs through a multilevel process of detailed evaluation by independent external evaluators; review within the department, including a departmental P&T sub-committee ("the sub-committee") and all tenured faculty of rank equal or higher to the rank that the candidate is being considered for promotion to ("the departmental committee"); review by the school-wide P&T committee ("the school-wide committee"); and review by the dean of the school and finally the provost of the university.

Prior to the start of the academic year, Stern's Office of Faculty Affairs will provide a schedule of the upcoming P&T deadlines, including when external letters and all materials are due. The schedule balances the need to guarantee adequate consideration with the desire that the process flow in a timely fashion. It includes these steps:

- The department chair forms a sub-committee for the case
- The candidate submits research, teaching & service statements, CV, & sample publications to department chair
- The department chair submits copies of these materials, and names of potential letter writers, to the dean's office
- The dean's office solicits outside letters
- The sub-committee prepares its report
- The department committee meets to discuss and vote on the case.
- The department chair submits the required materials to the dean's office (see Section V, "Required Materials")
- School-wide P&T committee meets to discuss and vote on the case, and then makes its recommendation to the dean
- Dean reviews the case and makes his/her recommendation to the provost
- Dean informs the department chair and candidate of the provost's decision

V. REQUIRED MATERIALS FROM DEPARTMENTS

Properly prepared, detailed, and well-documented materials are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the evaluation of the candidate. Each P&T dossier must contain the following:

- University P&T application, with department chair's recommendation and departmental vote sheet
- Departmental P&T sub-committee's report (see A below)
- External evaluations (see B below), and letters from 6th year review where applicable
- Teaching materials (see C below)
- Service statement (see D below)
- Research statement (see E below)
- CV
- Sample publications and papers

A. Departmental P&T Sub-Committee Report

The departmental P&T sub-committee prepares a report for inclusion in the promotion and tenure materials. Although the evaluation by the sub-committee indicates the reasons behind the sub-committee's recommendation, it is not an advocacy document; it should strive to provide a fair and complete assessment of the candidate. Thorough and honest assessments should not ignore candidates' defects. Lack of perfection is not a bar to promotion or tenure, and assessments that attempt to gloss over imperfections are more likely to arouse suspicion than admiration. It is far more helpful to the candidate, the school-wide P&T committee, and the dean to have a balanced discussion of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses.

1. Assessment of Research

The assessment of a candidate's scholarly research must address issues of quality, significance, impact, and future development. This section must provide evidence of the quality of the scholarly work, and must include:

- The sub-committee's assessment of both individual papers and the work overall
- A description for non-specialists of the place the candidate's work occupies in the relevant discipline or field, and why it is important to the department that this field be represented on its faculty. This should explain the ways in which the strength of the candidate in his/her particular field advance the department's current ambitions, supplement other strengths in the department, and affect the standing of the department
- Description of the quality and reputation of the journals or other venues of distribution in which the candidate's work has appeared
- Discussion of what parts of the candidate's work are based on the dissertation, and for such work, what advances have been made after the dissertation
- In fields where external funding is important, the candidate's success at securing grants must be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development
- A cohort table showing the candidate's research productivity and citations relative to peers at other academic institutions

2. Assessment of Teaching

The report must appraise the quality and pertinence of courses developed, provide an assessment of teaching performance, and evaluate the candidate's contributions to the undergraduate and graduate teaching program of the department and school. Specific evaluation and an analysis of the effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate teaching must be provided in narrative form. Evidence may be obtained both through the judgments of faculty (e.g., evaluation of course syllabi, first hand evaluation of class sessions by either a member of the sub-committee or another tenured colleague, etc.) and through student evaluations. In the case of a tenured external appointment, the materials must also include an indication of how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the department and school.

3. Assessment of Service

This assessment must indicate the quality and significance of service to the department, school, university, and profession. Specific comments, including testimony from fellow committee members, specification of authorship of particular reports and the like, are helpful. The assessment can also include a discussion of participation in professional organizations in the candidate's field.

