Memorandum to: Third Year Review Faculty

From: Claude Blenman
Director, Office of Faculty Affairs

Re: Third Year Review Requirements

Purpose and process: The purpose of the third year review is to provide you with constructive feedback and a candid assessment of your progress towards tenure. The process itself, along with the feedback you receive, are meant to be a mechanism to help you enhance the areas in which you may need improvement so that your chances for a successful tenure review are maximized. The materials which will comprise your third year review docket, discussed below, will be reviewed by your department chair, members of your department personnel committee, and external reviewers who are experts in your field of study.

Personal Statement: We recommend that your personal statement be approximately 5 (five) pages in length with 3 (three) of those pages being devoted to your current research and future research projects and the remaining pages devoted to your teaching and service to your Department, to Steinhardt, to the University and to your discipline. As you prepare the draft, we urge you to meet with your Department Chair as well as other senior members of your department to ask for insight, assistance, and guidance. Also, if time permits, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your draft prior to your scheduled meeting date.

Departmental Review Docket Requirements: Once your statement is completed in final, you will submit it to your department chair along with the following:

- Your updated curriculum vitae
- A copy of all your publications
- Your teaching evaluations
- A copy of the annual peer observations of your teaching

External Review Docket Requirements: Of the above five items, only the following three items will be sent to the external reviewers for consideration:

- Your personal statement
- Your updated curriculum vitae
- A copy of your publications

Materials to Assemble Docket: Please note that you should work with your department chair and department administrator to purchase any materials you will require to assemble your docket. This includes duplication costs and book purchases as necessary.

Timeline: For your reference, listed below is an approximate timeline for the Third Year Review for Tenure Track Faculty.
### Third Year Review for Fall Appointed Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty Affairs provides a list of untenured faculty members and highlights 3rd-year mandatory reviews</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Candidates submit materials to Department Chair</td>
<td>September 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department Personnel Committee reviews</td>
<td>November 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personnel Committee recommendation to Department Chair</td>
<td>January 20, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Department recommendations to Office of Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>February 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deans send letter to untenured faculty regarding review</td>
<td>July 6, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Third Year Review for Spring Appointed Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty Affairs provides a list of untenured faculty members and highlights 3rd-year mandatory reviews</td>
<td>July, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Candidates submit materials to Department Chair</td>
<td>January 26, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department Personnel Committee reviews</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personnel Committee recommendation to Department Chair</td>
<td>March 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Department recommendations to Office of Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>April 13, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deans sends letters to untenured faculty regarding review</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We hope the above information will help as you prepare for your review. Please do not hesitate to contact either me or Vice Dean Beth Weitzman should you have any questions or require additional assistance.
Assumptions
The decision to grant promotion or tenure is one that is of central importance to an institution of higher education, where the quality of education is dependent upon the strength of the quality of the individuals appointed as members of the faculty. The duty of the tenured faculty to give advice on decisions of tenure following a rigorous and effective review is perhaps their highest responsibility. The process begins with their review, and it is highly dependent upon their thoroughness, fairness and rigor. There are no absolute criteria, given that individual personnel decisions are unique. However, the process must be one that is governed by clear, objective, and equitable standards and procedures. At The Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development faculty personnel decisions are based on consideration of quality of performance in relation to the achievement of the goals of the School of Education in research, publication, creative work, instruction, and service. Service is considered with regard to the School, to the department, to the profession, and to the community through work in schools, health care settings, and cultural institutions.

The University Guidelines address standards as follows:

A high standard of excellence and effectiveness in teaching in the context of a research university is a prerequisite for tenure at NYU, as is the promise of effective contributions toward the work of the individual’s department or school and the intellectual life of the University. Once these prerequisites are met, outstanding scholarship or creative work in the arts is the requirement for tenure. 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 or creative work in the arts together with a record of effective teaching integrally influenced by scholarship or creative work. In the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in his or her field, in comparison with other individuals at similar points 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? In addition, the candidate must have achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be that the new work mark significant new scholarly research or artistic achievement since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate’s achievements since the last review for promotion.
It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement for tenure and promotion. Each case must be examined in detail by making explicit comparisons, by delineating special strengths, and by acknowledging limits or weaknesses. Context may be a criterion in judging the strength of a particular candidate. All these factors must be carefully discussed and weighed in reaching a recommendation on tenure and/or promotion.

Because these discussions about whether each candidate has achieved these high standards of excellence must be totally frank in order to arrive at good decisions, faculty must maintain total confidentiality.

I. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE
Departments are expected to adhere to the School’s general guidelines. In cases where departmental practice or policy is more explicitly detailed, or differs in any way from the general guidelines contained herein, the department must submit a written description to the Office of Faculty Affairs for review and approval.

A. DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES
Faculty Personnel Committee
Each department in the School maintains a faculty personnel committee or committees on appointments, sabbaticals, promotions, and tenure to render informed judgments on proposed recommendations relating to faculty members in the department. Committees on appointment, sabbaticals, promotions, and tenure may be separate or overlapping (i.e. a personnel committee). This committee may be appointed by the department chair, or it may be elected, following 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. The single restriction is that for tenure reviews only tenured faculty members may serve on the respective tenure committees, and for promotion reviews, only faculty members at or above the rank being requested in the promotion may serve on the respective promotion committee. When a department does not have at least three tenured faculty members, an ad hoc committee is appointed by the Dean in consultation with the department chairperson, with membership augmented by tenured faculty from other departments. Department chairpersons do not serve as members of personnel committees. Department personnel committees may consult other faculty members and students as necessary to have sufficient information for the review.

B. GENERAL PROCEDURES
Committee recommendations at the departmental level are part of the decision making process in every action pertaining to faculty appointment, sabbatical, promotion, and tenure. The department personnel committee should conduct a
review of the candidate’s docket and present a summary of the Committee’s
discussion to the department faculty who are eligible to vote in the review. The
department faculty, who have reviewed the docket in detail, should discuss and
vote on the docket. The deliberations of the personnel committee and the
department conclude with a closed ballot vote on the recommendation. The
personnel committee should prepare a detailed summary of its own deliberations
and vote, as well as a summary of the deliberations and vote of the department
faculty who are eligible to vote. The committee reports all definitive actions to
the department chairperson who, in turn, forwards the committee report to the
Dean along with the Chair’s independent recommendation, with the application
and all supporting documents.

The School and University have established deadlines, which should be strictly
adhered to by departments, for the collection and submission of materials for the
review. These deadlines will be determined by the Office of Faculty Affairs, in
accordance with University deadlines, and will be provided annually to the
academic departments.

The Dean refers the candidate’s application for promotion and/or tenure, all
supporting documents, the recommendations received from the department
personnel committee and chairperson, and the assessments of the external referees
for review and assessment to the school-wide Dean’s Advisory Committee on
Promotion and Tenure. For promotion of clinical faculty, the Dean may seek
advice from clinical faculty who are at or above the rank being requested in the
review.

The Dean’s Advisory Committee shall make recommendations to the Dean
concerning the merit of the candidates being considered for promotion or tenure.

Composition:

1. Members of the Advisory Committee shall be tenured full professors.
2. The Advisory Committee shall be a permanent committee of the School and shall consist of six members.
3. Half of the members shall be elected by the full faculty from each of the three major areas within the School (Education and Applied Psychology, Arts and Communication, and Health). Half shall be appointed by the Dean from these three areas.
4. Members of the Committee shall serve staggered, three-year terms, with reappointment or re-election possible after a two-year period following their service.
5. The Chair of the Committee shall be elected each year by members of the Advisory Committee for a one-year term from among second and third year members. The Chair may be re-elected.
6. The Dean participates in the Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting member.
The Dean submits his/her recommendation to the President and Provost, together with the application and recommendations of the external referees, the department personnel committee and department chair. The recommendation of the department personnel committee includes the numerical vote of the committee and the department, which should be taken by closed ballot. Following the action by the President and/or Board of Trustees the final decision is reported to the candidate, personnel committee and department chair.

C. PROMOTION, WITHOUT A CORRESPONDING TENURE REVIEW (TO FULL PROFESSOR, OR ALL NON-TENURE TRACK PROMOTION REVIEWS). See Section D for additional information on tenure decisions.

1. The following are excerpts from the Faculty Handbook of New York University, 2008:

   The rank of Assistant Professor should be granted only to those who have proved their worth as teachers and have given evidence of character and productive scholarship. The assistant professor should possess the maturity and attainment in the field of scholarship or professional practice of which the doctor’s degree is usually the testimonial.

   The rank of Associate Professor should be granted only to those who, in addition to all the qualifications for an assistant professorship, have an unusual contribution to make to the University through the excellence of their character, teaching, productive scholarship, or other educational service.

   The rank of Professor should be granted only after careful consideration of the individual’s character, scholarship, productivity, teaching ability, and reputation among peers in his or her own field, as well as his or her capacity for inclining students toward noteworthy attainments. It should be granted only to men and women who have been so tested that there is reasonable certainty of their continuing usefulness throughout the remainder of their working years. It should never be granted as the reward of seniority and should be reserved as a mark of distinction in the field of scholarship and instruction. It should never be granted as a recognition of usefulness in administration. (Faculty Handbook, pages 23 – 24)
2. Promotion Procedures, without a corresponding tenure review

In matters of promotion within The Steinhardt School, consideration of a faculty member by the personnel committee may be initiated by the committee itself, the department chairperson, the candidate, or the Dean. In cases where promotion yields tenure, and tenure action is concurrent, only tenured faculty may vote. In cases of promotion only those at a higher rank are eligible to participate and vote. For clinical faculty requesting promotion, all faculty at or above the rank requested are eligible to vote. Clinical faculty may not vote on the promotion of tenured or tenure-track faculty. Each candidate for promotion is expected to complete the University promotion application form, available online and in the Office of Faculty Affairs, and to submit supporting evidence and relevant materials for review.

