

Office of the Provost  
66 West 12th Street New York, NY 10011

September 13, 2010

To: Full Time Faculty

From: Tim Marshall, Provost

Re: Revisions to the Full Time Faculty Handbook and ongoing work

I am pleased to share with you an update on several important revisions to the Full Time Faculty Handbook. The present handbook has been in effect since its 2006. The process for revising the handbook will be an ongoing one, and revisions will occur incrementally, as needed, in order to devise or update relevant policies.

At the present time, we have made changes to only a few pages of the handbook, particularly those sections dealing with employment categories and reviews. These are areas we prioritized for review and revision in order to bring greater clarity and consistency to practices university-wide. While the changes summarized below relate to principal faculty, a variety of employment categories remain, including fixed term appointments.

Here is a summary of the key changes. *Please note that these revisions will only apply to newly hired or faculty on renewable contracts going forward.*

1. Renewable Term Appointments (RTAs) are added as one of the university's principal categories of full time faculty.
2. Extended Employment (EE) is preserved as a separate category of principal full time faculty, but redefined as a form of job security that can be sought by RTAs after a defined period of time and no longer as an employment track.
3. New language describes the substance of annual reviews for all full time faculty.
4. New language describes briefly the nature of periodic program reviews that will establish ongoing institutional need for any given program.
5. The revised handbook deletes a provision that had allowed newly hired principal full time faculty to decide after a post-probationary review whether or not to pursue tenure or EE.

As one additional change to the handbook, new language creates a standing faculty handbook committee of full time faculty representatives selected by the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate. This committee will serve to advise the faculty senate, deans, provost, president, and

trustees with regard to suggested revisions to the handbook. The next area of focus will be the divisional charters, and then section iv, which concerns faculty workload.

We have attached a .pdf of the handbook sections with the relevant changes highlighted. As soon as these sections have been properly formatted and placed within the larger handbook, both versions of the handbook will be accessible on the Provost Office website.

These revisions were developed over the course of the 2009-10 academic year by an ad hoc faculty committee whose members included Jay Bernstein (NSSR), Stefania de Kenessey (Lang), Julia Foulkes (NSGS), David Howell (Milano), Arien Mack (NSSR), Robert Polito (NSGS), Katie Salen (Parsons), Sven Travis (Parsons), and Reggie Workman (Jazz), chaired by Jim Miller (NSSR) in his capacity as Special Advisor to the Provost on the Faculty Handbook. The committee was advised and supported by Ron Kassimir, Eleni Litt, and Shannon Salinas from the Office of the Provost. The revisions were developed in consultation with the Deans Council and the Faculty Senate. The University's General Counsel and Vice President for Legal Affairs also reviewed both the substance and language of the revisions, and the revisions were reviewed and approved by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. I am grateful to everyone involved for the focus and seriousness they brought to this work.

The work on the handbook and the continued experiences in ensuring the development of university-wide norms for reviews and promotions has alerted us to many other policies and practices that need development and/or revision. To ensure the quality, transparency and equity of our practices, many areas are undergoing review this year. We have formed a Faculty Affairs Committee that will be reviewing and recommending policies in areas already identified and others that arise as we get more experience moving to university-wide practices. The committee has a broad agenda, will be advisory to the Provost, and will have a problem-solving mandate to recommend changes to existing policy and promote and surface ideas about new efforts. The topics below represent our initial agenda for the year. Others may be added. The names of the committee members are listed below and we will continue to update you on our progress.

- Designing a faculty mentoring program
- Implementing the annual faculty review process
- Supporting the grand-parented faculty promotion process
- Clarification of term review policies
- Promotion to rank policies for term and grand parented faculty
- Conversion policies for term faculty into RTA
- Faculty ombudsperson
- Supporting senior faculty for mentoring and review committee service

Members of the Faculty Affairs committee include: Bryna Sanger (chair) Ken Wark (Lang), Sarah Lawrence (Parsons), Elizabeth Aaron (Mannes) Tony Anemone (NSGS/Milano), Jay Bernstein (Chair, UPRC), Carol Wilder (Chair, UTRC), Jim Miller (Chair, Handbook Committee), Carolyn Comiskey (Provost Office/Curriculum and Learning), Eleni Litt (Provost Office/Faculty Affairs).

Thank you for your interest, participation, and patience as we continue to develop and review policies and practices in an effort to strengthen and support our faculty.

DRAFT DRAFT

## *Handbook page 2 revised*

### **Revision of the *Full-Time Faculty Handbook***

The New School and the faculty commit their good faith efforts to the process of achieving agreement on policy issues affecting the faculty, including but not limited to the provisions of this handbook.

Because of the range of subject matters and the authority for them, these policies and procedures are subject to change at any time. Revisions to the handbook will be incorporated periodically. ~~Faculty are responsible for checking the Office of the Provost website to keep abreast of alterations and additions.~~

The board of trustees retains the right, in the best interest of the university, and in its fiduciary capacity, to alter the provisions of this handbook, except that any changes made to tenure and extended employment shall not apply to faculty who, at the time of the change, are tenured or hold extended employment contracts, without their individual consent. While preserving the right to institute changes, the president and the board of trustees will consult the elected representatives of the faculty, and will consider amendments proposed by the faculty through its selected representatives, before altering the handbook. If the faculty proposes amendments that are not accepted by the board of trustees, the faculty should be informed of the reasons for the non-acceptance.