4. Supplementary Materials

The departmental P&T sub-committee may include additional materials that it considers informative and useful for the assessment of the case. This may include information about the candidate's work that may

not be evident from the rest of the record, such as referees' reports for unpublished works, reports of grant review panels, etc.

When the candidate has an associated appointment in a secondary department or program, the sub-committee review must include a written evaluation from the secondary department explaining, among other matters thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that department or program's mission. This evaluation may be written by the chair of the secondary department after formal consultation with departmental or program members. In the case of affiliated appointments, written evaluations from the secondary department or program are recommended but not required.

B. External Evaluations

Promotion cases require at least five letters of evaluation from qualified external scholars. The P&T materials must contain: (a) a list of all external evaluators from whom letters were requested, including those who declined, (b) a brief explanation for why each individual was chosen (e.g., she is the most widely published author in the candidate's field; he is in a different discipline but edits the premier journal in the candidate's field, etc.), (c) CVs for each of the external evaluators, (d) all of the letters submitted, (e) a copy of the solicitation letter, (f) all communications with potential evaluators, and (g) whether any of the letter writers have previously evaluated the candidate for promotion.

1. Selection of External Evaluators

The departmental committee determines whether a case is sufficiently strong for a tenure or promotion review. If the determination is negative, the committee recommends not soliciting external letters and the candidate is given the option to withdraw his or her case or to proceed with the review.

If this determination is positive, the sub-committee and department chair generate a list of at least ten potential qualified external evaluators. This list should be shared with all members of the departmental committee, so that they have the opportunity to offer input or make suggestions. The department chair should then define a set of twelve names that are acceptable to a majority of the departmental committee members, forward this set to the vice dean of faculty, and discuss with the vice dean of faculty any names for which there were objections.

The vice dean of faculty may supplement the list with up to three additional names. In tenure cases where there has been a previous promotion to untenured associate professor, at least half of the names on the list should be people who did not write letters for the prior review, with the aim of obtaining at least three letters from individuals who have not previously been asked to evaluate the candidate. If three letters from "new" evaluators are not received, the vice dean of faculty has the discretion to solicit additional letters.

Evaluators normally hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a nonacademic institution (e.g., laboratory or research institute).

Evaluators must be recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline. They must be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations. At least one of the evaluators must be a scholar identified with broader sectors of the discipline in question. The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at United States institutions; when appropriate, evaluations should be solicited from abroad.

The letter-writers cannot be scholars that have been suggested by the candidate to serve as evaluators. Nor can the evaluators be scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associates. If the department inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns was close to the candidate, this must be noted in the departmental report. The time needed to obtain necessary replacement letters in such cases can significantly delay consideration of a case.

2. Supplementary Evaluators

The department may choose to include additional letters, beyond the number required, from outside evaluators who have been suggested by the candidate or who are coauthors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this status is clearly noted.

3. Solicitation Letter

Stern's vice dean of faculty will solicit external letters based on the recommendations from the department, using templates such as shown in Exhibit A. The solicitation letters explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate's peers, and do not imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. All evaluators receive the same CV, personal statement, and copies of the candidate's work (typically three to five papers, selected by the candidate).

4. Confidentiality of External Letters

The confidentiality of letters from external evaluators must be preserved; only eligible voters in the department may have access to the letters. Neither the names of writers nor the content of the letters, even in summary form, may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond eligible voting members of the department.

In all communications with them, evaluators must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, except as required by law, and that they will be viewed only by eligible voting members of the department, the school-wide P&T committee, the relevant dean(s), and the provost's office.

New York University's policy regarding the confidentiality of such external letters and other tenure decision materials is found in the NYU Faculty Handbook's section entitled Legal Protection for Faculty Members.

