

## **Tenure, Promotion, and Mentorship for Undergraduate Faculty**

**Approved: 31 January 2015**

The criteria, standards, and procedures discussed below are intended to be consistent with the *Faculty Handbook for the Manhattan Campuses* dated January 2013 (the “Faculty Handbook”), in which guidelines and requirements regarding eligibility for tenure and promotion, and processes regarding tenure review, post-tenure review, denial of tenure and appeals can be found in the sections on Faculty Appointments and on Faculty Review Committees. These criteria, standards, and procedures are designed to promote high academic standards for promotion and tenure, and to ensure fair and rigorous assessment of candidates.

Any faculty member who may become a candidate for tenure should receive from the provost, soon after accepting the appointment, an electronic link to the Faculty Handbook, to these guidelines, and to any additional guidelines governing tenure, promotion and teaching evaluation, which may be promulgated by the faculty member’s unit of primary appointment, by his/her division or by his/her department. The Faculty Handbook provides that each academic unit shall state in writing its standards and procedures for the granting of Tenure. This document contains the standards and procedures for the Undergraduate Schools.

### **1 General statement on third-year reappointment of tenure-track faculty, tenure, and promotion to the rank of associate or full professor**

Tenure reflects and recognizes a candidate's unique, long-term potential value to the institution, as evidenced by professional performance and growth. Therefore, the candidate must be an outstanding and productive scholar; demonstrate a record of excellence as an educator; and provide evidence of active, effective service to his/her department, discipline, school and university. Tenure is not only a reward for past accomplishments but also a vote of confidence that the candidate will continue to be an important and productive scholar, educator, and member of the Yeshiva University academic community. Promotion to the rank of full professor recognizes the candidate’s ongoing productivity in the field and continuing contributions to the educational mission of the University. A faculty member’s responsibilities may be subdivided into the categories of A) research/scholarship, B) teaching, and C) service to the department, school, discipline and university.

#### *1.1 Research and scholarship*

Research and scholarship are understood to be intellectual work whose significance and originality is validated by peers within the candidate’s department/school and among peers in his or her chosen field(s) across the national and international domains. The scholarship must have an impact on the body of knowledge in the faculty member’s chosen discipline(s). In some instances, successful external funding for research (primarily in the sciences) is also taken into consideration.

While the kinds of scholarship for faculty across the range of positions at the University will vary, the requirement that the significance of the scholarship be validated and be communicated

through publications and presentations to colleagues in the relevant academic disciplines and to the public beyond the University will sustain a uniformly high standard (see Appendix 1).

### *1.2 Teaching*

Faculty with responsibilities in instruction can be promoted and tenured only when there is clear documentation of effective performance in various teaching roles. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and the ability to organize material and convey it effectively to students. Additionally, there should be evidence of contributions to the educational mission of the department and school that can be measured by: students advised and/or mentored, student enrollment, participation in curricular development, development of new courses and substantial revision of previously taught courses that contribute to the overall curriculum, student engagement in research, student achievements, innovation in teaching strategies, or incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning. Evaluation of instruction is based on a combination of systematic and on-going peer/chair evaluations, tabulated responses from student evaluations, and a teaching portfolio. Guidelines for classroom observations devised by the dean, in consultation with the department chairs and the divisional executive committees, will reflect a standard undergraduate format (see Appendix 2). Evaluation of teaching is enhanced by evidence of student learning, based on any relevant assessment standards adopted by the department or program.

### *1.3 Service*

Faculty service is essential to the University's success in serving its central missions, and is a responsibility of each faculty member. Faculty are expected to be collegial and constructive members who render service to their department, school and university, as well as to their professional communities beyond Yeshiva University. Examples include service in faculty governance; in helping the Admission Office recruit students; in major advising and mentoring of individual students and student groups; service on department, school, and university committees; and active involvement in professional societies.