~~In order to facilitate this process, the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate shall appoint a standing Faculty Handbook Committee, consisting of full-time faculty members and relevant staff members from the Provost Office. This advisory committee shall meet periodically to review the Handbook and propose suggested revisions. As part of this mutual process, the provost will then meet with representatives of elected faculty leadership and the deans to discuss and clarify proposed changes to the handbook; and then forward his or her recommendations to the President and Board of Trustees.~~

Within the limits of law and the charter of The New School, authority to interpret this handbook is delegated to the president by the board of trustees, who hold the final authority, and who agree to consider interpretations provided by the faculty through its established structures before declaring final interpretation of provisions.

In order to carry out many of the policies and procedures outlined in the handbook and to discharge the duties of curricular oversight, the board of trustees recognizes the need for the faculty to organize itself and recognizes duly constituted faculty officers and committees.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

**PROPOSED REVISION with key new passages highlighted in yellow.**

### *iii. Faculty Categories, Appointment Types, and Ranks*

- **Faculty Categories**

At The New School, practitioners whose work is recognized in their professions teach side by side with scholars whose careers are established in the academy. The New School welcomes the expertise and richness that both practitioners and scholars bring to teaching and learning.

The New School has four appointment categories for full time faculty: Renewable Term Appointment (RTA), Extended Employment (EE), and Tenure Track. In addition, the university offers Fixed Term Appointments (FTA).

RTA faculty, EE faculty, and Tenure Track faculty are responsible for planning and managing the curriculum, the supervision of junior and part-time colleagues, and academic quality. They are expected to be effective teachers, to advise students, to play an active role in their profession, department, division, and university governance, and to meet standards of scholarly, creative, or professional achievement as established through their divisions/schools. All full time faculty are subject to annual review as well as periodic substantive evaluations; all faculty may be terminated by the university for cause or under extraordinary circumstances, as discussed in section xiii (“Separation”).

When a faculty position becomes vacant, or it is determined that a new appointment is needed, the dean of that division shall consult with the provost. After authorization to fill the position has been obtained, the dean shall follow university policies and procedures for filling the position. All initial appointments to tenure track and RTA require an open national search to fill the line authorized by the Provost. In all cases, these policies shall be consistent with EEO regulations and university guidelines for the recruitment of faculty. Final approval for all appointments, after the provost’s and president’s endorsements, rests with the board of trustees.

#### ***a. Renewable Term Appointments***

Renewable term faculty are responsible for teaching and service and providing expertise in their field or profession. They are expected to be effective teachers and may advise students and play

an active role in their department/program. Renewable term appointments are made to faculty who demonstrate excellence either in teaching, in service, or in scholarly and creative endeavor. Renewable term appointments will normally be made for periods of three or five years, and may be renewed indefinitely, subject to meeting expectations for performance, and also subject to institutional need. Renewable term appointments carry no presumption of continuing employment beyond the specified contract period. Under some circumstances, senior renewable term faculty can be considered for promotion to Extended Employment.

### ***b. Extended Employment***

To qualify for extended employment (EE), an RTA faculty member must demonstrate ongoing excellence in teaching. In addition, faculty must elect to be evaluated for ongoing excellence in either service or their scholarly, creative or professional activities with the remaining category requiring an ongoing and good level of performance. After three contract renewals, or ten (10) years, whichever comes first, a qualified RTA faculty member may be nominated by a Dean to apply for EE. In addition, a qualified RTA faculty member may ask once to apply for EE. Applying for EE does not jeopardize a renewable term appointment. Faculty with extended employment appointments are renewable term appointments who have achieved and are committed to maintaining excellence in teaching, as well as ongoing excellence in either service or in scholarly, creative or professional activities, with the remaining category requiring an ongoing good level of performance; they have been affirmatively confirmed in such status by action of the board of trustees on recommendation of the provost through the president, subsequent to appropriate peer and administrative review. An extended employment appointment carries a presumption of continuous employment, subject to a triggered post-promotion review, and subject to demonstrable institutional need.\*

### ***c. Tenure and Tenure Track***

#### ***i. Probationary Tenure Track***

All new junior tenure-track appointments are probationary. Probationary appointments may be terminated at the end of any contract period based on performance and/or institutional need considerations.

#### ***ii. Tenure Eligible***

Tenure-eligible appointments are made for one three-year term, following successful review at the end of the probationary period. The decision to award tenure is made in the third year of this contract period. Tenure appointments are designed for faculty who intend to excel in scholarly/professional and/or creative activities and teaching. Because tenure is the ultimate long-term commitment on the part of the university to an individual faculty member, it requires a commitment to sustained excellence in scholarly, creative or professional activities as well as ongoing excellence in either teaching or service with the remaining category requiring an ongoing and good level of performance.

#### ***iii. Tenure***

Faculty with Tenure are those who have not only proven sustained excellence in their scholarly and professional/creative achievements and teaching or service, but are committed to maintaining these standards; they have been affirmatively confirmed in

---

\* Periodic program reviews, conducted every seven years independently of personnel reviews, will help establish continuing institutional need for a program.

such status by action of the board of trustees on recommendation of the provost through the president, subsequent to appropriate peer and administrative review. An appointment with tenure means an appointment without limit of time, subject to triggered post-promotion review.

