

# The Leonard N. Stern School of Business

## Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

September 1, 2024

### I. INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth principles and procedures for tenure and promotion at NYU Stern. These principles support high academic standards and ensure a comprehensive and fair review of candidates. These guidelines affirm principles and policy incorporating the University Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) and template for school policies that were first issued by the provost in 2004. They also consolidate practice and procedures as they have evolved in NYU schools.<sup>1</sup> This document has been reviewed by the Office of the Provost and has been deemed to be in full compliance with the Guidelines. Any changes to the guidelines in this document must be submitted to the Office of the Provost for approval.

### II. STANDARDS FOR TENURE

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

The successful implementation of the Guidelines to achieve and maintain high academic standards depends on the leadership of the deans, the provost and the president working in conjunction with the tenured faculty. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate among the strongest in the field, in comparison 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. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context of each subdiscipline may be a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. The current and future shape of programs in the department and school may be relevant considerations. All these factors must be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure.

---

<sup>1</sup> The “New York University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines” also known as the “Core and Essence Document” were issued in March 2004; and the “Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – Sample Template” in June 2004. The 2004 Guidelines were previously revised in April 2017.

### III. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION

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

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

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

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

### IV. PROCEDURES & SCHEDULE

Promotion and tenure (P&T) review and recommendation occurs through a multilevel process of detailed evaluation. This includes review by independent external evaluators (minimum of 5); review within the department, including a departmental P&T sub-committee ("the sub-committee") and all tenured faculty of rank equal to or higher than the rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion ("the departmental committee"); review by the school-wide P&T committee ("the school-wide committee"); and review by the dean of the school and finally the provost of the university.

#### A. For required promotion and tenure cases

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

- The department chair forms a sub-committee for each case
- The candidate submits research, teaching & service statements, CV, & sample publications to department chair
- The sub-committee prepares a preliminary report and submits it to the department chair
- The department P&T committee reviews the preliminary sub-committee report and candidate's materials, and recommends names of potential external letter writers to department chair.
- The department chair submits copies of the candidate's materials, preliminary sub-committee report, and names of potential letter writers, to the dean's office

- The dean's office solicits external letters from this list of names, and may supplement it with up to three additional names.
- The sub-committee prepares a final report once external letters are received.
- The department P&T committee meets to discuss and vote on the case.
- The department chair submits the required materials to the dean's office (see Section V, "Required Materials")
- School-wide P&T committee meets to discuss and vote on the case, and then makes its recommendation to the dean
- Dean reviews the case and makes a recommendation to the provost no later than June 1
- Dean informs the department chair and candidate of the provost's decision

#### **B. For promotion to full professor**

Tenured associate professors may be considered for promotion to professor at any point after receiving tenure. Starting three years after their effective date of tenure and every other year thereafter, each associate professor will receive a notification from the Vice Dean for Faculty and Research, with a copy to the relevant department chair, asking whether they want to be considered for promotion to full professor, and inviting the person to discuss the matter with their department chair. Should the candidate wish to proceed after that conversation, the review will proceed.

The review includes a cohort analysis and a review of the candidate's CV, teaching and course evaluations, and service contributions. The subcommittee presents its assessment and recommendation at a meeting of the department's full professors, who discuss and vote on the case. The timing of this process and the steps involved are analogous to the tenure review process.

See Section III. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION for greater detail on performance expectations.

#### **V. REQUIRED MATERIALS FROM DEPARTMENTS**

Properly prepared, detailed, and well-documented materials are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the evaluation of the candidate. It is the responsibility of the Department P&T Committee to verify that each P&T dossier contains the following:

- University P&T application, with department chair's recommendation and departmental vote sheet, including the count and signatures of those present
- Department P&T sub-committee's report (see A below)
- External evaluations (see B below), and letters from previous reviews where applicable
- Teaching materials (see C below)
- Service statement (see D below)
- Research statement (see E below)
- CV
- Sample publications and papers