3. External Referees for promotion

Each department develops a list of prospective external referees for faculty who are to be considered for promotion. The department chairperson may consult with senior program faculty in identifying potential external who are scholars with whom the candidate has not been closely associated. The Department chairperson requests and secures a minimum of five written recommendations from highly qualified external referees from comparable institutions who are at or above the rank being considered in the review for each applicant for promotion. If the candidate is in a field outside that of members of the Personnel Committee, or Dean’s Advisory Committee, or if the case requires it, the Department should seek additional external evaluations. The department chair furnishes the referees with the candidate’s curriculum vitae, selections of published works, and other relevant documents, which may include the candidate’s personal statement. The recommendations received are confidential and should be kept in a file separate from the candidate’s docket and made available only to members of the Personnel Committee, department faculty who are eligible to vote in the review, the Dean’s Advisory Committee, the Provost’s Office, and President. Referees are requested to comment specifically on research, scholarship, and creative contributions, and may also discuss other factors included in the promotion form, e.g. teaching, publication history, community and school outreach, citizenship, honors, and awards, etc. (See sample letters attached).
The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved. Only eligible voters in the department should be allowed access to the letters. For both ethical and legal reasons, neither the writers nor the content of the letters should be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond members of the department eligible to vote, not even in summary form. In all communications with them, writers of letters should be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence that, unless the law requires it, they will be seen only tenured members of the department, the Dean, the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Provost’s Office and the President.

4. Department Review for Promotion
The department chairpersons provide their respective personnel committees with the following materials on each applicant for promotion:
   a. Completed original promotion application.
   b. Written statements from external referees.
   c. Annual Faculty Professional Activities Reports and peer and chairperson evaluations.
   d. Course syllabi, student evaluations of teaching, and reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness, including publications and/or creative contributions.
   e. Documentation in support of all other factors detailed in the application form.
      1. An analysis of the impact of the candidate’s scholarly work on the field (may include but is not limited to: citation analysis; comparative analysis of comparable peers; reviews of performances, exhibitions or creative works; clinical practice expertise or recognition; reviews of academic book and journal articles; readers’ reviews of unpublished books; external review letters; assessment of colleagues, citations in public media as well as citation index; new internet metrics, etc., where appropriate)
   f. Any other material deemed relevant to the review.

5. Committee Recommendation for Promotion.
The Department Personnel Committee submits to the department chairperson its written recommendation, signed by the members of
the Committee, on each application for promotion considered. Each statement of recommendation includes the following information:

a. The dates on which the committee met to consider the application.
b. The vote of the committee and the department faculty who are eligible to vote (the record of the vote should not include the vote of individuals, but rather the total number supporting or opposing, taken by closed ballot).
c. Criteria for evaluation
d. Evidence considered
e. Rationale for the recommendation, addressing all of the three criteria areas of research and scholarship, teaching and service. The evaluation by the Personnel Committee should not be an advocacy document and must include a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate.

6. Chair’s Recommendation for Promotion
The department chairperson prepares a statement of his/her own recommendation for the applicant for promotion, and should also include an independent and fair assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in the three criteria areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service. The statement endorses or opposes the recommendation of the Personnel Committee and gives specific reasons, makes independent observations, and offers the chair’s evaluation of the candidate.

7. Documents for Submission for Promotion
For each application for promotion the department chairperson forwards to the Office of Faculty Affairs the following material:

a. The completed original application form with attachments
b. A minimum of five recommendations from external referees, who have experience in comparable institutions, including some indication of how the external referees were selected.
c. Signed detailed recommendation of the personnel committee, including the numerical vote of the committee, and of the department, if applicable.
d. Recommendation of the Department Chairperson.

8. School-wide Dean’s Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure.
The Dean provides the application and supporting documentary materials to the Dean’s Advisory Committee for review and evaluation. The Committee meets to consider each of the
candidates for promotion and prepares a signed, detailed recommendation that includes for each candidate the numerical vote of the committee and a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses. This recommendation should address all of the three criteria areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service. The Dean may attend the meetings of the Dean’s Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

9. Dean’s Recommendation
The Dean sends his/her recommendation to the Provost, with all supporting materials.

10. Concluding the Process: Reporting Back to the Candidate
The following is an excerpt from the Faculty Handbook of New York University, 2008

“In order to preserve a meaningful process of peer review for promotion and tenure, it is vital to obtain candid analysis and opinion from qualified scholars. Therefore, it is the general policy of New York University to treat as confidential all evaluations of University faculty, making only such limited exceptions as are necessary to permit informed review of promotion and tenure decisions by the appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University.”

In keeping with the above University policy, following are guidelines regarding the provision of feedback to the candidate.

a. The Department Chair or the Personnel Committee Chair, if the chair so designates, shall meet with the candidate and shall only indicate the overall outcome of the deliberations at the departmental level.
b. Upon inquiry, the Director of Faculty Affairs informs the Department Chair of the physical location of the docket, i.e., it is with the Schoolwide Personnel Committee or it is with the Dean's Office.
c. The Dean’s (favorable/unfavorable) recommendation is forwarded to the Office of the Provost.
d. Once the Dean's Office receives official notification from the Office of the Provost regarding the promotion decision, the Dean's Office will write to the Chair and faculty member and inform them of the Provost's decision.
e. It is imperative that the confidentiality that has been assured to faculty, students, colleagues, and reviewers not be violated.
D. TENURE REVIEW. See Section D for additional information on promotion to higher rank without a corresponding tenure review.

