

## TENURE AND PROMOTION AT THE NYU TANDON SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

*October 28, 2015*

### **Preface**

This document sets forth the procedures for tenure and promotion at the NYU Tandon School of Engineering (NYU School of Engineering). It is designed to be consistent with the NYU Provost's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, as found at

<http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance/policies-and-guidelines/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines.html>

and the NYU Faculty Handbook, as found at

<http://www.nyu.edu/faculty/governance-policies-and-procedures/faculty-handbook.html>

This document is modeled on the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the Faculty of Arts and Science at <http://as.nyu.edu/object/aboutas.pp.assocdean.promotion>

This document will be maintained as a publicly available web page, which will be updated every year.

### **Applicability**

This document will apply to the consideration of all tenure and promotion cases.

### **1 Introduction**

The granting of tenure by the NYU Tandon School of Engineering (NYU School of Engineering) represents a mutual lifetime commitment by the NYU School of Engineering and the faculty member to allow the faculty member to pursue scholarly and teaching activities at the NYU School of Engineering. Tenure and promotion are therefore granted at the NYU School of Engineering on the basis of high impact in and out of the academic community of the candidate's scholarly, inventive, creative, educational, and service activities, as judged by peers in the candidate's discipline. Successful candidates must provide a clear and objective demonstration that their past accomplishments and the promise of future accomplishments will merit tenure and/or promotion.

The Dean of the NYU School of Engineering makes recommendation to the Provost of the University on each tenure and/or promotion case only after a careful review, as detailed by this document, has been made by the department and the NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee. At the NYU School of Engineering, tradition and faculty-approved policy hold that this occurs through a multilevel process involving detailed evaluation within the department, review by the NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) consisting of elected and appointed tenured full professors of the NYU School of Engineering, independent external evaluations at both the department and the NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee levels, and such other information as deemed appropriate by the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering. The NYU Provost will perform an additional review of each case before the final decision is made by the NYU Provost.

While there is often a remarkable degree of unanimity in the recommendations made at the various levels of review, it is not unusual for there to be divergent opinions.

Disagreement may occur because of differences in perspective, differences in the weighing of strengths and weaknesses in the case, additional information not evident in preceding stages of the evaluation, and so on. In case of seriously divergent recommendations, either the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering or the NYU Provost may choose to extend the process and seek additional information but has no obligation to do so.

## **2 Standards**

### **2.1 Conferring Tenure**

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure at the NYU School of Engineering is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field in comparison with individuals at similar points in their careers at NYU, nationally, and, if relevant, abroad?

It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement, and context may well become a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. The current and future shape of programs both in a department and beyond it at the NYU School of Engineering may be relevant considerations. Each case must be examined in some detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths and acknowledging limits or weaknesses. These factors must be carefully and openly weighed.

### **2.2 Promotion to Full Professor**

The inquiry for such cases 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 NYU, nationally, and, if relevant, internationally? In addition, there is a presumption that the candidate will have achieved some milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be the publication of a major book or a set of articles that mark significant new research and professional advancement since the conferring of tenure. The dossier must clearly indicate which materials distinguish the candidate's achievements since the last review for promotion.

### **2.3 Expectations of Candidate**

In order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at the NYU School of Engineering, candidates must have records of outstanding scholarly achievement and recognition for it within their fields; they must be able to demonstrate that they are effective teachers; and they should have contributed, beyond their research and teaching, to the work of their departments and the life of the University. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be awarded.

### **2.4 Acceleration of Schedule**

Proposals for early promotion and tenure must be considered extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is normally not in the best interest of a candidate or the institution to propose the candidate for promotion and/or tenure ahead of schedule unless the case is exceptionally well justified. The Dean of the NYU School of Engineering should be consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. It should be noted that external experts whose evaluation of the candidate are sought in these cases must be asked to comment specifically on whether there are special grounds for an early decision. Department Chairs and committees must also specifically address this issue. However, even with these affirmative recommendations, the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering will not proceed with an early tenure recommendation unless the case is extraordinary and compelling, particularly in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

