

**Resolution on Implementation of External Evaluation in Tenure and Promotion Review for
Tenure Track Faculty Hired 2018-2019 and Thereafter.
Updated March 8, 2022**

BACKGROUND: At their November 18, 2019, meeting, the CUNY Board of Trustees approved, *City University of New York Resolution to Require CUNY Colleges to Use External Peer Review in Considering Promotion and Tenure Cases*, which included the following:

RESOLVED that, effective with the 2019-2020 tenure and promotion process, all CUNY colleges shall use a CV format that clearly distinguishes between peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed scholarship and creative activity, and be it further

RESOLVED that, effective with tenure track faculty hired in 2018-2019, all four-year degree granting colleges in CUNY shall ensure that faculty members pursuing tenure and/or promotion are evaluated by peers who have expertise in their area(s) of study and are external to CUNY.

In response to the resolution the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs provided *Guidelines for External Evaluation*.

City Tech faculty, administrators and staff were then consulted at meetings and an open hearing, in development of this resolution. Per this consultation, it is acknowledged that the standards for promotion and tenure have not changed; the external evaluator reviews are just one additional component to be considered in the process. It is also important to note that there was significant input that the selection of external reviewers and solicitation letters should reflect the culture and norms of the discipline, the college, and the university. This input was used to prepare this resolution.

Therefore, be it:

RESOLVED that New York City College of Technology (NYCCT aka City Tech) adopts the following procedures and policies for implementation of external evaluation in tenure and promotion review:

- I. The guidelines provided by the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs: CUNY OAA Guidelines for External Evaluation, as amended
- II. Incorporation of required deadlines into the existing ISR calendar
- III. Support for candidates, their departments, and administrators in preparing for and implementing the external evaluator review requirement
- IV. Adoption of a CV format that clearly distinguishes between peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed scholarship and creative activity

Details follow:

I. The guidelines provided by the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs: CUNY OAA Guidelines for External Evaluation

1. Selection of evaluators:
 - a. Faculty under review should have a minimum of three letters of external evaluation.

- b. To yield three letters, six names should be provided, no more than half by the candidate. The other three (or more) names should come from the candidate's chair or department P&B
- 2. Solicitation letters:
 - a. A dean or provost (or their designee) should solicit the evaluation letters, not the candidate or the candidate's chair.
 - b. Evaluators should receive samples of the candidate's publications or creative works (photos of art, CDs of music)
 - c. The solicitation letter should reference the CUNY standard for promotion or tenure and should ask the evaluators to describe their relationship to the candidate—if and how they know them. The solicitation letter may provide other context, like teaching load, if appropriate, or may ask the evaluators to provide context.
 - d. Evaluators should be asked to submit their own CVs along with their letters.
 - e. All letters received, whether positive or negative, must be included in the file.
- 3. Criteria solicited from evaluators:
 - a. The significance and originality of the candidate's work, and the impact or potential for impact on the field.
 - b. The appropriateness of the methodology used to create the work and the quality and appropriateness of the outlets used to disseminate it.

II. Incorporation of required deadlines into the existing ISR calendar

Deadlines for soliciting and receiving external evaluator reviews will be added to the usual ISR calendar, allowing sufficient time for each step. A sample calendar is provided in Appendix A.

III. Support for candidates, their departments, and administrators in preparing for and implementing this resolution

To ensure that candidates have appropriate guidance, it is recommended that:

- For pre-tenure faculty, the Professional Development Plan anticipates the need to provide a CV and samples of work for review by the beginning of the Spring semester of Year 6. For faculty planning to apply for promotion before tenure, this should occur earlier in the PDP.
- The annual evaluation conference and the Dean's Third Year Review include explicit discussions of the candidate's progress toward having appropriate CV and samples to submit for review.
- The Faculty Commons provides workshops and mentoring on the preparation of the CV and samples and the identification of possible reviewers.
- Departments provide guidance to candidates regarding the forms of academic and practitioner scholarship and creative work in their area(s) that will carry the most weight in consideration of their cases, as well as respected venues for submitting their work, and expectations for the qualifications of suggested reviewers. In so doing, they should keep in mind:
 - The faculty member's freedom to publish in any venue they choose;
 - The requirement that although scholarship and creative work varies greatly across departments, the standard for achievement will be consistent.