1. Department Review for Tenure
   The department chairpersons provide their respective personnel committees with the following materials on each applicant for tenure:
   a. Completed original tenure application.
   b. Written statements from external referees
   c. Copies of annual professional development reviews that took place during the probationary period.
   d. Course syllabi, student evaluations of teaching, and reports of peer observations, including formal assessments of teaching effectiveness.
   e. Documentation in support of all of the other factors detailed in the application form, including publications and/or creative contributions. An analysis of the impact of the candidate’s scholarly work on the field (may include but is not limited to: citation analysis; comparative analysis of comparable peers; reviews of performances, exhibitions or creative works; clinical practice expertise or recognition; reviews of academic book and journal articles; readers’ reviews of unpublished books; external review letters; assessment of colleagues, citations in public media as well as citation index; new internet metrics, etc., where appropriate)
   f. Any other material deemed relevant to the review.

2. External Referees for Tenure
   Each department develops a list of prospective external referees for faculty who are to be considered for tenure. The department chairperson may consult with senior program faculty in identifying potential external referees who are scholars with whom the candidate has not been closely associated. The department chairperson requests and secures a minimum of five written recommendations from highly qualified, tenured external referees from comparable institutions who are at or above the rank being considered in the review for each applicant for tenure. If the candidate is in a field outside that of members of the Personnel Committee, or Dean’s Advisory Committee, or if the case requires it, the department ought to seek additional external evaluations. The department chair furnishes the referees with the candidate’s curriculum vitae, selections of published works, and other relevant documents, which may include the candidate’s personal statement or selected teaching evaluations. The
recommendations received are confidential and should be kept in a file separate from the candidate’s docket and made available only to members of the Personnel Committee and department faculty who are eligible to vote in the review. Referees are requested to comment specifically on research, scholarship, and creative contributions, and may also discuss other factors included in the promotion form, e.g. teaching, publication history, community and school outreach, citizenship, honors, and awards, etc. (sample letters are attached)

The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved and only eligible voters in the department should be allowed access to the letters. For both ethical and legal reasons, neither the writers nor the content of the letters should be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond eligible members of the department, not even in summary form. In all communications with them, writers of letters should be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence and that, unless the law requires it, they will be seen only tenured members of the department, the Dean, the Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Provost’s Office, and the President.

3. Committee Recommendation.
The personnel committee submits to the department chairperson its written recommendation, signed by the members of the committee, on each application for tenure considered. Each statement of recommendation includes the following information:

   a. The date(s) on which the committee met to consider the application.
   b. The vote of the committee and of the department faculty who are eligible to vote (the record of the vote should not include the vote of individuals, but rather the total number supporting or opposing, taken by closed ballot).
   c. Criteria for evaluation
   d. Evidence considered
   e. Rationale for the recommendation, addressing all of the three criteria areas of research and scholarship, teaching and service. The evaluation by the Personnel Committee should not be an advocacy document and must include a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate.
4. Chair’s Recommendation for Tenure
   The department chairperson prepares a statement of his/her own recommendation for the applicant for tenure, and should also include an independent and fair assessment of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in the three criteria areas of research and scholarship, teaching and service. The statement endorses or opposes the recommendation of the Personnel Committee and gives specific reasons, makes independent observations, and offers the Chair’s evaluation of the candidate.

5. Documents for Submission for Tenure
   For each application for tenure the department chairperson forwards to the Office of Faculty Affairs the following material:
   a. The completed original application form with attachments.
   b. A minimum of five recommendations from external referees, including some indication of how the external referees were selected. Letters should be from people who are not personally or professionally affiliated with the candidate, from comparable institutions, are tenured and at or above the rank being considered in the review.
   c. Signed detailed recommendation of the personnel committee, including the numerical vote of the committee, and of the department, if applicable.
   d. Recommendation of the department chairperson.

6. School-wide Dean’s Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure.
   The Dean provides the application and supporting documentary materials to the Dean’s Advisory Committee for review and evaluation. The Committee meets to consider each of the candidate’s for tenure and conducts a closed ballot vote to inform the recommendation. The committee prepares a signed, detailed recommendation that includes for each candidate a record of the numerical vote and a fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses. This recommendation should address all of the three criteria areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service. The Dean may attend the meetings of the Dean’s Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure, as a non-voting member.

7. Dean’s Recommendation
   The Dean sends his/her recommendation on tenure to the Provost, with all supporting information.
8. Concluding the Process: Reporting Back to the Candidate
The following is an excerpt from the Faculty Handbook of New York University, 2008

“In order to preserve a meaningful process of peer review for promotion and tenure, it is vital to obtain candid analysis and opinion from qualified scholars. Therefore, it is the general policy of New York University to treat as confidential all evaluations of University faculty, making only such limited exceptions as are necessary to permit informed review of promotion and tenure decisions by the appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University.”

