

TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES TISCH SCHOOL OF THE ARTS

Introduction

The tenure and/or promotion process begins at the time of the candidate's hiring. Tenure-track appointments should be made in good faith, with the Department's commitment to providing the ongoing support and mentorship that make success possible. Regular, consistent, frank, and constructive feedback is crucial to a candidate's success. Each Department's tenure guidelines should outline, and the Chair should ensure, that such feedback is provided regularly, not only at the time of the Third Year Review but throughout a faculty member's employment at the University. While the success of candidates ultimately rests on the candidate's accomplishments, the tenure and/or promotion process is highly dependent on the fairness, rigor, candor, and good counsel of the candidate's senior colleagues.

Each Department should have its own set of guidelines specifying the expectations and procedures specific to that Department. Department guidelines for tenure and promotion must be consistent with those of the University and the School. They should be reviewed by the tenure-track faculty in the Department at five-year intervals and modified if expectations or procedures have changed.¹

Tenure Standards

Tenure and promotion at NYU are granted based on outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research and/or creative work. Given the many groundbreaking and hybrid activities of TSOA faculty, all forms of scholarly and creative research must be considered with equal seriousness and rigor. Given the highly collaborative nature of creative research, candidates must receive appropriate consideration for their contributions to such work. Achieving tenure at NYU necessitates that a candidate also has a record of effective teaching and mentoring deeply informed by their scholarly and/or creative research. Service toward the work of the Department, Tisch School of the Arts, and NYU, as well as the broader academic community, is expected.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Evaluating a candidate for tenure is a process of inquiry, "Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in the candidate's field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers?" and "Do the candidate's contributions to the field enhance the goals of the Department and NYU Tisch School of the Arts?" Markers of achievement will vary from one Department to another. Specific and clearly articulated Department guidelines for Tenure and Promotion are necessary both to guide tenure-stream faculty and to ensure tenure committees adhere to a standard of equitable fairness. Output should be commensurate to that of comparable tenured faculty in substance and impact, even as it is unique. Each case must be

¹ Proposed modifications to Department guidelines for promotion and tenure must be approved by the TSOA Dean and the Provost.

examined in detail by making explicit comparisons to faculty at peer institutions in the same or analogous fields, identifying special strengths, and acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context may be a criterion in assessing the strength of a particular candidate. Context can include particular features of the culture of the Department in question (for example, teaching and service requirements, and other Department expectations). All these factors must be carefully documented and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure.

Promotion to Full Professor

The inquiry in such cases is similar to that regarding tenure cases. Successful candidates will have demonstrated significant scholarly and/or creative achievement in their field beyond achieving tenure and be comparable to other individuals in their field at the same point in their career. The markers of such achievement for promotion to Full Professor may vary from one Department to another. Again, the requirements for promotion to Full Professor should be stated as clearly as possible in the Department guidelines for tenure and promotion.

Department Chairs should consult with the Dean or the Dean's representative before bringing a candidate up for promotion to Professor. Such cases are not governed by a "clock," but may be initiated when the candidate's accomplishments fulfill the expectations for that rank articulated in the Department Guidelines. When a Department Chair is a candidate for promotion, the Dean or the Dean's representative will designate a senior scholar in the Department (or outside of the Department if none is available within) to lead the review process.

The duty of the senior faculty to advise on tenure and promotion decisions is among their highest responsibilities, and as such, they should attend to their responsibilities seriously. Careful consideration should be made of the criteria for tenure and/or promotion that have been communicated to the candidate (for example, in the Third Year Review), and whether those criteria have been met. Of course, Department criteria may change over time, but when they do, it is incumbent upon Chairs to communicate these changes to candidates in advance of their promotion cases.