Guidance on selecting external evaluators is provided in Appendix B. Guidance on preparing solicitation letters is provided in Appendix C.

IV. Adoption of CV format that clearly distinguishes between peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed scholarship and creative activity

The adopted CV format is provided in Appendix D

Appendix A

B. Sample ISR calendar including submission deadlines requiring external evaluators

Tenure

Tenure vote takes place in Fall of Year 7

March of Year 6

- Chair requests list of potential reviewers from candidates for tenure

By end of April

- Candidates submits to the Chair their official CV (Appendix D, template) and scholarly material (scholarly or creative work products) in electronic format/ links to candidate websites to be considered by reviewers - currently what is included in the Scholarship and Professional Growth section of the ePARSE.
- Department Appointments Committee chooses list of reviewers from candidate's list and list provided by Appointments Committee members.

Beginning of May

- Chair forwards to the Dean the list of reviewers and the candidate's CV and other scholarly materials
- Dean solicits evaluation letters from all selected reviewers. Reviewers must notify Dean of acceptance within one week. Reviewer receives access to CV and scholarly and creative works, requesting external evaluator reviews returned to the Office of the Provost.

During month of August

- Deadline for receipt of reviewer evaluation letters
- Office of the Provost provides evaluation letters and CVs to Department Appointments Committee for review

September

- Department Appointments Committee meets to review the credentials of candidates and vote on tenure.

October

- College P&B Review Committee on Tenure reviews files of all candidates recommended for tenure and votes

November

- College P&B votes on tenure

On or by December 1

- Candidates notified of President's decision whether to recommend tenure

Promotion:

September

- Candidate submits RPA with list of proposed evaluators to chair. Chair forwards RPA to Dean, who forwards to Provost, who forwards fully signed RPA to OFSR
- Department Appointments Committee chooses list of reviewers from candidate's list and list provided by Appointments Committee members.

Early October

- Chair submits RPA with final list of evaluators to Dean.

Mid-to-late October

- Candidate eParse closed to any changes
- Dean solicits evaluation letters from all selected reviewers. Reviewers must notify dean of acceptance within one week. Reviewer receives access to CV and scholarly and creative works, requesting external evaluator reviews returned to the Office of the Provost.

Mid to Late November

- Deadline for receipt of reviewer evaluation letters

By early January

- Department Peer Committees complete review and votes on whether to recommend promotion

April

- Ad hoc promotion committees complete review process and votes

Late April/ May

- P&B votes on promotion and recommends candidates to President

Appendix B

1. Criteria for the selection of external evaluators

The determination of the identity of the reviewers is a significant decision. Six reviewer letters should be solicited at a minimum in order to obtain the minimum 3 reviews. Generally, these should be from more senior scholars/ professionals than the candidate.

