

## New York City College of Technology

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

### Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Process

*Adopted by the College Personnel & Budget Committee, 22 April 2010; revised, 29 September 2016*

#### **Introduction**

This document was developed to summarize guidance available to the faculty, both those serving on personnel committees and those considering or coming up for personnel actions, on the procedures, documentation, and assessment criteria involved in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process at New York City College of Technology. The organization and much of the language in this document follow closely a similar document developed at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, with changes made to accommodate the mission, governance plan, and academic program at New York City College of Technology. We acknowledge with appreciation the work of the faculty and administrators of John Jay College.

In the City University of New York, the procedures and assessment criteria involved in making academic personnel recommendations and decisions are governed by the Bylaws and Policies of the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York, including the Statement on Academic Personnel Practice of the City University of New York, and the Max-Kahn Memorandum. Nothing in these guidelines should be interpreted as contradicting CUNY Bylaws, policies, and procedures. The College Charter further defines the structure, composition, and responsibilities of the College governance bodies involved in the process, and the responsibilities of the college officials involved in each step of the process.

This document applies to members of the instructional staff in the following ranks: distinguished professor, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, distinguished lecturer, lecturer, chief college laboratory technician, senior college laboratory technician, and college laboratory technician.

All votes on personnel actions by the College Committee on Personnel and Budget are advisory to the President of the College.

## **Table of Contents**

### **I. The Candidate's File and the Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation**

- A. The File
- B. The Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation
- C. The Annual Evaluation Conference and the Annual Evaluation Conference Memorandum
- D. The Third Year Review by the Dean

### **II. The Personnel Process**

- A. General Guidance about the Process
- B. Department Appointments Committees
- C. Review Committees of the College Personnel & Budget Committee
- D. College Personnel & Budget Committee

### **III. Guidance for Candidates and the Committees**

- A. General Guidance for Candidates
- B. Teaching
- C. Scholarly and Professional Growth
- D. Service
- E. Lecturers and Instructors
- F. College Laboratory Technicians

### **IV. Timelines**

- A. General Guidance about the Timetable for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion
- B. General Timetable for Preparation of the Record

### **V. Resources**

#### **Appendix A/ CUNY Resources (Also available online from the OFSR Webpage)**

- 1. Bylaws of the Board of Trustees
- 2. Statement on Academic Personnel Practice of the City University of New York
- 3. Max-Kahn Memorandum

#### **Appendix B/ New York City College of Technology Resources**

- 1. Documents (Available online from the OFSR Webpage)
  - College Governance Plan
  - College Bylaws
- 2. Forms (Also available online from the OFSR Webpage)
  - Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation
  - Annual Evaluation
  - Candidate's Request for Personnel Action
  - Peer Committee Report Cover Page
  - Professional Development Plan

# I. The Candidate's File and the Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation

## A. The File

1. Before consideration for any personnel action, a candidate must submit to the Office of Faculty and Staff Relations (OFSR) an updated Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation (PARSE), which summarizes and evaluates professional activity. The PARSE should be submitted on an archival disk or as described in I.A.2./7. Candidates who intend to apply for promotion and/or fellowship leave or scholarly incentive award also submit a Candidate's Request for Personnel Action form (RPA) signed by the candidate and the department chair (Chair) and noted by the school dean (Dean) and the Provost.
2. The candidate must also submit to OFSR documentation, as indicated on the PARSE, for each item listed. **Items lacking documentation will not be considered.** For particularly voluminous files, the candidate may wish to include a table of contents. Candidates are encouraged to submit documentation in an appropriate digital format.
3. It is ultimately the responsibility of the candidate to put together the file so that it most accurately and positively reflects the case for an affirmative personnel action.
4. Candidates have the right at all times to review their file, with the exception of external letters of reference and evaluation, the actual vote counts, and any other materials excluded pursuant to CUNY policy.
5. Each year OFSR will set closing dates for the annual review in the spring and for the beginning of the review processes for reappointment and tenure and for promotion in the fall. Updated PARSE forms should be submitted and faculty files completed before the spring closing date for the annual evaluation conference with the Chair, at which point the file is closed. Such additions are generally limited to material not available at the time of the annual evaluation and that augments an item reported as in progress (e.g., acceptance of an article or funding of a grant proposal identified as submitted). Candidates who wish to add updated information to their files during the period between the completion date for the annual evaluations in the spring and the date stipulated for the review process to begin in the fall must submit the material to OFSR by the latter date and inform their Chair in writing. See Paragraph II.A.5 for procedures to follow in the event that information potentially seriously adverse to the candidate is raised.
6. When a file is closed for the review process, additions and changes to the file are not permitted except in exceptional circumstances (such as a filing error that would materially affect the accuracy of the record). Such additions or changes require the permission of the Provost, the recommendation of the Chair, and the consent of the candidate signified by the candidate's initials on the document to be added. The Dean should be informed. Additional information received for the files that is not added is retained by OFSR for addition after consideration of the current personnel action is complete. The file reopens once the current personnel action is complete as reflected in a documented action by the President.
7. The general organization of candidate files is determined by the Provost in consultation with the OFSR Director, and may change from time to time based on evolving policies, procedures, operations, and technologies. However, there shall always be a confidential section or sections of the files as described in I.A.4. above.

## B. The Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation (PARSE)

1. The Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation (PARSE) is the principal record of a faculty member's accomplishments during each academic year and cumulatively. It was developed for the faculty to demonstrate general progress in the three principal areas of teaching, scholarly and professional growth, and service, and serves as the basis for the annual evaluation. All full-time faculty members will submit a PARSE annually, in time for the preparation of the annual evaluation. Tenured full professors will submit an updated PARSE at least every three years.

In addition, the PARSE provides faculty members who are candidates for personnel actions with an instrument to present to departmental and College review committees, outlining their contributions. More fully than the CV, the PARSE provides an opportunity to explain these contributions with special emphasis on contributions while at New York City College of Technology (NYCCT).

- Tenure-track faculty members at NYCCT develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP) during the first year of service, in consultation with the Chair and noted/ reviewed by the Dean. Candidates for a first reappointment (reappointment for a second year) prepare a PDP prior to the vote on reappointment for a second year. They also prepare a preliminary PARSE to be used for the first annual evaluation.
  - For subsequent reappointment and tenure reviews, the PARSE provides a means of documenting progress toward achieving the goals and targets that are described in the PDP, as well as providing an opportunity to explain changes to the PDP.
2. The PARSE shall first list only those materials since the initial appointment at New York City College of Technology (Section 18A). Faculty members shall also list works released before their tenure track employment at NYCCT, but these must be listed separately in a section following works released while at NYCCT. Candidates for promotion shall clearly identify and first list materials released since attaining their current rank. Materials released prior to their last promotion (or appointment to current rank) shall be listed separately (Section 18B).
  3. The "Publication and Production" category should be divided and clearly labeled as follows (**This list is not exhaustive; other categories should be used, as needed, to identify candidates' professional production or publication within the context of their disciplines**). Departments are encouraged to identify forms of publication and production, as well as the forms of peer-review, pertinent to their fields. The University Bylaws require "evidence that his/her alertness and intellectual energy are respected outside his/her own immediate academic community."
    - Articles—refereed scholarly journals (print or online)
    - Articles—non-refereed scholarly journals (print or online)
    - Articles—non-scholarly print or online publications (i.e., magazines, newsletters, non-scholarly journals, etc.)
    - Books—peer-reviewed scholarly
    - Books—edited
    - Books—other
    - Book chapters—peer-reviewed
    - Conference presentations—peer-reviewed
    - Conference presentations—not peer-reviewed

- Creative works in peer-reviewed literary journals
- Creative peer-reviewed work in other venues (e.g., performances, exhibitions, etc.)
- Custom-published works/ self-published works (must be so identified)
- Encyclopedia articles
- Grant awards, scholarly and educational (See III.C.2.b.)<sup>1</sup>
- Law review articles
- Patents allowed and pending
- Reports (in-house, for agencies, etc.)
- Reprints, performances, or translations of one's work
- Reviews
- Translations
- Other scholarly, technological, or creative/professional works

*\*Within each sub-category, material shall be listed in chronological order, with the most recent works first. All citations shall be complete, including page numbers. **It is the responsibility of the candidate to make sure that the PARSE has proper citations.***

**Documentation is required for any item to be considered. As per I.A.2./5. above, documentation must be deposited in OFSR before the file is closed.**

**For non-print works**, documentation in the form of audio or video recordings, visual presentations, etc. should be made available in appropriate format to OFSR. OFSR will make these accessible by providing the necessary equipment to the members of review committees or the College P&B.