Review Procedures

The review process for all considerations of tenure and promotion has six phases:

- Preparation of the candidate's file
- Department Review
- Chair's Review
- TSOA Tenure and Promotion Advisory ("All School") Committee Review
- Dean's Review
- Provostial Review

Responsibilities of the Candidate

Following the schedule outlined in the timeline at the end of this document (Appendix A, “Timeline”), the candidate should provide:

- Candidate’s current curriculum vitae
- Personal statement (including discussion of candidate’s research, teaching philosophy, and service)
- A list of relevant publications and/or artistic productions (and where appropriate, as in the case of exhibitions, descriptions of the work)²
- Evidence of the quality of scholarly and/or creative work (reviews; awards, grants, fellowships, etc.; readers’ reports; citation analysis; etc.)
- Packets can include supplementary information about the candidate’s work that may not be evident from the rest of the record, e.g., the reader’s reports for unpublished work, reports of grant review panels, etc.
- Course syllabi for all courses taught during the relevant review period.³
- Course feedback (including student evaluations, peer observations, or other formal assessments of teaching effectiveness, if available)
- A list of the candidate’s supervision of dissertations and theses, or other relevant supervisory roles (such as PhD or MA Committee participation)
- The candidate’s service record and potential contributions toward the work of the Department and the intellectual life of the University and the academic community

In addition, the Department Review packet shall include the following (to be added by either the Office of Faculty or the Department Administrator associated with the case:

- Tenure review only: a copy of the formal written letter(s) or written report to the candidate from the Third Year Review⁴
- External reviews (see below, “Department Review”)

Department Review Committee

The Department Committee must have at least three members. 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. They may be appointed by the Department Chair or they may be elected, under Department guidelines. The Committee must consist of only tenured members; and for cases of promotion to Professor rank, only Professors may serve. If the Department does not have three eligible members, the Department Chair must consult with the Office of Faculty

² In the cases of promotion to Full Professor, these should include only works published or produced since the tenure review.

³ For promotion reviews from Associate Professor to Professor: where more than ten years have lapsed since the previous promotion, the syllabi for all courses taught the last six years are required.

⁴ Candidates who have not undergone a Third Year Review (those hired, for example, at the rank of advanced Assistant Professor), and candidates for Full Professor who have not been advised on their trajectory may request a written letter from the Chair outlining the expectations for tenure and/or promotion. If the Chair is not a Full Professor, Associate Professors may request such a letter from the Dean.

about drawing on tenured faculty from other Departments of the School and, if necessary, other Schools at NYU in fields related to that of the candidate to form an ad hoc Committee consisting of three or more members. The Committee must not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, including but not limited to a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close association. The Department Chair, too, must recuse her-/himself if they have a similarly close association with the candidate.

The Department Committee is charged with identifying potential external reviewers who, like members of the Committee, must not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, including but not limited to a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close association. **(See Appendix B, “External Reviewers” for selection criteria and confidentiality considerations.)** The Office of Faculty will review this list and invite eligible individuals using the template (see Appendices C(i) and C(ii), “Template Solicitation Letter to External Reviewer”). Per the NYU Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, the review must include the reports of a minimum of 5 external reviewers. It is suggested that the Committee Chair produce a list of 10 potential external reviewers in order to secure at least seven willing and appropriate reviewers, in case personal or professional obstacles arise preventing completion of the review of the candidate’s materials.

The Department may also choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is explicitly noted in the packet. These letters may be included in addition to, but not instead of, the five letters from external evaluators not identified by the candidate. Department guidelines should indicate whether such supplemental letters may be included in the packet and, if allowed, the maximum number of such letters may be included.

As part of the tenure review, the candidate will have their teaching observed by at least one Department Review Committee member. This class visit will be at a mutually convenient time, established in advance, at a time when formal instruction is being provided in real time (i.e., not pre-recorded, asynchronous lecture/demonstration).