In keeping with the above University policy, following are guidelines regarding the provision of feedback to the candidate.

a. The Department Chair or the Personnel Committee Chair, if the chair so designates, shall meet with the candidate and shall only indicate the overall outcome of the deliberations at the departmental level.
b. Upon inquiry, the Director of Faculty Affairs informs the Department Chair of the physical location of the docket, i.e., it is with the Schoolwide Personnel Committee or it is with the Dean's Office.
c. The Dean’s (favorable/unfavorable) recommendation is forwarded to the Office of the Provost.
d. Once the Dean's Office receives official notification from the Office of the Provost regarding the tenure decision, the Dean's Office will write to the Chair and faculty member and inform them of the Provost's decision.
e. It is imperative that the confidentiality that has been assured to faculty, students, colleagues, and reviewers not be violated.

E. NOTICE OF MANDATORY TENURE REVIEW
The tenure application review normally occurs in the year preceding a faculty member’s final non-tenure or probationary year, and a definitive recommendation on tenure must be made by the Dean. This timing makes possible a year’s notice of termination to those in their terminal year who are not awarded tenure status. The Office of Faculty Affairs provides each department with a list of its faculty members for whom tenure and/or promotion recommendations are required.

F. ACCELERATION OF SCHEDULE FOR TENURE REVIEW
Proposals for early promotion and tenure must be considered extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution to propose candidates for promotion and/or tenure ahead of schedule
unless the case is very well justified. The Dean should be consulted prior to the preparation of an early case. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. It should be noted that external experts whose evaluation of the candidate are sought in these cases must be asked to comment specifically on the special grounds for an early decision. Chairs and departmental committees must also specifically address this issue. However, even with these affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary and compelling, particularly in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

G. NEW APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE

In the case of new appointments to tenure, the report must include a summary of the recommendations of the search committee and must identify the external referees consulted by the department in the search process, indicating which were selected by the candidate and which were selected by the department. The search committee should seek at least five external referee letters (at least three not recommended by the candidate) from suitable evaluators, some of whom may have been sought as part of the search process, but at least two of whom would need to answer all of the relevant questions of the tenure review process as outlined here (a sample letter to external referees is attached). The report may also include letters from other search committee referees as supplemental materials to the docket. The docket for new appointments with tenure must include a description of the candidate’s teaching, evidence of excellence, and an indication of how the candidate will meet the teaching needs of the department. The candidate should address teaching in his or her personal statement and submit teaching evaluations from their current institution. If evaluations are not available, alternative documentation must be provided by the chair of the search committee.

II. ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Each year, the departmental committee on personnel, or a subcommittee thereof, should consider evidence of accomplishment in the three areas of research and scholarship, teaching and service and include a discussion about where the candidate should focus efforts in order to provide feedback that will lead to a record of excellence in all three areas of performance in the years preceding tenure. A copy of the statement is forwarded to the department chairperson for reaction and his/her recommendation. The department chairperson confers with the faculty member under review about the committee’s evaluation, as well as about his/her own assessment. The department chairperson sends copies of the committee’s recommendation and his/her recommendation to the Office of Faculty Affairs for review by the deans; copies are sent to the faculty member under consideration.
The Dean reviews each professional development statement but provides a written report on the professional development of untenured faculty only at the third-year review (see below).

This department annual professional development report is based upon a thorough review of the annual Faculty Professional Activities Report and supporting evidence, which should include a review of the publications or creative productions for that year, student evaluations, and peer observations of teaching that are conducted annually by a senior member of the department. The report should indicate specifically the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member under consideration in relation to School and department criteria. Where there are weaknesses, the committee suggests courses of action to improve performance which are conveyed to the faculty member in writing by the department chairperson and Office of Faculty. The department chair, the dean, or the faculty member may request a meeting to discuss the outcome of the annual review. Each subsequent professional development statement reviews the current Faculty Professional Activities Report and all previous annual statements, with special attention to the implementation of recommendations for improvement. Evidence of improvement is cited along with continued need for development. Again, where warranted, specific activities designed to improve performance are suggested by the department chairperson and/or the Dean to the faculty member.

III. THIRD YEAR REVIEW
A. Process
Probationary assistant and associate professors, will be subject to a formal third year review of their performance, (in lieu of the annual professional development review) to determine whether or not they should be reappointed or be given notice of termination. The third year review will follow the same procedural steps as the annual professional development review, with the exception that the review should be more comprehensive. Faculty should submit an updated curriculum vitae, a personal statement, a copy of all publications, teaching evaluations, and copies of annual peer observations of teaching to the Department Chair and Personnel Committee. Departments may choose to collect additional information (i.e. external reviews) as long as the process is consistent for all untenured faculty in the department and the Office of Faculty Affairs has been informed in writing of departmental practice. The department chair and personnel committee will submit a report to the Dean by February 1 recommending continuation or termination of probationary service.
SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTERS
TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

Dear xxxx:

XX, currently an Assistant Professor in the XX department, is being considered for promotion <with or without tenure>. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of xx research. I am enclosing Professor XX's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies of xx work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor XX's work with respect to scholarly research, originality, scope, and significance.

