

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

January 25, 2010

To: Deans and Directors  
From: Tim Marshall, Provost  
Re: Administrative Timeline for Faculty Reviews for AY 2010-2011

Planning for faculty promotion reviews scheduled in the 2010-2011 year should begin in spring 2010 as outlined in the timeline that follows. The overall plan is that in the spring, deans will determine which of their faculty will be reviewed in the following year and designate (to the extent possible) the individuals who will serve on the divisional review committees. As soon as practical in the latter part of the spring 2010 semester and over the summer external letter writers will be identified and solicited, so that all materials will be in place for committee consideration in the fall. As in the past, the fall semester will be the time when divisions conduct their reviews so that in the following spring (spring 2011) the University Promotion Review Committee (UPRC) can do its procedural reviews.

We appreciate that this timeline is somewhat different from last year's primarily to account for the need to identify and solicit letters from the external reviewers earlier in the process (and therefore earlier in the year). We also appreciate that it might not be possible in every single case to secure letter writers as early as suggested, but encourage that a good faith effort be made in every case.

The divisional review is considered complete once the dean reviews the dossier and makes his/her positive or negative recommendation by letter to the provost. The dossier and dean's letter are delivered to the UPRC who conducts a procedural review of the case and makes its recommendations by letter to the provost who, after an independent assessment, will make his recommendation to the president and the Board of Trustees for final approval.

### **Detailed Timeline**

The faculty member, the divisional committee, the dean, the UPRC, and the provost have specific roles to play to ensure a meaningful review and promotion process for faculty being reviewed. The following timeline includes key tasks with corresponding deadlines/timeframes.

All divisions are required and expected to complete their part of the review process by the last day of the fall semester. The dates below are university guidelines, but not mandatory if the division finds other *earlier* dates work better.

#### **February 1**

Deans provide provost with a list of all faculty scheduled for review in the AY 2010-2011.

**February 15**

Deans notify their respective faculty in writing regarding their review and provide a timeline of the review process.

**March 1**

Faculty scheduled for fall 2010 promotion review submit to the dean's office, or department chair as relevant, a current CV and an annotated list of 3-5 potential external reviewers (in paper and electronic formats). Faculty may also submit a veto list of up to three potential external reviewers who they specifically request not be contacted. The names of confirmed external reviewers will thereafter remain confidential.

**April 1**

Deans, in accordance with divisional specific procedures, identify faculty to serve on review committees and submit to the provost's office for review.

**May 1**

Deans notify faculty to serve on divisional review committees.

**By Mid-May**

Chairs of divisional review committees (in consultation with the dean and committee members) identify list of external reviewers to be contacted for each faculty member standing for promotion review taking into account lists submitted by faculty member being reviewed. Initial requests to be made by phone and/or email followed by hard copy letter request (using template provided by the provost's office). Letters from external reviewers will be due no later than mid-October. External reviewers will evaluate scholarship and/or creative professional practice, along with the candidate's contribution to their field.

**June 1**

The dean's office provides the provost's office (electronically) copy of CV, and final list of names of external reviewers, along with veto list of each faculty member standing for promotion review.

Additional Information regarding letters from External Reviewers:

*Tenure Review* - Letter writers specify relation, if any, with the candidate. Letters are to be substantive, providing an account of the candidates' contribution to the field. For Tenure, 5-8 external letters will be required.

*Extended Employment* - Letter writers specify relation, if any, with the candidate. Letters are to be substantive, providing an account of the candidates' professional performance. For EE, 3-5 external letters will be required.

**Aug 1**

Faculty submit dossiers to the dean's office (or department chair at NSSR). Faculty should consult their dean's office about submission of dossiers and guidelines regarding photocopying, reimbursement, etc. No reimbursements will be made without prior approval. Faculty should consult separate memo regarding *Guidelines for Preparation of Dossiers for Employment Review*. Please note that starting in AY 2010-2011 submission via electronic dossier will be encouraged, although not required. Additional information regarding electronic dossiers and electronic submissions will be forthcoming.

**Sept 1**

Deans' offices overnight mail dossiers to external reviewers. For NSSR Departments, chair will mail dossiers to external evaluators.

**October 15**

Deadline for external reviewers to submit letters.

**Throughout fall semester as they become ready; no later than the last day of semester**

Departmental/divisional committees complete reviews of all faculty dossiers and submit letters to divisional committees/deans.

Divisional committees/deans complete their reviews and write a positive or negative recommendation to the provost. Deans' offices submit three copies of the faculty members' dossier to the provost's office for distribution to the UPRC. The dossiers are to include all external review letters, committee letter, (or departmental review letter, and divisional committee letter for NSSR) record of divisional committee discussion, the dean's letter, and, in the case of positive recommendations, a draft of the docket to be submitted to the Board of Trustees.

**February 1**

Provost's office distributes full dossiers including copies of external reviewer reports and deans' memos to the UPRC.