C. Teaching Materials

The materials must provide evidence of teaching performance and teaching potential within the context of a research university, and should include:

- A teaching statement from the candidate explaining his/her teaching philosophy, learning goals for students, and strategies and methods employed to help students attain those goals
- Student evaluations (both an aggregated summary across courses and complete CFE reports for all course sections taught)
- Sample syllabi (or access to NYU Classes or other online teaching sites)
- List of advisees (graduate and undergraduate)
- List of PhD dissertation or Master's thesis advisement, including those in progress
- Where appropriate, reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness

D. Service Statement

The materials must include a brief statement from the candidate of his or her service to the department, school, university, and/or profession, particularly information that might not be evident from the CV.

E. Research Statement

The materials must include a statement by the candidate explaining his/her scholarly identity and contributions, narrating the trajectory of his/her career. This statement should be written in a way that helps readers see the underlying themes and unifying threads in the candidate's work, the questions that he/she seeks to answer, and why these questions are important. The statement should describe the relationships among the works already published, a description of new projects planned or under way, and future research goals.

VI. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Departmental procedures must conform to the guidelines below. If there are questions of interpretation, the department chair should consult in advance with the vice dean of faculty, who will consult with the provost's office as necessary.

A. Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for making sure that the appropriate procedures are followed and that the required materials are prepared and submitted to the dean's office. It is also the department chair's responsibility to complete the university P&T application and to provide his/her recommendation. If the department chair is an associate professor, the sub-committee report for cases involving promotion to full professor must be reviewed by the dean instead of the chair.

When a department chair is a candidate for promotion, the dean, after consultation with the chair, will designate a senior scholar in the department (or outside of the department if none is available within) to lead the review process. The report of the departmental P&T sub-committee must be submitted by the sub-committee's chair directly to the dean.

B. Departmental P&T Sub-Committee

The departmental P&T sub-committee may be appointed by the department chair or it may be elected, according to traditional practice in the department. Departments may establish ad hoc committees for each promotion and tenure case, or they may establish a single committee each year to review all cases. In either case, the sub-committee must consist of at least three members of appropriate rank (see Section VI.D below, "Department Faculty Eligible to Vote"). The sub-committee must not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate, though such individuals are eligible to participate in the full departmental discussion and vote on the case.

As outlined in Section V.A. above, the departmental P&T sub-committee assembles and/or prepares the required materials, reviews them in detail, and prepares a written report for presentation to the tenured faculty of appropriate rank. The materials and report must be made available for inspection well in advance of the meeting at which the case will be discussed and a vote taken.

Following the departmental P&T meeting (below), the chair of the sub-committee is responsible for revising the sub-committee report to incorporate the discussion of the departmental committee, including concerns, reservations, and minority views. This report should be made available to all departmental committee members, who may suggest edits. It is best if a consensus is reached in the editing process, but if any member of the committee feels that his or her views are not accurately or adequately captured in the report, then he or she may submit a dissenting opinion letter that will be added to the file and made available to the departmental committee and the school-wide P&T committee. The letter must be signed.

In the case of a joint appointment, the composition of the department sub-committee must include members of both units. Both units must vote on the report, with the guidelines herein outlined concerning procedures and reporting applying to both. Each chair must forward his or her unit's recommendation to the dean only after consultation with the other unit. If the departments or programs arrive at significantly different judgments, the dean will ordinarily invite the chairs together to discuss the case.

C. Departmental P&T Meeting and Vote

The chair of the departmental P&T sub-committee presents the case at a meeting of all department faculty eligible to review and vote on the particular case (see Section D below). Faculty who cannot be physically present are allowed to participate virtually, although the number of virtual participants should be kept to a minimum. After a discussion, a vote must be taken and tallied. Absent faculty, including those on sabbatical or leave of absence, may submit their views in writing to be shared at the meeting, but they will not be eligible to vote because they will not have had the benefit of the discussion of the case. Re-voting must not be conducted for the purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.

The duty of the tenured departmental faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is perhaps its highest responsibility. Faculty members who participate in the P&T process must uphold high standards of responsibility and ethical behavior. Responsibility includes the obligation to give careful attention to the materials of a promotion or tenure case and to share the results of that deliberation only with eligible departmental colleagues. Ethical behavior includes a clear obligation to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings, since confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.