### **3 Guidelines and Procedures**

#### **3.1 Department**

##### **3.1.1 Departmental Responsibilities:**

- 1) The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on tenure decisions is perhaps their highest responsibility. The process begins with their review, and it is highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness, and rigor. To give weak advice to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering on the assumption that the difficult decisions will be made at a later stage subverts the principle of peer review and faculty governance, and is an abdication of departmental responsibility. Reports that are considered by the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering or Tenure and Promotion Committee to fall into this category will be returned to the department with a request that the problem be corrected. The candidate and department are jointly responsible for providing a complete dossier in accordance with the bylaws of the faculty.
- 2) Reasonable doubt precludes a favorable recommendation. Common indicators of reasonable doubt include a highly split vote or a Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee Report that fails to achieve consensus. If a reasonable doubt exists, the department should indicate as much to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering and the NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee.

##### **3.1.2 Mandatory Review:**

- 4) A mandatory review is a review for tenure that takes place during the last year of a candidate's probationary period. A recommendation and dossier must be submitted in all mandatory review cases, whether positive or negative. If, however, the candidate resigns by the end of the tenth week of the fall semester, effective on or before the last day of August immediately prior to the following academic year, the department need not make a submission. In this instance, the Department Chair must forward a letter by the end of the tenth week of the semester, stating explicitly that the resignation was freely tendered without duress.

##### **3.1.3 Departmental Guidelines and Procedures:**

- 5) Each department has its own traditions and established practices for making personnel and other decisions. Such practices may be followed in promotion/tenure reviews provided that they conform to the guidelines below. If not, the procedures must be adapted to these guidelines. If there are questions of interpretation, the Department Chair should consult in advance with the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering.
- 6) When a Department Chair is a candidate for promotion, the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering, after consultation with the Department Chair, will designate a senior scholar in the department (or outside of the department if none is available within) to lead the review process.

##### **3.1.4 Departmental Votes: Eligibility of Members**

- 7) Only the whole tenured faculty of a department is authorized to vote and collectively make a recommendation for or against tenure at the rank of associate professor. For an appointment at the rank of full professor with tenure or for a promotion to full professor, the vote and authority reside with the tenured full professors in the department. The formal vote of the eligible faculty must be a secret vote.
- 8) Chairs of departments with fewer than five tenured full professors (for a candidate being considered for promotion to full professor) or with fewer than five tenured full and associate professors (for a candidate being considered for tenure or promotion to associate professor) should consult with the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering about drawing upon professors emeriti and tenured faculty from other departments of appropriate rank to form an ad hoc committee, which consists of five or more members, includes all of the faculty in the department who are eligible to vote, and which will act as the voting faculty for each tenure and promotion case in the department.
- 9) A reasonable effort must be made to enable eligible faculty on leave to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote. When faculty members are unable to attend the meeting because of a leave or other absence, they shall be invited to make their views known to the other eligible members through written or electronic communication, but their votes must be recorded separately to distinguish them from those made with the benefit of the open discussion of the case.

### 3.1.5 Departmental Review: Tenure and Promotion Committee:

- 10) The eligible voting members of the department, and such others involved in departmental votes as noted in item 7 above, must be presented with a detailed, formal, written review of the candidate.
- 11) This review may be conducted by all those eligible to vote, acting as a committee-of-the-whole. Alternatively, in large departments it is usual for the department to establish a Department Tenure and Promotion Committee to carry out the review. This committee may be appointed by the Department Chair, or it may be elected, following 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 committee should consist of three to five members who are eligible to vote, as described above. The committee should not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as 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. The Department Chair, if eligible to vote on the particular case, may serve on the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, but not as the chair of the committee.
- 12) It is the responsibility of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee to assemble the relevant review materials (detailed below), to review these materials in detail, and to prepare a written report for presentation to the eligible faculty. The file and the written report should be made available for inspection by faculty eligible to vote on the case well in advance of the meeting at which the case will be discussed and the vote taken.