**E-publications and Web-based materials:** When e-publications conform to the categories listed above, the candidate should provide a link or URL. When digital materials must be viewed electronically, OFSR will arrange opportunities for review.

4. The Self-Evaluation section of the PARSE should be complete but concise, normally limited to 3 pages or fewer, single-spaced. The candidate's statement may address, but is not limited to, the following topics as appropriate to his or her case:
  - The candidate's activities and accomplishments during the previous year, and how those activities and accomplishments contribute to the success of the department and the College;
  - The candidate's accomplishments in the three areas of evaluation presented in section III herein: teaching, scholarly and creative/professional growth, and service;
  - How the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative/professional work satisfies departmental or disciplinary criteria explained in section III.C.1.c.;
  - Extraordinary circumstances;
  - Significant aspects of service, research, scholarship, creative/professional work, or teaching which a reviewer might not otherwise understand;
  - When the candidate is being considered for reappointment, an explanation of the relationship to the candidate's PDP for the remaining years before tenure consideration; and
  - When a candidate is being considered for tenure or promotion, a summary of accomplishments and contributions since initial appointment at NYCCT or since the last promotion.

---

<sup>1</sup> Major grant awards are considered a significant contribution to the college.

5. Faculty members will submit the PARSE to their department chair in advance of the annual evaluation conference, observing the closing date set by OFSR. Once any agreed upon changes have been made and the evaluation signed, candidates will submit the PARSE directly to the OFSR office.

### **C. The Annual Evaluation Conference and the Annual Evaluation Conference Memorandum**

1. Pursuant to Article 18.3 of the PSC Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), at least once a year, each employee other than tenured full professors shall have an evaluation conference with the department chairperson or a member of the Department Appointments Committee to be assigned by the Chair. Tenured full professors may be evaluated. At the conference, the employee's total academic performance and professional progress for that year and cumulatively to date shall be reviewed. **The PARSE, in which the faculty member records general progress in the three principal areas of teaching, scholarly and professional growth, and service, as represented in his or her file, serves as the basis for the annual evaluation.** Following this conference, the Chair or the assigned member of the Department Appointments Committee shall prepare a record of the discussion in memorandum form for inclusion in the employee's personnel file. Within ten (10) working days after the conference, a copy of the memorandum shall be given to the employee. If the overall evaluation is unsatisfactory, the memorandum shall so state. The employee in such case shall have the right to endorse on the memorandum a request to appear in person before the Department Appointments Committee.
2. In assessing the employee's total academic performance and professional progress, the Chair or evaluator may include the following topics and issues:
  - The candidate's activities and accomplishments during the previous year, and how those activities and accomplishments contribute to the success of the department and the College;
  - The candidate's accomplishments in the three areas of evaluation presented in section III herein: teaching, scholarship and creative/professional work, and service;
  - How the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative/professional work satisfies departmental or disciplinary criteria explained in section III.C.1.c.;
  - Extraordinary circumstances;
  - Observations related to the guidance in section III.A. General Guidance for Candidates;
  - Significant aspects of service, research, scholarship, creative/ professional work, or teaching which a reviewer might not otherwise understand;
  - When the candidate is being considered for reappointment, an explanation of the relationship to the candidate's PDP for the remaining years before tenure consideration.

#### **D. The Third Year Review by the Dean**

Effective March 2011, the CUNY Board of Trustees adopted a policy requiring a review of each faculty member at the end of his or her third year of service “In order to ensure that each tenure-track faculty member has adequate guidance on the progress s/he is making towards meeting the standards for tenure. “ As implemented at New York City College of Technology, the procedure has the following steps:

1. The school dean (Dean) reviews the PARSE and personnel file of each untenured tenure-track faculty member in the spring of his/her third year of service, following the annual evaluation conducted pursuant to the PSC/CUNY collective bargaining agreement.
2. The Dean meets with the chairperson of the faculty member’s department to discuss the faculty member’s progress.
3. The Dean prepares a memorandum to the Chair regarding the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and setting forth recommendations for any additional guidance to be provided to the faculty member.
4. The Dean’s memorandum is provided to the faculty member and discussed with him/her by the Chair and the Dean. Following the meeting, the Dean may, where appropriate, attach an addendum to the memorandum based on the Dean’s participation in the meeting or the Chair’s report of the meeting to the Dean. In accordance with the procedures set forth in the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the Professional Staff Congress, the faculty member shall be asked to initial the Dean’s memorandum and addendum, if any, before it is placed in his/her file, and the faculty member shall have the right to include in his/her personnel file any comments s/he has concerning the Dean’s memorandum.

## II. The Personnel Process

### A. General Guidelines about the Process

1. Recommendations to the President regarding the reappointment, tenure, and promotion of academic personnel are made by the College Personnel & Budget Committee (P&B), following recommendations made at the department level and by College review committees. The College P&B consists of the chairs of the academic departments and the Provost. The Executive Director of OFSR serves as secretary to the committee.
2. Review Committees for reappointment and tenure are composed of department chairs elected by the College P&B. The composition of Review Committees for promotion to the ranks of associate professor and professor is discussed in section C. below.
3. Those portions of all meetings of Departmental, Review, and College P&B Committees at which personnel actions are discussed are considered confidential. Members of the committees should be aware that discussing candidates outside such meetings is not permitted and is considered by the College to constitute misconduct. The Max-Kahn Memorandum states, with respect to confidentiality:

*We likewise believe that it would be professional misconduct for a member of a P&B committee to disclose the substance or even the nature of the discussion at the P&B meeting. As far as the actions of a Department and/or its committees in respect to a candidate are concerned, only the Chairman of the Department should be empowered to discuss these actions with a candidate. As far as the actions of the college P&B committee, with respect to a candidate are concerned, only the president of the college or his designee should be empowered to discuss these actions with a candidate.*

4. The OFSR file is the official file. Those participating in the review of a candidate at any level (Departmental, Review Committee, College P&B) are expected to make their assessments on the basis of the official file. Only information contained in a candidate's official file shall be considered in committee discussions or used in the evaluation of a candidate at any level, whether by the Departmental, Review, or College P&B Committees.
5. Adding material to the file once it is closed.  
Supporting material: Once a file is closed, with the exception of additional supporting material pursuant to sections I.A.5-6., the Departmental, Review, or College P&B committees shall not consider any materials outside of those contained in the employee's personnel and administrative files.