We also request an explicit comparison of xx 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 XX'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 XX would be considered a strong candidate for promotion <and tenure> in other leading departments in the field.

We will need your letter within four weeks, sooner if possible. The University’s procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a hard copy of a current curriculum vitae or, if it is more convenient, a url pointer to your vita.

My assistant, XX, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the tenured professors of this department, and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University, to the extent allowed by law.

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,

XXXX
SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER, EXTERNAL SENIOR APPOINTMENT

Dear xxxx:

Professor X of the University West at East is being considered for a tenured appointment at the rank of full professor in the XX department. Because of your knowledge of the field, we would very much appreciate your evaluation of his/her research. I am enclosing Professor X's curriculum vitae with this letter. Also enclosed are copies of his/her work. It will be of particular value to us if you provided a candid assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Professor X's research with respect to intellectual quality, originality, scope, and significance. We also request 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 X's teaching ability or service to the university and/or the professional community, we would appreciate your comments on these matters as well. Please indicate in your letter how long and in what specific capacities you have known Professor X.

Finally, we would appreciate your judgment of whether or not Professor X would be considered a strong candidate for appointment as a full professor in other leading departments in the field. We will need your letter within four weeks, sooner if possible. The University’s procedures also require that with your letter you forward to me a hard copy of a current curriculum vitae or, if it is more convenient, a url pointer to your vita. My assistant, XX, will contact you via email within a week to see if you have any questions and to ascertain if you will be able to help us. Let me assure you that your letter will be kept confidential. It will be available only to the tenured professors of this department, and appropriate decision makers and review panels within the University, to the extent allowed by law.

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,

XXXX
PERSONAL STATEMENT

In recent decades, there has been a vast expansion in the psychological study of women's issues. As part of this expansion of scholarship, I have worked throughout my early career to advance research in the area of gender-related influences on women's mental health. Now, as I apply for tenure and promotion at New York University, I welcome this opportunity to look back on my contributions to this dynamic field of study, and to anticipate my future contributions.

In my research, I have worked closely with community organizations, clinicians, and women's health advocates. I have conducted research with psychiatric inpatients, immigrant women, abused women, and individuals living in poverty who have allowed me the privilege of giving voice to their experiences. The foundation for my scholarship, teaching, and academic service is derived from the following two principles: (1) a commitment to scientifically-grounded and socially-informed scholarly endeavors that can have a positive transformative effect on individuals and on communities; and (2) a belief that the development of conceptual and methodological models aimed at representing the lives of disempowered groups must involve continual self-reflection and egalitarian collaboration amongst researchers, practitioners, participants, and students.

My scholarship has focused on three domains of research, each of which examines social and psychological factors related to women's mental health and emotional well-being. These three domains are: depression in women, women's experience of emotional abuse, and feminist epistemology and social action. Below, I will describe my work in each of these three domains. That description will be followed by an overview of my contributions as a teacher and educator. Lastly, I will outline my various service contributions.

I. Scholarship

In general terms, I am interested in the interplay between social and psychological factors that influence the mental health and emotional well-being of disadvantaged groups of women. My research investigates the variables and mechanisms through which societal and cultural sources of disempowerment serve to increase the risk of mental health problems in various populations of women. My work has been published in prominent peer-reviewed journals including Psychology of Women Quarterly, Sex Roles, the Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, the Journal of Gender Studies, the Journal of Social Psychology, Psychosomatic Medicine, Feminism and Psychology, the Journal of Emotional Abuse, and the Journal of Gender, Culture and Health. Among the populations I have studied are immigrant women, women living in poverty, women in developing countries, women of color, and female psychiatric patients. Currently, I have three main areas of research, which I outline below.

1. Depression in Women

Much of my research explores factors in women's lives that influence their vulnerability to depression. This particular line of research began with a study that explored possible sources for the well-documented finding that women are more prone than men to the ruminative response style (a form of cognitive rumination associated with depression). This project was the first study to ever investigate sources underlying this gender difference; the results showed that women are
more likely than men to receive ruminative advice from members of their social networks (Oatley & Toner, 1996). These findings highlighted the role of women’s social and interpersonal experiences as key variables in depression. I further explored such experiences in a subsequent study that found adulthood emotional abuse to be a significant precipitating factor for major depression in women (Oatley, & Toner, 1999). This study illustrated not only the damaging effects of emotional abuse on women’s well-being; it also illustrated the methodological utility of the semi-structured approach to data collection and analysis that formed the basis for the project. I have integrated such an approach into my two most recent studies on women’s depression. The first of these studies was a cross-cultural investigation of depression and its psychosocial correlates among women living in the Caribbean and among women who recently immigrated to Canada from the Caribbean (Oatley & Toner, 2001c). The second study investigated life stress and depression in an outpatient sample of women (Oatley, & Toner, 2002). Both of these studies included a construct that I labeled *domains of meaning*, which represents the key domains from which participants derive a positive sense of self and is assessed through a semi-structured interview. These studies showed a significant negative relationship between depressive symptoms and participants’ satisfaction with their key life domains.