### *1.4 Evaluation*

Candidates are assessed by their peers and university administrators. At Stern College and Yeshiva College, there are four levels of assessment: by departmental colleagues, under the direction of the department chair (see section 1.4a); by members of the executive committee of their division (see section 1.4b); and then by the deans of their units, and by the provost (see section 1.4d). At Sy Syms School of Business, there are three levels of assessment: by the SSSB personnel committee (see section 1.4c); and then by the dean and by the provost (see section 1.4d). The contents of the complete dossier including internal and external recommendations are completely confidential and may not be shared with anyone outside of the evaluation process, including the candidates themselves. Nevertheless, candidates should be informed of the recommendations made on the departmental and divisional levels without breach of confidentiality, within one week of the decision having been made.

No faculty member or university administrator may vote on a third-year review, tenure, or promotion case at more than one level. In such cases where an individual is eligible to vote at both the departmental and divisional levels, the faculty member may choose at which level to cast his/her vote. Faculty members holding an administrative appointment as a dean, will vote at

the decanal level only. He or she is required to recuse himself/herself from discussions at other levels, except in response to a direct invitation to answer questions posed at other levels of review during a limited portion of the relevant meeting(s).

*1.4a Departmental evaluation (only applicable to Stern and Yeshiva Colleges)*

Under the direction of the chair, department members of a rank higher than that of the candidate form the department personnel committee, which reviews the candidate's dossier and evaluates his/her performance. In cases where there are fewer than two department members of a higher rank, the candidate may request that the dean invite appropriate members of other departments to form an ad hoc personnel committee to evaluate the candidate. Following a departmental review, the chair submits a letter, summarizing the opinions and recommendations of the department and the results of its anonymous voting tally, to the divisional executive committee, with a copy to the candidate's dean(s).

*1.4b Divisional evaluation (only applicable to Stern and Yeshiva Colleges)*

Full-time faculty in each division will elect an executive committee which will also serve as a divisional personnel committee. A majority in the executive committee must hold the rank of full professor and only committee members of a higher rank than the candidate can assess the candidate's dossier and vote on his/her third-year reappointment or tenure and promotion. The executive committee should normally consist of 5 tenured members. In the case of a committee of 5, at least 2 members must come from Stern College for Women and 2 from Yeshiva College, and no more than 2 members may come from the same discipline. Divisions with more than 20 tenured faculty members may at their discretion increase the committee to 7 members. In the case of a committee of 7, at least 3 members must come from Stern and 3 from Yeshiva College, and no more than 3 members may come from the same discipline. The committee members will then elect a chair from among themselves. The term of office is normally 2 years. Should any member of the committee be unable to serve out the entire term, a special election will be held to determine the faculty member to complete the unexpired term. The divisional executive committee will review and assess the candidate's dossier, which contains the departmental evaluation. Following the executive committee's review, the chair submits a letter, summarizing the opinions and recommendations of the executive committee and the results of its anonymous voting tally to the candidate's dean(s).

*1.4c SSSB Personnel Committee (only applicable to Sy Syms School of Business)*

SSSB's Personnel Committee, which consists of all tenured members of the SSSB faculty, also serves as the body which reviews candidates being considered for third-year review, tenure and promotion. In this role, only faculty of a rank higher than that of the candidate may comprise a candidate's personnel review committee. The eligible members of the committee will select a chair from their midst, who may also be the candidate's area head. This personnel review committee will assess the candidate's dossier, which contains the departmental evaluation. Following the committee's review, the chair submits a letter, summarizing the opinions and recommendations of the personnel committee, and the results of its anonymous voting tally to the candidate's dean.

*1.4d Dean and provost evaluations*

The dean reviews the candidate's dossier which now includes, for Stern and YC, the departmental and divisional recommendations, and for SSSB, the promotion and tenure committee recommendation. The dean then submits his/her letter of recommendation to the provost. The provost reviews the candidate's dossier, taking into consideration the recommendations on all three levels. The provost may consult with his/her own review committee which consists of members of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and other outside scholars. In cases involving tenure, the Provost's recommendation is discussed with the President and must receive final approval from the Board of Trustees.