#### ***d. Fixed Term Appointments and Visiting Faculty***

##### ***i. Fixed Terms***

Faculty members with fixed term appointments provide temporary academic services. Appointments are based upon the experience and academic background of the candidate and programmatic needs. Fixed term appointments may be made for periods of one (1) to three (3) years. Fixed term appointments may *not* be renewed, except in special circumstances, and then only once, and for a total term not to exceed three (3) years. FTA faculty may also apply for RTA and tenure track jobs involving an open national search.

##### ***ii. Visitors***

Visiting appointments are generally given to persons on leave as full-time faculty from another institution. The duration of the appointment of a visiting professor is normally one year, but cannot exceed three years. Other appointments of a short-term nature, made on non-renewable contracts, may be made based on program needs.

## **• Faculty Ranks and Titles**

There are four faculty ranks for fixed-term, RTA, EE, tenure-track and tenured faculty at The New School: Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, differentiated by levels of education and professional accomplishment. Appointment or promotion to any academic rank carries with it the possibility, but no presumption, of reappointment and includes no right to permanent or further reappointment or to promotion to any higher rank.

### **Instructor**

Faculty members with the rank of instructor have shown evidence of their potential or ability as teachers. Instructors will generally not possess the terminal degree, or its equivalent, in their chosen field.

### **Assistant Professor**

The rank of assistant professor is granted to faculty members who, in addition to the qualifications for an instructor, possess a terminal degree in their discipline or have the equivalent in scholarly/professional/creative experience and/or creative output. In addition, assistant professors must show promise of scholarly, artistic, and/or professional/creative accomplishments and recognition in their field and potential for service to their profession, to the university and to their division, and department. Assistant professors must demonstrate effectiveness as teachers and advisors, including concern for the personal worth and educational development of individual students.

### **Associate Professor**

The rank of associate professor for tenured faculty shall be granted only to those who, in addition to all of the qualifications for an assistant professor, also demonstrate ongoing excellence in scholarly, creative or professional activities as well as ongoing excellence in either teaching or service with the remaining category requiring an ongoing and good level of performance. In addition, associate professors must demonstrate excellence as advisors to undergraduates and graduate students (where applicable) and as mentors to junior colleagues. They must have a solid record of service to the university and to their division, and department. The rank of associate professor for extended employment faculty shall be granted only to those who, in addition to all of the qualifications for an assistant professor, also demonstrate ongoing excellence in teaching as well as ongoing excellence in either service or their scholarly, creative or professional activities with the remaining category requiring an ongoing and good level of performance. In addition, associate professors on extended employment must demonstrate excellence as advisors to undergraduates and graduate students (where applicable) and as mentors to junior colleagues. They must have a solid record of service to the university and to their division, and department.

### **Professor**

As the highest level of university achievement, this rank denotes widely recognized scholarly/professional/creative distinction, excellence as a teacher, advisor, and mentor, and significant leadership within the university, division, and department. The faculty member will have a record of service in important leadership roles. The rank of professor should be granted only to those who, in addition to all of the qualifications for an associate professor, also have gained national/international recognition in their discipline or field.

Visiting faculty hold the rank of Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor, based on their home institution designation, or level of education and scholarly/professional/creative accomplishment.

Outside of the ranking system, The New School has three other titles for faculty:

***a. Distinguished Professor***

Senior members of the faculty may be awarded this title by the board of trustees in recognition of distinguished service to the university and eminence in their discipline. In some cases, faculty with equivalent achievements at other institutions may be hired with the rank of Distinguished Professor.

***b. Professor Emeritus/Emerita***

Upon retirement, this title may be awarded to faculty by the board of trustees in recognition of distinguished service to the university and significant contributions to their fields. It is an honorary title that does not carry teaching or other duties but may entitle the holder to access to certain university resources and facilities.

***c. Professor of Professional Practice***

Term and visiting faculty whose careers have been formed outside of the academy may be awarded this title by the dean in consultation with the provost.

**PROPOSED REVISION with key new passages highlighted in yellow.**

## ***v. Faculty Evaluation***

### **• Faculty Reviews**

The New School has four types of faculty reviews including: Annual Performance Reviews, Post-Probationary Reviews, Promotion Reviews, and Post-Promotion Reviews. In addition, the New School conducts Periodic Program Reviews.

#### ***a. Annual Performance Review***

An evaluation of every faculty member's performance is held each year. The annual performance review enables supervisors to provide faculty with development support and mentoring, when needed, as well as to assess faculty progress and expectations in preparation for promotion and reappointment reviews. Annual performance reviews are also intended to insure faculty productivity and the maintenance of high standards. All faculty are asked to complete an annual workload report, requested annually by the dean. Included on the report are: instructional activities, creative scholarship, and other scholarly, professional, and creative work, and service activities and recognition the prior year. Reviewed at the division/school level along with teaching evaluations these annual reports become part of the basis for salary adjustments and leaves and also become part of the personnel file.

