

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY GROSSMAN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION ON THE TENURE TRACK OR TENURE

Updated April 1, 2025

1. INTRODUCTION

The New York University Grossman School of Medicine Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) set forth the core principles and procedures for tenure and promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty at NYU Grossman School of Medicine. They are designed to support high academic standards in awarding tenure and promotion and to ensure a comprehensive, rigorous, and fair review of the candidates. These Guidelines are in accordance with the promotion and tenure guidelines established by New York University (the “University”) and the NYU Grossman School of Medicine and NYU Grossman Long Island School of Medicine Faculty Handbook (the “Faculty Handbook”)¹; in case of conflict with these Guidelines, the Faculty Handbook will take precedence.

2. TENURE STANDARDS

All candidates for tenure should demonstrate a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly research or other scholarship, including a record of substantial sustained federal funding, with strong reputations for scholarly excellence, the commitment and capacity to stay at the forefront of their fields and demonstration of a potential impact on policy and practice in their field. Independent evidence of scholarly achievements must include publication of major peer-reviewed papers. Books and/or chapters that integrate, synthesize, summarize, and extend the existing literature are also considered evidence of scholarly productivity. Certain other types of activities are generally recognized as demonstrative of an individual's stature in research or scholarship. Many of these activities are manifestations of peer recognition and may include: invitations to lecture on the national and international level; invitations to contribute to major scientific meetings and publications; membership on editorial boards of prominent journals; membership on scientific and professional advisory committees at national and/or international levels; membership on research peer review committees; the receipt of honors for scientific or scholarly achievements; election or selection to membership and/or leadership positions in professional organizations; funding from national peer-reviewed funding agencies (such as the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and similar agencies in the government and the private sectors); and the attraction and training of productive graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. These faculty members will expend major efforts in scholarly

¹ See Faculty Handbook for NYU Grossman School of Medicine and NYU Grossman Long Island School of Medicine at <https://med.nyu.edu/for-faculty/sites/default/files/faculty-handbook-for-the-nyu-grossman-and-nyu-grossman-long-island-school-of-medicine.pdf>

activity, including teaching and investigator-initiated research. They should also have evidence of distinguished records as teachers or mentors of students.

As described in the NYU Grossman School of Medicine Policy and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (<https://med.nyu.edu/forfaculty/sites/default/files/policies-procedures-for-appointment-promotion-tenure.pdf>) there are three separate tracks for tenure at the School.

Promotion on any of the tenure tracks requires evidence of: (1) excellence in research, scholarship, or creative expression in one's discipline of sufficiently high quality to gain favorable recognition within the discipline at the national level; (2) a high level of effectiveness in teaching, and (3) significant contributions in the area of service to the school.

Thus, in order to have a reasonable prospect of gaining tenure at NYU Grossman School of Medicine, a candidate must have a record of outstanding achievement and recognition in scholarly work. Candidates are expected to publish their work in peer reviewed journals, obtain extramural funding for their research from national granting agencies, and ultimately achieve national or international peer recognition in their fields. Taken into account with other variables, in the absence of such a record, tenure will not be granted.

The successful implementation of the Guidelines to achieve and maintain high academic standards depends on the leadership of the NYU Grossman School of Medicine Dean (the “Dean”) and the University Provost and the President, working in conjunction with the tenured faculty. The process of evaluating a candidate for tenure is an inquiry: Is the candidate for tenure among the strongest in the candidate’s field, in comparison with other individuals in the same field at similar points in their careers, taking into consideration the goals of the department and the school.

It is neither desirable nor possible to define an abstract and universal standard of measurement. Each case must be examined in total 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.

3. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES: STAGES I, II, III

Generally

Faculty receive an annual review by their department's mentoring Committee. In addition, the faculty member's departmental appointments, promotion, and tenure committee (the "DAPC") reviews a faculty member when they are up for promotion on the tenure track², as part of the third and sixth year reviews, and when the faculty member is proposed for tenure. The DAPC will consist of a minimum of three tenured members of the faculty member's department of appropriate rank appointed by the Department Chair for renewable three year terms; the Department Chair will select one of the members to serve as chair of the DAPC. If there are less than three tenured faculty members in a department, the Department Chair will consult with the Dean about drawing on tenured faculty with appropriate backgrounds from other departments of the School to form an ad hoc committee consisting of three or more members³. The DAPC should not include scholars with whom the candidate has been closely associated. The Chair of the Department should not be a voting member of the DAPC.

The Dean makes recommendations to the Provost regarding promotion and tenure. The recommendation of the Dean must be informed by the DAPC, the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee (in cases of tenure decisions), the NYU Grossman School of Medicine Appointments, Promotion and Tenure committee for tenure/tenure-track faculty (the "APT Committee"), and experts in the candidate's field.

The process of promotion and tenure is managed through the Office of Faculty Records. The APT Committee meets monthly from September through May. All tenure dossiers must be submitted to the Provost's Office no later than June 1 for tenure decisions to be made by August 31.

Faculty Responsibilities

It is essential that tenured faculty members who participate in the promotion and tenure process uphold high standards of responsibility and ethical behavior. This includes the obligation to give careful attention to the materials of a tenure or promotion case and a clear obligation to maintain the confidentiality of proceedings both during and following the review, since confidentiality makes honest and open discussion possible.

² As used herein, "promotion" refers to promotion on the tenure track.

³ For purposes of these Guidelines, the processes and procedures applicable to the DAPC shall also apply to any ad hoc tenure committee that may be formed within NYU Grossman School of Medicine.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW: STAGE I

Reviews

Annual Review

During their tenure probationary period (the “Probationary Period”)⁴, the Department Chair or her/his designee will inform faculty members annually of their prospects of being recommended by the Department for promotion or the granting of tenure. This is accomplished through annual mentoring meetings between the faculty member and their mentoring committee. Each year, this process will culminate in a mentoring letter signed by the committee, faculty member, and chair or his/her designee, which will be provided to the Office of Faculty Records.

If at any time during the Probationary Period the prospect of being recommended for tenure is considered unlikely as noted as part of the annual review(s), the Department Chair will ask the DAPC to review the faculty member and make a recommendation. The Department Chair will forward to the Dean the DAPC recommendation along with his or her own recommendation. The Dean will approve or disapprove the recommendation. If the decision is to not reappoint a tenure eligible faculty member, the Department Chair will meet with the faculty member and notify them in writing, not later than March 1 of the first year of academic service, if the appointment is to be terminated on August 31; not later than December 15 of the second year of academic service, if the appointment is to be terminated on August 31; and in all other cases, not later than August 31, if the appointment is to be terminated on the following August 31 or not later than 1 year before the termination of the appointment. A copy of the written notification will be provided to the Dean or the Dean’s designee and will include the names of the members of the DAPC who performed the review.

Third- and Sixth- Year Reviews

The Chair of the Department and the DAPC will complete a formal review of tenure prospects in the third and sixth year of service for all assistant professors and associate professors on the tenure track. Since the Library is on a 7-year time clock, Curators will only have a third year review as they will be considered for tenure in the sixth year. For those faculty members whose probationary timetable is shortened due to qualifying previous service, the review timetable may be adjusted appropriately, including the possible elimination of the third-year and/or sixth year review. At the direction of the Dean, the Office of Faculty Records will notify the department administrator, the DAPC Chair, and Department Chair when these reviews are due.

⁴ The term “probationary period” refers to the period of time beginning with the appointment of a faculty member to a full-time scholar or tenure-track position through the earlier of the time that they are granted or denied tenure, transfer off of the tenure-track, or separate from employment from NYU Grossman School of Medicine.