Potentially seriously adverse material: Should it happen that a member of a committee becomes aware of any potentially seriously adverse information or materials, such as a complaint about an employee not contained in the personnel file, s/he shall immediately bring the matter to the attention of the Chair, who shall contact the College's legal designee for guidance as to whether the information should be placed in the file and what procedure if any should be followed.



6. Members of any Departmental, Review, or College P & B committee must recuse themselves from any deliberation or vote where their participation might reasonably create an impression that the candidate would improperly influence him or her or unduly enjoy his or her favor, or that the committee member is affected by the kinship, rank, position, or influence of the candidate or any party or person.
7. The specific votes taken in a candidate's case, whether at the Department Appointments Committee, a Review Committee of the P&B, or at the College P&B, shall not be discussed with or disclosed to the candidate or any other person not having official access to the record of the case.

## **B. Department Committees**

The first vote in a personnel action is the responsibility of a departmental committee. All votes are based on a review and discussion of the candidate's file. Each member of the Department Appointments Committee and the department Peer Committee is obligated to review the entire official file of the candidate, as well as the PARSE. The official file is in OFSR. At the departmental level, the procedure for reappointment, certification, and tenure differs from that followed for promotions.

### **1. Reappointment, Certification, or Tenure—Department Appointments Committee**

- a. Department Appointments Committees meet in early September to vote on a candidate's reappointment, certification, or tenure. (Reappointment for the second year is voted on in the spring of the first year).
- b. Department Appointments Committees shall not meet with the candidates except when the candidate is exercising a contractual right (Section 18.2.a. of CBA) to meet with the committee in regard to an unsatisfactory evaluation. See section I.C.1. above.
- c. As soon as possible, the Chair (or a designated member of the Committee) will inform the candidate as to whether the Department Appointments Committee vote was negative or positive. Actual vote counts shall not be communicated to the candidate. No other member of the Committee is to discuss the Committee action with the candidate and it is not appropriate for candidates to request such discussion with any members of the Committee. The Chair shall be available to the candidate for guidance about the process.
- d. The department vote, noted by the Dean, is sent to OFSR via a transmittal form and becomes incorporated into the candidate's file for the next committee level, the Review Committee. OFSR will notify the Provost of the department vote. Department Committees should meet according to the schedule in IV.B. so that the work of the Review Committee(s) will not be delayed.

### **2. Promotion**

- a. At the beginning of each academic year, the Director of OFSR issues a personnel calendar posted on the OFSR Webpage as the Instructional Staff Calendar, which includes deadline dates for the promotion process. OFSR also sends to each Chair a listing of those faculty members eligible to apply for promotion and will notify each eligible candidate. Any individual who does not receive notification and questions the eligibility listing should contact the Director of OFSR.

- b. Faculty members indicate the wish to be considered for promotion by submitting a PARSE updated to reflect the cumulative record. The PARSE, updated annually, will contain a summary of all activity since the candidate's last promotion or since appointment to the rank of assistant professor. The candidate must submit the PARSE on an archival disk or as otherwise directed by the Provost. The PARSE is accompanied by a Candidate's Request for Personnel Action form (RPA) signed by their Chair and noted by their Dean and the Provost. This action will constitute a request that the candidate's career at New York City College of Technology to date, as reflected in the PARSE and supported by documentation, be reviewed and evaluated for that purpose. Applications of candidates as well as the required evaluations must be filed with OFSR by the announced deadline dates.

The candidate for promotion must also submit to OFSR by the posted deadline documentation for each item listed on the PARSE. A teaching portfolio is also required. **Items lacking documentation will not be considered.**

#### REVIEW PROCESS—Departmental level

At New York City College of Technology, the promotion process to the senior ranks originates with an evaluation by the departmental peer committee. For promotion to the rank of professor, the peer committee is composed of all full professors in the department; for promotion to the rank of associate professor, the committee consists of all associate and full professors in the department. The following procedures are to be followed at the departmental level:

##### **A. Department Chairs:**

1. have all eligible candidates observed during the fall semester, review the observations with the candidates within a three week period, and prepare the appropriate memoranda;
2. determine from the candidates whether they wish to appear before the peer committee;
3. consult with the school dean prior to the peer committee's evaluation of the candidate;
4. convene the peers to discuss each candidate and to elect a representative to be interviewed by the ad hoc promotion committee of the College P&B;
5. hold a conference with each candidate to discuss the Peer Committee Report and minority report (if any) and reflect the discussion in a memorandum signed by the Chair and candidate, a copy of which should be given to the candidate. The Chair will inform the candidate that if there are discrepancies regarding matters of fact, the candidate has the opportunity to attach a rebuttal.
6. submit the reports, observations and memoranda together with the name(s) of the elected peer(s) to the Director of OFSR via the Dean by the posted deadline date.

## B. Peer Committee

1. It is the peer committee's responsibility to evaluate each candidate using the Bylaws of the University Board of Trustees performance criteria for promotion:

*For appointment as or promotion (for instructors appointed prior to October 1, 1968) to **assistant professor**, the candidate must have demonstrated satisfactory qualities of personality and character, evidence of significant success as a teacher, interest in productive scholarship or creative achievement and willingness to cooperate with others for the good of the institution. He/she must also have obtained the ph.d. degree, or an equivalent degree, in an accredited university except that persons holding positions on December 31, 1975 as assistant professors or instructors in the community colleges shall have a master's degree and four years of appropriate teaching, technological, or industrial experience or the ph.d. degree. In the libraries, for promotion to or appointment as assistant professor, the candidate must, in addition to the requirements of instructor, have completed a doctorate or an additional master's degree and in exceptional cases some other logical combination of two years' graduate study or more beyond the bachelor's degree.*

*For promotion to the rank of **associate professor**, the candidate must possess a record of significant achievement in his/her field or profession, and evidence that his/her alertness and intellectual energy are respected outside his/her immediate academic community. There must be evidence of continued growth and effectiveness in teaching, service to the department /college/ university /community and professional relationships with colleagues.*

*For promotion to the rank of **professor**, in addition to the qualifications for associate professor, the candidate must possess a record of exceptional intellectual, educational or artistic achievement and an established reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline.*

*For **non-teaching faculty** the candidate must possess a record of significant achievement in his/her profession and evidence that his/her competence and achievements are recognized and respected outside his/her own immediate community.*

2. The peer committee's evaluations should result in a written report and vote prepared by the peer committee in the presence of the file. All members of the committee sign the report.
3. In those instances where a candidate makes application for promotion and does not fit the above model, the following procedures will apply:
  - a. Where the Chair is the only peer in the department, the Dean shall act as a second peer, with the department peer writing the report;
  - b. Where the Chair makes application and there are no other peers, the evaluation is performed by the Dean;

- c. Where the Chair makes application and there is only one peer, the Dean and the peer constitute the evaluating body with the peer writing the report;
  - d. Where the Chair makes application and there are two or more peers, the Dean convenes the peer committee, an election is held for a peer's chair, the Dean leaves, and the peer committee evaluates all candidates with the peer's chair writing the report;
  - e. Where the Chair does not make application and is not a peer, the Chair convenes the peers, participates in the evaluative discussions but does not vote.
4. In the case of consideration for promotion, if the vote of the department is not affirmative, the candidate must decide and inform the Chair as to whether to proceed with consideration of the case by the ad hoc committee for promotion of the College Personnel & Budget Committee.

### **C. Review Committees of the College Committee on Personnel & Budget (P&B)**

Following action by Department Appointments Committees/ Peer committees, candidates' files are subject to review by the Review Committees of the College Committee on Personnel & Budget.