Each of these previous studies has demonstrated the importance of examining contextual life factors in women’s depression. My current research is continuing this line of research through an exploration of reduction in depressive symptoms among women participating in a poverty transition program in New York City. In support of this research, I am Principal Investigator on a research grant from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) for a study entitled Recovery from Depression following Positive Life Change. This study is a longitudinal investigation of the role of self-efficacy and hopefulness as mediators in recovery from depression among women experiencing the transition out of poverty. The preliminary findings from this study indicate that self-efficacy (i.e., the belief that one has the capability to bring about positive outcomes) is an especially strong predictor of the reduction of depressive symptoms over time. As my next step in this line of research, I am developing a proposal to further investigate the positive mediating role of self-efficacy. This proposed work is a longitudinal study of recovery from depression and other mental health problems among a group of abused women with disabilities. In this research, I am collaborating with Freedom House, a new center in New York which is the city’s first shelter for women with disabilities who have experienced domestic violence.

Lastly, my research on depression in women has explored a phenomenon labeled *self-silencing*. Self-silencing is a progressive self-devaluation posited to be experienced by women when they silence certain thoughts and opinions in order to avoid interpersonal conflict. I have investigated self-silencing across diverse samples of women (Oatley & Toner, 2002; Toner, 2001c; Toner, Stuckless, Gallop, Diamant, Gould, & Vidins, 2000). Consistent with others’ previous research with different samples, I found self-silencing to be significantly correlated with symptoms of depression. In my current work on this topic, I am co-editing a book with Dana Crowley Jack who originated the self-silencing theory. We have been issued a contract for this book from Oxford University Press. This volume, entitled *Cultural Perspectives on Women’s Depression: Self-Silencing, Psychological Distress, and Recovery*, will include leading authors from fourteen different countries writing about social and psychological factors influencing depression within their own cultures.
2. Women's Experiences of Emotional Abuse

This second area of inquiry involves the investigation of women's experiences of adulthood emotional abuse and the impact of such abuse on health and well-being. In addition to my research documenting emotional abuse as a precipitating factor for depression in women, I conducted the first study to ever examine the association between emotional abuse and the development of functional gastrointestinal syndromes in women (et al., 2000). In empirically establishing this association, this study documented a phenomenon which had previously been discussed only as clinical speculation. I have also conducted cross-cultural research on emotional abuse through a study comparing Caribbean women and Caribbean-Canadian immigrant women on the experiences of emotional abuse ( & Toner, 2005). This study documented both qualitative and quantitative differences between the two samples with respect to the nature of abuse experienced and the attributions the women made concerning the causes behind the abuse. One key finding from this study was that the women in the immigrant sample reported a connection between emotional abuse and racism in their lives.

One of the challenges in conducting research on emotional abuse is that it is a relatively new sub-field and it lacks the strong theoretical and epistemological foundation that is necessary for thorough investigation. Given this challenge, I have developed a theoretical framework for the exploration of emotional abuse in women (in press – b). This framework, which is largely informed by the philosophical writings of Judith Butler, conceptualizes emotional abuse through the lens of the performativity of power and through gendered notions of self. Because this work will be published in a widely-read interdisciplinary journal, I expect that it will influence a broad range of scholars interested in a philosophically-grounded approach to studying emotional abuse and other forms of violence against women. In my own research, I am using this framework to construct interview protocols to measure women's experiences of emotional abuse in a manner that integrates qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

The impact of my research in the area of emotional abuse has been documented in three important ways. First, I was appointed to the Editorial Board of the Journal of Emotional Abuse in 1999; this prestigious multi-disciplinary board consists of the leading scholars studying emotional abuse. Second, I was chosen to write the chapter on emotional abuse in the American Psychological Association's highly influential Encyclopedia of Women and Gender ( & Toner, 2001a). Lastly, there has been extensive media coverage of my work on emotional abuse in the form of numerous radio, television, magazine, and newspaper reports; this coverage has allowed the findings from my research to reach a broad international audience.

3. Feminist Epistemology and Social Action

My final area of scholarly work involves the exploration of the connection between feminist approaches to knowledge-building and ways of achieving positive social change. In this work, I have examined the limiting role of societal expectations of women in a patient sample (Richardson, & Toner, 1998) and in a Muslim sample ( & Toner, 2001b). I have also written on the possibilities for social action and the need for social change predicated on feminist conceptualizations of resistance and collectivity. These writings have focused on emancipatory epistemological approaches, such as those of Foucault (, 2002), and on the need for a feminist stance in transforming derogatory representations of women in mainstream psychiatry (2004).
Most recently, I have been exploring innovative philosophical approaches that can be applied in researching women's life experiences and women's self-definitions of "identity". In an article to be published later this year (in press-a), I put forth a model for applying a feminist epistemological stance designed to encourage researchers in psychology to engage in the empirical investigation of social change and social issues such as racism, sexual discrimination, and poverty. In other work (2006), I draw upon feminist notions of difference and diversity to outline new construals of identity. I argue that, by broadening our understanding of "identity" beyond that of a unidimensional, static trait, we open new possibilities for psychological research that captures women's lived experience.