- The candidate should be asked for a list of 3 or more suggested reviewers, including:
 - i. Name, title, and institutional (or professional) affiliation and contact information
 - ii. Brief description of area of specialization (in a sentence or two) and professional credentials to serve as a reviewer.
 - iii. Explicit explanation of the relationship of the external reviewer and the candidate and how they qualify to serve as a reviewer.
- The Department Appointments Committee must also develop a list. The final list of reviewers is chosen by the Department Appointments Committee from the combined lists. Three reviewers will be chosen from the candidate's list, and at least three reviewers must be individuals not suggested by the candidate. The candidate must be given the final list of reviewers. The candidate should not be involved in the departmental selection of the 3 or more external reviewers, with two exceptions: 1) the candidate should be allowed to list and justify individuals he or she would definitely not want to serve as an external reviewer, and 2) if asked, the candidate may provide a list of key scholars in the field if these are not known to the chair or DAC. The list should only include reviewers external to CUNY. No external evaluator should be on the list lacking the needed impartiality to evaluate the candidates scholarly and creative activities - the required "arm's length" relationship, defined below.
- Once the list of 6 proposed external evaluators is finalized, the Department Chair must submit to the Dean a list of reviewers, including for each external reviewer:
 - i. Name, title, and institutional (or professional) affiliation and contact information
 - ii. Brief description of area of specialization (in a sentence or two) and professional credentials to serve as a reviewer.
 - iii. External evaluator CV. If available through open sources
 - iv. Explicit explanation of the relationship of the external reviewer and the candidate and qualifications to serve as a reviewer. The candidate should submit this information (i-iv) to the department chair.
 - v. Explicit explanation of any relationships with department members, particularly Appointments Committee members
 - vi. Source of suggestion - candidate or Appointments Committee.
- External reviewers who, based on the judgement of the School Dean and Department Appointments Committee, cannot be categorized as independent or being at "arm's length," will not count toward the pool of six external evaluator nominees.
- The Dean must send a uniform letter of solicitation to all reviewers. Templates of letters sent will be posted on the Provost's website or other public site (see Appendix C1 for possible samples). A copy of the letter must be included in the file of letters received. The external reviewer must be provided with copies with the appropriate portions of the candidate's file, such as what is currently found in the "Scholarship and Professional Growth" section of the ePARSE. This will be provided in electronic format unless the

reviewer requests otherwise. Lead time of at least one month prior to the requested response date is recommended.

- The Dean will prepare a file including a listing of the reviews solicited, the solicitation letter sent and the responses, and given to the Office of the Provost, which will receive and store the external reviews. For tenure, the file will be provided to the Department Appointments Committee and the P&B Review Committee; for promotion, the file will be provided to the departmental Peers Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion. The file will be available to all members of the College P&B. All reviewers who were formally requested to evaluate the candidate must be listed and all letters must be included, along with the CV of the reviewer. An explanation must be provided for each case in which a reviewer did not provide a letter. Letters may be sent in electronic format as long as they contain a valid electronic signature.
- **The candidate must not see the reviewers' letters under any circumstances.** Original letters must be retained in the Office of the Provost. Letters may not be viewed by anyone not directly charged with recommending the relevant personnel action (the above is based on Queens College practice).

Additional guidance

The intent is to select reviewers who understand the scope and depth of the discipline for which their professional opinion is being sought and to provide an independent review of the candidate's scholarly and creative works. The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate should be categorized as free of conflict of interests and at "arm's length" from the candidate. Reviewers providing external evaluations should have no personal, academic or professional relationship with the candidate that would cause them to be invested in the candidate's promotion. The term professional relationship can be further defined as any relationship where the external reviewer and the candidate:

- a. Share a financial endeavor (clients, business partners)
- b. Have an interdependent research project
- c. Have functioned in the role as a mentor/mentee relationship within the last 3 years
- d. Are related to each other through biology or legally.
- e. Share any other relationship that would bring impartial evaluation into question

Exceptions to a "professional" relationship may include the case of very large national clinical trials where multiple authors have a very distant relationship or service on national research or service panels or creative projects in which specific disciplines function simultaneous or sequentially to create one final project (a documentary/short film or movie, art installation, theater productions, architectural projects). The Department Chair or Department Appointments Committee (DAC) will need to explain the relationship between the external reviewer and the candidate and how the proposed reviewer qualifies to serve as a reviewer. External reviewers who cannot be categorized as impartial or being at "arm's length" will not count toward the pool of six required external evaluator nominations for this process.

External evaluators outside the academy, such as industry professionals, may be included when a clear explanation of the relevance of such a review is presented by the Chair or Department Appointments Committee. Special care is required to ensure that the University requirements are met, that evaluators are both appropriately qualified and objective and that evaluators outside the academy have been clearly informed about the purpose and scope of the evaluation.