#### *1.4e External reviewers*

The research and scholarship of candidates for tenure and promotion to associate or full professor are assessed both internally and by external reviewers in their fields. External reviewers are selected from a list of names provided by the candidate, and from a list of names provided by the dean in consultation with the department chair (see section 4.1 below). The dean is responsible for approving the final list, for contacting the reviewers, and for obtaining at least 5 external review letters. Consistency in the letter, soliciting evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, is of critical importance, and the standard sample letter should be followed as closely as possible (see Appendix 3).

An individual perceived by the candidate as having a strong negative personal bias toward him/her, or someone who has a clear conflict of interest should not be asked to serve as an external reviewer. Except for unusual circumstances, the candidate's mentor and dissertation supervisor as well as co-authors should not be asked to serve as external reviewers for tenure and promotion to the ranks of associate or full professors.

#### *1.5 Appointments with tenure, subject to ratification*

In exceptional circumstances, a candidate can be appointed to the faculty with tenure, subject to ratification by the Board of Trustees. Such an appointment should only be made in cases where a year-long probationary appointment without tenure would be inappropriate (for example, in cases where the candidate would assume significant administrative responsibilities). In such cases, the provost must solicit statements supporting the candidate's tenure from the dean of the candidate's school and the chair of the candidate's proposed department, or, in the absence of such a chair, from a departmental chair in a related discipline. The provost must also solicit letters supporting an appointment with tenure from three external referees in the candidate's field. Tenured members of the department should be part of the hiring process.

## **2 Mentorship**

### *2.1 Mentorship of tenure-track faculty*

Near the end of each academic year, tenure-track faculty members should meet with the dean of their unit in consultation with the department chair or, in the absence of a chair, with a senior mentor appointed by the dean, in order to discuss their progress in scholarly productivity, teaching performance, and service as well as any concerns which may have arisen. The dean and chair (or appointed mentor) should advise the candidate on developing a body of scholarly or creative work suitable for the award of tenure. In addition, the dean and chair (or appointed mentor) should discuss with the candidate matters relating to the quality of one's teaching

assignments and should provide the candidate with helpful advice and guidance to develop skills in the various types of coursework that are relevant to the educational mission of the department and university. A classroom observation, coordinated by the chair and the faculty member, should also be submitted each year to the dean, after having been shared and reviewed by the faculty member. While minimizing service at this time so as not to hinder one's research agenda, the dean should also discuss what constitutes adequate service within the department or school. The dean or appointed mentor should write a short account of this meeting, send it for comments to the faculty member, and add the account with the faculty member's comments to her/his file. These annual memoranda are only used as a record of discussion points, which assist the mentoring process, and may not be used as part of the candidate's dossier.

### *2.2 Mentorship of tenured faculty*

The University's post-tenure review policy (cf. *MC Faculty Handbook*, Chapter IV, Section F subsection v.) is designed to encourage and assist all tenured members of the University faculty in their professional growth and in the ways in which they can best contribute to their school's academic excellence, by reviewing their academic pursuits of research and teaching, as well as their service to the university community. As a collaborative process between the dean, in consultation with the department chair or appointed mentor, and the tenured faculty member, it serves to determine ways to best match the faculty member's academic and personal interests with the research and instructional needs of the department, unit, and university. In this way, post-tenure reviews serve as an important mentoring process, and, if appropriate, would offer opportunities for assessing a candidate's desire and progress in seeking promotion to the rank of full professor.