**Throughout the spring in coordination with the schedule of Board of Trustees Meetings**

UPRC conducts procedural review of all divisional reviews.

Chair of the UPRC submits written recommendation to the provost's office. Provost will review UPRC recommendations and will make an independent assessment in each case.

Provost makes recommendation to President and Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees regarding promotion reviews.

**June 30**

Deans submit formal written notice to faculty of Board of Trustee actions regarding promotion decisions with hard copies to the provost's office.

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

## Dossier Guidelines 2010-2011

### Overview

The Promotion Review dossier is one of the most important documents a faculty member prepares. The dossier is the primary means by which a faculty member makes a case for his or her overall contribution to the University as a full-time faculty member, rather than a comprehensive collection of information. In other words, it is a reflective curation of materials deemed representative of the faculty member's teaching, research scholarship/professional practice, and service. Faculty should put care into its preparation, paying close attention to the case that is being made through the materials being included. Faculty members are encouraged to approach colleagues from across the university at any point during its preparation, for informal review and comment.

What follows are a few things to keep in mind when preparing your dossier along with general guidelines and requirements for its preparation. **Please refer to The New School Full-Time Faculty Handbook section on reviews (page 32) and the appendices section on Evaluation and Promotion (pages 70-85) for a comprehensive overview of requirements.**

### Dossier Formatting

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. Duplicating services (at The New School and elsewhere) can create pdf versions of your documents and publications. Please consult with publishers of your work who may be able to provide digital versions to be used during the review process.

- 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).

As outlined in the Full-Time Faculty Handbook, the Dossier should include the following core content:

- 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, teaching, 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** (*this is not a comprehensive list, only examples of what may be included in the dossier as evidence to support your personal statement. For a more comprehensive list, please refer to the Full-Time Faculty Handbook, pp. 70-85*)

**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
- 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. You should consult with the Full-Time Faculty Handbook for additional information about what to include in this section.

#### **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

#### **Additional Requirements for submission of your complete dossier:**

You should consult with your chair or dean's office regarding the number of copies of the dossier you should submit.

Available on the web:

<http://www.newschool.edu/provost/faculty/dossiers/>

# The New School Full-Time Faculty Handbook

Posted September 25, 2006

## Distinction between Tenure, Extended Employment, and Term Appointments

Category	Tenure	Extended Employment	Term Appointments
<b>Job Security</b>	Continuous employment provided faculty continue to meet performance standards	Continuous employment provided institutional need continues and faculty continue to meet performance standards	No presumption of continuous employment. Contracts may be for 1 to 5 years, renewable up to a total of 10 years
<b>Evaluative Criteria for promotion: Teaching, Scholarship, Service</b>	Excellence in scholarship and excellence in either teaching or service with good level in the remaining category	Excellence in teaching and excellence in either scholarship or service with good level in the remaining category	Not applicable
<b>Duration of Scholarly Activity</b>	Ongoing	Ongoing	Will remain current in field
<b>Kinds of scholarly work considered</b>	Scholarship of discovery <sup>8</sup> Scholarship of integration Scholarship of application Scholarship of teaching Scholarship of creative work in the performing arts <sup>9</sup>	Scholarship of discovery Scholarship of integration Scholarship of application Scholarship of teaching Scholarship of creative work in the performing arts	Scholarship of discovery Scholarship of integration Scholarship of application Scholarship of teaching Scholarship of creative work in the performing arts
<b>External Referees (candidate may suggest names)</b>	At least 5 letters from leading scholars and/or practitioners in the field. Dean or chair may make further inquiries	At least 5 letters from qualified scholars and/or practitioners in the field. Dean or chair may make further inquiries	No external referees required after initial appointment although peers may be consulted for reappointment.
<b>Negative Promotion Review</b>	One year of employment prior to actual termination	One year of employment prior to actual termination	Not applicable
<b>Annual Performance Review</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Post-Appointment Review</b>	Post Tenure Review if triggered by two consecutive unsatisfactory annual reviews	Institutional Suitability Review based on assessment of institutional need and performance review	Administrative review at end of contract if renewal of line is approved
<b>Change of Appointment Type</b>	None	Faculty originally hired on Renewable Term contracts and whose official start date began prior to May 2006 and who are promoted to Extended Employment status, may make a one time request for a review for Tenure with an accompanying switch in employment status at the end of either the first or second Extended Employment term.	While a dean or chair may recommend that a particular faculty member on a term appointment be switched to a principal appointment, there is no presumption that the request will be granted. If it is granted, the faculty member must stand for peer review according to the standards and procedures set forth for the review of principal faculty.

<sup>8</sup> The scholarship of discovery is the only form of scholarship accepted at The New School for Social Research for tenure promotion as consistent with the mission of the division.

<sup>9</sup> The scholarship of creative work in the performing arts is only relevant to faculty in the performing arts schools consistent with their mission.