Failure to meet minimal obligations and standards the department/program and division/school have stipulated for its faculty will result in an "unsatisfactory" rating. Written notification of an unsatisfactory rating and the considerations upon which it is based shall be given to the faculty member, with copies to the dean and provost. It should be recognized that a single unsatisfactory annual performance evaluation indicates a serious problem which should prompt remedial action for all full-time faculty and may lead to dismissal for fixed term and visiting faculty. Faculty

members may respond in writing with a letter to the chair/director for inclusion in the personnel file if they feel the rating is in error. The dean must respond to the faculty member in writing. Two consecutive annual ratings of unsatisfactory performance for a renewable term, extended employment or tenured faculty member will result in a post-promotion review and may result in dismissal for other faculty.

## ***b. Reappointment Reviews***

### **for Tenure Track Appointments**

In the fall semester of the fourth year, probationary tenure-track faculty will stand for postprobationary review. Tenure eligible reappointments are made to faculty who demonstrate ongoing excellence in their scholarly, creative or professional activities. Faculty are evaluated for ongoing excellence in either teaching or service with the remaining category requiring an ongoing and good level of performance.

### **for Renewable Term Appointments**

Renewable term faculty are responsible for teaching and service and providing expertise in their field or profession. They are expected to be effective teachers and may advise students and play an active role in their department/program. Renewable term reappointments are made to faculty who demonstrate excellence either in teaching, or service, or in scholarly and creative endeavor. Renewable term appointments will normally be made for periods of three or five years, and may be renewed indefinitely, subject to meeting expectations for performance, and also subject to institutional need. Renewable term appointments carry no presumption of continuing employment beyond the specified contract period. Under some circumstances, senior renewable term faculty can be considered for promotion to extended employment.

## ***c. Promotion Reviews***

### **for Extended Employment**

Extended employment appointments are made to renewable-term faculty who demonstrate ongoing excellence in teaching as well as ongoing excellence in either service or their scholarly, creative or professional activities with the remaining category requiring an ongoing and good level of performance.

### **for Tenure**

In the fall semester of the third year of a tenure eligible appointment, faculty will stand for tenure. Tenure appointments are made to faculty who demonstrate ongoing excellence in their scholarly, creative or professional activities as well as ongoing excellence in either teaching or service with the remaining category requiring an ongoing and good level of performance. Faculty who are to be appointed with tenure must go through a New School Tenure promotion review. Faculty promoted to Tenure and Extended Employment will be automatically promoted to Associate Professor unless they already hold such rank.

#### *d. Post-Promotion Reviews*

Faculty with extended employment (EE) and tenure are not exempt from ongoing evaluation. They, like their renewable term (RTA) counterparts, have an obligation to maintain their performance as outstanding teachers, exemplary scholars, and good citizens. Likewise, the university has an obligation to work with faculty members in a constructive manner to promote and advance faculty development.

Initiated after two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews of a tenured or EE faculty member, the post-promotion review is an important part of this process. This formal institutional evaluation offers a place for a more in-depth discussion of a faculty member's progress over the course of one's career than is possible in annual reviews. The post-promotion review is meant to assist both the university and faculty to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of each faculty member and offers an opportunity to develop strategies and plans that may build on perceived strengths and address acknowledged weaknesses. Established procedures exist for dismissal of tenured faculty on grounds of incompetence, malfeasance, or failure to perform duties, as well as on grounds of bona fide financial exigency or program termination. Post-promotion reviews shall be mandatory when triggered by two consecutive negative annual performance evaluations for tenured or EE faculty. Annual reviews for years spent on leave without pay shall be disregarded for the purpose of this calculation. The review shall be conducted by an ad hoc committee convened by the appropriate division. Upon recommendation of the head or chair and with the approval of the dean, a post-promotion review may be waived or postponed if there are extenuating circumstances that prohibit a meaningful review. An example of an extenuating circumstance is health problems.

The purpose of a post-promotion review is to focus the perspective of the faculty peers on the full scope of a faculty member's professional competence, performance, and contribution to the department, division, and university mission and priorities. The faculty member has both a right and the obligation to provide a dossier with all documents, materials, and statements that she or he believes to be relevant and necessary to the review. The faculty member will be given no less than four weeks to assemble a dossier for the committee. The head or chair will supply the review committee with the last two annual performance evaluations, all materials which were considered in those evaluations, any further materials deemed relevant, and other materials the committee requests. Copies of all materials supplied to the committee will be given to the faculty member. The faculty member has the right to provide a written rebuttal of evidence provided by the head or chair.

The committee will weigh the faculty member's contributions to the discipline, the department/division, and the university through teaching, research and/or professional and creative practice, and service. The burden of proving unsatisfactory performance is on the university. The committee will prepare a summary of its findings and make a recommendation to the head or chair, with copies to the dean and provost. Final action and notification of the faculty member is the responsibility of the head or chair and dean, with the concurrence of the provost.

The review may result in one of the following outcomes:

□ Certification of satisfactory performance. The committee may conclude that the faculty member's competence and/or professional contributions are satisfactory to meet the minimum expectations, thus failing to sustain the assessment of the head or chair. The review is then complete. An unsatisfactory rating in any subsequent year would be counted as the first in a new sequence.