Within the first five years after having received tenure or promotion, tenured associate professors and full professors should meet with the dean of their unit in consultation with their department chair or, when appropriate, with a mentor appointed by the dean. Faculty shall provide the dean with a current c.v., updated research, teaching and service statements, as well as teaching evaluations, and a brief self-assessment to serve as the basis of the discussion. In the case of tenured associate professors, discussions about promotion to full professor would be an appropriate agenda item. If pertinent, and in consultation with the provost, a suggested target date to apply for promotion to full professor should be mutually considered. If, subsequently, the application for promotion date is deemed unfeasible, the dean in consultation with the department chair, or appointment mentor, will meet with the associate professor within five years of the last post-tenure review. A follow-up report will summarize the professional and personal growth made in the intervening years and if and when appropriate, in consultation with the Provost, a new target date to apply for promotion will be suggested. The post-tenure review process assures that mentorship discussions, will take place at least once every five years.

### **3 Third-year reappointment of tenure-track faculty, tenure, and promotions to the rank of associate or full professor reviews**

Tenure-track faculty members are formally reviewed in the third year of their employment at the university. While tenure-track appointments are generally made for a first term with the clear possibility of reappointment, such action is by no means automatic. If there is evidence of satisfactory progress in research, teaching and service, reappointment would normally be

recommended.

Tenure-track faculty members are normally reviewed for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor in the sixth year of their employment at the university. Promotion to the rank of full professor, however, is not fixed to a pre-determined time period. Appointment to this rank is not a recognition of length of service, but rather a recognition of the quality and continued promise of the candidate's scholarly or creative achievements in his/her field and of the excellence of his/her contributions to the University in teaching and service. Thus promotion to full professor is an individually determined matter, based on periodic assessments by the dean and department chair, or appointed mentor, and on discussions with each faculty member, concerning his/her own professional growth and personal trajectory, and ultimately considered by the provost of the university.

### *3.1 Submission*

The Dean provides the candidates with a timetable to submit evidence of their productivity in research or creative work, teaching, and service to the university. Typically, these submissions should include:

updated cv, statements of the candidate's achievements and future plans with respect to both scholarship and teaching; copies of published work or exhibitions, reviews of the work, recent conference papers, grant reviews, and other evidence of professional achievements; sample syllabi, assignments, and teaching evaluations, including a classroom observation report of one class written by a tenured faculty member, which has previously been shared with the candidate; and an account of service to the department, unit, university and profession (see Appendix 4). An electronic submission of the portfolio is recommended.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to the ranks of associate or full professor should also provide a list of at least 5 names of external reviewers, with brief details of their scholarly credentials and their relationship to the candidate; a list of names of potential reviewers they feel are unfit to assess their work, with reasons; and the names and contact information of 10 alumni/alumnae from whom letters giving evidence of the candidate's teaching and mentorship can be requested. The Dean, in consultation with the department chair, or appointed mentor, is responsible for developing another list of at least 5 external reviewers, and names are chosen from both lists by the dean in order to obtain at least 5 external reviewers to be included in the candidates' dossiers. The dean is also responsible for obtaining the alumni letters and including them in the dossiers.

The submitted dossiers of all candidates are assessed internally by the department, the division and the dean, who submits a recommendation to the provost. The dean's timetable (see Appendix 5), which is shared with the candidates, also sets the deadlines for these recommendations. In the case of tenure, the final decision is made by the University's Board of Trustees to whom the provost submits his/her recommendation after consultation with the president. If tenure has already been granted, the provost makes the final decision concerning promotion to the rank of full professor. Candidates should be informed of the recommendations, including the vote, but without breach of confidentiality, within one week of the decisions being made.

## Appendix 1

### Tenure and Promotion Policies

#### a. Stern College and Yeshiva College

##### **Field-specific requirements for research (November 2013, subject to revision by the divisional Executive Committees, as in section 1.4b, above)**

The criteria, standards, and procedures discussed below are intended to be consistent with section 1, above.

##### *a. Humanities and Jewish Studies*

The Humanities Division includes faculty teaching in the departments of Art, English, History, Languages, Music, and Philosophy. The Jewish Studies Division includes faculty engaged in all disciplines of academic Jewish Studies, including Bible, Jewish history and Jewish philosophy.