1. Review Committees are subcommittees of the College Committee on Personnel & Budget. Subject to C.3. below. Review Committees are formed to address reappointment, tenure, promotion, waivers and equivalencies, and fellowship leave.
2. Formation of Review Committees.
  - a. At its first meeting of the academic year, the College P&B elects from among its members, those who will serve on all review committees except those on promotion.
  - b. During the fall semester, the President makes assignments to the ad hoc promotion committees. There shall be two committees, an Ad Hoc Committee for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and an Ad Hoc Committee for Promotion to the Rank of Professor. The College Governance Plan provides that these ad hoc committees shall consist of five or six members. Each ad hoc committee includes at least two department chairs, one of whom serves as the committee chair. In assigning faculty to the committees, the President shall to the degree possible ensure that each committee reflects diversity of disciplinary perspectives and provides for reasonable rotation of committee assignments. Members who do not hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor shall not be assigned to the Promotion Review Committee for Associate Professor; members who do not hold the rank of Professor shall not be assigned to the Promotion Review Committee for Professor.
3. Multiple actions. When a candidate is coming up for two actions, e.g., reappointment and promotion, or tenure and promotion, the two actions will be considered completely separately with no communication between the two relevant Review Committees.
4. General Guidelines for Review Committees. The consideration of the candidate at the Review Committee shall be an independent one, based solely on the candidate's file and without

consultation or discussion with anyone else on or off the committee except as provided for in the procedure.

- a. All members of a Review Committee are obligated to review the files of all candidates who come before the Committee.
- b. Any discussion of the action or the candidate outside of a Review Committee constitutes a breach of confidentiality. If any problems or questions arise from a study of the material in the file, these should be presented only at the Review Committee and not discussed beforehand.

5. Reappointment, Certification, and Tenure.

- a. Chairs of candidates being considered by the Review Committee will be alerted by the Review Committee Chair to be available in case they are needed to provide information to the Committee. If any member of the Review Committee needs questions answered or points clarified about any candidate, the Chair of the candidate's department will be invited to appear before the committee. When the candidate him/herself is the Chair, the Department Appointments Committee shall elect one of its members to appear in lieu of the Chair.
- b. The Chair of a candidate's department, whether a member of the Review Committee or called in by the Committee, will not make a presentation to the Review Committee, nor be present for discussion of the candidate by the Review Committee. A candidate's Chair, or at-large member from the candidate's department if a member of the Review Committee, will be asked to leave the room during the discussion of his or her department's candidate, and s/he will not vote on the candidate. In the case of joint appointments, this will apply to both Chairs.
- c. As soon as possible, but in any case prior to the next meeting at which the candidate will be considered, the Chair of the Review Committee will inform the candidate's Chair as to the Review Committee's vote and the substance of the discussion including the issues raised.
- d. As soon as possible, the candidate's Chair will inform the candidate as to whether the Review Committee outcome was positive or negative. Actual vote counts shall not be communicated to the candidate. No other member of the Committee is to discuss the Review Committee action with the candidate and it is not appropriate for candidates to request such discussion with any members of the Committee. The candidate's Chair shall be available to the candidate for guidance about the process.

6. Promotion.

- a. During the spring semester, the ad hoc committees for promotion review all applications, personnel files and relevant materials and interview candidates, elected peers, school deans, the provost and department chairs. In addition, the committees, at their discretion, may call upon anyone either within or outside of the College to assist in their evaluations. The committees will forward their reports to the President prior to their being presented to the College P&B late in the spring semester.
  - 1) A candidate will be considered recommended with a vote of 5-1 or 4-1. That is, for a candidate to be considered recommended there must be a minimum of five positive votes (for a 6 member committee) or four positive votes (from a 5 member committee).

- 2) In cases where a committee member is a member of the same department as the candidate, the committee member will recuse him/herself from the interviewing and voting processes. A candidate will then be considered recommended with a vote of 4-1 or 3-1 (four positive votes from a five-member committee or three positive votes from a four-member committee).

#### **D. College Personnel & Budget Committee**

1. All personnel actions are submitted to the College Personnel & Budget Committee (P&B) for a vote. Office of Faculty and Staff Relations shall send notices of meeting dates and the list of candidates to all members.
2. The Process of Consideration of Candidates.
  - a. Departmental and Presidential initial appointment actions are reported to the College P&B in a report that is periodically updated and circulated to the members. On request by any member, a case will be placed on the agenda of the College P&B for further consideration.
  - b. In any case where tenure reciprocity (based on tenure earned at another academic institution) is to be granted with the initial appointment, the candidate's CV will be circulated. On request by any member, the appointment will be placed on the agenda of the College P&B for consideration and vote.
  - c. Every candidate is reviewed and voted upon every year until tenure is decided. The following table summarizes the modes and schedules on consideration. In the table on the next page, the following terms are used:
    - **Service year:** The year of service for the candidate during which the action is considered. For example, during the second year a candidate is considered for reappointment for the third year.
    - **Appointment year:** The year of service for the candidate that the action pertains to. For example, during the second year a candidate for reappointment for third year.
    - **Presentation:** The candidate's department chair or one or more members of the review committee (for a candidate in which there is a full review) will make an oral presentation of the case based on the official record. Committee members are also expected to have individually reviewed the official record of the case known as the candidate's file. The file is located in OFSR.
    - **Vote:** At the department, review committee (ad hoc reappointment) and College Personnel & Budget Committee levels, actions are always based on a confidential-ballot vote.

<b>7 year tenure clock- [All reviews are done in context of PDP]</b>	
Service year	
Spring of 1 <sup>st</sup> yr	Departmental review (vote by department appointments committee) Professional Development Plan (PDP) approved Vote on reappointment for 2 <sup>nd</sup> year by College P&B First PARSE submitted, prior to annual evaluation
Fall of 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr	Departmental review Vote on reappointment for 3 <sup>rd</sup> year by College P&B
Fall of 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr	<b>Full Review/ Presentation by ad hoc reappointment committee of P&amp;B</b> questions→Letter of guidance +Full review at 4 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
Spring of 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr	Review by School Dean
Fall of 4 <sup>th</sup> yr	Departmental review, P&B vote [possible full review]
Fall of 5 <sup>th</sup> yr	<b>Full Review/ Presentation by ad hoc committee</b> questions→Letter of guidance +Full review at 6 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
Fall of 6 <sup>th</sup> yr	Departmental review, P&B vote [If letter of guidance at 5 <sup>th</sup> year reap.→ Full Review]
Fall of 7 <sup>th</sup> yr	<b>Full Review/ Presentation by ad hoc committee</b> Tenure vote
Fall of 8 <sup>th</sup> yr	<b>Tenure begins</b>

3. Candidates for action within each group are presented in department alphabetical order, and by alphabetical order within each department. However, exceptions to this order may be made with the agreement of the Committee. For second and fourth year reappointments and for sixth year reappointments where there has been no letter of guidance, the department Chair presents the candidate. For third and fifth year reappointments and for sixth year reappointments when there has been a letter of guidance for year five, a member of the appropriate Review Committee first summarizes the discussion of the Review Committee, after which the candidate's Chair is invited to add remarks. When the candidate for a personnel action is a department Chair, the candidate may select any other faculty member of the College Personnel & Budget Committee or the School Dean to act in lieu of the Chair in presenting the candidate's credentials to the College P&B.
4. Faculty members of the College P&B who hold the rank of Assistant Professor, or a lower rank, may not vote on candidates for promotion to Professor.
5. An absolute majority (50 percent +1) of those eligible to vote is required for an affirmative recommendation to the President.
6. Notification of Candidates: Candidates will be notified by their department Chairs of the decision of the College P&B; the candidate is not to be told the actual vote.
7. Promotion and/or early tenure candidates may withdraw at any point in the personnel process. Early tenure candidates who receive a negative vote at any stage in the consideration of their candidacy shall be voted on a second time on the question of their reappointment. When a candidate withdraws, votes taken up to that point remain part of the file.