The Department Committee’s report to the Chair should include the following:

- An assessment of the candidate’s research that addresses the following:
 - An explanation of the importance of the candidate’s field of expertise,
 - An assessment of the quality and quantity of research, including progress on future development,
 - The impact of the candidate’s research on their field(s), and
 - A summary and consideration of the external reviewers’ assessments
- An assessment of teaching performance, with specific consideration of:
 - teaching performance,
 - the quality and relevance of courses developed, and
 - contributions to the undergraduate (and/or graduate, where relevant) teaching program of the Department

- o NB: for tenure review, evaluation and an analysis of the effectiveness of undergraduate and graduate teaching must be provided in narrative form
- An assessment of service that addresses the following:
 - o the quality and significance of service to the Department and the University, as appropriate to faculty rank
- Comparison to individuals at other institutions at similar stages in their careers at comparable rank

The Department Committee report should include a recommendation in favor or against the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate.

The evaluation by the Department Committee should not be an advocacy document; it must provide a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and provide specific reasons for the basis of the Department Committee's recommendation. If there is a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the packet, the Committee should share that information in its report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation.

Indicators of doubt may include a split vote within the Department Committee or a split vote between the Department Committee and the eligible Department faculty voters. The report should lay out, in substantive terms, the basis for the positive and negative votes. Re-voting is not permitted unless an irregularity in the vote is discovered. Re-voting must not be undertaken for the sole purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split Committee or Department vote. All members of the Department Review Committee must sign the Signature Page of the report, attesting that they have read the packet and that it represents the opinions of the Committee clearly and fairly.

Depending on the Department Tenure Guidelines, the report and recommendation of the Department Review Committee may be presented to the tenured Department faculty of appropriate rank for a vote, or may be passed on to the Chair of the Department.

In the case where the entire tenured faculty is eligible to vote, a reasonable effort must be made to enable eligible faculty to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote, and the vote of the faculty must be reported to the Dean by the chair of the Department. The candidate's materials and the Department Review Committee's written report must be made available for inspection well in advance of the meeting at which the case will be discussed and the vote taken. Voting must be by secret ballot. The number of votes from absent members without the benefit of open discussion must be recorded and reported.

Tenured faculty members who participate in the promotion and tenure process must uphold high standards of responsibility and ethical behavior. Responsibility includes the obligation to give careful attention to the materials of a tenure case and to share the results of that deliberation only with eligible Department colleagues. Ethical behavior includes a clear obligation to

maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings both during and following the review, since confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.

Department Chair's Report

After reviewing the Department Committee's report, the Chair will prepare a document which includes the following:

- A description for non-specialists of the place of the candidate's work in the discipline
- A balanced assessment of the candidate's performance in the estimation of the Chair, including both strengths and weaknesses
- The numerical vote by rank-eligible faculty (if applicable), including
 - a summary of faculty discussion (if applicable)
- The Chair's recommendation

The Chair's letter must include 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 is also helpful for this statement to include information about the candidate's performance as measured by the usual criteria for excellence in the candidate's discipline (e.g., quality of venues within which the work appears).

Note Regarding Promotion to Full Professor

For promotions to Full Professor, the vote and authority resides with the Full Professors in the Department. If there are fewer than three tenured Full Professors, the Office of Faculty, after consultation with the Chair, will designate three or more senior scholars in the School to participate in the review process. If the Department Chair is not a Full Professor, the report of the Committee for promotion must be reviewed by the Dean instead of the Chair. Department Guidelines should stipulate whether all Full Professors in the Department are required to vote, but in any case, at least three senior scholars must participate in that process.

Note Regarding Cross-Appointments

Tenure review and third-year review for faculty with appointments involving more than one unit of the University ("cross-appointments") must ensure the input of all relevant units.

All evaluations of individuals with cross-appointments in more than one unit, whether part of a third-year review or preparatory to a recommendation for promotion or tenure, should include an explicit discussion of the special circumstances of the appointment, expectations for the candidate's multi-disciplinary activities, perspective and position, and the judgment of how well the appointee has met these expectations. The composition of the Department Review Committee in the primary unit (division, department, or program) must include members of both units. Both units must review the report, with the guidelines herein outlined concerning procedures and reporting applying to both. Each Chair must forward the unit's recommendation to the Dean (where cross-appointments are between schools, to the Dean of each school) only

after consultation with the other unit. If the units arrive at significantly different recommendations, the Dean (where joint appointments are between schools, the Deans) will ordinarily invite the Chairs together to discuss the case. Where joint appointments are between schools, the Dean of each School forwards his or her letter to the Dean of the primary school, for inclusion in the packet.