### 3.1.6 Cross Appointments

- 13) In the case of a Joint Appointment, an ad hoc Department Tenure and Promotion Committee should be formed that includes members of both departments. Both units must vote on the Report, with the Guidelines herein outlined concerning procedures and reporting applying to both. Each Chair should forward his or her unit's recommendation to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering only after consultation with the other unit. If the departments arrive at significantly different judgments, the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering will ordinarily invite them together to discuss the case.
- 14) When the candidate has an Associated Appointment in a secondary department, the departmental review must include a written evaluation from the secondary department explaining, among other matters thought relevant, the particular contribution of the candidate to that program's teaching and research mission and to its administration. This evaluation may be written by the Chair of the secondary department after formal consultation with departmental members.
- 15) In the case of Affiliated Appointments, such written evaluations on the secondary appointment are recommended but not required.

### 3.1.7 Materials for the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee

- 16) The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee must prepare a Tenure and Promotion file for examination by eligible departmental voters. It should include the curriculum vitae of the candidate, a statement of teaching and research interests by the candidate, copies of publications and other writings, letters from external evaluators, and the evaluation by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee. The dossier should include published academic book reviews of the candidate's work. In the case of books not yet reviewed by the press, publisher's reader reviews should be included in the dossier. A citation analysis, if relevant, may also be included.
- 17) The candidate's statement of teaching and research interests should include the following:
  - A narrative of his or her career trajectory
  - A description of the relationship among works already published or distributed
  - A description of new projects planned or under way
  - A description of the role that teaching (including particular courses) plays in his or her career.
- 18) The file prepared by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee must include a copy of the candidate's Third-Year Review, any previous review for tenure or promotion, letters, if any, from the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering acknowledging the previous reviews, and separate Assessments of Teaching Performance, Research and Scholarship, and Service.
- 19) The evaluation by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee should not be an advocacy document; it should strive to provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate. It should indicate, with reasons, the basis for the departmental recommendation.

20) The Assessment of Teaching Performance must document and appraise the effectiveness of the candidate's teaching. The documentation should include student evaluations, as well as relevant additional information, such as a list of all courses taught and their enrollments over the past four years (graduate courses, major courses, departmental service courses, college service courses, etc.); course syllabi; firsthand evaluations of class sessions by tenured colleague(s); and a description of the department standard for quantity (course load) of tenure-track faculty.

21) The appraisal of teaching effectiveness should include an analysis of the candidate's teaching strengths and any weaknesses. For the latter, some indication should be given of how the department and candidate are addressing these weaknesses. The appraisal should address both undergraduate and graduate teaching and should include not just an assessment of teaching performance in specific courses but also an evaluation of the overall significance of the candidate's contributions to the undergraduate and graduate teaching programs of the department. Specific mention, where relevant, should be made of research mentorship. The appraisal should be provided in narrative form; raw data, such as copies of an entire class's student evaluations, which is not accompanied with any analysis or explanation, is discouraged.

22) The above instructions apply to external candidates as well as internal candidates. External candidates are expected to submit teaching evaluations from their current institutions and should be encouraged to address teaching in their personal statements. If evaluations are not available, alternative documentation of likely teaching effectiveness must be provided by the Chair of the department that is considering the candidate. In addition, the dossier must include a description of what the candidate's graduate and undergraduate teaching contributions are expected to be and the significance of these contributions for the department.

23) The Assessment of Research and Scholarship must address issues of quality, significance, coherence, and future development. The candidate's written work, published and unpublished, should be carefully read by at least three senior members of the department, who must jointly sign this portion of the Report. The quality and significance of the journals in which the candidate's work has appeared should be appraised. If they are not the best journals in the field, the best journals should be named and the absence of publications in them explained. The quality of the publisher of the candidate's book(s) should be appraised as well.

In the case of joint authorship, the report should include information about the norms of the field regarding order of authorship and an assessment of the candidate's contributions to the co-authored work. The report should indicate what parts of the candidate's work are based on the dissertation, and for such work, what advances have been made upon the work of the dissertation. The candidate's success at securing grants, where appropriate, should be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development. The assessment should list and appraise the relative competitiveness of grants and fellowships received in the past five years.