□ Certification of deficiencies. The committee may concur that the faculty member's competence and/or professional contributions are unsatisfactory to meet the minimum expectations. The committee may then recommend dismissal for cause, a sanction other than dismissal for cause, or a single period of remediation not to exceed two years.

○ Dismissal for cause. If dismissal for cause is recommended, the case shall be referred to the division-level promotion and tenure committee, which shall review the case as presented to the committee and determine whether the recommendation is consistent with the evidence. If the division-level committee upholds the recommendation for dismissal, then the procedures in the dismissal for cause section will begin immediately. If the president decides to proceed with the dismissal, the faculty member shall be provided a statement of charges and notification of a right to a formal hearing in accordance with dismissal for cause policy.

○ Sanction other than dismissal for cause. A severe sanction generally involves a significant loss or penalty to a faculty member, such as, but not limited to, demotion in rank and/or a reduction in salary, or suspension without pay for a period not to exceed one year. Routine personnel actions such as a below-average or no merit increase, reassignment, removal of an administrative stipend, or verbal or written reprimand do not constitute a severe sanction within the meaning of this policy.

A recommendation to impose a severe sanction shall be referred to the division-level promotion and tenure committee, which shall review the case as presented to the committee, provide an opportunity for the faculty member to be heard, and determine whether the recommendation is consistent with the evidence. The division-level committee may reject, uphold, or modify the specific sanction recommended by the committee. If the division-level committee also recommends the imposition of a severe sanction, then the same procedure for dismissal for cause will guide the process. If a severe sanction is imposed or ultimately rejected, then the post-tenure review cycle is considered complete. An unsatisfactory rating in any subsequent year would be counted as the first in a new sequence.

○ Remediation. If a period of remediation is recommended, the committee will specify in detail the deficiencies it has noted, detail specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve, and establish a timeline for meeting the goals. The head or chair will meet with the faculty member at least twice annually to review progress. The head or chair will prepare a summary report for the committee following each meeting. At the end of the specified remediation period, the committee will either certify satisfactory performance or recommend dismissal for

cause or a sanction other than dismissal for cause following the procedures described above.

## • **Standards for Faculty Review**

### ***a. Division Standards***

Each division shall develop, maintain, and publish a statement of minimum standards for satisfactory faculty performance using the following process:

1. Standards should be written with the participation of the faculty in the division.
2. Standards should be approved by a vote of the faculty in the division.
3. Standards developed and approved by the faculty in the division will then be reviewed by the dean, and if approved, forwarded to the provost. If the dean does not approve, he or she must explain his/her reasons to the faculty and work with the faculty to produce standards that are mutually acceptable.
4. All standards must be approved by the provost before they are published.
5. Once approved, the standards should be published and made available to all faculty members in the division via the *Full-Time Faculty Handbook*.
6. Revisions of the standards should also follow the procedures outlined above.

### ***b. Guidelines for University-wide Minimum Standards***

The following guidance is provided for the development of minimum standards:

1. Divisions should carefully assess and state the overall standards of professional performance and contribution they consider minimally acceptable for extended employment and tenured faculty. Each division's evaluation mechanism should allow a distinction between performance that is deficient in one or more areas and that requires improvement and performance which is so seriously deficient as to merit the formal designation "unsatisfactory."
2. Division standards should embrace the entire scope of faculty contributions. Expectations should recognize differences in faculty assignments within the same division. Standards should typically address: the faculty member's skill, effort, and effectiveness in contributing to all aspects of the institution's mission; the faculty member's activity in and contributions to the academic discipline; and the faculty member's contributions to the collective life of the department, division, and university.
3. Divisional statements should affirm support for the basic principles of academic freedom and should express tolerance for minority opinions, dissent from professional orthodoxies, and honest and civil disagreement with administrative actions.
4. Divisional statements should include the expectation that all faculty members will adhere to the standards of conduct and ethical behavior as stated in the *Full-Time Faculty Handbook* and/or promulgated through other official channels.

## • **Criteria for Faculty Review**

### ***a. General University Evaluation Guidelines***

Contributions to the division and the university by a faculty member shall be evaluated using four criteria:

- Advanced knowledge of the subject matter and an active commitment to extending that knowledge;
- Scholarly or professional/creative achievements and contribution to the field or discipline that bring credit to the division and university;
- Effectiveness as a teacher and advisor, demonstrating concern for the personal worth and development of individual students; and
- Effective work as a university citizen to strengthen the department, division and university.

In applying these criteria, each recommending authority will consider all relevant sources of information obtained for evaluation, including the opinion of students. Opinion of experts outside the university will be sought for promotion to extended employment and tenure and for promotion to full professor. The criteria shall be applied in a manner that fosters each division's particular mission and improvement in the overall quality of the faculty. Each case shall be judged on its own merits and not on comparisons with past decisions.

### ***b. Division Evaluation Criteria***

Because academic culture and disciplines vary among the divisions, the details of formative (annual) and summative (periodic) evaluation procedures for all faculty are developed in and by the individual divisions and their faculty committees, consistent with university guidelines and shall meet the following requirements:

- Each division must have clear criteria and weights for faculty evaluation and promotion that have been vetted by the full-time faculty, including clear standards for judging excellence in teaching and scholarly or professional/creative practice.
- Weights for the following criteria shall be specified: teaching and advising effectiveness; scholarly, professional, or creative production; university and divisional citizenship and service.
- Each division will maintain up-to-date curriculum vitae or resumes for all faculty and syllabi for all courses offered for academic credit.
- Provisions shall be made for including student evaluations of teaching and advising.
- Confidentiality shall be protected at all stages.