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

TSOA Tenure and Promotion Advisory (“All School”) Committee Review

The Office of Faculty shall pass the candidate’s packet on to an All School Committee composed of at least three faculty members of appropriate rank from different Departments, appointed by the Associate Dean of Faculty. This Committee is charged with reviewing the candidate’s packet, the reports of the Department Review Committee, and the Chair’s Review, to ensure that the review has thus far been conducted fairly and rigorously, consistent with the standards of NYU and the School. The All School Committee submits its letter to the Dean for their review.

The Dean’s Review

The Dean will inform the Department Chair of the advice provided by the All School Committee on Promotion and Tenure, as well as of their own proposed recommendation to the Provost. In the case of a Dean's recommendation contrary to that of the Department, the Dean will also provide the All School Committee and the Department Chair with the reasons. The Department Chair will then have ten days in which to provide further information or counterarguments before the Dean’s final recommendation is made to the Provost.

If the Dean has a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the packet, the Dean should share that information in the Dean’s report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation. Indicators of doubt may include a split vote within the Department or School-Wide Committee or a clear difference of opinion between the Department Committee and School-Wide Committee. The Dean’s report should explain, in substantive terms, the basis for the positive and negative votes in earlier stages of review. The Dean’s recommendation constitutes the definitive recommendation of the School and will be accompanied by the packet, Department recommendation, and the All School Committee recommendation.

Provostial Review

[See NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, “Provostial Review: Stage III”]

Guidelines for Appeal

In the event of a negative decision, the candidate has the right to file a grievance by the provisions of the University's [Faculty Grievance Procedures](#).

Additional Provisions

Procedures for tenured external hires (lateral hires), tenure clock stoppage, and acceleration of review are governed exclusively by NYU's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

Appendix A: Timeline

The following represents the typical tenure review timeline (i.e., for an Assistant Professor hired as of the beginning of the Fall semester, on a 7-year contract).

Year 5

Fall Semester: The Office of Faculty will invite the candidate to a workshop (or if necessary, meet one-on-one) to describe the review process and the contents of the candidate's packet to be submitted at the end of the following Spring Semester (Year 5). During the period of preparation of the packet, the Committee Chair will be available for consultation regarding qualitative questions, such as the appropriateness of materials and their presentation.⁵

Early Spring Semester: The Associate Dean of Faculty, in consultation with the Chair, will charge the candidate's Department Review Committee, which will be constituted by at least three faculty members of appropriate rank. One member will be designated Committee Chair. [A sample charge letter is attached as Appendix D, "Tenure Review Committee Charge."] The candidate will be informed of the constitution of their Committee by the Department Chair.

June 1: By this date, the Committee Chair, in consultation with fellow Committee members, will prepare a list of at least ten **potential external reviewers** of appropriate rank and expertise. The candidate will have an opportunity to inform the Committee Chair of any colleagues in the field who might be inappropriate for such service based on a history of professional or personal interaction which might compromise their objectivity, along with a specification of the reason(s). This list will be reviewed by the Office of Faculty to confirm the suitability of those identified. Once the list has been confirmed suitable, the Office of Faculty will send an invitation to these individuals to participate in the review process. [See Appendices C(i) and C(ii), "Template Solicitation Letter to External Reviewer"]

June 1: The candidate will upload, by this date, all materials required of them for the Interfolio packet (see above, Responsibilities of the Candidate). The candidate's complete uploaded packet will be made available to the Department Committee. In addition, the following sections will be made available to external reviewers: the cv; the Statement(s); and Scholarly and/or Creative

⁵ Clarity should be established between the candidate, the Committee Chair, the Department Chair and the Associate Dean regarding the applicability of scholarly and/or artistic materials toward promotion in regard to the nature, venue, and relative completion (e.g. manuscript vs. published text) of the project. These questions should be outlined as clearly as possible in the Department Guidelines for Tenure and/or Promotion.