Secondary and Joint Cross Appointments

Tenure review and third and sixth year review for faculty with appointments involving more than one department of NYU Grossman School of Medicine shall ensure the input of both departments. One department will be deemed the primary department for purposes of the review. All evaluations of individuals with NYU Grossman School of Medicine secondary appointments, whether part of a third or sixth year review or preparatory to a recommendation for promotion or tenure, must include a discussion by the secondary department's DAPC, which will also convene to consider the candidate's promotion and/or tenure. The secondary department's DAPC must vote on the candidate, and the secondary Department Chair must discuss the DAPC's findings and recommendation with the Chair of the primary Department. A recommendation from both Department Chairs must then be submitted to the Dean as part of the process outlined in these Guidelines. Should the final decision of the secondary Department at GSOM disagree with the primary GSOM Department's recommendation for promotion or tenure, the process can continue; however, the faculty member will no longer continue to maintain his or her secondary appointment in the secondary department at GSOM.

Tenure review and third and sixth year review for faculty with joint cross appointments involving NYU Grossman School of Medicine and another NYU school shall ensure the input of both schools.⁵ NYU Grossman School of Medicine will be deemed the primary school for purposes of the review.

Reviews for Promotion or Tenure

The DAPC will initial review candidates proposed for promotion and/or tenure.

In each case, the DAPC will review, at minimum, a curriculum vitae in a format approved by NYU Grossman School of Medicine (the "NYU Grossman CV"), as well as mentoring letters. The NYU Grossman CV shall include a candidate's record of grant funding, publications and discoveries, teaching duties and performance, service record, mentoring and advising history and success, and potential contributions toward the work of the department, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, and NYU Langone Health. The DAPC will assess research contributions, teaching performance, and service.

After the evaluation by the DAPC, the DAPC will vote on whether or not to recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure (as relevant) and will provide their written

⁵ A summary of Cross Appointments can be found at

https://www.nyu.edu/content/dam/nyu/provost/documents/OAA/Cross_Appointments_GNF_2020.pdf

recommendation to the Department Chair. The recommendation should lay out, in substantive terms, the basis for the positive and negative votes.

The DAPC will strive to provide a fair evaluation, as reflected in the DAPC recommendation, including an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate; it is not an advocacy document. The recommendation must indicate, with reasons, the basis for its recommendation. If there is a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, the DAPC should share that information in its report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation. All members of the DAPC must be listed with the summary of votes recorded.

Preparation of the Initial Docket

Following the recommendation of the DAPC with respect to tenure, an initial docket (the "Initial Docket") must be prepared within the department for review by the Department Chair, and for subsequent forwarding to the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee (in the case of a tenure decision), the APT Committee, the Dean, and the Provost.

As evidence of outstanding achievement, the Initial Docket must include:

- Candidate's current curriculum vitae
- Candidate's personal statement
- Funding history template
- Copies of the candidate's scholarly work (5-7 PDFs of recent representative papers, preprints, or articles in press)
- Copy of the written report to the candidate from the Third Year Review and from the Sixth Year Review (or reviews at an adjusted timetable as set forth herein), when appropriate, with the exception of a Library Curator who will have only a 3-year review.
- Recommendation of the DAPC
- Names of external evaluators provided by candidate and the Department Chair
- Supplementary materials

Discussion of Items in the Initial Docket

Candidate's Personal Statement

The candidate's personal statement must narrate the trajectory of the candidate's career in a 1-2 page statement that describes major academic/scientific achievements and projected research and scholarly endeavors.

Third and Sixth Year Review

All tenure dockets (except for lateral hires, discussed further below) must include a copy of the written report to the candidate from the Third-Year Review and the Sixth-Year

Review (or, in the case of faculty members whose probationary timetable is shortened due to qualifying previous service, the reviews completed on the adjusted timetable) with the exception of the Library Curator who will submit only a Third-Year Review.

External Evaluators

All tenure and promotion dockets must include a list of external evaluators, including those who declined. All departmental communications with potential evaluators must be documented and included in the docket.