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

- 25) The following should be provided: (1) A list of all Ph.D. and Masters dissertations for which the candidate has been the primary advisor, (2) a list of other dissertation and theses committees on which the candidate has served, and (3) a comparison with the average number of dissertations supervised and/or committees served on per faculty member within the department.
- 26) The report must explain the importance of the candidate's field of expertise. In what ways do the strengths offered by the candidate in that field advance the department's current goals? How do the candidate's strengths supplement other strengths in the department and vice versa? How do the candidate's field and performance affect the standing of the department?
- 27) In the case of new appointments to tenure, it is helpful for the report to include the justification for establishing a tenured position within the department in the candidate's field of expertise. A letter from a suitable evaluator selected by the search committee that answers all the relevant questions of the tenure review process, may be used as one of the department's five required outside letters for the Department Tenure and Promotion dossier. The report may also include letters from other search-committee referees as supplemental materials to the dossier.
- 28) The candidate's position in the field and the discipline as a whole should be described as precisely as possible. This appraisal should include comparisons with other scholars both within the department and in the discipline at large. The department may submit additional material that it considers informative and useful for the assessment of the case, under a section of the dossier titled "Supplementary Materials."

### 3.1.8 Solicitation of Letters from Outside Evaluators:

- 29) A complete departmental dossier must include a minimum of five letters from outside evaluators. The letter of solicitation, which should come from the Chair of the Department, must follow the prototype shown in Section 6. The letter must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate's peers, and it must not in any way imply that a positive or negative response from the evaluator is desired. Before letters are solicited from outside evaluators, the Department Chair must send a draft of the letter for review and approval to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering. In addition, the Department Chair is required to provide the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering with a list of all evaluators being solicited by the department. This list must be approved by the Dean of the School of Engineering before letters are sought. All outside letters of evaluation must be current (written within one year of the review by the NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee).
- 30) All evaluators should be provided with the same published work, curriculum vitae of the candidate, and statement of teaching and research interests. If there is unpublished work to be considered, the department should ask all evaluators to comment on the quality of the unpublished work.

31) The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; only eligible voters in the department should be allowed access to the letters. Neither the identity of the writers nor the content of the letters must be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond eligible members of the department, not even in summary form. In all communications with them, writers of letters should be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence and that they will be seen only by tenured members of the department, the NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee, the NYU School of Engineering Dean's Office, the NYU Provost's Office, and designees of the NYU School of Engineering and NYU Provosts.

### 3.1.9 Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators:

32) Evaluators will normally hold a tenured position (as a full professor in the instance of cases of promotion to full professor) in an institution of recognized distinction, such as a research university or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory, museum, or research institute).

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

34) Evaluators cannot be suggested by the candidate, nor can the suitability of potential evaluators be discussed with the candidate. The evaluator must not be a scholar with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate. Individuals listed on the candidate's c.v. as personal or professional references are not eligible to serve as outside references.<sup>1</sup> If the department should inadvertently solicit an opinion from someone it later learns was close to the candidate or whom the candidate independently suggested, note of that fact must be made in the departmental report.

35) The candidate may identify one or two scholars who he/she believes would not for professional or personal reasons provide a balanced evaluation. The candidate must state in writing the reasons for this belief. The department and Dean of the NYU School of Engineering are not required to accept the candidate's request to exclude a scholar as an evaluator.

36) As a professional courtesy, evaluators should be given six weeks to send their evaluations in the case of requests for promotion and tenure; evaluators for individuals being considered as new hires with tenure should be asked to provide letters within three to four weeks.

---

<sup>1</sup> Co-authors, with no collaboration within the past five years, will be acceptable with permission of the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering.

37) The Report of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee must include a list of all potential evaluators who were asked to write on behalf of the candidate, including those who declined, and those, if any, identified by the candidate as inappropriate. All departmental communications with potential evaluators should be documented and included in the dossier. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written and why the particular referee's opinion matters must be included with the dossier, as well as an explanation for each of the declinations. CVs (not just bios from the evaluator's web site) are required for all external evaluators.