## A. Department P&T Sub-Committee Report

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

### 1. Assessment of Research

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

- The sub-committee's assessment of the individual papers that are included in the packet, as well as the work overall;
- A description for non-specialists of the place the candidate's work occupies in the relevant discipline or field, and why it is important to the department that this field be represented on its faculty. This should explain the ways in which the strength of the candidate in their particular field advance the department's current ambitions, supplement other strengths in the department, and affect the standing of the department;
- Description of the quality and reputation of the journals or other venues of distribution in which the candidate's work has appeared;
- Discussion of what parts of the candidate's work are based on the dissertation, and for such work, what advances have been made after the dissertation;
- In fields where external funding is important, the candidate's success at securing grants must be evaluated in relation to reasonable expectations for scholars in the same field and at the same stage of professional development;
- Under the direction of the Department P&T committee a cohort table showing the candidate's research productivity and citations relative to peers at other academic institutions, following these guidelines will be prepared:
  - For candidates who have received tenure clock extensions, there will be two cohort tables: one based on the year the PhD was received, and one that adds the length of any tenure clock stops. For example, if the PhD was received in 2015, and the tenure clock was stopped for a total of two years, one table would reflect the 2014-16 cohort, and the other would show the 2016-18 cohort. The two tables will be given equal consideration.
  - For candidates who had previous service at another institution, their cohort will be based on the year their PhD was received, with exceptions as noted above. For candidates who had previous service outside academia, their cohort will typically be based on the year they rejoin academia.

- Departments may provide a selective list of journals that are considered top-tier, and may report the total count of publications in these journals for candidates and the peer group. See Appendix C for details on producing departmental lists. No schoolwide list of top journals exists.

## **2. Assessment of Teaching**

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

## **3. Assessment of Service**

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

## **4. Supplementary Materials**

The departmental P&T sub-committee may include additional materials that it considers informative and useful for the assessment of the case. This may include information about the candidate's work that may not be evident from the rest of the record, such as referees' reports for unpublished works, reports of grant review panels, etc.

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

## **B. External Evaluations**

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

### **1. Selection of External Evaluators**

The departmental P&T committee reviews the case to assess whether it is sufficiently strong for a tenure or promotion review. The committee may recommend to the chair to not solicit external letters. After discussion with the chair, the candidate is given the option to withdraw the case or to proceed with the review.

If the case proceeds, the sub-committee and department chair generate a list of at least twelve potential qualified external evaluators. This list should be shared with all members of the departmental P&T committee, so that they have the opportunity to offer input or make suggestions. The department chair should then define a final list of twelve names that are acceptable to a majority of the departmental committee members, forward this set to the Vice Dean for Faculty and Research, and discuss with the Vice Dean for Faculty and Research any names for which there were objections.

The candidate may request to exclude up to two specific external letter writers. The candidate must list the names and justification for exclusion for review by the department's chair, P&T subcommittee, and P&T committee prior to their final selection of the external reviewers. If the department decides to recommend including any of the names the candidate requested to exclude, it must provide the reason for this inclusion. This exclusion list, along with the final list of external reviewers, will be included in the packet for final approval by the Vice Dean for Faculty and Research.

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

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

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

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

## **2. Supplementary Evaluators**

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

## **3. Solicitation Letter**

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

#### **4. Confidentiality of External Letters**

The confidentiality of letters from external evaluators must be preserved; only eligible voters in the department may have access to the letters [i.e. tenured faculty at the rank under consideration (or above) for the candidate]. Neither the names of writers nor the content of the letters, even in summary form, may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond eligible voting members of the department.

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

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

#### **C. Teaching Materials**

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

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

#### **D. Service Statement**

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

#### **E. Research Statement**

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

## **VI. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

Department procedures must conform to the guidelines below. If there are questions of interpretation, the department chair should consult in advance with the Vice Dean for Faculty and Research, who will consult with the dean and provost's office as necessary.

### **A. Department Chair**

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

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

#### **a. Department P&T Sub-Committee**

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

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

Following the departmental P&T meeting (below), the chair of the sub-committee is responsible for revising the sub-committee report to incorporate the discussion of the departmental committee, including concerns, reservations, and minority views. This report should be made available to all departmental committee members, who may suggest edits. It is best if a consensus is reached in the editing process, but if any members of the committee feel that their views are not accurately or adequately captured in the report, then they may submit a dissenting opinion letter that will be added to the file and made available to the departmental committee and the school-wide P&T committee. The letter must be signed. If there is a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the case, the sub-committee should share that information in its report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation.

In the case of a joint appointment, the composition of the department sub-committee must include members of both units. Both units must vote on the joint report, with the guidelines herein outlined



concerning procedures and reporting applying to both. Each chair must forward the unit's recommendation to the dean only after consultation with the other unit. If the departments or programs arrive at significantly different judgments, the dean will ordinarily invite the chairs together to discuss the case.