The Dean will solicit letters from among: (a) nine nationally and internationally known scientists or colleagues in the candidate's field who are external to NYU recommended by the Department Chair and (b) an additional three nationally and internationally known scientists or colleagues in the field external to NYU recommended by the candidate. The evaluation process can proceed after a minimum of seven letters are received, five of which must come from evaluators suggested by the Department Chair. External evaluators, or referees, should be leaders in their field and familiar with the candidate's research, scholarly work, and reputation. Referees should not be collaborators or co-investigators or those with whom the candidate is closely associated.

Letters should not be from co-workers, and letters from former students are discouraged. Referees who hold university positions should hold a title of the same or higher rank as the proposed title of the candidate. If an opinion is inadvertently solicited from someone who later turns out to be close to the candidate, this must be noted in the departmental record.

Criteria for Selecting Outside Evaluators: Normally, selected evaluators will hold a tenured position in an institution of recognized distinction as a research university, a position of equivalent rank in an academic unit that does not grant tenure, or a position of equivalent rank in a non-academic institution (e.g., laboratory or research institute). Evaluators must be recognized leaders in the candidate's discipline. Evaluators must be representative of their subject, broadly defined, and not be drawn exclusively from narrow specializations. At least one of the evaluators must be a scholar identified with broader sectors of the discipline in question. The list of evaluators need not be restricted to those at United States institutions.

Additional criteria for selecting referees:

1. Must not be a co-author on a peer-reviewed publication within the last five years; however may be co-author on committee or work group and/or meeting reports (assuming this does not conflict with any of the other statements below);
2. Must not be a co-investigator on any type of research grant within the last five years;
3. Must not have been a mentor or mentee of the candidate;

4. Must not have been a collaborator of the candidate within the past 5 years; and
5. May be colleagues on national committees, study sections, or conference organizations.

The suitability of the evaluators with respect to rank, appropriateness or fit with the candidate's field, level of expertise and leadership in the field, and absence of conflict of interest will be a consideration in review by the Chair of the APT Committee, the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee Chair (if up for tenure), the Dean, and the Provost.

Solicitation of Letters from Outside Evaluators: The letter of solicitation, which comes from the Dean or the Dean's designee, must follow the prototype attached as an Appendix. The letter must explicitly request comparative rankings with the candidate's peers, and they must not in any way imply that a position or negative response from the evaluator is desired.

All evaluators must be provided with the same NYU Grossman C.V., personal statement, and copies or descriptions of the candidate's work.

Confidentiality of Evaluations: It is NYU Grossman School of Medicine's policy to treat as confidential all evaluations of 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 and as may be required by law.

The confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators must be preserved; letters will be made available only to those who have a need to know in connection with the promotion and tenure process, including but not limited to, members of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee (if up for tenure), the APT Committee, Dean(s), and the University's Provost Office. Neither the names of writers nor the content of the letters may be communicated to the candidate or anyone else beyond those eligible, not even in summary form. In all communications with them, writers of letters must be assured that their letters will be held in such confidence, except as required by law, and that they will be seen only by those noted above.

Supplementary Materials

Dockets can include supplementary information about the candidate's work that may not be evident from the rest of the record.

Recommendation of Department Chair

After review of the Initial Docket, including the recommendation of the DAPC, which is advisory to the Department Chair, the Department Chair will prepare a written evaluation and recommendation, which must include a description of the candidate's role in the department, potential for growth, and extramural funding. The Department Chair must

then forward to the Dean the DAPC recommendation, including the numerical vote of the DAPC and the names of the DAPC members, the Initial Docket, and the Department Chair's evaluation and recommendation.

Effective Departmental Reviews

Properly prepared, detailed, and well-documented dockets are the most effective instrument for conveying the essence of the department's evaluation of the candidate. Indeed, it is the thorough and honest appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate that is most useful to the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee (if up for tenure), the APT Committee, and the Dean, often more so than the final vote, for it gives substantive meaning and texture to the evaluation.