A candidate's scholarly output must demonstrate the candidate's ability to carry out high-quality independent research, and indicate a solid trajectory for future research. For the award of tenure and promotion in English, History, Art History, Languages, Music Theory, Philosophy, and Jewish Studies, a candidate should therefore have demonstrated the significance of her/his scholarship by publishing one or more monographs and several important articles in top-ranking peer reviewed presses and journals. A faculty member should also be recognized in her/his field with papers accepted for presentation at conferences or symposia, publications in conference proceedings and/or invitations to speak at other universities or prestigious conferences. Book chapters, edited volumes, and substantial pedagogical materials (e.g. textbooks), as well as book reviews and significant encyclopedia articles, may be accorded equal weight if they are rated highly by external experts who are consulted during the review process. Major grants or awards will also be taken into consideration.

Candidates in Studio Art and Musical Composition and Performance should have demonstrated originality and breadth of vision in the ongoing creation of art works and a strong record of performances and/or exhibitions.

Typically, candidates for promotion from Associate to Full professor in the Humanities and Jewish Studies will have produced substantial new scholarship or creative work of high quality, and will have consolidated a national reputation within their fields.

##### *b. Natural Sciences and Mathematics*

The Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics includes faculty members teaching in the departments of Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics and Computer Science, and Physics.

For the award of tenure and promotion, a candidate should have demonstrated the significance of his/her research by being a corresponding author in high impact publications, receiving external funding to support his/her research program, and presenting his/her work as an invited speaker at

meetings, seminars, conferences and/or symposia.

There is no minimum number of publications, or amount of external funds received and/or applied for, in order to receive successful tenure evaluations. The key factor is the demonstrated evidence of the establishment of an independent and successful research program that can be maintained with sufficient external funding. The articles, taken as a whole, must demonstrate a solid trajectory for future research. The quantity of research publications depend strongly on the discipline, and the candidate's department chair and senior colleagues will advise the candidate on what they (and his/her future tenure application reviewers) consider a norm for successful tenure cases. The Provost's office expects that once the startup funding runs out, the candidate's program will be sustained with external funds.

Typically, candidates for promotion from Associate to Full professor in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics will have produced substantial new scholarship of high quality, and will have consolidated a national reputation within their fields.

#### *c. Social Sciences*

The Division of Social Sciences includes faculty members teaching in the following departments: Economics, Education, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, and Speech Pathology and Audiology.

For the award of tenure and promotion, a candidate must ordinarily publish a monograph, or high quality papers in respected, peer-reviewed journals, with demonstrable impact, in that the book or articles are cited by others in the field writing in similarly respected, peer-reviewed journals. The articles, taken as a whole, must demonstrate the candidate's ability to carry out independent research and indicate a solid trajectory for future research. More broadly, a faculty member should be known in his or her field with papers accepted for presentation at conferences or symposia and/or invitations to speak at other universities or at conferences. Significant external grants or awards will also be taken into consideration.

Typically, candidates for promotion from Associate to Full professor in the Social Sciences will have produced substantial new scholarship of high quality, and will have consolidated a national reputation within their fields

#### **b. Sy Syms School of Business**

Tenure and promotion policies are among the most important ways we provide an institutional environment promoting research. Below is a copy of our published criteria for tenure and promotion:

*Associate Professor:* To qualify for the rank of associate professor, a candidate must demonstrate significant depth and breadth of knowledge and must show potential for making a unique and significant contribution to his/her discipline or to the broader field of business. This knowledge and potential must be demonstrated both in the candidate's teaching and in his/her research and publication activities.



Evidence of teaching quality may include student evaluations of courses and class activities, peer evaluations and classroom observation, development of new courses and pedagogical materials, as well as publications and conference presentations on pedagogical issues.