Appendix C

1. Guidance on Solicitation Letters:

- a. The School Dean will solicit the evaluation letters from all external evaluators on the list provided by the chair.
- b. External evaluators will base their evaluation on the candidate's scholarship and creative works, or what is currently found in the ePARSE section "Scholarship and Professional Growth."
- a. The solicitation letter should reference the CUNY standard for promotion or tenure and should ask the evaluators to describe their relationship to the candidate—if and how they know them. The solicitation letter may provide other context, like teaching load, if appropriate. Sample solicitation letters are provided in Appendix C.
- b. All letters received, whether positive or negative, must be included in the file presented for review by the appropriate committees.
- c. Letters must be kept confidential. In no case may they be shared with the candidate. Original letters will be returned to and stored in the Office of the Provost.

2. Information to be solicited from evaluators:

Sample solicitation letters are provided in Appendix C. The following is to be included in the evaluator's letter.

- d. Evaluators are to describe their relationship to the candidate—if and how they know them.
- e. Evaluators are to specify the significance and originality of the candidate's work, and the impact or potential for impact on the field.
- f. Evaluators are to indicate appropriateness of the methodology used to create the work and the quality and appropriateness of the outlets used to disseminate it. Evaluators are to submit their own CVs along with their letters

Candidates are free to include external assessments in their promotion materials, even those not deemed sufficiently at "arm's length." These may include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contributions to scholarly projects and other professional activities.

Candidates up for tenure and applying for promotion in the same academic year may opt to have the same external evaluation reviewers for both actions. In this case the solicitation letter will be customized to include the criteria for both tenure and the promotion, and the reviewer will be asked to prepare a separate review for each action - although the content is likely to include overlap, the recommendations will be based on different criteria.

Appendix C1. Sample Solicitation letters

Based on Queens College letter as revised 7/10/14

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate: Sample Solicitation Letter to External Reviewers in Academic Settings----Modify as Appropriate

Dear X:

Assistant Professor Y is being considered for tenure [and promotion to associate professor] in the Department of Z at New York City College of Technology. [Please note that these are separate decisions under CUNY bylaws]. University policy provides that teaching, scholarship, and service to the institution are the primary criteria on which tenure decisions are based, while service to the profession and service to the public may be supplementary considerations. To aid us in our deliberations, the College solicits letters from outside referees who are selected on the basis of their ability to provide a qualitative assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creative activity, professional growth, and standing in his/her field. We would be very grateful if you could assist us in this assessment process.

New York City College of Technology is a comprehensive college offering baccalaureate and associate degrees in a wide range of professional and career-focused areas, grounded on a strong liberal arts foundation. [In a number of disciplines, including ours, faculty may also be members of the doctoral faculty of the City University Graduate School.] The teaching load is generally three three-credit courses per semester but untenured faculty receive the equivalent of 8 three-credit courses in release time during their first five years. You may wish to take these factors into account as you assess Professor Y's record. However, our primary purpose in asking for your help is to evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarly and creative work.

It will be especially important for us to have an assessment of the character of his/her work and its relation to current scholarship in his/her discipline. In addition, we would appreciate your evaluation of his/her writings—scholarly products, how well they fulfill their intention, and how much they contribute to scholarship in the field.

To achieve tenure, it is expected that the candidate will present evidence of continued scholarly achievement and effectiveness in teaching since his/her original appointment, and the establishment of a reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline.

Attached please find for your review a curriculum vitae and copies of Professor Y's published work and work in progress. In your evaluation, it would helpful if you would comment on the potential for publication of the latter. You may also wish to comment upon the standing of the presses or journals in which Professor Y's work has been published.

Please also include a statement as to whether you are personally acquainted with Professor Y, and if so, how and to what extent. The letter of evaluation you write is confidential and will **not** be shown to the candidate. Also, please include a copy of your CV. Appropriate departmental and college committees will consider your evaluation carefully.

On behalf of the President of New York City College of Technology, I want to thank you for undertaking this assessment of Professor Y's scholarly credentials. You may be assured that your evaluation will be considered seriously as the College reviews the candidacy. Kindly respond within 7 days to **[insert email address]** by **[insert date]** to let us know whether or not you are able to perform this review.