After review by the Department Chair, the Department chair will forward the Initial Docket and their recommendation to the Office of Faculty Records to initiate the succeeding stages of the review process. The Office of Faculty Records will add to the Initial Docket the bibliometric report, the referee responses and, if applicable, the Academic Excellence Commission (AEC) letters (faculty performance letters related to the "Policy on Performance Expectations for Research Faculty") (collectively the "Full Docket").

DEAN'S REVIEW: STAGE II

The Dean is responsible for evaluating the Full Docket presented by the department and making a recommendation to the Provost. For cases evaluating whether to grant tenure, the Dean will use the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee and the APT Committee as advisory to the Dean; in all other cases, the Dean will use the APT Committee as advisory to the Dean.

Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee

The Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee that reviews those candidates for tenure will consist of three tenured faculty members selected by the Dean or the Dean's designee, one of whom shall be a member of the APT Committee and serve as the Chair. The Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee has the responsibility to review the Full Docket in detail, including the DAPC recommendation and recommendation of the Department Chair, and to prepare a written report with a recommendation in favor or against the tenure of the candidate. The Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee does not review cases for promotion on the tenure track without tenure.

Materials for the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee

The Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee will review the candidate's Full Docket.

Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee Review and Report

Upon receipt of the Full Docket, the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee will analyze the candidate's qualifications for tenure, which includes but is not limited to, the following, as applicable: field of expertise, assessment of research contributions, teaching performance, and service. Upon completion of its review, the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee will prepare a report signed by all members of the Committee containing its recommendation either in support or against the tenure of the candidate. A copy of the report will be sent to the Dean or the Dean's designee.

The APT Committee

The APT Committee shall consist of fourteen tenured full professors in the NYU Grossman School of Medicine representing various departments across the School appointed by the Dean or the Dean's designee for three-year terms that are renewable. The Chair of the Committee will be selected by the Dean or the Dean's designee. The Dean and/or the Dean's designee will sit with the APT Committee without vote and with voice confined to procedural issues or responses to questions by the Committee. The APT Committee shall make its recommendation with respect to the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate to the Dean.

Materials for the APT Committee

The APT Committee shall be provided with and review the Full Docket and the Report of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee (with respect to tenure cases). The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee who serves on the APT Committee will present the Report of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee to the APT Committee.

The APT Committee will prepare a report containing its recommendation either in support of or against the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate including the aggregate vote of the Committee (how many voted yes/no). The Full Docket, the Report of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee, and the Report of the APT Committee will be provided to the Dean for review.

Decision of the Dean

The Dean will review the submitted materials and develop a report of his/her recommendation. In the case that the Dean's recommendation is contrary to that of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee (in the case of tenure) and/or the APT Committee, the Dean will also provide the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee (if applicable), the APT Committee and the Department Chair with the reasons. If the Dean has a reasonable doubt about the excellence of the docket, the Dean should include that information in the Dean's report and consider withholding a favorable recommendation. Indicators of doubt may include a split vote within the DAPC or school committee(s) or a clear difference of opinion between the DAPC and school committee(s). The report should explain, in substantive terms, the basis for the positive and negative votes in earlier stages of review.

The Dean will first provide their report to the Department Chair, who will have ten (10) days to provide further information or counterargument before the Dean's recommendation to the Provost is made.

Thereafter, the Dean will timely provide the Dean's recommendation to the Provost. The Dean's recommendation to the Provost will include the basis for the positive and negative votes in earlier stages of the review. The Dean's recommendation constitutes the definitive recommendation of the NYU Grossman School of Medicine and will be accompanied by the Full Docket, the Report of the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee (if applicable), and the Report of the APT Committee.

PROVOSTIAL REVIEW: STAGE III

The Provost shall evaluate each tenure and promotion docket and recommendation submitted by the Dean. In doing so, the Provost may solicit additional information and/or letters of evaluation and may appoint an ad hoc committee composed of tenured faculty from GSOM to seek further counsel.