3.1.10 Presenting the Committee Report for a Vote:

38) The Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee should present the case to a full special departmental meeting of those eligible to attend and vote. After a discussion, a vote must be taken. The vote must be by secret ballot and tallied following departmental custom or departmental decision in advance of the presentation of the report.

3.1.11 Recommendation of the Chair:

39) The Report of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and the vote by eligible faculty are advisory to the Department Chair. The Chair must forward the Report and closed vote (including the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions, if any) to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering with his or her own recommendation. The report must be a balanced assessment of the candidate's performance. Documents that do not deal with evident weaknesses, in the case of a positive recommendation, or that do not deal with evident strengths, in the case of a negative recommendation, will not be accepted. If the Department Chair's recommendation differs in significant ways from the Report of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee upon which the department voted, the Chair must inform the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee in writing. If the Committee is not a committee-of-the-whole, voting members of the department must also be notified that the Department Chair's recommendation differs from that of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.

40) The Department Chair's letter must include a summary of the faculty discussion preceding the vote (taking into account the confidentiality of the discussion, i.e., without attributing quotes to faculty names), as well as a description for non-specialists of the place the candidate's work occupies in the relevant discipline or field, and explain why it is important to the department that this field be represented on its faculty. It may also be helpful for this statement to include information about the usual criteria for excellence in the candidate's discipline (e.g., the quality of the venues within which the work appears). The letter must report the number of faculty eligible to vote; the faculty eligible to vote who are on leave, and when applicable, an explanation as to why faculty members on leave did not vote. If the recommendation is for early tenure, the department Chair's letter must address the reasons or circumstances that designate it as "early" (e.g., if the candidate had prior service in the tenure track at another institution, a delayed tenure clock due to family obligations or medical leave, or extraordinary accomplishments).

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

42) If the Department Chair is an Associate Professor or the Department Chair is the candidate for promotion, the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will prepare all materials normally prepared by the Department Chair and submit them directly to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering.

### 3.1.12 Effective Departmental Review:

43) The Department Chair and all members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee must sign the Signature Page of the dossier, attesting that they have read the dossier and that it represents the opinions of the committee clearly and fairly. The completed dossier is then forwarded to the Office of the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering to initiate the succeeding stages of the review process.

44) A properly prepared, detailed and well-documented dossier is the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the department's evaluation of the candidate. Indeed, it is the thorough and honest appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in each of the criteria (research, teaching, and service) that is most useful to the NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee and Dean of the NYU School of Engineering, often more so than the final vote, for it gives substantive meaning and texture to the evaluation. Submission of dossiers in a timely fashion is strongly urged in order to prevent delays from unforeseen complications that may arise, especially for dossiers received near the end of the academic year.

## 3.2 Dean of the NYU School of Engineering

### 3.2.1 NYU School of Engineering Committee on Tenure and Promotion:

45) The NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of seven full professors at NYU School of Engineering. Four members from four different departments are elected by the faculty; the other three are appointed by the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering, who should take into account the departmental diversity of the TPC. None of the members of the committee may hold any administrative positions of department Chair or higher.

46) In the election of the four members, there may be more than one nominee from each department but at most one (the one receiving the most votes) can be elected to the TPC. A rare exception for two elected members from the same department can be made if they are elected in different years and if no alternative elected member is available from a department that is not represented on the TPC. Each member will serve a term of two to three years.

47) The Dean of the NYU School of Engineering or his or her representative sits with the Tenure and Promotion Committee without vote and with voice confined to responses to questions by the Committee.

48) The NYU School of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) will perform a comprehensive review of each case following the standards and guidelines in this document. In its review process, the TPC will consider the full dossier, including the written evaluations of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Chair. The TPC may interview the Department Chair and appropriate tenured faculty at the NYU School of Engineering. The TPC may seek additional information from persons in the candidate's field to determine the candidate's standing among his academic peers, his or her contributions to the advancement of knowledge in the field, as well as his or her strengths, weaknesses, and future potential. When contacting any person outside the NYU School of Engineering, at least two TPC members will participate in each interview.