Evidence of research and publications quality may include a significant body of research published in high-quality, peer reviewed scholarly and professional journals, presentations at major national and international conferences, as well as publications in scholarly books or monographs. The quality of research will be corroborated by letters obtained from qualified external reviewers, a majority of whom will be chosen by the SSSB Dean and senior Faculty in the candidate's area.

To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate's research and teaching must be judged to be at least very good. In addition, the candidate must be engaged in important service to the School, the University or the profession.

*Tenure:* To be awarded tenure, a candidate must meet all criteria for promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, the candidate must be rated as excellent in either teaching or research, and must show evidence of developing a national or international reputation as a scholar or educator. If tenure is being considered after the candidate's promotion to Associate Professor, special attention must be paid to the candidate's contributions and development since the promotion to Associate Professor.

*Full Professor:* To qualify for the rank of Professor, a candidate must be an outstanding educator and role model, acknowledged by colleagues both within and outside of Yeshiva University to have made unique contributions to his/her discipline or to the broader field of business. Such contributions may include excellence in teaching; significant development of pedagogical materials; significant developments in research methodology, vision of the field or a sustained substantive contributions to his/her field of study; or material contributions to professional practice.

Successful candidates will have published their work and results in scholarly journals and books, will have presented it at leading national and international conferences, and will be recognized authorities in their field as demonstrated by published peer reviews, quantity and quality of citations, and reputation for excellence among professional practitioners, students and colleagues. Quality of scholarly and professional reputation will be documented in letters obtained from qualified outside reviewers, a majority of whom will be chosen by the SSSB Dean and senior Faculty in the candidate's area.

To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a candidate must be rated as excellent in either teaching or research and very good in the other, and must show evidence of having a national or international reputation as a scholar or educator. In addition, the candidate must be engaged in significant and important service to the School, the University or the profession.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Sample classroom observation form**

Name of Instructor:

Name of Observer:

Date of Observation:

Title of the Course:

1. Comment on the overall content of the course and how it fits with the departmental offerings and/or the College's general education requirement:
2. Summarize the content of the observed session:
3. Comment on the ability of the instructor to communicate the subject to the class:
4. Was the instructor able to intellectually engage the students?
5. Was student participation encouraged? Comment on the quality and quantity of student participation.
6. Comment on the instructional resources used by the instructor. If the instructor used available technology was it effective?
7. Any additional comments?

### Appendix 3

#### Sample of letter requesting external reviewers to assess tenure and promotion cases



Dear Professor XX,

Dr. XX is a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of XX at Yeshiva College, Yeshiva University. Dr. XX has taught at Yeshiva at the rank of Assistant Professor since 20xx. I am writing now to ask you to help us with this review by serving as an external evaluator Dr. XX's work.

As you can see from the attached *curriculum vitae*, XX's research focuses on "-----" We hope that you will be willing to provide us with your candid evaluation of Professor XX's scholarly contributions and their significance in the areas in which you feel qualified to comment. In addition, we would welcome your comments on his/her potential to make important contributions to his/her field in the future, on his/her standing within the discipline, and any other aspects of her professional competence with which you are familiar.

In order for us to make full use of your evaluation of Professor XX, we will ask to receive your letter by November 1, 20xx. As you consider Professor XX's contributions to the field, please keep in mind that Professor XX's teaching assignment consists of XX courses per academic year.

Professor XX's tenure dossier will be completed in early August; if you agree to serve as an evaluator, we'll send you an electronic copy of HIS/HER work at that time. If you prefer a hard copy instead, please let me know. If you don't feel that you can serve as an outside evaluator at this time, we would be grateful for your recommendation of others in your field whom we might contact as potential referees.

I know that this review process is time-consuming and even burdensome—but I count on you to know from experience how much the well being of every university depends on such thoughtful and well-informed evaluation. We will value your opinion and treat it with confidentiality. Please accept in advance my thanks and the thanks of Yeshiva University.

Sincerely,