Sincerely,

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: Sample Solicitation Letter to External Reviewers in Professional Settings----Modify as Appropriate

In certain disciplines, practitioner scholarship is a key component of a candidate's research profile. In these cases, the dean may wish to point this out to external reviewers by including the language in paragraph 4 below:

Dear X:

Assistant Professor Y is being considered for tenure [and/or promotion to associate professor] in the Department of Z at New York City College of Technology. [Please note that these are separate decisions under CUNY bylaws]. University policy provides that teaching, scholarship, and service to the institution are the primary criteria on which tenure decisions are based, while service to the profession and service to the public may be supplementary considerations. To aid us in our deliberations, the College solicits letters from outside referees who are selected on the basis of their ability to provide a qualitative assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creative activity, professional growth, and standing in their field. We would be grateful if you could assist us in this assessment process.

New York City College of Technology is a comprehensive college offering baccalaureate and associate degrees in a wide range of professional and career-focused areas, grounded on a strong liberal arts foundation. [In a number of disciplines, including ours, faculty may also be members of the doctoral faculty of the City University Graduate School.] The teaching load is generally three three-credit courses per semester but untenured faculty receive the equivalent of 8 three-credit courses in release time during their first five years. You may wish to take these factors into account as you assess Professor Y's record. However, our primary purpose in asking for your help is to evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarly and creative work, whether as a researcher or a practitioner.

It will be especially important for us to have an assessment of the character of the candidate's work and its relation to current thinking and practice in the field. In addition, where appropriate, we would appreciate your evaluation of the candidate writings/scholarly products - how well they fulfill their intention, and how much they contribute to scholarship or practice in the field.

To achieve tenure, it is expected that the candidate will present evidence of continued scholarly achievement and effectiveness in teaching since his/her original appointment, and the establishment of a reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline. Practitioner scholarship is the creation and translation of knowledge and expertise into professional practice. The dissemination of practitioner scholarship should include, but is not limited to, peer reviewed professional outlets (e.g., publications, presentations, and professional materials). Factors in evaluating a candidate for tenure or promotion must include demonstration of significant original work and the impact of the candidate's work on his or her professional field as supported by external review.

Attached please find for your review a curriculum vitae and samples of Professor Y's published/professional work as well as work in progress. In your evaluation, it would helpful if you would

comment on the potential for publication of the latter.. You may also wish to comment upon the standing of the presses or journals in which Professor Y's work has been published.

Please also include a statement as to whether you are personally acquainted with Professor Y, and if so, how and to what extent. The letter of evaluation you write is confidential and will **not** be shown to the candidate. Also, please include a copy of your CV. Appropriate departmental and college committees will consider your evaluation carefully.

On behalf of the President of New York City College of Technology, I want to thank you for undertaking this assessment of Professor Y's scholarly credentials. You may be assured that your evaluation will be considered seriously as the College reviews the candidacy. Kindly respond within 7 days to **[insert email address]** by **[insert date]** to let us know whether or not you are able to perform this review

Sincerely,

Based on Queens College letter as revised 7/10/14

For Tenure and Promotion to Professor: Sample Solicitation Letter to External Reviewers in Academic Settings----Modify as Appropriate

Dear X:

Associate Professor Y is being considered for promotion to professor in the Department of Z at New York City College of Technology. University policy provides that, “the candidate for professor must have a record of exceptional intellectual, educational or artistic achievement and an established reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in the discipline.” To aid us in our deliberations, the College solicits letters from outside referees who are selected on the basis of their ability to provide a qualitative assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creative activity, professional growth, and standing in their field. We would be grateful if you could assist us with this assessment process.