□ The criteria and weights shall be approved by the Office of the Provost, and will be made accessible to all faculty members through the *Full-Time Faculty Handbook*.

The goal is to communicate, in a timely way, a coherent set of expectations with specific examples to the candidate.

### ***c. Approval and procedural considerations for Divisions' evaluation process***

The procedures for evaluation followed by each division are adopted on a majority vote of each division and approved by the Office of the Provost for consistency with general personnel policy of the university. The procedures become effective when recorded by the Office of the Provost.

By delivery of this handbook with the initial appointment contract, or as soon as is practicable, full-time faculty will be advised of governing criteria, as well as procedures generally employed in decisions affecting all types of appointment contracts. Any special criteria adopted by the faculty member's department or division will be transmitted at the time of appointment or as soon as practicable.

Faculty members shall be advised in writing at the time of initial appointment and as deadlines approach by the appropriate administrative officer when decisions affecting retention, promotion, or award of all types of appointment contracts are to be made and when evaluations of performance are to be conducted. They shall be afforded reasonable opportunity to present in person or writing all relevant information.

Recommendation for retention and promotion of faculty and award of extended employment and tenure originate with a broadly-based group within the department (such as an elected departmental personnel committee), or with the chair/director, and with a broadly-based group within the division (such as an elected faculty personnel committee) or the dean. In each instance, regardless of origin, the recommendations are commented upon by both the chair/director, the dean and the appropriate faculty group.

Department chair/directors and/or deans review full-time faculty annually.

Departments or divisions must also conduct periodic constructive evaluations of all members of the department or division, regardless of rank, at intervals stated in this handbook. Annual reviews, post-tenure, institutional suitability, and other periodic evaluations are placed in each individual personnel file. The recommendations of the faculty and the dean are submitted to the provost.

The provost submits to the president the provost's recommendations for retention, promotion, and the award of all types of contracts. The president's decisions are final, subject to the approving action by the board of trustees.

### **University Schedule for Faculty Reviews**

The provost sets the calendar for faculty evaluation. The following schedule applies to post-probationary and promotion reviews:

□ By February 1 of each academic year, the dean shall notify the provost of all reviews to be scheduled for the upcoming academic year. Reviews will be completed by the end of the fall term so that the Executive Committee of the board of trustees

can review the administration's recommendations by its March meeting.

□ By February 15, the dean will notify candidates in writing of the upcoming review, describing the committee and its process, the division's evaluation criteria, the calendar, and the dossier to be prepared.

### **Dossier Guidelines**

By August 1<sup>st</sup> the candidate will prepare a dossier to include:

**1. Table of Contents:** The Table of Contents should clearly list every document contained in your dossier.

#### **2. Current Academic CV**

CVs should be detailed to include all relevant information. The following information is generally included:

Employment history

Education

List of publications with clear indication of whether publications are peer or non-peer reviewed, along with full bibliographic citation.

Grant awards, including the amount, year, and granting body of the award, along with a short explanation of what the grant was used to fund.

Citations of public lectures should include lecture title, location, and date, with keynote lectures indicated as such.

#### **3. Personal Statement**

The Personal Statement should be 8-12 pages, single-spaced. The purpose of the Personal Statement is to provide a clear, detailed, and self-reflective overview of the candidate's contributions in the areas of research, scholarship, professional practice, and service. The statement provides candidates with an opportunity to make a case for their contribution to the University and the fields of which they are part, discuss key contributions to their program, school and field, and to outline professional goals, teaching pedagogy, and the core values that have shaped their practice to date. It is a document that reflects on past practices and discusses goals for the future, and, above all, creates a context for the review of the dossier in its entirety. The statement should address the areas of scholarship/professional practice, teaching, and service fully and separately, as well as explain the connections between them. Candidates are encouraged to discuss their plans for the future in the context of the university and the fields of which they are part, indicating future directions and potential outcomes.

#### **4. Evidence**

##### **A. Teaching**

**Syllabi:** Samples of syllabi should be chosen to demonstrate the range and development of your pedagogy. These can include examples of assignments, quizzes, exams, portfolios, etc., which should be clearly matched with syllabi.

List of courses taught including course titles, year and semester the course was offered along with a short description of the course, the number of students enrolled, and the level (grad, undergrad, mixed).

Course evaluations will be provided by your dean's office. (Please note that you should not provide these yourself.)

##### **B. Scholarship/Professional Practice**

○ For traditional academic disciplines this section should include only material that has been published or presented. Examples of scholarship include:

🕒 books

🕒 articles

🕒 conference papers

- ⌚ reviews
- ⌚ awards and recognitions
- For performance and practice-based work, this section should include only material that has been published, performed, exhibited or presented. Examples of performance and practice-based work include:
  - ⌚ management reports or public surveys
  - ⌚ design patents
  - ⌚ music/theater/critical manuscripts
  - ⌚ music scores, videos, published works performed by others
  - ⌚ exhibition catalogues
  - ⌚ other materials as appropriate to your discipline

### **C. Service**

List of service activities including the title of the committee, along with the year and charge of the committee should be included, along with relevant indication of the role played on the committee (i.e. Chair). In addition, list any activities in service to your profession, including membership in professional organizations, service on professional committees, etc. Indicate your level and dates of involvement. You may also include reports that you authored or other information relevant to your service.