49) After its review of a case, the TPC will submit a written recommendation and the results of a secret ballot vote to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering. Any member of the TPC who is from the same department as the candidate or has a joint appointment in the candidate's department may participate in discussions about the candidate but will abstain from the vote. Any other conflict of interest that arises will be handled by the TPC on an ad hoc basis.

50) Upon receiving the recommendation and vote from the TPC, the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering will inform the Department Chair of the advice provided by the TPC, as well as of his/her own proposed recommendation to the NYU Provost. In the case of a NYU School of Engineering Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the department, the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering will provide 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 NYU School of Engineering Dean's final recommendation is made to the NYU Provost.

51) If there are questions during the TPC's review of any case, the TPC may ask the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering, the Department Chair, or the Chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee to attend a meeting of the Committee to provide clarifications and additional information.

### 3.2.2 NYU School of Engineering Dean's Outside Evaluators:

52) The Dean of the NYU School of Engineering may solicit additional reviews that are treated as confidential and are to be used by only the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering, the NYU School of Engineering TPC, and the NYU Provost. To ensure that the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering does not solicit evaluators already contacted by the department, the Department Chair is required to provide the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering with a list of all evaluators being solicited by the department. This list must be approved by the Dean of the School of Engineering before letters are sought.

### 3.2.3 NYU School of Engineering Dean's Recommendation

53) The Dean of the NYU School of Engineering will ordinarily make a recommendation to the NYU Provost for each case by February 16 (promotion only) and March 15 (tenure with or without promotion).

### 3.3 NYU Provost

54) The NYU Provost shall evaluate each tenure and promotion dossier and recommendation submitted by the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering. In evaluating a promotion or tenure recommendation submitted by the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering, the NYU Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation, and may in unusual cases appoint an ad-hoc advisory committee composed of tenured NYU faculty to seek further counsel. The NYU Provost shall support or oppose the NYU School of Engineering Dean's recommendation in his or her final decision. The NYU Provost will inform the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering of his or her pending decision. In those cases in which the NYU Provost's decision will be contrary to the recommendation of the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering, the NYU Provost will provide the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering with the reasons and give the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering an opportunity to provide further information or counter-argument before the NYU Provost's final decision. The NYU Provost shall notify the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering of the final recommendation, along with reasons thereof if the NYU School of Engineering Dean's recommendation is disapproved.

#### **4 Materials**

55) Each department will provide the complete dossier (Section 4.2, items [a] through [q]) for each candidate for promotion and/or tenure to the NYU School of Engineering Dean's office. All transmittals to the TPC will be from the NYU School of Engineering Dean's office. Only complete dossiers containing all items ([a] through [q]) shall be submitted to the TPC.

56) The candidate's CV will include a list of all relevant publications. What must be provided for each item are the title, names of all authors in the order appearing in the paper, journal name, volume, beginning and end pages, and date (month and year). Refereed journal papers must be listed separately from refereed conference papers and other publications. No publications in conference or workshop proceedings should be listed under refereed journal publications, irrespective of the quality of the conference.

58) For each grant or contract on which the candidate is a principal or co-principal investigator, the following information must be provided: the grantor, the names of all principal and co-principal investigators, the duration of the contract, and the total amount. The candidate's role in each grant must be described. The Principal Investigator for each grant must be explicitly stated.

##### **4.1 Preliminary Materials**

59) Internal promotion and tenure and new hires with tenure:

- Three (3) copies of the candidate's current curriculum vitae.
- Three (3) copies of the candidate's statement of teaching and research interests.
- Three (3) copies of the candidate's most relevant publications since the Third-Year Review and the same number of copies of any other writings (published or unpublished) reviewed by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- Draft of letter to external evaluators. This requires the NYU School of Engineering Dean's approval before the letters are sent.
- A list of evaluators to be solicited by the department.
- Materials should be provided as electronic copies (one) and also as hard copies (above).

