

12-1993

Tenure Standards and Review Schedule

Anwar Shaikh PhD

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/as_archive



Part of the [Economics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shaikh, Anwar PhD, "Tenure Standards and Review Schedule" (1993). *Archives of Anwar Shaikh*. 43.
https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/as_archive/43

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Levy Economics Institute of Bard College at Bard Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Archives of Anwar Shaikh by an authorized administrator of Bard Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@bard.edu.

December 22, 1993

TO: Executive Faculty

FROM: Judith Friedlander

J. M. F.

RE: Tenure Standards

I am distributing before the Executive Meeting a copy of the latest draft of the Tenure Standards and review schedule. Please bring the material with you this afternoon. Now that we have a set of documents to look at, I hope we will be able to have the long overdue discussion about tenure and perhaps resolve some of the issues raised in the December 16th memo, sent to all of us by thirteen of our colleagues. I look forward to seeing you at 2:30 PM.

Tenure Standards

Tenure is not something earned by passing tests or accumulating a requisite number of points. Rather, the granting of tenure is contingent both on the achievements and promise of the candidate and on the needs of the institution.

Although no formal criteria can substitute for the conscientious, unbiased, and considered judgment of colleagues, it is important to articulate in advance the standards to be used in evaluating past achievements and future promise of candidates. These are made in three areas. These criteria are listed in descending order of importance. All are necessary and none is sufficient:

- A. Evidence of a genuine contribution to knowledge and capacity to do original work on a high level, with the prospect of continued fruitful scholarship. In this light, such factors as the following will be taken into account: (1) capacity creatively to evaluate and integrate new evidence and new concepts within an established body of knowledge; (2) independence of mind and intellectual integrity in scholarly matters; (3) a reflective relationship to one's discipline, based on awareness of larger issues in the discipline and devotion to their further exploration; (4) a substantial and publicly-evaluated body of written work - normally, a minimum of one published book, or its equivalent in articles; (5) clear evidence of significant new research beyond the dissertation and continuing scholarly productivity.
- B. Teaching ability. Beyond the competence necessary for carrying out instructional responsibilities in the Graduate Faculty and Eugene Lang College, this criterion includes the capacity and willingness to be available to work closely with students and to help detect fruitful lines of research and assess for suitability a variety of intellectual approaches and research tools. This standard, in short, specifies an orientation to teaching that helps students develop scholarly judgment and independence. The ability to take a lead role in directing dissertations is of special importance in the Graduate Faculty.
- C. Effective contributions to the collegial and administrative tasks of the Graduate Faculty and the University.

These standards should also provide the framework for non-tenure faculty renewals, at which point the fullest possible information about that evaluation and assessment should be conveyed to the candidate.

SCHEDULE FOR FACULTY PROMOTIONS AND FOR RENEWAL OF FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AT END OF TERM

For the sake of illustration, assume that all terms end in the period July-August.

Spring semester:

1. The Dean informs department chairs of faculty whose terms will be completed at the end of the following academic year.
2. The chair meets with the candidate to review timetable and procedures.
3. The candidate supplies an updated c.v., personal statement, and copies of relevant publications to date, so that department members and Dean can make use of summer to read materials.
4. The department draws up a list of outside referees, including names supplied by the candidate.
5. The department chair contacts potential referees and confirms the final list. Materials may be sent out at any time over the summer, as referees request.

Early September (prior to start of academic year):

1. The Dean reviews with chairs the status of reviews, and notifies the Provost. Any remaining questions about procedures will be clarified.
2. The candidate brings the department chair all additional written materials not supplied in the spring, including updates to the c.v. and personal statement.
3. If it has not been done already, the Chair distributes materials to outside referees with deadline of mid-October (end of October for tenure cases).

Fall Semester:

1. The departments carry out reviews for reappointments without tenure and for promotion of tenured Associate Professors. Recommendations and complete dossiers are due in the Dean's Office by November 1. (Wherever possible, reading materials will have been duplicated over the summer or during October.)
2. The Junior Reappointments Committee meets during November and reports to the Dean by November 21. The Dean reports to the Provost by December 15.
3. The tenured Professors meet during November and report to the Dean on promotions to full Professor by December 1. The Dean reports to the Provost by January 15.
4. The departments also carry out tenure reviews. Recommendations and complete dossiers are due in the Dean's Office by November 15. (Wherever possible, reading materials have been duplicated over the summer or during October.) The Tenure Committee meets during early December and reports to Dean by December 21. The Dean meets with tenured faculty after January 20, and reports to the Provost by January 31.

February:

1. The Dean meets with the Provost and President about all reviews. Any additional information or clarification is supplied prior to the March Executive Committee meeting of the Board.

April 15:

1. The Dean notifies each candidate of the results.

MATERIALS THAT BELONG IN A DOSSIER:

1. The current vita of the candidate.
2. A personal statement from the candidate.
3. Copies of all publications and work in progress since the last review.
4. Published reviews of the candidate's publications, where available.
5. Outside letters of reference. Normally six letters will be submitted, of which at least three should come from referees suggested by the candidate.
6. Evaluative information from students, represented in a variety of ways. (Each department should clarify its particular procedures in advance with the Dean.)
7. Letters from colleagues in other departments or divisions of the University, if available and appropriate.
8. A memo from the chair summarizing the department's recommendation and its reasoning.
9. A memo from the relevant faculty review committee (Junior Reappointments Committee, Tenure Committee, or Tenured Professors), summarizing the committee's discussion, the range of opinions, and the final vote.

The Dean prepares a separate memo, which is submitted with the above materials to the Provost. During the review process the Dean, Provost, or President may choose to make additional inquiries, both inside and outside the institution.