### **C. Department P&T Meeting and Vote**

The chair of the departmental P&T sub-committee presents the case at a meeting of all department faculty eligible to review and vote on the particular case (see Section D below). Faculty who cannot be physically present are allowed to participate virtually, although the number of remote participants should be kept to a minimum. After a discussion, a vote must be taken and tallied. Re-voting must not be conducted for the purpose of achieving near consensus or unanimity or to avoid reporting a split vote.

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

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

In the case of a mandatory promotion or tenure review, if the eligible faculty members of the department do not support tenure or promotion, the candidate must receive a letter stating that the departmental committee does not recommend promotion or tenure. The department also advises the dean of its recommendation. The candidate may request that the case be considered at the school-level and such a request will be honored.

### **D. Department Faculty Eligible to Vote**

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

#### **i. Small Departments**

Chairs of departments with fewer than three faculty members of appropriate rank must consult with the dean about drawing upon faculty from other departments in fields related to that of the candidate so as to form an ad hoc committee consisting of three or more members. For a candidate being considered for promotion to full professor, if there are fewer than three tenured full professors, the dean, after consultation with the chair, will add to the review process other full professor committee members in domains related to the candidate's field.

### **ii. Faculty on Leave or Sabbatical**

All eligible faculty members, including those on sabbatical or leave of absence, are expected to attend the meeting in person or remotely. Departments should make a reasonable effort to enable eligible faculty, including faculty members on leave, to receive all relevant materials and to participate in the discussions and vote. Those who are unable to attend may submit their views in writing to be shared at the meeting. Only those present at the meeting may vote. The need to maintain anonymity during voting applies to all participants.

### **iii. Faculty with Joint, Associated or Affiliated Appointments**

Tenured faculty members with joint appointments have voting rights on P&T cases in both departments. Faculty with associated or affiliated appointments do not participate in governance in their secondary unit.

## **E. Submission of Materials to Dean**

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

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

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

## **F. Communication with Candidate**

Appendix B provides guidance on what the department chair may communicate to the candidate at various points in the process. Changes in this guidance should be reviewed by the provost's office.

## **VII. SCHOOL-WIDE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

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

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

The dean and/or dean's representative attends the departmental presentation, without vote and with voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the committee. They do not attend the subsequent

deliberations or voting. It is the responsibility of the committee chair to ensure that the deliberations are thorough, accurate, free of bias, and fair. Members of the committee who are in the same department as the candidate attend the presentation and deliberations, but do not participate in the discussion or vote.

Following the vote, the committee prepares a report outlining its evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the case and its recommendation. This report is forwarded to the dean and Vice Dean for Faculty and Research. The dean and vice dean will have the opportunity to meet with the committee to discuss their recommendation and to request elaboration or clarification on the written report.

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

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

### **VIII. DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

The dean will ordinarily make the recommendation to the provost by April 15<sup>th</sup>. In cases when a professor's appointment began in the spring semester, and a decision must be rendered by the provost by January 14th, the dean will ideally make a recommendation by October 15.

### **IX. PROVOST'S DECISION**

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

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

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

### **X. CANDIDATE'S APPEAL**

In the event of a negative promotion or tenure decision, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the University's faculty grievance procedures outlined in the [NYU Faculty](#)

## **XI. SCHEDULE OF REVIEWS AND PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS**

### **A. Tenure Clock**

The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in formal University rules adopted by the Board of Trustees. The current rules are found in the University's Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Title I and II stated in the NYU Faculty Handbook. Faculty members initially appointed as assistant professors will have a maximum probationary period of nine years, with a formal review no later than year five for promotion to untenured associate professor and no later than year eight for promotion to tenured associate professor. Faculty members initially appointed as untenured associate professors will have a maximum probationary period of five years, with the tenure review conducted in the fourth year. This timing is subject to the exceptions related to tenure clock stoppage as described in subsection F below.

### **B. Annual Review**

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

### **C. Third-Year Review**

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

### **D. Mandatory Fifth-Year Review<sup>2</sup>**

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

---

<sup>2</sup> During the transition period from sixth-year to fifth-year review, any untenured professor at Stern whose tenure clock's fifth year is 2024-25 or later, so typically those who started in 2020-21 or later, may opt in to the fifth-year review in lieu of the sixth-year

review. If an individual who would have been eligible for the five-year review was on leave or had a tenure clock extension during their first five years, thereby extending that period, the person will still be eligible for the five-year review, as long as their fifth year in active duties is 2024-25 or later.