60) Internal promotion only:

- Three (3) copies of the candidate's current curriculum vitae.
- Three (3) copies of the statement of teaching and research interests by the candidate.
- Three (3) sets of the candidate's publications since tenure review as well as any additional writing, published or unpublished, reviewed by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- Draft of letter to external evaluators. This requires the NYU School of Engineering Dean's approval before the letters are sent.
- Materials should be provided as electronic copies (one) and also as hard copies (above)

4.2 Dossier

61) The dossier is submitted by the candidate's department to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering. It must include all items listed below and a set of selected publications, three (3) copies, double-sided preferred, and electronic copies of all files.

62) The dossier consists of the following items:

- a. A table of contents indicating all page numbers (or sections separated by tabs) for each of the items below, which should be presented in the document in precisely the order given below
- b. Current curriculum vitae
- c. Candidate's statement of teaching and research interests
- d. All forms required by the NYU Provost
- e. The recommendation of the Department Chair (or Department Chairs for Joint or Associated Appointments)
- f. Report of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee:
  - An assessment of the candidate's research and scholarship
  - An assessment of the candidate's teaching performance (e.g., student evaluations, faculty evaluations, etc.)
  - An assessment of the candidate's service record
  - A signature Page signed by all members of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee
- g. Academic book reviews, if relevant
- h. Readers' reviews of unpublished books, if relevant
- i. A citation analysis, if relevant
- j. A list of Ph.D. and Masters dissertations supervised
- k. A copy of candidate's Third-Year Review (internal promotion and tenure cases only)
- l. Teaching evaluations
- m. Syllabi
- n. A list of evaluators with rationale for choices and reasons for any who were asked and declined
- o. A copy of the letter by which evaluations were solicited
- p. Letters of evaluation from external evaluators (minimum of five)
- q. A copy of each external evaluator's curriculum vitae

4.3 Notification of Decision

63) For a tenure case, the candidate and the Department Chair will be notified by the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering before the last day of the candidate's probationary period as a tenure-track faculty.

#### 4.4 Guidelines for Appeal

- 64) In the event of a negative decision, the candidate has the right of appeal. Ordinarily, the candidate would first confer with the Department Chair or the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering to seek an informal resolution or explanation of the decision. If not settled informally, the candidate may appeal to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering to convoke the NYU School of Engineering Faculty Grievance Committee, which is a standing committee of elected faculty members. The Grievance Committee, after reviewing the case, will advise the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering of its recommendation. After reviewing the recommendation of the Grievance Committee, the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering will notify the candidate of his or her final decision.
- 65) Should the decision not be satisfactory to the candidate, he or she may appeal in writing to the Chancellor of the University and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs within 15 days after receiving written notification of the Dean's decision. The Chancellor of the University and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs shall in each case obtain the advice of the Faculty Council Grievance Committee. This grievance procedure is detailed in the NYU Faculty Handbook.

### 5 Deadlines

#### 5.1 Internal Tenure and Promotion or Promotion only

- 66) By June 1, the Department Chair must forward the preliminary materials to the Office of the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering (See section 4.1).
- 67) By October 15, the completed Tenure Dossier (CD with dossier in pdf format, original, and three [3] printed copies) or the completed Promotion Dossier (electronic copy with dossier in pdf format, original, and three [3] printed copies) must be forwarded to the Office of the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering (See section 4.2).
- 68) For faculty whose tenure clock began at the start of the spring semester, the relevant deadline dates are the first weekday in December for preliminary materials and March 31 of the following academic year for submission of the completed dossier.

#### 5.2 New Hires with Tenure

- 69) The NYU Provost's Office has established a timeline for the review of tenure dossiers, including those of new hires with tenure. The NYU School of Engineering must submit completed dossiers to the NYU Office of Academic Appointments no later than May 15 of the current academic year. With this in mind, the Department Chair must submit to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering the completed Tenure Dossier (electronic copy with dossier in pdf format, original, and three [3] copies) for any new hires with tenure, no later than 30 days before the above deadline. Preliminary materials (e.g., CV, statement of teaching and research interests, list of evaluators, and publications) will be needed by no later than 60 days before the deadline for the department's submission to the Dean of the NYU School of Engineering.