### **D. Letters**

You will be asked to supply a list of names of 3-5 people who have the knowledge and experience to be able to evaluate your dossier in the context of the larger field. These reviewers should hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor (those ranks that indicate having been successful in a promotion review); in the case of a field that extends beyond academia, it should be someone with a well-established reputation in the field and familiar with the standards of academia. When making the list, please keep in mind that the people you recommend should not be anyone who might be in position to benefit from your promotion, such as your dissertation advisor, a co-editor or co-author, etc. You may also list up to three people who you do not want to be contacted. The Dean's Office (or in the case of NSSR, the department) solicits all of the external letters; they are confidential, and you should never attempt to contact any potential external evaluators, either before or after the review.

## **5. Supplemental Documents**

Documents provided by your dean's office to supplement candidate dossiers:

- Post-Probationary Review and annual performance reviews
- Student course evaluations
- External letters of review and list indicating names of those provided by candidate
- Notes (if available) from divisional review committee
- Committee Letter
- Dean's Letter

## **6. Submitting dossier in hard copy or electronically**

Dossiers may be presented in hard copy or electronically. While electronic dossiers are not mandated, they are strongly encouraged and faculty will be supported in creation and maintenance of their electronic dossier. A division may mandate electronic dossiers at its discretion.

Please consult with your dean's office regarding support for creation of your dossier

- ⌚ Regarding hard copy:

The hard copy of the dossier must be presented in a three-ring binder (to allow for insertion of additional material such as letters from external reviewers, student evaluations, annual

performance reviews, etc.) and should include tabbed dividers and sub-dividers to help with organization of materials.

DVD/CD sleeves should be used in the binder to contain materials presented in that format. DVDs and CDs should be clearly labeled with an ink pen. Please do not use sticky labels, as they create problems when the disks are inserted.

Publications and other significant works should be included in their entirety. Digital copies are preferred, but in cases where digital copies are not available, hard copies will be accepted.

Time-based documentation of performances, installations, and other works should be included in QuickTime format (.mov).

DVDs or flash drives are a good choice of media for presentation of digital materials.

Please make sure that all materials are clearly labeled and cross-referenced in the appropriate written sections of the dossier.

⌚ Regarding electronic dossiers:

DVDs and flash drives are the current standard for electronic storage of your dossier. Please consult your dean's office if you have questions.

The electronic dossier should be viewable on both a PC and Mac platform, and should not require the viewer to install specialized software or hardware.

Publications and other works should be included in their entirety. Digital copies are preferred, but in cases where digital copies are not available, hard copies will be accepted. Time-based documentation of performances, installations, and other works should be included in QuickTime format (.mov).

The divisional review committee will evaluate the dossier, discussing the candidate's contributions, strengths, and deficits. References supplied by the candidate or otherwise will be contacted by phone and dossiers will be sent for their review.

After review, the dean will forward the dossier to the provost. The dossier will include:

- An up-to-date curriculum vitae and the personal statement.
- Supporting materials developed since the last university review such as copies of papers, slides of work, and excerpts from book chapters.
- A succinct, candid recommendation by the chair/director which analyzes strengths of the candidate and areas for future development, giving specific examples. The recommendation will assess standing of the candidate in his or her discipline or field, teaching and advising effectiveness, evaluation by peers and contribution to the department.
- A succinct, candid recommendation by the dean that discusses the suitability of the candidate for the position, the candidate's scholarship or artistic promise, and the contributions by the candidate to other divisions. If concerns have been noted, specific expectations for improvement should be noted.

If the review is positive and the provost and president approve, the provost will prepare a board docket for presentation to the Executive Committee of the board of trustees for their approval.

If the recommendation is negative, the review is not forwarded to the university. In consultation with the provost, the dean informs the candidate of the outcome.

The chair/director or dean shall be responsible for communicating with the candidate in person and informing him or her of university actions.

Candidates have the right to appeal the committee's recommendation on the grounds of a violation of process, but not the substance of the decision. The first step will be a

conversation with the dean. If a written appeal is made to the dean, he or she, in consultation with the provost, will forward the appeal through the proper channels. The committee can recommend reconsideration by the original review committee or constitution of a new review committee if evidence exists of improper process. If rejected, there is no further appeal.

In case of a negative promotion review for tenure or extended employment, the faculty member shall receive one (1) year of employment prior to actual termination.

The faculty dossier to be forwarded by the dean to the provost for review shall discuss each of the criteria in accordance with division and university standards and will specify

starting date, proposed rank or title, salary, appointment type/track, and, where applicable, the duration of the appointment.

- **Establishing Institutional Need**

All University departments and programs shall be reviewed every seven years to assess their performance – and also to establish a demonstrable institutional need for both renewable term (RTA) and extended term (EE) faculty. Intended to determine program quality as well as institutional need, program evaluations will seek to assess program excellence in the field, student learning outcomes, relevance and market demand. These reviews will include a department self study and will seek an independent review which will include external reviewers convened by the provost. These periodic program reviews will be a principal vehicle for academic and budget planning and the associated decisions about strategic investments, growth and program direction.