The Provost will make the final tenure and/or promotion decision. The Provost will notify the Dean of the Provost's decision. In those cases in which the Provost's decision is contrary to the recommendation of the Dean, the Provost will provide the Dean with the reasons and give the Dean an opportunity to provide further information or counterargument before the Provost's final decision. The Provost shall notify the Dean of the final decision, along with reasons thereof, if the Provost's decision continues to be contrary to the Dean's recommendation.

Upon notification of the Provost's decision, the Dean will inform the Department Chair and the candidate the decision in writing.

4. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

Mandatory Review for Tenure

A docket and recommendation must be submitted to the Dean for all faculty in their mandatory review year, whether the recommendation is positive or negative. If, however, the candidate tenders a letter of resignation on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review, effective on or before August 31 of the final probationary year, a docket and recommendation need not be submitted. The letter of resignation must state explicitly that the resignation was freely tendered without duress. In this instance, the Department Chair must forward the letter of resignation to the Dean on or before August 31 of the year prior to the mandatory review year. (For appointments that start mid-academic year, the deadline date is one year prior to the last day of the month of the year prior to the mandatory review).

Tenured External Appointments (Lateral Hires)

Tenured external appointments require a tenure review at the department, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, and University levels; their appointments are made pending completion of the tenure review, and this shall be recorded in the appointment letters. A tenured external appointment will be subject to review only by the DAPC and the APT Committee; there shall be no review by the Ad-Hoc Tenure Committee. Any exception to this practice requires the written consent of the Provost.

In the cases of tenured external appointments, the DAPC and the APT Committee shall review the appointment utilizing the same standards and procedures as for internal candidates. For appointments at the rank of full professor with tenure, the vote and authority for the tenure recommendation resides with the full professors on the APT Committee. For appointments at the rank of associate professor with tenure, the vote and authority reside with all tenured faculty members on the APT Committee. The votes should be taken by closed ballot.

Dockets to be submitted to the Provost minimally must include the following:

- The Full Docket (to be assembled as set forth above)
- Seven external evaluations from qualified individuals not associated with the candidate with a list stating the credentials of these individuals
 - Additional criteria for selecting referees:
 - Must not be a co-author on a peer-reviewed publication within the last five years; however, may be co-author on committee or work group and/or meeting reports (assuming this does not conflict with any of the other statements below);
 - Must not be a co-investigator on any type of research grant within the last five years;
 - Must not have been a mentor or mentee of the candidate;
 - Must not have been a collaborator of the candidate within the past 5 years;
 - Must not have worked with the candidate at a previous institution within 5 years; and
 - May be colleagues on national committees, study sections or conference organizations

- The Report of the APT Committee which includes the qualifications for justifying a tenured position and a written report of the review of the candidate
- The recommendation of the DAPC

Tenure Clock Stoppage

The tenure clock for faculty is set forth in the University Bylaws and the Faculty Handbook and may be extended in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook. For those candidates who have been granted tenure clock stoppage, requests for, and/or the granting of, tenure clock stoppage do not affect future determinations about whether to grant tenure.

Acceleration of Schedule

Proposals for early promotion to associate professor and for tenure must be considered extraordinary actions. Indeed, it is not normally in the best interest of a candidate to propose candidates for tenure ahead of schedule. The best reason for proposing early consideration is a record of extraordinary accomplishment that can be readily distinguished from strong cases. Even with these affirmative recommendations, the Dean will not recommend early tenure unless the case is extraordinary and compelling in relation to the already high expectations for candidates reviewed under the usual schedule.

Additional or Alternative Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion of a tenured faculty member to full professor requires that the candidate has achieved a significant milestone or marker beyond the work considered at the point of awarding tenure. The normal expectation will be that there is significant new scholarly research achievement since the conferring of tenure. The docket must clearly indicate which work distinguishes the candidate's achievements since the last review for promotion.

For promotions to tenured full professor, the vote resides with the full tenured professors on the DAPC and the APT Committee. The recommendation of the DAPC must be submitted by its Chair directly to the Dean.