Materials (i.e., publications, documentation of creative, entrepreneurial, and/or activist practice, and the optional relevant support materials listed above).

June-October: During this period, candidates for tenure will have their teaching observed by at least one Department Review Committee member. This class visit will be at a mutually convenient time, established in advance, at a time when formal instruction is being provided in real time (i.e., not pre-recorded, asynchronous lecture/demonstration. (Candidates for promotion to Full Professor will have their teaching assessed based on syllabi and teaching evaluations.)

October 15: Deadline for letters from external reviewers, which will be compiled and uploaded by the Department administrator.

November 1: The Department Review Committee will submit its report. The report will be organized with clearly demarcated sections in this order:

- a) Introduction: a brief characterization of the candidate's area(s) of research, length of employment at NYU, courses (or types of courses) taught, and the Committee's recommendation to the Chair;
- b) Research and/or artistic practice (as applicable);
- c) Teaching/Pedagogy; and
- d) Service.

The report will reflect and address any dissent or difference of opinion among external reviewers and/or the Department Committee itself. All Committee members must agree that the report fully and fairly represents the input of all concerned. Committee members who disagree can write a minority report.

November 1-December 1: Where specified in Department guidelines, the tenured faculty will review the Committee's report and vote on its recommendation. If there is a Department meeting and discussion, the report should capture the central elements of that discussion (positive and negative). These documents will be delivered to the Department Chair by December 1.

December 1-December 15: The Office of Faculty will charge the TSOA Advisory ("All School") Committee.

December 1-December 31: The Department Chair will review the candidate's packet and the Department Review Committee's report (as well as the vote of the faculty when applicable) and draft their letter to the Dean. The Department Chair's letter and the Department Review Committee's report will be delivered to the Office of Faculty by January 15. These will then be circulated to the All School Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

January 15-March 15: The All School Committee will review the candidate's materials, the Department Committee Report, and the Chair's letter, and submit their letter to the Dean.

June 1: By this date, the Dean's recommendation will be delivered to the Provost.

August 31: By this date, the Provost will notify the School, the Department, and the candidate of the decision of the promotion case.

Appendix B: External Reviewers

All tenure and promotion dockets must include a list of external evaluators, including those who declined. All Department/School communications with potential evaluators must be documented and included in the docket. A brief rationale for the selection of the evaluators who have written must be included in the docket, as well as an explanation for each of the declinations.

Criteria for Selection of External Reviewers

Based on nominations from the Department Review Committee and/or Department Chair, the Office of Faculty will solicit letters from a sufficient number of outside evaluators who are recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline, to secure at least five such letters. These five letters must be from evaluators who are not scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associates. Co-authors will be acceptable reviewers only in certain fields, such as fields with very small membership, and then only acceptable with permission of the Dean. If the Department inadvertently solicits an opinion from someone it later learns is close to the candidate, this must be noted in the Department report.

The Department may also choose to include additional letters from outside evaluators that have been suggested by the candidate or who are co-authors or the thesis advisor of the candidate, provided that this information is clearly noted in the docket. These letters may be included in addition to, but not instead of, the five letters from external evaluators not identified by the candidate.

Evaluators selected normally will 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. Evaluators must be recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline. Evaluators 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 packet must include specific explanations for the choice of particular referees contacted. The explanations must consist of more than the CVs of the referees. They must state why this particular referee's opinion matters, based on their expertise and familiarity with the candidate's discipline or area of creative practice. It is particularly important to exclude referees, such as

former advisors or collaborators, who have a personal or professional connection to the candidate.

Confidentiality of Reviews

The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; only eligible voters in the Department must be allowed access to the letters. Neither the names of writers nor the content of the letters may 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 must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, except as required by law, and that they will be seen only by eligible tenured members of the Department, the School Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the relevant Dean(s) and the Provost's Office.