The P&T process is highly dependent upon the faculty of the department being honest, thorough, fair and rigorous. To provide a weak recommendation or one that is not well supported by the data, on the assumption that the difficult decision to not promote will be made at a later stage, subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance and is an abdication of departmental responsibility. Decisions that are considered by the dean or school-wide P&T committee to fall into this category will be returned to the department with a request that the problem be corrected.

Reasonable doubt for granting promotion or tenure precludes a favorable departmental recommendation. At any point prior to sending the P&T materials to the dean's office (whether before external evaluations are sought, after external evaluations are received or after the departmental discussion and vote), the eligible members of the department can decide to not move forward with the case.

In the case of a mandatory promotion or tenure review, if the eligible faculty of the department does not support tenure or promotion, the candidate must receive a letter stating that the departmental committee has decided that it will not be recommending promotion or tenure, and specifying the end date of the candidate's appointment. However, the candidate has the right to request that his/her case be considered at the school-level. If such a request is made, it will be honored.

D. Departmental Faculty Eligible to Vote

All tenured faculty of a department are eligible and authorized to vote for or against promotion, tenure or appointment at the rank of associate professor and to make a collective recommendation. Only full professors are eligible to vote for promotion or appointment to the rank of full professor. Voting should be by closed ballot and reported by numbers. Some special cases exist:

1. Small Departments

Chairs of departments with fewer than three faculty members of appropriate rank must consult with the dean about drawing upon faculty from other departments in fields related to that of the candidate so as to

form an ad hoc committee consisting of three or more members. For a candidate being considered for promotion to full professor, if there are fewer than three tenured full professors, the dean, after consultation with the chair, will add to the review process other full professor committee members in fields related to the candidate's field.

2. Faculty on Leave or Sabbatical

Faculty on leave or sabbatical may vote on tenure and promotion cases, but only if they are able to participate in the meeting at which the vote is to be taken. As noted above, absent faculty are not eligible to vote because they will not have had the benefit of the discussion of the case.

3. Faculty with Joint, Associated or Affiliated Appointments

Tenured faculty members with joint appointments have voting rights on P&T cases in both departments. Faculty with associated or affiliated appointments must be granted voting rights by their secondary department in order to vote on P&T cases in that department.

E. Submission of Materials to Dean

The department chair and all faculty members present at the departmental committee meeting (including those who participated virtually) must sign the signature page, attesting that they participated in the vote, that the reported results are accurate, and that proper procedures were followed.

The department chair must complete and sign the university P&T application, including a summary statement of the basic arguments substantiating the recommendation for promotion. This summary statement should be made available to all departmental committee members before it is submitted to the dean's office.

The chair adds this application and the departmental vote sheet to the P&T materials, and forwards the materials to the dean's office to initiate the succeeding stages of the review process. Recommendations that do not acknowledge evident weaknesses, in the case of a positive recommendation, or that do not address evident strengths, in the case of a negative recommendation, will not be accepted.

VII. SCHOOL-WIDE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

The school-wide P&T committee is appointed by the dean and consists of a sufficient number of full professors in the school to represent major faculty areas. The usual term of membership is three years, with appointments staggered to insure some continuity from year to year.

For each case, either the chair of the departmental P&T sub-committee or the department chair makes a presentation to the school-wide P&T committee, explaining the strengths and weaknesses of the case and answering any questions. If subsequent questions arise, the department or sub-committee chair may be asked to clarify or to provide additional information. The committee may also request presentations by faculty who have written dissenting letters, in cases where such letters have been submitted.

The dean and/or his or her representative attends the departmental presentation, without vote and with voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the committee. He or she does not attend the subsequent deliberations or voting. It is the responsibility of the committee chair to ensure that the deliberations are thorough, accurate, free of bias, and fair. Members of the committee who are in the same department as the candidate attend the presentation and deliberations, but do not participate in the discussion or vote.

Following the vote, the committee prepares a report outlining its evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the case and its recommendation. This report is forwarded to the dean and vice dean of faculty. The dean and vice dean

will have the opportunity to meet with the committee to discuss their recommendation and to request elaboration or clarification on the written report.