In exceedingly rare cases, a faculty member may be retained at the assistant professor rank with the option for tenure review in year eight. This might occur, for example, when the faculty member has a small number of publications but a strong pipeline of working papers, with uncertainty about the likely publication success and impact of the work.

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

#### **E. Acceleration of Tenure Clock**

An early review for associate professor without tenure is one that occurs prior to the fifth year on the tenure clock. An early tenure review occurs prior to the eighth year on the tenure clock. The dean or Vice Dean for Faculty and Research must be consulted prior to the preparation of an early tenure case. The best reason for proposing early consideration of tenure is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. External letter writers must be asked to comment specifically on the grounds for an early decision. Department P&T sub-committee reports must also specifically address this issue. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the dean will not recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the normal schedule.

#### **F. Stopping the Tenure Clock**

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

## APPENDIX A: SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS

### A-1. Promotion to Associate Professor without Tenure

Dear Professor.....:

Professor ....., currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of..... , is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure at the Stern School of Business at New York University. Given your standing within and knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research and your recommendation as to whether or not Professor ... should be promoted.

At Stern, assistant professors are evaluated for promotion to associate professor no later than in the fifth year on their tenure clock. A promotion to associate professor without tenure would signal to the candidate that a positive tenure recommendation by the eighth year of the individual's tenure clock is reasonably possible, assuming continued evidence of research quality and increasing evidence of impact. This faculty member has had X semesters of approved tenure clock stoppage. This may be a consideration when evaluating the candidate's cohort.

If you accept this invitation to write, Professor ... vita, personal statement, and samples of their work will be made available to you to review and/or download.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor ....'s research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, impact, and significance. We would also appreciate an explicit comparison of his/her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor ....'s teaching ability or service to the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well. Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor .... would be considered a strong candidate for untenured associate professor in other leading schools.

We will need your letter and CV, submitted via Interfolio's secure delivery system, by email or regular mail, no later than .... Please indicate your willingness to assist us by selecting 'I Accept' or 'I Decline' in this message by .... If you are declining, we would appreciate a short note telling us why.

Please let us know if you need any additional information. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential, to the full extent allowed by law. It will be seen only by the tenured professors of the department who are eligible to discuss and vote on the case and the appropriate decision makers within the university.

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

Sincerely,

Vice Dean for Faculty and Research

## **A-2. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Dear Professor ...,

Professor ... currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of..., is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Given your standing within and knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of her research and your recommendation as to whether or not Professor ... should be promoted with tenure.

This faculty member has had X semesters of approved tenure clock stoppage. For reference, Stern's typical tenure clock is 8 years.

If you accept this invitation to write, Professor ...'s vita, personal statement, and samples of her work will be made available to you to review and/or download.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor ...'s research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, impact, and significance. We would also appreciate an explicit comparison of her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor ...'s teaching ability or service to the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well. Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor... would be considered a strong candidate for promotion and tenure in other leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter and CV, submitted via Interfolio's secure delivery system, by email or regular mail, no later than .... Please indicate your willingness to assist us by selecting 'I Accept' or 'I Decline' in this message. If you are declining, we would appreciate a short note telling us why.

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

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

Sincerely,

Vice Dean for Faculty and Research

### **A-3 Mandatory Tenure and Promotion Review**

Dear NAME,

NAME, currently an Associate Professor in the Department of XYZ, is being considered for tenure. We appreciate that ### years ago, we asked you to review Professor NAME for promotion to associate professor without tenure. We are now reviewing them for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation again of their research and potential for future success.

If you accept this invitation to write, Professor ...'s vita, personal statement, and samples of her work will be made available to you to review and/or download.

It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor ...'s research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, impact, and significance. We would also appreciate an explicit comparison of her work with that of the most prominent individuals working in the same field who are at comparable points in their careers. Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor ...'s teaching ability or service to the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well. Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor... would be considered a strong candidate for promotion in other leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter and CV, submitted via Interfolio's secure delivery system, by email or regular mail, no later than .... Please indicate your willingness to assist us by selecting 'I Accept' or 'I Decline' in this message. If you are declining, we would appreciate a short note telling us why.

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

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

Sincerely,

Vice Dean for Faculty and Research



#### A-4 External Hire with Tenure

Dear Professor.....:

We are considering Professor....., currently an Assistant/Associate/Full Professor at....., for an appointment as a tenured associate/full professor in our ..... department. Given your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of their research and your recommendation as to whether or not Professor ... should be appointed as a tenured associate/full professor.