**Appendix C(i): Template Solicitation Letter to External Reviewer
(tenure and promotion to Associate Professor)**

[Date], 20XX

[XXXX
XXXX]

Dear Professor XXXX:

Assistant Professor XXXX is currently being evaluated for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure at the Tisch School of the Arts. Because of your recognized expertise in some or all of Professor XXXX's field[s] of research, your name has been advanced by the Review Committee and we would very much appreciate your evaluation of Professor XXXX's materials.

Tisch School of the Arts utilizes Interfolio.com to manage promotion reviews; if you agree to undertake this review, you will receive an email message containing a link that should provide you with access to Professor XXXX's file, along with instructions on uploading your evaluation. Once you accept that invitation, you should be able to see the materials.

It will be of particular value to us if you provide a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of those materials concerning the intellectual and/or creative quality, originality, scope, and significance. NYU's "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" set forth the following criteria:

*The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure 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?*⁶

To assist in your review, we draw your attention to the fact that this candidate's dossier includes work performed in one or more years in which COVID-19 placed severe restrictions on all faculty members. [If appropriate: Also note that the tenure clock was automatically extended for all tenure-track faculty, including this candidate.⁷]

⁶ "New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines,"

<https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/promotion-tenure-guidelines.pdf> (accessed 15 September 2017).

⁷ See "[COVID-19 and Tenure Review](#)," dated March 25, 2020.

If you have interacted with this candidate personally, please include in your letter how long and in what capacities you have known the candidate. (Evaluators must not be individuals with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.) If you know Professor XXXX's teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would welcome your comments on these matters as well.

Finally, please indicate your assessment of whether Professor XXXX would be considered a strong candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure at your institution, as described above and in the full policy, in other leading Departments in the field. References to comparable scholars/artists at rank are particularly helpful.

Please upload your letter into Interfolio by XXXX. The university's review procedures also require that with your letter you forward to us via email your current curriculum vitae. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the review Committee of this Department and appropriate decision-makers and review panels within the university, to the extent allowed by law.

Thank you very much for 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. On behalf of NYU, thank you again for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Associate Dean, Faculty Services and Academic Affairs

cc: [Department Chair]
[Department Administrator]
[Committee Chair]

**Appendix C(i): Template Solicitation Letter to External Reviewer
(promotion to Professor)**

[Date], 20XX

[XXXX
XXXX]

Dear Professor XXXX:

Associate Professor XXXX is currently being evaluated for promotion to the rank of Professor with Tenure at the Tisch School of the Arts. Because of your recognized expertise in some or all of Professor XXXX's field[s] of research, your name has been advanced by the Review Committee and we would very much appreciate your evaluation of Professor XXXX's materials.

Tisch School of the Arts utilizes Interfolio.com to manage promotion reviews; if you agree to undertake this review, you will receive an email message containing a link that should provide you with access to Professor XXXX's file, along with instructions on uploading your evaluation. Once you accept that invitation, you should be able to see the materials.

It will be of particular value to us if you provide a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of those materials concerning the intellectual and/or creative quality, originality, scope, and significance. NYU's "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines" set forth the following criteria:

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure 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?

[...] "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? In addition, the candidate must have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be that the new work mark significant new scholarly research or artistic achievement since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate's achievements since the last review for promotion."⁸

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

If you have interacted with this candidate personally, please include in your letter how long and in what capacities you have known the candidate. (Evaluators must not be individuals with whom the candidate has been closely associated, such as a thesis advisor, co-author, or other close associate.) If you know Professor XXXX's teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would welcome your comments on these matters as well.

Finally, please indicate your assessment of whether Professor XXXX would be considered a strong candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor with Tenure at your institution, as

⁸ "New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines,"

<https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/promotion-tenure-guidelines.pdf> (accessed 15 September 2017).

described above and in the full policy, in other leading Departments in the field. References to comparable scholars/artists at rank are particularly helpful.