School-wide P&T committee deliberations are conducted among the full group. No conversations regarding a case should be conducted among subsets of the full committee. Deliberations are confidential. Individual members of the committee are prohibited from discussing cases with any faculty outside of the committee.

The committee's recommendation is advisory to the dean, who may accept that recommendation or not.

VIII. DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION

The dean reviews and considers all of the provided information and recommendations, and based on these materials, as well as school-level strategic considerations, decides whether or not to recommend promotion to the provost. The dean informs the department chair of his/her proposed recommendation to the provost.

In the case of a dean's recommendation contrary to that of the department, the dean provides the department chair with the reasons. The chair will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counter-argument before the dean's final recommendation is made.

The dean will ordinarily make his or her recommendation to the provost by April 15th. In cases when a professor's appointment began in the spring semester, and a decision must be rendered by the Provost by January 14th, the dean will ordinarily make a recommendation by December 1.

IX. PROVOST'S DECISION

The provost shall evaluate all promotion and tenure materials and accompanying dean's recommendation. In evaluating a promotion or tenure recommendation, the provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation, and may, when appropriate, appoint an ad-hoc advisory committee composed of tenured faculty to seek further counsel.

The provost shall support or oppose the dean's recommendation. The provost will inform the dean of the pending decision before it is final. 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 and give the dean an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the provost's final decision. The provost shall then notify the dean of the final decision, along with an explanation if the dean's recommendation is disapproved.

Upon notification of the provost's decision, the dean will write to or meet with the department chair and the candidate informing them of the decision.

X. CANDIDATE'S APPEAL

In the event of a negative promotion or tenure decision, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the university's faculty grievance procedures outlined in the NYU Faculty Handbook.

XI. SCHEDULE OF REVIEWS AND PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS

A. Tenure Clock

The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal university rules adopted by the Board of Trustees. The current

rules are found in the University's Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Title I and II stated in the NYU Faculty Handbook. Faculty members initially appointed as assistant professors will have a maximum probationary period of nine years, with a formal review no later than year six for promotion to untenured associate professor and no later than year eight for promotion to tenured associate professor. Faculty members initially appointed as untenured associate professors will have a maximum probationary period of five years, with the tenure review conducted in the fourth year.

B. Annual Review

Departments will conduct an annual review of all untenured faculty members to ascertain that each one is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Untenured faculty who are not making satisfactory progress must be given feedback to this effect, and should be given terminal contracts or encouraged to resign.

C. Third-Year Review

University rules require a review of all assistant professors in their third year on the tenure clock. The candidate submits the same set of materials as for a tenure review. These materials are reviewed by a three-person sub-committee within the department, which writes a report assessing the candidate's progress and areas in need of improvement. A copy of this report is shared with and discussed by the other tenured members of the department, and a copy submitted to the vice dean of faculty. The report is also shared with the candidate, along with verbal feedback.

D. Mandatory Sixth-Year Review

If an assistant professor is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the sixth year review will be a promotion or promotion and tenure review, following all of the standards and procedures set out in Sections II-IX above. The results of this promotion review may be a recommendation for promotion to untenured associate, a recommendation for promotion to tenured associate, or a recommendation for termination. As indicated in Section III, promotion to associate professor without tenure is appropriate when there is a good likelihood of a positive tenure recommendation in the eighth year, depending on continued evidence of the quality of the candidate's work and increasing evidence of the impact of the work. If this is not the case, then termination is the appropriate outcome. Promotion to associate professor with tenure is appropriate in cases where the candidate clearly meets the school's tenure standards: a record of outstanding research achievement and recognition, together with a record of effective teaching, and that he or she is among the strongest in his or her field in comparison with others at a similar point in their careers.

In exceedingly rare cases, a department can recommend to the dean that a faculty member be retained at the assistant professor rank with the option for tenure review in year eight. This might occur, for example, when the faculty member has a small number of publications but a strong pipeline of working papers, with uncertainty about the likely publication success and impact of the work. In such cases, the department chair must submit a report to the dean's office by September 1 of the sixth year, with an explanation and justification for the recommendation. If the dean supports the recommendation, the candidate will be retained as an assistant professor. If not, the candidate must be either evaluated for promotion to untenured associate professor or terminated.