New York City College of Technology is a comprehensive college offering baccalaureate and associate degrees in a wide range of professional and career-focused areas, grounded on a strong liberal arts foundation. [In a number of disciplines, including ours, faculty may also be members of the doctoral faculty of the City University Graduate School.] The teaching load is generally three three-credit courses per semester but untenured faculty receive the equivalent of 8 three-credit courses in release time during their first five years. You may wish to take these factors into account as you assess Professor Y's record. However, our primary purpose in asking for your help is to evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarly and creative work.

It will be especially important for us to have an assessment of the character of his/her work and its relation to current scholarship in his/her discipline. In addition, we would appreciate your evaluation of his/her writings—scholarly products, how well they fulfill their intention, and how much they contribute to scholarship in the field.

To achieve tenure, it is expected that the candidate will present evidence of continued scholarly achievement and effectiveness in teaching since his/her original appointment, and the establishment of a reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline.

Attached please find for your review a curriculum vitae and copies of Professor Y's published work and work in progress. In your evaluation, it would be helpful if you would comment on the potential for publication of the latter. You may also wish to comment upon the standing of the presses or journals in which Professor Y's work has been published.

Please also include a statement as to whether you are personally acquainted with Professor Y, and if so, how and to what extent. The letter of evaluation you write is confidential and will **not** be shown to the candidate. Also, please include a copy of your CV. Appropriate departmental and college committees will consider your evaluation carefully.

On behalf of the President of New York City College of Technology, I want to thank you for undertaking this assessment of Professor Y's scholarly credentials. You may be assured that your evaluation will be considered seriously as the College reviews the candidacy. Kindly

respond within 7 day to **[insert email address]** by **[insert date]** to indicate whether or not you are able to perform this review.

Sincerely,

For Tenure and Promotion to Professor: Sample Solicitation Letter to External Reviewers in Professional Settings----Modify as Appropriate

In certain disciplines, practitioner scholarship is a key component of a candidate's research profile. In these cases, the dean may wish to point this out to external reviewers by including the language in paragraph 4 below:

Dear X:

Associate Professor Y is being considered for promotion to professor in the Department of Z at New York City College of Technology. University policy provides that, "the candidate for professor must have a record of exceptional intellectual, educational or artistic achievement and an established reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in the discipline." To aid us in our deliberations, the College solicits letters from outside referees who are selected on the basis of their ability to provide a qualitative assessment of the candidate's scholarship or creative activity, professional growth, and standing in their field. We would be grateful if you could assist us in this assessment process.

New York City College of Technology is a comprehensive college offering baccalaureate and associate degrees in a wide range of professional and career-focused areas, grounded on a strong liberal arts foundation. [In a number of disciplines, including ours, faculty may also be members of the doctoral faculty of the City University Graduate School.] The teaching load is generally three three-credit courses per semester but untenured faculty receive the equivalent of 8 three-credit courses in release time during their first five years. You may wish to take these factors into account as you assess Professor Y's record. However, our primary purpose in asking for your help is to evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarly and creative work, whether as a researcher or a practitioner.

It will be especially important for us to have an assessment of the character of the candidate's work and its relation to current thinking and practice in the field. In addition, where appropriate, we would appreciate your evaluation of the candidate writings/scholarly products - how well they fulfill their intention, and how much they contribute to scholarship or practice in the field.

To achieve tenure, it is expected that the candidate will present evidence of continued scholarly achievement and effectiveness in teaching since his/her original appointment, and the establishment of a reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline. Practitioner scholarship is the creation and translation of knowledge and expertise into professional practice. The dissemination of practitioner scholarship should include, but is not limited to, peer reviewed professional outlets (e.g., publications, presentations, and professional materials). Factors in evaluating a candidate for tenure or promotion must include demonstration of significant original work and the impact of the candidate's work on his or her professional field as supported by external review.

Attached please find for your review a curriculum vitae and samples of Professor Y's published/professional work as well as work in progress. In your evaluation, it would helpful if you would comment on the potential for publication of the latter. You may also wish to comment upon the standing of the presses or journals in which Professor Y's work has been published.