8. Ultimately, the College Personnel & Budget Committee's recommendations for reappointment, tenure, certification and promotion are approved or disapproved by the President, who decides which recommendations to forward to the CUNY Board of Trustees. The final decision is that of the Board of Trustees.
9. Candidates for reappointment, certification, and tenure must be notified of the President's recommendation by the first of December. The President will make his/her final recommendations regarding promotion known to the candidates and the College community before the promotions take effect on September 1st.
10. Appeals process: Candidates who are denied reappointment, tenure, certification, or promotion have the right to appeal to the Appeals Committee or directly to the President. Candidates not recommended for promotion will meet with their Chair and Dean early in the fall semester and prior to the beginning of the next promotion process so that the substance of the ad hoc committee's report relative to their candidacy may be shared with them. A record of this meeting will be summarized in a memorandum and placed in the candidate's personnel file.
11. When the President is unavailable for a scheduled meeting of the College Personnel & Budget Committee, the Provost shall preside in her/his place.



### **III. Guidance for Candidates and the Committees**

#### **A. General Guidance for Candidates**

The Criteria used in making personnel recommendations are governed by the *Bylaws and policies of the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York*, including the *Statement on Academic Personnel Practice* of the City University of New York and the Max-Kahn Memorandum. Nothing in these guidelines should be interpreted as contradicting CUNY Bylaws, policies, and procedures. The purpose of this section is to summarize guidance to the faculty, both those on personnel review committees (including departmental appointments committees and peer committees and the College Personnel & Budget Committee or its subcommittees and ad hoc committees) and those considering or coming up for personnel actions, on the factors they should take into account in demonstrating and assessing whether the criteria have been met.

Demonstrating professional and collegial behavior is a material factor in the assessment of a candidate's case. The Bylaws of the University (Section 11.7.B) state: "*...the candidate must have demonstrated satisfactory qualities of personality and character, ability to teach successfully, interest in productive scholarship or creative achievement and willingness to cooperate with others for the good of the institution.*"

With respect to longevity and seniority as a factor in promotion, it is not the length of time in rank, but rather the quality of work since the last promotion that is germane. The Bylaws of the University (Section 11.7.B) state: "*Longevity and seniority alone shall not be sufficient for promotion.*"

For the first and second-year reappointments, candidates are expected to have made some progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure relative to their time of service at the College. For third and subsequent reappointments, candidates are expected to have made significant progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure relative to their time of service at the College. The Professional Development Plan, developed by the faculty member and the department chair and reviewed by the school dean, should provide direction for the way in which the faculty member will fulfill the requirements.

In individual cases, extraordinary performance in one or more areas can sometimes be considered as compensating for lesser and perceived lesser contributions in another area; however, there must be evidence of contribution in each area.

#### **B. Teaching**

1. The two formal measures most frequently used in evaluating teaching effectiveness are student evaluations and departmental peer observations. A Teaching Portfolio is required for promotion and faculty members are strongly encouraged to include it in the Professional Development Plan. In addition, committees may wish to consider other evidence relating to a candidate's success in teaching. Activities that may be presented in making the case for clear evidence of the individual's ability and diligence as a teacher (for the granting of tenure), continued effectiveness in teaching (for

promotion to associate professor), or an established reputation for excellence in teaching (for appointment to full professor), include, but are not limited to, the criteria discussed below:

- Developing new and well-received courses and innovative pedagogy (relevant syllabi should be included in the file). In evaluations for tenure and promotion, a candidate's instructional material and techniques are considered to be scholarly work when they incorporate new ideas or scholarly research. Otherwise they are examined within the criteria of teaching;
- Exhibiting teaching range and vitality by the number and variety of courses taught;
- Participation in a learning community, team-teaching, or other inter-disciplinary collaborations;
- Attending and participating in faculty development programs, especially when these are related to specific goals for development as a teacher and when the results or outcomes are demonstrable;
- Sponsoring of students for awards, scholarships, student competitions or inclusion of writing in *City Tech Writer*;
- Advising for CUNY BA, honors, or independent studies (independent study and honors papers or projects are to be available in the candidate's Teaching Portfolio);
- Receiving professional recognition for teaching in the form of awards, professional honors;
- Seeking grants promoting research opportunities for students and addressing student concerns (grant application/narrative must be in the file);
- Advising students (beyond major advisors who receive release time for this);
- Participating in the programs offered through the Faculty Commons;
- Mentoring and supervision of adjuncts;
- Mentoring students in scholarly, scientific, and professional activities;
- Development of effective techniques for teaching and educational support (results or assessments should be included);
- Contributing to publication in pedagogical journals; outreach to other educational institutions; demonstrating the use of outcomes assessment strategies to measure student learning;
- Creative/innovative use and incorporation of technology in teaching or teaching online; and
- Teaching that supports the initiatives of the College.

2. Department Chairs are encouraged to incorporate factors such as these, when applicable, in annual evaluations as one way of making them part of the candidate's personnel file.

3. Factors that might negatively affect a personnel action and suggest that a candidate needs to pay more attention to his/her teaching are:

- Persistent low student evaluations of teaching (SET) or repeated complaints by students;
- Persistent low student performance;
- Inattention to persistent problems in teaching;
- Being unavailable to students during posted office hours;
- Failure to observe and enforce safe and compliant practice in laboratories;
- A record of coming late to class, leaving early, giving finals early etc. as this is registered in writing to the Chair or Dean; and

- Late submission of grades, attendance rosters, or other required documentation, or inattention to incomplete grades;
  - Lack of co-operation meeting departmental scheduling needs.
4. Grade reports: To help inform discussion of student evaluation scores of faculty, grade distribution statistics for all faculty should be available for reference by all personnel review committees.

### C. Scholarly and Professional Growth

#### 1. General Criteria

- a. The departments at NYCCT span a wide variety of disciplines and professional fields. In disciplines where research/publication are the norm, such research/publication is expected to be related to the candidate's field, and make a contribution to scholarship. In the creative, educational, and career fields, as per the CUNY Bylaws, forms of excellence other than scholarly print publication are recognized. The key factor in evaluating a candidate's scholarly and professional growth is review by those in the field or profession from outside the candidate's "own immediate academic community" at a degree of rigor comparable to that in peer-reviewed academic publication.
  - b. Publications submitted in support of an application are to be in published form (with the exceptions for creative artists noted above), or in galleys or page proofs. Works not at this stage should not be listed as publications, but as Works in Progress. (For a journal article, if galleys are not available, an acceptance letter from the editor of the journal would be acceptable, along with a copy of the text). For non-print works, documentation should be provided in an appropriate format to OFSR.
  - c. It is recognized that different disciplines have different criteria by which to assess excellence, such as the role of multiple authorship and the length of articles, or the value and nature of the candidate's artistic works. It is the responsibility of the candidate's Chair, in developing the annual evaluation, to assess how the candidate's research and scholarship satisfies criteria of the candidate's department and discipline.
  - d. General criteria for promotion to **Associate Professor** are stated in the CUNY Bylaws: In addition to the qualifications required of an Assistant Professor, an Associate Professor must "possess a record of significant achievement in his/her field or profession, or as a college or university administrator. There shall be evidence that his/her alertness and intellectual energy are respected outside his/her own immediate academic community."
  - e. General criteria for promotion to **Full Professor** are stated in the CUNY Bylaws: The CUNY Bylaws require of a Full Professor, a "record of exceptional intellectual, educational, or artistic achievement and an established reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline." The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that excellence by a substantial and ongoing quantity and quality of research/publication.
2. Guidelines for judging scholarship: The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate the significance of her/his contributions in the PARSE Self-Evaluation section.