70) For new hires with tenure who cannot be reviewed by the stated deadlines, their appointments may need to be delayed to the following semester or academic year, or their initial appointment can be in a non-tenured position as Visiting Professor or Professor without tenure, with the understanding that their status will be changed as soon as the tenure process is completed. It is important when communicating with a candidate for a tenured position that the candidate be made aware of these restrictions in the timing of the NYU School of Engineering tenure review process.

## **6 Sample Solicitation Letter, Mandatory Tenure and Promotion Review**

Dear [xxxx],

[Candidate name] is being considered for a tenure-track appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor in our [Department of YYYY]. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of [his or her] research and potential for future success.

I am enclosing [candidate name's] curriculum vitae and [his or her] teaching and research statement with this letter. If you agree to evaluate [his or her] case, I will forward a file containing copies of [his or her] selected work upon your request. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of [candidate name's] research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, and rate of publication. Your comments on the scope and significance of [his or her] research and interests would be valued. We also would be grateful for an explicit comparison of [his or her] work with the most prominent individuals working in the same field at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome.

If you have knowledge of [candidate name's] teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well. Also, please include in your letter a statement of whether and in what specific capacities you may have known the candidate or known of [his or her] research.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not [candidate name] would be considered a strong candidate for appointment as Assistant Professor in other leading departments in the field. We will appreciate receiving your letter within six weeks if possible, and if that is not possible, to please let us know.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the professors of this department, and 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,

## 7 Sample Solicitation Letter, External Senior Recruitment

Dear [xxxx]:

[Professor X] of the [University West at East] is being considered for a tenured appointment at the rank of full professor in our [Department of Name]. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of [his or her] research.

I am enclosing [Professor X's] curriculum vitae and [his or her] teaching and research statement with this letter. If you agree to evaluate [his or her] case, I will forward a file containing copies of [his or her] selected work upon your request. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of [Professor X's] research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, and rate of publication. Your comments on the scope and significance of [his or her] research and interests would be valued. We would also be grateful for an explicit comparison of [his or her] work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome.

If you have knowledge of [Professor X's] teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your comments on these matters as well. Also, please indicate in your letter how long and in what specific capacities you may have known the candidate or known of [his or her] research.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not [Professor X] would be considered a strong candidate for appointment as a tenured full professor in other leading departments in the field.

We will appreciate receiving your letter within three to four weeks if possible, and if that is not possible, to please let us know. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the professors of this department, and 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,

## **8 Sample Solicitation Letter, Promotion Review**

Dear [xxxx],

[(candidate name)], currently an [Assistant/Associate] Professor in the Department of [XX], is being considered for [tenure and promotion]. Because of your knowledge of the field in which [he/she] has worked, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of [his/her] research (published and unpublished).

I am enclosing Professor [XX's] curriculum vitae and [his/her] teaching and research statement with this letter. If you agree to evaluate [his/her] case, I will forward a file containing copies of [his/her] selected work. If you need copies of any other of [his/her] published or unpublished works to make your evaluation, please let me know immediately, and they will be sent. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor [XX's] research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, and rate of publication. Your comments on the scope and significance of [his/her] research and interests would be valued. We also would be grateful for an explicit comparison of [his/her] work with 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 [XX's] teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well. Also, please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you may have known the candidate or known of [his/her] research.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor [XX] would be considered a strong candidate for promotion and tenure in other leading departments in the field. We will appreciate receiving your letter within six weeks if possible, and if that is not possible, to please let us know.

Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. It will be available only to the tenured professors of this department, and appropriate decision makers and review panels 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,

## **9 The Tenure Clock**

A faculty member on the tenure track will have a title of Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor. The probationary period for a tenure-track faculty member at the NYU School of Engineering, is six years with a review in the third year, unless the NYU School of Engineering and the faculty member have mutually agreed in writing to a shorter period. The length of the probationary period conforms with one specified in the NYU Faculty Handbook, unless the NYU School of Engineering faculty and the NYU Provost formally approve something different that is specific to the NYU School of Engineering.

## **10 Stopping the Tenure Clock**

Tenure-clock stoppage may be granted, under specific conditions (cited below), for a maximum of two semesters during the probationary period. For details, please refer to the [NYU Faculty Handbook](#).