Please also include a statement as to whether you are personally acquainted with Professor Y, and if so, how and to what extent. The letter of evaluation you write is confidential and will **not** be shown to the candidate. Also, please include a copy of your CV. Appropriate departmental and college committees will consider your evaluation carefully.

On behalf of the President of New York City College of Technology, I want to thank you for undertaking this assessment of Professor Y's scholarly credentials. You may be assured that your evaluation will be considered seriously as the College reviews the candidacy. Kindly respond to **[insert email address]** by **[insert date]** to confirm whether you are able to perform this review within 7 days.

Sincerely,

Appendix D - CV Template



CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME

RECOMMENDATION FOR

APPOINTMENT

REAPPOINTMENT

PROMOTION

REAPPOINTMENT WITH TENURE

OTHER (Designation as Vice President, Dean, etc.)

CURRENT TITLE

DEPARTMENT

EFFECTIVE DATE

SALARY RATE

I. HIGHER EDUCATION

A. DEGREES

Institution	Dates Attended	Degree & Major	Date Conferred

B. ADDITIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION and/or EDUCATION IN PROGRESS

Institution	Dates	Degree or Certificate & Major	(Expected) Date Conferred

II. EXPERIENCE

A. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Institution	Department	Rank	Dates

B. OTHER EXPERIENCE

Institution	Department	Rank or title role	Dates

III. ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL HONORS

Honor or Award	Granting Institution	Date

IV. PUBLICATIONS/CREATIVE WORKS

A. REFEREED PUBLICATIONS/CREATIVE WORKS, PERFORMED OR EXHIBITED (Peer-reviewed works)

Publication Title (* indicate student co-authors)	Publisher/Venue	Date

--	--	--

B. OTHER PUBLICATIONS/ CREATIVE WORKS, PERFORMED OR EXHIBITED
 (Non-peer-reviewed works)

Title	Publisher/Venue	Date

V. UNPUBLISHED WORK (Supported by evidence, including unpublished PhD or Master’s Thesis)

A. WORKS ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION/EXHIBITION/PRODUCTION

Title	Publisher/Venue	Date of Acceptance

B. WORKS SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION, EXHIBITION or PRODUCTION

Title	Publisher/Venue	Date of Submission

VI. GRANTS AND SPONSORED PROGRAMS

A. External

Name of Grant	Funding Agency	Dollar Amount (direct costs/total)	Award Period (<u>underline</u> current awards)	Role (PI, Co-PI)

B. Internal (CUNY or PSC)

Name of Grant	Funding Agency	Dollar Amount (direct costs/total)	Award Period (<u>underline</u> current awards)	Role (PI, Co-PI)

VII. CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS AND INVITED LECTURES (Indicate invited lectures/presentations with *)

Title of Presentation/Lecture	Name and Location of Conference/Lecture	Date

VIII. SERVICE

A. COLLEGE SERVICE

Name of Committee or Project	Type of Service	Role (i.e. Chair)	Dates

B. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Name of Committee or Project	Type of Service	Role (i.e. Member)	Dates

C. COMMUNITY SERVICE: Include public service to the NYC community beyond the campus (e.g. mentoring of local high school students) and service to the community of your discipline (e.g. journal reviewing/editing, conference organizing)

Name of Organization or Project	Type of Service	Role	Dates

IX. MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

Name of Professional Organization	Membership Role (i.e. Board)	Dates

X. OTHER NOTABALE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

DATE SUBMITTED

Acknowledgements: These recommendations result from discussions with the department chairs and from a meeting of a subcommittee on External Evaluation on 2/28/2020 (Bonne August, John McCullough, Gerarda Shields, Maura Smale, David Smith) and further conversations with David Smith, Justin Vazquez-Poritz, Gerarda Shields, Reginald Blake, Kim Cardascia and Pamela Brown on 3/17/21 and an External Evaluation subcommittee of chairs – Maureen Archer and Douglas Davis, along with Dean Gerarda Shields, in consultation with all chairs, which met in March and April, 2021, as well as feedback from College Council membership at the April 2021 meeting.

Special thanks to all who contributed.