- a. A scholarly book, based on original research. To assess the quality of the scholarship put forth by the candidate, the following will serve as guidelines for evaluation:
- The topic of the publication is significant to the academic community or the discipline involved.
  - The research is original and/or the work contains new (original) ideas or significant new interpretations.
  - The work meets appropriate scholarly standards: surveys the literature, uses serious methodology, contains complex ideas, moves the field or discipline ahead.
  - The publisher has a reputation for scholarly publishing and subjects manuscripts to a pre-publication review process.
  - While the length of a piece of work is not, by itself, an indication of quality, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that his/her body of work is “substantial.”
  - Scholarly or professional reviews, citations of work in the discipline, and scholarly funding are several ways of judging scholarly contribution. If a book has received reviews, either pre- or post-publication, these should be part of the candidate’s file. Similarly, citations of one’s work may be noted, both in the self-evaluation part of the PARSE and, if desired, in an addendum to the PARSE called Citations.

If a scholarly funding agency, a government or private grant, or a practitioner group has funded the work, at any stage, this should be noted in the candidate’s file.

- b. Candidates may demonstrate that they have established a reputation for scholarship, as required by the CUNY By-laws, in a variety of ways by publications other than a scholarly book. Guidelines regarding quality will be the same as those asked about a book. For full professor, in terms of quantity, the equivalent of several substantial scholarly pieces since the last promotion is a general guideline. For associate professor, the expectation is less demanding. Work considered appropriate in this category might include but not be limited to:
- Book chapters;
  - A co-authored book (The nature of the candidate’s contribution or a description of the collaborative effort should be clearly stated in the file);
  - Scholarly articles (substantial articles published in journals in the candidate’s field with a national reputation and external review process);
  - Edited books (nature of the editing should be clearly stated and address the questions of originality of conception, editor’s role in conceptualizing the project, integration of the articles with an introduction, extensive editing, etc.);
  - Textbooks in the candidate’s field (The appropriate weight given to a textbook can be established through evidence in the form of either pre- or post-publication reviews attesting to the book’s quality, demonstrated familiarity with the literature in the field, and/or innovative approaches and/or through a record of adoptions of the text by significant academic institutions and/or inclusion in major university libraries and/or through publication of later editions.);
  - Scholarly and educational grant applications (information on the outcome of the applications, and the narratives from the application should be included in the file. For applications that were not funded, the candidate may wish to supply positive reviews);

- Juried shows, reviewed performances, or awards in professional competitions;
  - Patents;
  - Other evidence of professional or creative work that meet an established standard of professional accomplishment. Departments are encouraged to articulate standards of professional accomplishment appropriate to their fields.
- c. In addition to the above, other evidence of scholarly, professional, or creative achievement might include but not be limited to:
- Ongoing presentation of scholarly papers at national and regional meetings in candidate's field (to be considered, papers should be included in the file);
  - Editorship of a scholarly or professional journal;
  - Positions as discussant or chair of panel at regional, national or international meetings in the candidate's field;
  - Papers included in conference proceedings (note if proceedings were refereed);
  - Professional positions in one's field, i.e. officer of national or regional association;
  - Leadership in training workshops in candidate's field;
  - Invited talks in candidate's field (those should be included in file to be considered);
  - Special exhibits organized by the candidate;
  - Organization of scholarly conferences;
  - Research notes, published letters to editors of scholarly journals, reviews, newsletter articles, media appearances, etc.;
  - Instructional material or techniques that incorporate new ideas or scholarly research;
  - Invited review of grants or scholarly work.

#### **D. Service**

1. Department, College and University service is recognized as important in considering a candidate for promotion to either Associate or Full Professor, as well as in reappointment and the granting of tenure. The expectation for service increases as one moves up in the ranks. While candidates for tenure are expected to demonstrate a commitment to service, candidates for Associate Professor should have an established record of service to the College community and/or University. Candidates for Full Professor should have established records of continuing and increasingly significant service to the College. Significant service to accrediting agencies or to professional organizations related to the candidate's discipline or area of professional expertise is given weight. In addition, service to the outside community related to one's professional expertise, while not required, is given consideration.
2. It is recognized throughout the College that certain activities and committees take a significant amount of time and energy and have a substantial impact on the College community. These may include, but are not limited to:
  - Chairing of, and participation in, various ad hoc committees (such as Middle States);
  - Service as Department Chair or College administrator;
  - Active participation on/leadership of a College Council Standing Committee;

- Obtaining and administering significant institutional grants;
  - Leadership and substantial participation in conferences, colloquia, and symposia held at the College or the University;
  - Participation on College Council (as department representative or at-large) or on the University Faculty Senate; and
  - Advising of Student Clubs.
3. Candidates should clearly document the nature of their service on the PARSE and include it also in the self-evaluation. Any published materials resulting from such service, for which the candidate is responsible, may be included in the file.
  4. The name of the Chairperson of the committees on which the candidate has served should be noted on the PARSE next to the name of the committee. The department Chair will be responsible for contacting the Chairs of those committees for comments on the candidate's contribution. It is appropriate that this information be shared with the personnel review committees at each level of the process.
  5. Service thus consists of not merely being a formal member of a committee, but will be evaluated in terms of level of work involved, attendance, participation, and contribution.
  6. Although not required, candidates may offer evidence of pertinent and significant community and public service in support of reappointment. Evidence of such service may include, but not be limited to:
    - Service provided to community organizations with purposes broadly related to the mission of the College and the areas of focus of the College's academic programs;
    - Providing public information and education through the news media;
    - Providing public education by appearing in public events, documentaries, and other means of public information;
    - Service to the Federal, state, and local government in special roles such as an advisor, expert, mediator, or compliance monitor; and
    - Service as an elected or appointed public official, or as a governance board member for an independent organization, provided that the service can be rendered in a manner that complies with applicable CUNY regulations.

## **E. Lecturers and Instructors**

1. The title of Lecturer is used for full-time members of the faculty who are hired to teach and perform related faculty functions but who do not have a research commitment.
2. The guidance for reappointment of Lecturers is the same as for Assistant Professors, in all areas except for research and scholarship, which is not required.
3. Lecturers are eligible for a Certificate of Continuous Employment after five years of continuous service.

4. The Distinguished Lecturer title is a full-time non-tenure-bearing faculty title. Distinguished Lecturers are eligible for annual reappointment but may not serve in the title for more than a total of seven years. The guidance for reappointment for Distinguished Lecturers is the same as for Lecturers.
5. The title of Instructor is used for full-time members of the faculty who are hired to teach and perform related faculty functions, and who are expected to qualify for appointment as Assistant Professor within five years of initial appointment.
6. The criteria for reappointment of Instructors are the same as for Assistant Professors, in all areas except for research and scholarship. With respect to research and scholarship, the following expectations apply:
  - Active progress toward the award of a terminal degree which would qualify the candidate for appointment as Assistant Professor within five years of initial appointment;
  - Demonstration of the capacity to maintain an active research program.Appointment for the sixth year is conditioned on attainment of the terms of agreement upon hiring.