## Major changes and cuts in section *iii. Faculty Categories, Appointment Types, and Ranks*

- All of the text that follows was cut, since the University has chosen to stop making joint appointments for a host of reasons.

### **Joint Appointments**

Joint appointments are granted to principal full-time faculty to render service to two departments/program or divisions/schools of the university, pursuant to the principal faculty appointment types. Faculty holding joint appointments are expected to participate in each department/program or division/school to which they are assigned.

Joint appointments are usually created:

- To fulfill curricular or research needs of a division/school
- In connection with interdisciplinary or professional/disciplinary teaching and research programs involving several units
- To enhance a faculty member's teaching and/or research opportunities
- To increase recruitment prospects for attractive faculty

Each joint appointment involves a home division/school and a collaborating division/school or units. The home division/school initiates recruitment and all forms of evaluation and salary review and offers faculty support and services. The collaborating unit(s) participates in the search and all forms of evaluation and salary review.

#### **a. Agreement**

An Agreement to Initiate a Joint Appointment (AIJA) must be approved by the provost before a search can be authorized. The AIJA should be signed by the program directors or department chairs and the deans of all units seeking authorization. It should clearly articulate:

- Designation of home and collaborating division/school or units
- The process of recruitment including composition of committees, responsibilities and authorities of each division/school
- Employment category and decisions regarding annual performance and salary review and evaluation for reappointment, promotion, including composition of committees, responsibilities and authorities of each division/school
- Rank

## **b. Memorandum of Understanding**

In addition to the AIJA, each joint appointment is accompanied by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which is signed at the time of appointment by the program directors or department chairs, the faculty member and the deans of all units involved and approved by the provost. The MOU should clearly articulate:

- Designation of home and collaborating division/school or units
- Teaching assignments
- Service expectations
- Scholarship/professional or creative achievement expectations
- The method of participation of each division/school in faculty evaluation and salary review
- Allocation of resources, corresponding to teaching, scholarship and service expectations (office space, computers, operating support, travel funds, etc.)

The MOU may be revised when appropriate. A revised MOU must record the signatures of all participants and must be approved by the Office of the provost.

\* \* \*

## Major changes and cuts in section v. *Faculty Evaluation*

- The text below was cut, since the possibility of switching from tenure track to some other sort of track opened up Pandora's box. (It also contradicted similar language in section iii.)

In the fall semester of the fourth year, probationary faculty will stand for post-probationary review to determine the appropriate track for continued employment: extended employment eligible or tenure eligible. The review will consider the faculty member's choice in tracks.

- The passages in section v listing Faculty Ranks was cut, and pasted into section iii, where they more logically belonged.

## Overview of Faculty Employment Categories (September 9, 2010)

| Category   | ..... P R I N C I P A L F A C U L T Y .....   |  |  | FIXED TERM<br>(1-2 years)  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
|  | TENURE  | EXTENDED EMPLOYMENT<br>(Promotion from RTA only<br>as of August 2010)  | RENEWABLE TERM   |  |
| <b>Job Security</b>  | Continuous employment as long as performance standards are met  | Presumption of continuous employment as long as standards of performance and institutional need are met                    | No presumption of continuous employment  | No presumption of continuous employment  |
| <b>Criteria for Promotion or Renewal</b>                                   | Excellence in scholarship or creative endeavor; excellence in service or teaching; and good in 3 <sup>rd</sup> category | Excellence in teaching; excellence in service or in scholarship or creative endeavor; and good in 3 <sup>rd</sup> category | Excellence or good in teaching, service, and scholarship or creative endeavor. All RTAs need to be engaged with current scholarly or creative practices. | Good record of teaching and service, and engagement with current scholarly or creative practices |
| <b># of letters of independent reviewers of scholarly or creative work</b> | At least <b>eight</b> external letters from leading scholars or practitioners   | At least <b>five</b> external letters from leading scholars or practitioners   | At least <b>three</b> letters from independent peers within The New School.  | N/A  |
| <b>Consequences of negative promotion review</b>                           | One year of work prior to termination   | One year of work prior to termination  | One year of work prior to termination  | Immediate termination  |
| <b>Conversion to different type of appointment</b>                         | Not allowed   | Not allowed (except for grandfathered EE faculty who may ask once to be converted to tenure with an up or out review)      | Dean can recommend conversation to EE, and faculty member can apply once for EE  | Dean can recommend conversion to Renewable Term  |
| <b>Annual reviews</b>  | Annual performance reviews; post tenure review triggered by two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews               | Annual performance reviews; post EE review triggered by two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews                      | Annual performance reviews; post-eight year review triggered by two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews  | Annual performance review  |
| <b>Benefits</b>  | Research support; may apply for a one-semester sabbatical every sixth ear   | Research support; may apply for a one-semester sabbatical every sixth year   | Research support; may apply for a one-semester sabbatical every sixth year   | None   |
| <b>Institutional need reviews every five years?</b>                        | No  | Yes  | Yes  | Yes  |