A departmental recommendation must be submitted to the dean for all faculty members in their mandatory review year, even if the recommendation is negative. If, however, the candidate tenders a letter of resignation on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review, effective on or before August 31 of the final probationary year, materials and recommendation need not be submitted by the department. The letter must state explicitly that the resignation was freely tendered without duress. In this instance, the chair must forward

the letter of resignation to the dean on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review year.

E. Acceleration of Tenure Clock

An early tenure review is one that occurs prior to the sixth year on the tenure clock. The dean or vice dean of faculty must be consulted prior to the preparation of an early tenure case. The best reason for proposing early consideration of tenure is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. External letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the grounds for an early decision. Departmental P&T sub-committee reports must also specifically address this issue. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the dean will not recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the normal schedule.

F. Stopping the Tenure Clock

Tenure clock stoppage may be granted for a maximum of two semesters for primary caregiver responsibilities or for illness or disability. For details, please refer to the NYU Faculty Handbook (<http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook/the-faculty/other-faculty-policies/leave-of-absence.html>).

EXHIBIT A: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS

A. Promotion to Associate Professor without Tenure

Dear Professor.....:

Professor, currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of....., is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure at the Stern School of Business at New York University. Given your standing within and knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research.

At Stern, assistant professors are typically evaluated for promotion to untenured associate professor in the sixth year on their tenure clock, with a tenure review in the eighth year. A promotion to untenured associate professor suggests a good likelihood of a positive tenure recommendation in the eighth year, assuming continued evidence of research quality and increasing evidence of impact.

Enclosed are Professor's vita, personal statement, and samples of his/her work. Hard copies can be mailed if you prefer.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, impact, and significance. We would also appreciate an explicit comparison of his/her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor's teaching ability or service to 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. Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor would be considered a strong candidate for untenured associate professor in other leading schools.

We will need your letter, [submitted via our secure delivery system]by email or regular mail, no later than (date, in bold). Please also send a copy of your current curriculum vitae, which is required by the University's promotion procedures.

..., our Faculty Affairs Coordinator, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential, to the full extent allowed by law. It will be seen only by the tenured professors of the department who are eligible to discuss and vote on the case and the appropriate decision makers within the university.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you no doubt know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review. I look forward to receiving your evaluation.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Morrison, Vice Dean of Faculty

B. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Dear Professor..... :

Professor, currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of..... , is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at the Stern School of Business at New York University. Given your standing within and knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research.

Enclosed are Professor's vita, personal statement, and samples of his/her work. Hard copies can be mailed if you prefer.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, impact, and significance. We would also appreciate an explicit comparison of his/her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor's teaching ability or service to 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. Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor would be considered a strong candidate for tenured associate professor in other leading schools.

We will need your letter, [submitted via our secure delivery system] by email or regular mail, no later than (date, in bold). Please also send a copy of your current CV, which is required by the University's promotion procedures.

..., our Faculty Affairs Coordinator, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential, to the full extent allowed by law. It will be seen only by the tenured professors of the department who are eligible to discuss and vote on the case and the appropriate decision makers within the University.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you no doubt know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review. I look forward to receiving your evaluation.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Morrison, Vice Dean of Faculty

C. Promotion to Associate Professor with or without Tenure

Dear Professor.....:

Professor, currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of....., is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor *with or without tenure* at the Stern School of Business at New York University. Given your standing within and knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research.

At Stern, assistant professors are evaluated for promotion to associate professor in the sixth year on their tenure clock. A promotion to associate professor *without tenure* suggests a good likelihood of a positive tenure recommendation in the eighth year, assuming continued evidence of research quality and increasing evidence of impact. A promotion to associate professor *with tenure* in the sixth year signals an exceptionally strong case that already meets Stern's high standards for tenure.