Please upload your letter into Interfolio by XXXX. The university's review procedures also require that with your letter you forward to us via email your current curriculum vitae. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the review Committee of this Department and appropriate decision-makers and review panels within the university, to the extent allowed by law.

Thank you very much for 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. On behalf of NYU, thank you again for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Associate Dean, Faculty Services and Academic Affairs

cc: [Department Chair]
[Department Administrator]
[Committee Chair]

**Appendix D: Charge to the Department Review Committee
[Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor]**

Dear Colleagues:

The duty of the senior faculty to give advice on tenure and promotion decisions is among their highest responsibilities, and as such, they should attend to the task with great care. Meticulous consideration should be made of the criteria for tenure and/or promotion that have been communicated to the candidate (for example, in the Third Year Review), and whether those criteria have been met. Your charge as a Department Committee is to conduct a thorough, rigorous and fair examination of Professor X's packet, which will be made available to you via Interfolio. That file will include:

- Current curriculum vitae
- Personal statement (including discussion of candidate's research, teaching philosophy, and service)

- A list of relevant publications and/or artistic productions (and where appropriate, as in the case of exhibitions, descriptions of the work)⁹
- Evidence of the quality of scholarly and/or creative work (reviews, videos, readers' reports, citation analysis, etc.)
- packets can include supplementary information about the candidate's work that may not be evident from the rest of the record, e.g., the reader's reports for unpublished work, reports of grant review panels, etc.
- Course syllabi
- Course feedback (including student evaluations, peer observations, or other formal assessments of teaching effectiveness, if available)
- A list of the candidate's supervision of dissertations and theses, or other relevant supervisory roles (such as PhD or MA Committee participation)
- The candidate's service record and potential contributions toward the work of the Department and the intellectual life of the University and the academic community
- Copy of the formal written letter(s) or written report to the candidate from the Third Year Review¹⁰
- External reviews (see below, "Department Review")
- NYU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
- TSOA Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
- [Department] Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

In addition, at least one member of the Committee should arrange to observe Professor X in the classroom and include a report on that observation. This class visit will be at a mutually convenient time, established in advance, at a time when formal instruction is being provided in real time (i.e., not pre-recorded, asynchronous lecture/demonstration).

The Committee is charged with taking all of the above into consideration and making a recommendation to the Department chair as to whether you think Professor X should be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. NYU's policy on tenure outlines the criteria for evaluation as follows:

A successful candidate for tenure will demonstrate that they are producing generative work that advances their field, as compared with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the Department and the School. It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. The markers of such achievement will vary from one Department to another, and they should be articulated as clearly as possible in Department Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging

⁹ In the cases of promotion to Full Professor, these should include only works published or produced since the tenure review.

¹⁰ Candidates who have not undergone a Third Year Review (those hired, for example, at the rank of advanced Assistant Professor, or those Associate Professors who have not been advised on their trajectory) may request a written letter from the Chair outlining the expectations for tenure and/or promotion. If the Chair is not a Full Professor, Associate Professors may request such a letter from the Dean.

*limits or weaknesses. Context may be a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. This may include particular features of the culture of the Department in question (for example, teaching and service requirements, or other Department expectations). All these factors must be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure.*¹¹

The Committee's report should be organized with clearly demarcated sections on the following:

- A brief description of the original position for which the candidate was recruited and the reason for their selection
- An explanation of the importance of the candidate's field of expertise
- An assessment of the quality and quantity of research and/or artistic contributions, including the promise of future development
- A summary and consideration of the external reviewers' assessments
- An assessment of teaching performance
- An assessment of service

Once the Committee has submitted its report and recommendation to the Department Chair (via Interfolio), the Chair will review all of the above write their report and recommendation, and submit it to the Office of Faculty (also via Interfolio).

[Note: a similar document should be sent, with relevant modifications, to Committees for Promotion to Full Professor.]

¹¹ "New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines," <https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/compliance/documents/promotion-tenure-guidelines.pdf> (accessed 15 September 2017).