

Questions for the Provost's Office about university promotion and review procedures

It is a generally accepted principle of promotion and review procedures that individual faculty members are entitled to know who is reviewing them. Is there a mechanism for this in the current set of (tenure and EE) reviews? Will there be a mechanism also for future reviews?

Faculty members standing for promotion to tenure or extended employment (EE) review will not be notified of the individual reviewers, but the names of the members of the University Ad Hoc Promotion Review Committee will be announced in Spring '09. Currently, we are in an ad hoc process as provided for in the Full-Time Faculty Handbook (Handbook). The Provost will appoint a standing University Faculty Promotion Review Committee in Fall '08. Even though the Handbook anticipates the ad hoc process will be in place for a number of years, the goal is to move out of it within one year. The Provost will appoint a standing faculty committee every fall.

What criteria were used to select reviewers, and were there any guiding principles governing these selections? How will criteria for future reviews be established?

The Provost appointed reviewers to the University Ad Hoc Promotion Review Committee for the Fall '07 and Spring '08 reviews. The reviewers are comprised of selected tenured faculty members from The New School for Social Research (NSSR), three tenured faculty members from outside of NSSR and several external experts. The external experts are tenured faculty members from other institutions who represent a field or discipline not represented at The New School. It was and continues to be extremely important for the review process to include appropriate divisional as well as disciplinary representation.

It is unclear from what the university community has been told up to this point whether the plan is to move future (tenure and EE) reviews to individual divisions, or whether reviews will continue to take place at the university-level. Has this been decided, and, if not, how will it be decided? If reviews continue to take place at the university-level, will the non-divisional, university role be primarily procedural, or will it be content-based? Will chairs then lack a significant role in promotion decisions, with deans as the only significant voice? (This set of questions is especially pressing in cases of faculty working outside NSSR – say, at Parsons, Milano and NSGS – in disciplines overlapping with NSSR departments, i.e., in cases in which there are fears about a loss of divisional autonomy.)

The Handbook requires that all promotion reviews be conducted by a University Promotion

Review Committee. That committee will make all recommendations for tenure and EE to the Provost who then recommends to the President and the University Board of Trustees (BOT). The Deans, in consultation with their faculties and department chairs, will present individual cases to the University Promotion Review Committee. The Deans do not vote. Promotions are granted by the BOT. The challenge for the University is to ensure appropriate divisional representation on the University Promotion Review Committee, whether ad hoc or standing. Faculty members standing for promotion review will be reviewed by their peers with appropriate divisional and disciplinary representation. Each candidate has the opportunity to present letters of support from colleagues from within or without the University. These letters are supplemented by additional letters included in the dossier for review.

It is important as far as fairness and transparency are concerned to make the sorts of promotion and review principles and procedures touched on in 2 and 3, above, public and, more specifically, to incorporate them into the handbook. Are there plans to do this?

As we move out of the ad hoc review process, the procedures and processes for the standing review committee will be incorporated into appendices to the Handbook. This year, some of this information, such as the names of the ad hoc review committee members will be presented to the Faculty Senate for publication to the faculty community.

Are this year's EE reviews being handled differently than tenure reviews? If so, how? Who is on the relevant review committees, and what steps are being taken to ensure proper consideration for service and teaching?

In Fall '07 and Spring '08, all Promotion reviews will be conducted the same. The University Ad Hoc Promotion Review Committee will review all faculty members standing for tenure or EE. Each candidate for either tenure or EE will be reviewed by a sub-committee of at least three faculty members who will provide divisional representation and, where necessary, an external expert. In both tenure and EE cases, external experts from the candidate's field will be recruited to participate as voting members. The evaluation of excellence in teaching and service will necessarily be made by faculty members from within the candidate's division who are best situated to review the dossier.

What is the role of individuals with EE in the promotion and review process, and, more generally, how is their role and status in the university community envisioned?

Faculty members with EE will be called upon to review candidates standing for EE. The Handbook does not require that only tenured faculty members review faculty members standing for EE. Both faculty members with tenure and EE will review dossiers for EE. Importantly, the reviewers must also represent the field or discipline of the reviewees. It is

anticipated that Faculty members with EE will play a substantial and vital role in the ad hoc review committee as well as the future standing review committee.

As we evolve as a University with more principal faculty holding EE, the Provost is exploring areas where the senior faculty with EE will serve the broader University community in addition to the promotion and review process.

Is there a grievance process for this year's reviews?

The Handbook provides for a grievance process called the *University Faculty Grievance Committee* (see pg. 66). The Faculty Senate will select five faculty members to serve on the standing grievance committee to review grievances brought by a faculty member claiming that the procedures followed in deciding to deny tenure or EE were not followed. The University Faculty Grievance Committee will, after reviewing the full record, make its recommendation to the Provost on procedural, not substantive, grounds. This grievance process also applies to decisions not to reappoint.

The Provost has briefed several divisions on the role that the Board of Trustees is playing in the current review proceedings, and he has spoken in this connection of members of the Board exercising “three new levels of supervision.” What does this mean?

The BOT's committees of the Education Policy Committee and The Institutional Policy Committee formed the Subcommittee on Faculty Promotions and Review. The Provost meets regularly with the members of that subcommittee to report on the procedures and processes of promotion to tenure and EE and their compliance with the Handbook. That subcommittee does not review individual cases for substance, only the procedures and processes as they are developed. Recommendations for promotions are submitted to the Executive Committee of the BOT for approval. The sub-committee will dissolve after the first year, coinciding with the appointment of the standing promotion review committee.

In the handbook, the research standards for tenure specify “one or two books and probably thirty or more articles”? Faculty members in different divisions have asked whether there is a typo in this statement. Should it instead read “or”?

This passage was in an earlier version of the Handbook and is not included in the final version.