My scholarship in this area has been acknowledged in several ways. For my work examining notions of identity in women's lives, I was selected in 2005 to chair the American Psychological Association's Division 35 Task Force on Intersecting Identities. Chairing this Task Force has positioned me to bring together leading national and international scholars researching identity. We are currently developing a book proposal for an edited volume on intersecting identities in women's lives. In addition to being a Task Force chair, I have been appointed as a Consulting Editor for Sex Roles: A Journal of Research and as a member of the Editorial Board of Psychology of Women Quarterly; these are two influential journals in the area of gender issues and women's issues in psychology. I am also a reviewer for the Journal of Gender Studies, the prominent international cross-disciplinary journal in gender studies, and a reviewer for research on gender issues for the Journal of Social Psychology, the American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, and the Chinese University Grants Committee. In addition to the grant support for my current research on women in transition out of poverty, my work on gender issues and social change has been funded by research grants from the following sources: the Liberty Foundation, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, and the Canadian Race Relations Foundation.

II. Teaching

I try to foster a collaborative and egalitarian environment through my classroom teaching, my advisement, and my research mentorship. My primary classroom teaching has been the course on Program Development and Evaluation in Counseling (E63.2663). This course is a requirement for all of the MA students in our Counseling Psychology program, and I teach it every semester. I have enjoyed the challenges and rewards of teaching this research course to a body of students whose primary focus is on clinical training and service delivery. I have also taught the course on Women and Mental Health (E63.2041). In this course, I draw extensively on examples from my own research and experience, and I encourage students to explore the ways in which applied psychological research can change people, groups and environments in powerful ways. The course attracts a broad range of graduate students from various disciplines across the university who choose this class as an elective. In addition to teaching these graduate courses, I will be teaching an undergraduate course on Women and Mental Health (E63.1041) which will allow me to encourage undergraduate students to consider the socio-cultural influences on women's mental health and well-being. In my courses, I support student learning through participatory classroom instruction that allows for considerable student input and through the use of Blackboard website technology. The evidence of the effectiveness of my teaching is represented both in the student evaluations I receive and in the reports of the teaching observations performed by my colleagues in the Department of Applied Psychology.
In addition to my classroom instruction, I regularly have over 30 student advisees annually with whom I meet to provide program and career guidance. I have also served on ten dissertation committees in the Department of Applied Psychology, and have been Chairperson on three of those. Another important part of my involvement with students is my active research team which typically consists of ten or more students each year. I hold weekly research team meetings in which we discuss theoretical and procedural issues pertaining to my ongoing research. I also regularly bring members of my team to meet with staff and clients at the community-based sites that form the basis for my collaborative research. From working on this team, my students have gained experience in data collection and analysis as well as new knowledge about feminist and psychological theories of positive social change.

III. Service

I have been very active in my service to the university and in the community. In the Department of Applied Psychology, I have been on several committees, including the department’s Undergraduate Committee (on which I have devoted time to finding new ways to meet the diverse needs of the undergraduate students by providing mentorship, planning curriculum revisions, and overseeing the field placements of several students per year) and the Resource Committee (which allocates monetary resources). Within the Counseling Psychology Program, I have served on the Committee on Mental Health Counselor Licensure and the Committee on Comprehensive Examinations, and I have chaired the PhD program Admissions Committee.

Within the Steinhardt School of Education, I am a very active member of the Steering Committee of the Commission on Gender, Race, and Social Justice, which involves the organizing of groups and events focused on the promotion of equity. In addition, I am serving a three-year term on the Faculty Council and Senate of the Steinhardt School of Education and on the Student Affairs Committee. In 2005-2006, I Co-Chaired the school-wide Faculty Elections in the School of Education. This year, I will be chairing the Student Affairs Committee of the School of Education.

My service outside of the university largely involves using my research collaborations as a mechanism for serving numerous groups within the broader community. These groups have included the Project Enterprise Poverty Transition Program, Seward Park High School, and Women’s Health in Women’s Hands Community Health Center. My service to these groups involves such activities as giving talks and preparing policy reports. I also have the honor of serving on the Executive Committee of the American Psychological Association’s Division 35 (the Society for the Psychology of Women) and chairing the Applied Social Issues Internship Committee of Division 9 (the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues); this latter committee adjudicates applications to fund students’ research involving collaboration with community organizations. In addition to these contributions, my role as a reviewer and editorial board member on several journals involves reviewing an average of two manuscripts per month. I have also contributed to the academic community by giving 47 presentations at conferences and scientific meetings, including keynote and invited addresses. I believe that these contributions, along with my scholarly publications and appointments to high-profile national committees, is evidence of the impact and visibility of my work.
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