#### **F. College Laboratory Technicians**

1. A College Laboratory Technician shall perform laboratory functions and other technical duties of a highly skilled nature which are reasonably related to such functions but which are nevertheless non-teaching. Where appropriate, the technician shall exercise some supervision.
2. A Senior College Laboratory Technician shall, through technical or administrative skills, assume, under faculty or executive direction, clearly defined supervisory functions or perform complex technical functions in laboratories or technical areas.
3. Each department in which one or more College Laboratory Technicians or Senior College Laboratory Technicians are appointed shall develop a specific job description that will be related to the laboratory or technical requirements of each position.
4. The guidance for reappointment of a College Laboratory Technician is
  - The candidate shall have the personal characteristics needed to work effectively with students and staff.
  - The candidate shall have effectively and efficiently performed the functions defined in the departmental job description that applies to his or her position.
5. The guidance for reappointment of a Senior College Laboratory Technician is
  - The candidate shall have the personal characteristics needed to work effectively with students and staff.
  - The candidate shall have effectively and efficiently performed the functions defined in the departmental job description that applies to his or her position.
6. College Laboratory Technicians or Senior College Laboratory Technicians are eligible for tenure after five years of continuous service.

## **IV. Timelines**

### **A. General Guidance about the Timetable for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion**

1. Except for first year faculty, full-time tenure-track faculty must be reviewed and voted on for annual reappointment prior to December 1 during the fall of each year and must be reviewed and voted on for reappointment with tenure during the 7<sup>th</sup> year of tenure-track employment. (See II.D.2. above concerning the tenure clock.) These annual reappointments and the reappointment with tenure votes are mandatory. An unsuccessful candidate for reappointment with tenure completes that academic year and may not return to engage in full-time service the subsequent year.
2. A candidate for reappointment may seek a tenure vote in a year prior to the year that a mandatory tenure vote is to take place; such a petition for early tenure is subject to all the processes of reappointment and tenure and, in addition, is subject to a waiver of tenure clock (whichever pertains) that must be requested by the College President and approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees.
3. Other exceptions to the 7-year tenure clock are breaks in service: a break in service, such as a duly granted leave of absence or service stoppage, for other than a duly granted unpaid childcare leave or paid parental leave, may require that the tenure clock be reset to the beginning of year one of a new tenure clock when full-time service resumes. This means that all service prior to the leave or break in service could be lost and might not count toward tenure. In the case of childcare or parental leave, the tenure clock resumes upon the resumption of full-time service, with the time spent on parental leave being counted as time served or earned toward tenure.
4. Consideration and vote on promotion to a higher professorial rank may take place in any year after a faculty member has served three years in rank. A candidate must express the intent to be a candidate for promotion by submitting an updated PARSE and a signed RPA form, as stipulated in section II.B.2.b. to OFSR, by the date specified in the timetable that appears in section IV.B. of this document. A promotion personnel action may take place before a candidate is tenured, during the same year as a candidate is being considered for reappointment with tenure, or in any year subsequent to a candidate having been awarded tenure. A candidate for promotion may withdraw her or his candidacy for promotion at any time during the promotion process so long as OFSR receives this written request prior to the vote by the College Personnel & Budget Committee.

### **B. General Timetable for Preparation of the Record**

For full-time faculty members in professional titles, and for full-time lecturers, instructors, and college laboratory technicians, reappointment, tenure, appointment, appointment with a Certificate of Continuous Employment, and promotion are considered by a series of committees. Since the reappointment and reappointment with tenure or CCE committees – beginning with the Department Appointments Committees – meet in early September, candidates should start reviewing and organizing their material the previous spring. Candidates who have duly submitted updated PARSE forms and provided the requisite documentation to OFSR should have files that are complete or nearly so, requiring only some rearrangement and, in the case of voluminous files, the addition of a table of contents. The



files of candidates for reappointment actions are closed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> week from the start of the fall semester. The following table summarizes the timetable for the production and review of the record (Dates are approximate; OFSR will distribute an annual personnel calendar also available on OFSR Webpage):

<b>FALL SEMESTER</b>	
September—November	Reappointment and Tenure Review
Mid-September	<b>Candidates for Reappointment/Tenure:</b> Files closed for review
Mid-September—Mid-October	<b>Review Committees</b> meet
September	OFSR notifies candidates eligible for promotion
October-November	P&B meets to consider reappointment/tenure
First 10 weeks of semester	<b>Chairs:</b> Teaching observations conducted
First 2-3 weeks of October	<b>Candidate Deadline:</b> Notify OFSR of candidacy for promotion by submitting RPA, PARSE, and supporting material
Early-November	<b>Candidates for Promotion:</b> Files closed for review
Mid-November-December	<b>Peer Committees</b> meet to review files of candidates for promotion
End of November	<b>Candidate Deadline:</b> Fellowship Leave/ Scholar Incentive Leave applications due
December 1	Non-Reappointment letters must be mailed; reappointment and tenure letters mailed.
January 1	<b>Peer Committees</b> Reports due to OFSR via Dean
<b>SPRING SEMESTER</b>	
February-April	<b>Promotion Review:</b> Ad hoc promotion committees meet to review files
First 10 weeks of semester	<b>Chairs:</b> Teaching observations conducted
March 1	<b>Chairs:</b> Annual evaluations must be scheduled
March-May	P&B meets to consider promotions and leaves
Mid-March	P&B meets to consider 1 <sup>st</sup> yr. reappointments <b>Chairs</b> present candidates (for 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr. appts.)
Early April	<b>Chairs:</b> Teaching observations completed
May 1	<b>Candidates:</b> PARSE and documentation materials due in OFSR for reappointment & tenure candidates
May 1	Non-reappointment letters must be mailed.
May	<b>Chairs:</b> Annual Evaluations conducted/written Third Year review conducted by School Dean; Conference with candidate and chair
Summer	<b>President</b> makes promotion decisions known to College. Promotion letters mailed to candidates.

## V. RESOURCES

### Appendix A / CUNY RESOURCES

#### 1. Excerpt from the University Bylaws

##### Section 11.7. INSTRUCTORS, ASSISTANT PROFESSORS, ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS, AND PROFESSORS.

###### A. Position Definition:

It shall be the responsibility of instructors, assistant professors, associate professors and professors to perform teaching, research, and guidance duties. They shall also, among other things, be responsible for committee and departmental assignments. They shall perform those administrative, supervisory, and other functions as may be assigned by the appropriate college or university authorities. Associate professors and professors, as the senior faculty shall have special responsibilities for maintaining the academic vitality of their departments. One of the principal means of exercising this responsibility is the continuation of peer evaluations of teaching members of the instructional staff, with special attention to their diligence in teaching and professional growth. Another chief responsibility of the senior faculty is to orient their junior and newly appointed colleagues. Senior faculty shall be available for such consultation and assistance in problems of both scholarship and teaching as the junior faculty may require.

###### B. Qualifications:

###### 1. INSTRUCTOR.

For appointment as an instructor, the candidate must have demonstrated satisfactory qualities of personality and character, ability to teach successfully, interest in productive scholarship or creative achievement and willingness to cooperate with others for the good of the institution. He/she must also have an appropriate master's degree from an accredited institution, or active progress toward a doctorate.