Appeal

In the event of a negative decision by the Provost with respect to promotion and/or tenure, the candidate has the right to file a grievance in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Handbook.

Appendix: Sample Letter for Soliciting External Evaluations for Mandatory Tenure and Promotion Review

Dear (Dr.):

The NYU Grossman School of Medicine is currently considering Dr. X, an Associate Professor in the Department of Pathology, for **tenure** on the Investigator/Educator track. As a tenured faculty member, Dr. X is expected to have achieved national and international recognition and be among the top scholars of similar rank in their field.

You have been suggested as someone who could give us a frank and unbiased opinion regarding Dr. X's qualifications for tenure, including the impact of his/her work and stature in the field. Understanding that your time is valuable, we have provided an evaluation form that should facilitate your review. Your opinions will be invaluable to our decision-making process.

Please indicate your willingness to evaluate Dr. X by following these steps below:

1. Click on the “VIEW REQUEST” button above and indicate whether or not you will be willing to perform an evaluation.

By accepting this request, you are acknowledging that you are not in conflict with the following criteria:

- Must not be a co-author on a peer-reviewed publication within the last five years. However, may be co-author on committee or work group and/or meeting reports (assuming this does not conflict with any of the other statements below).
- Must not be a co-investigator on any type of research grant within the last five years.
- Must not have been a mentor or mentee of the candidate.
- Must not have been a collaborator of the candidate within the past 5 years.
- Must not have worked with the candidate at a previous institution within 5 years.

By declining this request, you will have an opportunity to note in a text box if it is due to a conflict with the criteria above, or another reason such as a time commitment or if you feel you are unable to provide a candid evaluation of the candidate.

2. If you indicate “Yes, I accept” you will be directed to a page to view Dr. X’s curriculum vitae, personal statement, and publications, NYUGSOM’s criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure and the evaluation form.
3. Fill out the evaluation form. In the evaluation form template, write a few sentences with your impression of the candidate and their work for each section, in addition to marking your selected answer. While you are of course welcome to send a letter detailing your impressions of the candidate, we do prefer you use the attached word document labeled “Evaluation Form.”
4. After completion, please save to your desktop and return to us by either email or uploading to Interfolio.

5. All evaluations are strictly confidential.

We know that you have many demands on your time, but we would appreciate your evaluation by **March 1st, 2024**.

We hope you will assist us in this important process, but if you feel you are unable to evaluate Dr. X's candidacy, please let us know by emailing sarah.murslim@nyulangone.org at your convenience. Your opinion will be immensely important to us and we thank you in advance for considering this request.

Sincerely yours,
Steven B. Abramson, M.D.
Vice Dean for Education, Faculty
and Academic Affairs
NYU Grossman School of Medicine
550 First Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Tenured faculty at the NYU Grossman School of Medicine are expected to have achieved both national and international recognition and to be among the top scholars of similar rank in their fields. To help facilitate the review process, please provide us with feedback by answering the questions below.

Reviewer's Name:

Date:

Title:

Institution:

Candidate: John Doe, M.D.

Relationship to the Candidate: Select one:

Please provide comments:

Candidate Reputation and Contributions

1. Please describe your view of the candidate's leadership in the field and how their specific research findings have significantly impacted the field.

2. If you were to rank the candidate's stature and overall reputation in the field, would you consider him/her to be in the:

Top 1% Top 10% Top 25% Top 50% Lower 50% Unable to Comment

3. If you have ranked the candidate in the Top 1% or Top 10%, please describe any special qualities or achievements that makes this candidate stand out above their peers in terms of their contributions to the field?

4. Please name three other prominent individuals in this field and indicate how this candidate's work compares with regard to impact and innovation relative to these scholars, and why?

5. Based upon your knowledge of the candidate's work and the information provided, would he/she receive tenure at your institution?

Yes

No

Borderline Candidate

Don't Know

If no, please provide comments:

6. Please feel free to add any additional comments that you feel would be important to our committee in consideration of Dr. Doe's application for tenure.