Enclosed are Professor's vita, personal statement, and samples of his/her work. Hard copies can be mailed if you prefer.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, impact, and significance. We would also appreciate an explicit comparison of his/her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor's teaching ability or service to 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.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of, first, whether Professor would be considered a strong candidate for *untenured* associate professor at other leading schools, and second, whether he/she would be considered a strong candidate for *tenured* associate professor at other leading schools.

We will need your letter, [submitted via our secure delivery system] by email or regular mail, no later than (date, in bold). Please also send a copy of your current CV, which is required by the University's promotion procedures.

..., our Faculty Affairs Coordinator, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential, to the full extent allowed by law. It will be seen only by the tenured professors of this department who are eligible to discuss and vote on the case and the appropriate decision makers within the University.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you no doubt know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review. I look forward to receiving your evaluation.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Morrison, Vice Dean of Faculty

D. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure: Repeat Evaluator

Dear Professor

..... years ago, we asked you to review Professor for promotion to associate professor without tenure. We are now reviewing him/her for promotion to associate professor with tenure and would appreciate an update of your review. We would appreciate as much or as little detail as you would care to provide. But at a minimum, it would be ideal if you would send us your assessment as to whether Professor would be considered a strong candidate for appointment as tenured associate professor in other leading departments in the field.

We will need your additional comments, [submitted via our secure delivery system] by email or regular mail, no later than [date, in bold]. Please also send a copy of your current CV, which is required by the University's promotion procedures.

..., our Faculty Affairs Coordinator, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. At this time, she will also verify that we have contacted you at the correct email address, after which she will send you a copy of the letter you wrote [noyears] ago. This is a necessary step to protect the letters' confidentiality.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential, to the full extent allowed by law. It will be seen only by the tenured professors of this department who are eligible to discuss and vote on the case and the appropriate decision makers within the University.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you no doubt know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review. I look forward to receiving your evaluation.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Morrison, Vice Dean of Faculty

E. External Hire with Tenure

Dear Professor.....:

We are considering Professor....., currently an Assistant/Associate/Full Professor at....., for an appointment as a tenured associate/full professor in our department. Given your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research.

Enclosed are Professor's vita, personal statement, and samples of his/her work. Hard copies can be mailed if you prefer.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, impact, and significance. We would also appreciate an explicit comparison of his/her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor's teaching ability or service to 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. Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor would be considered a strong candidate for tenured associate/full professor in other leading schools.

Due to time constraints, we will need your letter, [submitted via our secure delivery system] by email or regular mail, by..... (date, in bold). Please also send a copy of your current CV, which is required by the University's promotion procedures.

..., our Faculty Affairs Coordinator, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential, to the full extent allowed by law. It will be seen only by the tenured professors of the department who are eligible to discuss and vote on the case and the appropriate decision makers within the University.

Thank you for generously assisting us. I realize this is a time-consuming task, but, as you no doubt know, it is a critical element of the academic process of peer review. I look forward to receiving your evaluation.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Morrison, Vice Dean of Faculty

F. Promotion to Full Professor

Dear Professor

Professor....., currently an Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of, is being considered for promotion to Full Professor. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research.

Enclosed are Professor’s vita, personal statement, and samples of his/her work. Hard copies can be mailed if you prefer.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor’s research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, scope, impact, and significance. In addition to an evaluation of Professor’s full body of research, we request particular consideration of research conducted post-tenure, with your assessment of whether or not a significant marker or milestone has been achieved beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. We also request an explicit comparison of Professor’s work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers.

Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor’s teaching ability or 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. Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor would be considered a strong candidate for full professor in other leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter, [submitted via our secure delivery system] by email or regular mail, no later than (date, in bold). Please also send a copy of your current curriculum vita, which is required by the University’s promotion procedures.

..., our Faculty Affairs Coordinator, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential, to the full extent allowed by law. It will be seen only by the tenured professors of the department who are eligible to discuss and vote on the case and the appropriate decision makers within the University.

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

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Morrison, Vice Dean of Faculty