If you accept this invitation to write, Professor .....’s vita, personal statement, and samples of his work will be made available to you to review and/or download.

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

We will need your letter and CV, submitted via Interfolio’s secure delivery system, by email, or regular mail, no later than .... Please indicate your willingness to assist us by selecting 'I Accept' or 'I Decline' in this message. If you are declining, we would appreciate a short note telling us why.

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

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

Sincerely,

Vice Dean for Faculty and Research

## A-5 Promotion to Full Professor

Dear Professor .....:

Professor..... , currently an Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of ....., is being considered for promotion to Full Professor. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of their research and your recommendation as to whether or not Professor ... should be promoted.

If you accept this invitation to write, Professor...’s vita, personal statement, and samples of his work will be made available to you to review and/or download.

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

Any additional comments you consider pertinent would be welcome. If you have knowledge of Professor .....’s teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your commentary on these matters as well. Please include in your letter a statement of how long and in what specific capacities you have known the candidate. Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor ..... would be considered a strong candidate for full professor in other leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter and CV, submitted via Interfolio’s secure delivery system, by email or regular mail, no later than ... Please indicate your willingness to assist us by selecting 'I Accept' or 'I Decline' in this message by .... If you are declining, we would appreciate a short note telling us why.

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

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

Sincerely,

Vice Dean for Faculty and Research

## **APPENDIX B**

### **NYU Stern Guidelines for Communication with P&T Candidate**

This guide provides the content of what the department chair can say to candidates about their tenure or promotion case. The actual language used may vary.

#### **When case is still within department:**

“The department meeting to discuss your case is scheduled for MONTH.”

“The school has solicited external letters for your promotion case.”

You may give the candidate suggestions about revising the research statement and/or the set of papers to include in the packet.

#### **When case has moved out of department and is with:**

##### **Schoolwide P&T:**

“The Schoolwide P&T Committee will discuss your case in MONTH.”

“The Schoolwide P&T Committee has sent its recommendation to the dean.”

##### **Dean:**

“The dean has made a recommendation to the provost.” OR

##### **provost:**

“The provost is reviewing your case.”

## Appendix C

### Department Process for Generating List of Top-Tier Journals

This appendix is an abridged version of the full report and recommendations, which should be consulted when generating these lists. It is available [here](#).

Each department chair is responsible for ensuring that the department maintains a list of top journals, to be updated every three to five years. No school-wide list is maintained. Departments provide the set of publication outlets viewed by the department as top-tier and details the process they undertook to arrive at their choices. Departments may also include a set of "other valued" outlets that they do not view as being quite in the top tier or that are specialized (e.g., so-called "field journals"), but that are still valued by the department.

#### *Inclusion Criteria*

There is no explicit requirement as to the number of outlets on the department's list. However, each outlet should satisfy some reasonable criterion for inclusion that is consistently applied across the entire list. For example, a department could use a quantitative criterion, such as an "Article Influence Score" above the population average of one. Though a department might deem a quantitative criterion to be a necessary condition for inclusion, it might not be sufficient to warrant inclusion. (Article Influence scores are available from [eigenfactor.org](http://eigenfactor.org) or Journal Citation Reports.) Departments may apply less quantitative or non-quantitative criteria instead or as well. When including a new publication outlet on a revised list, departments should clearly articulate the reasons why it was not included previously.

#### *Inter-/Multi-Disciplinary Issues*

Departments are welcome to include interdisciplinary outlets or outlets from other disciplines on their list as they see fit. An *a priori* list is strongly preferred to one that is tailored to the particular candidate *a posteriori*.

#### *Frequency of Updates*

The department's memo should be stable over time, revised every three to five years, with an explanation of the reasoning for any changes. If a department's list were to stay the same at the five-year mark, a brief reason for that conclusion will suffice. However frequently they alter their list, the changes need to be submitted prior to issuing any departmental subcommittee P&T reports for that year, and that version of the list needs to be the standard for all of the department's P&T cases for that academic year.

#### *Feedback Mechanism*

Prior to submission of a new version, departments have the option to receive a single round of non-binding feedback on their memo from the Vice Dean for Faculty and Research in consultation with the school-wide P&T committee. Departments that choose to participate in this feedback process (which does not empower the VDFR or school-wide P&T committee to veto decisions of or make demands on departments) would then be free to decide how/whether to incorporate that feedback.