###### 2. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR.

For appointment as or promotion (for instructors appointed prior to October 1, 1968) to assistant professor, the candidate must have demonstrated satisfactory qualities of personality and character, evidence of significant success as a teacher, interest in productive scholarship or creative achievement and willingness to cooperate with others for the good of the institution. He/she must also have obtained the ph.d. degree, or an equivalent degree, in an accredited university except that persons holding positions on December 31, 1975 as assistant professors or instructors in the community colleges shall have a master's degree and four years of appropriate teaching, technological, or industrial experience or the ph.d. degree. In the libraries, for promotion to or appointment as assistant professor, the candidate must, in addition to the requirements of instructor, have completed a doctorate or an additional master's degree and in exceptional cases some other logical combination of two years' graduate study or more beyond the bachelor's degree.

3. **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR.**

For promotion or appointment to the rank of associate professor, the candidate must possess the qualifications for an assistant professor, must have obtained the ph.d. or an equivalent degree from an accredited university, and in addition he/she must possess a record of significant achievement in his/her field or profession, or as a college or university administrator. There shall be evidence that his/her alertness and intellectual energy are respected outside his/her own immediate academic community. There shall be evidence of his/her continued growth and of continued effectiveness in teaching. Longevity and seniority alone shall not be sufficient for promotion.

In the libraries, for promotion to or appointment as associate professor, the candidate must, in addition to the requirements set forth for assistant professors in the libraries, possess a record of significant achievement in his/her profession. There shall be evidence that his/her competence and achievements are recognized and respected outside his/her own immediate community.

4. **PROFESSOR.**

For promotion or appointment to the rank of professor, the candidate must possess the qualifications for an associate professor, and in addition a record of exceptional intellectual, educational, or artistic achievement and an established reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline. There shall be evidence of his/her continued growth and the judgment on promotion shall consider primarily evidence of achievement in teaching and scholarship following the most recent promotion. Longevity and seniority alone shall not be sufficient for promotion.

**2. Statement of The Board of Trustees On Academic Personnel Practice In The City University Of New York (Effective January, 1976)--Appendix D**

**III. Reappointment**

The board reaffirms the commission's insistence that the decision to reappoint and the decision to tenure are two separate and distinct acts. Similarly, the board reaffirms its position that no appointment carries with it the presumption of reappointments or of eventual tenure.

1) In order to enhance, and maintain flexibility in recruitment, appointment and reappointment, the Board authorizes the option of two-year appointments for full-time members of the instructional staff, in appropriate instances, at the discretion of the college.

2) Decisions to reappoint faculty members shall take into account such institutional considerations as have been established and disseminated as a framework for all academic personnel actions.

3) The criteria upon which decisions to reappoint are based shall be as follows:

a) First Reappointment - Candidates for reappointment at the end of their initial term of appointment on a full-time line shall be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria:

(i) Teaching Effectiveness - There are a variety of ways, including classroom observation, to evaluate this criterion. The evaluation, however, should extend beyond normal class hours. Personnel committees should consider student evaluations as a factor in assessing the teaching effectiveness of an instructor.

(ii) Scholarly and Professional Growth - Candidates in tenure bearing titles for the first reappointment are expected to demonstrate their potential for scholarly work and their achievement in some of the following ways:

a) Evidence of research in progress leading toward scholarly publication.

b) Publication in professional journals.

c) Creative works, show and performance credits, etc., when such are appropriate to the department.

d) Development of improved instructional materials or methods.

e) Participation in activities of professional societies.

(iii) Service to the Institution - Since all full- time faculty members share broad responsibilities toward the institution, work in departmental and college committees should be considered in over-all evaluations. Although it is understood that not all junior faculty members will have an opportunity to serve on important committees, their evaluation should consider evidence of their informal contribution to such committee work and their participation in other regular administrative activities such as governance, registration, advisement, library and cultural activities.

(iv) Service to the Public - A candidate, though not expected to do so for the first reappointment, may offer evidence of pertinent and significant community and public service in support of reappointment.

b) Second and Subsequent Reappointments. In addition to criteria for the first reappointment candidates for the second or subsequent reappointment shall be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria:

(i) Teaching Effectiveness - Evaluation of this criterion shall include contractual teaching observations and peer judgments; assessment of the instructor's effort and success in developing new methods and materials suited to the need of his students: and assessment of student evaluations, and of other non-classroom educational efforts such as academic advisement.

(ii) Scholarly and Professional Growth - Candidates for the second and subsequent reappointments are expected to offer evidence of scholarly contributions to their disciplines. Evaluations of the quality of such work may be sought from outside the department. Achievements in the period following the last reappointment should be evaluated on the basis of publications of scholarly works in professional journals, or reports of scientific experimentation; scholarly books and monographs, and evidence of work in progress; significant performance or show credits or creative work; and improved instructional materials and techniques that have been found effective in the classroom either in the City University or elsewhere.

(iii) Service to the Institution - Effective service on departmental, college, and university committees.

(iv) Service to the Public - Institutions of higher education are expected to contribute their services to the welfare of the community. Although such activities are a matter of individual discretion and opportunity,

evaluation of a faculty member for reappointment should recognize pertinent and significant professional activities on behalf of the public. The absence of the contribution should not work to the disadvantage of any candidate for reappointment.

4) Judgments on reappointment should be progressively rigorous. In the second and subsequent reappointments, a candidate should be able to demonstrate that he has realized some of his scholarly potential. Similarly, standards of acceptable performance as teacher should be graduated to reflect the greater expectations of more experienced faculty members.

#### **IV. TENURE**

1) The decision to grant tenure shall take into account institutional factors such as the capacity of the department or the college to renew itself, the development of new fields of study, and projections of student enrollment.

2) The criteria upon which decisions to tenure are based shall be as follows:

a) Teaching Effectiveness - Tenure appointments shall be made only when there is clear evidence of the individual's ability and diligence as a teacher.

b) Scholarship and Professional Growth - Evidence of new and creative work shall be sought in the candidate's published research or in his instructional materials and techniques when they incorporate new ideas or scholarly research. Works should be evaluated as well as listed, and work in progress should be assessed. When work is a product of a joint effort, it is the responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort.

The following factors may be supplementary considerations in decisions on tenure. The weight accorded to each will vary from case to case.

c) Service to the Institution - The faculty plays an important role in the formulation and implementation of University policy, and in the administration of the University. Faculty members should therefore be judged on the degree and quality of their participation in college and university government. Similarly, faculty contributions to student welfare, through service on committees or as an advisor to student organizations, should be recognized.

d) Service to the Public - Service to the community, state and nation, both in the faculty member's special capacity as a scholar and in areas beyond this when the work is pertinent and significant, should be recognized.

3) Tenure shall not normally be granted before the fifth annual reappointment. Only in exceptional cases may tenure be granted before that time: when appointment to the faculty at the University requires the continuation of tenure previously awarded by another institution of higher learning; when a prestigious fellowship valuable to the college concerned interrupts continuous service during the probationary period; or when some extraordinary reason indicates that the college would be well served by the early grant of tenure.

4) The chancellor will publish annually a report on tenure in the University, which analyze the actions of each college and contains such pertinent data as may be of assistance to the college in the management of

tenure. The report will also contain the chancellor's judgment on the quality of tenure procedures and actions.

## **V. PROMOTION**

The board fully supports the commission's recommendation that the criteria established above for reappointment and tenure apply equally to decisions on promotion. It also reaffirms the commission's caution that judgments on promotion be sufficiently flexible to allow for a judicious balance among excellence in teaching, scholarship, and other criteria.

When considering decisions on either promotion or tenure, personnel committees should bear in mind that the two judgments represent two distinct acts. Just as it would be unwise to promote those whose qualities for tenure are questionable, so it would be equally ill-advised to tenure those whose capacity for promotion to senior rank is judged to be limited.

1) The criteria for appointment/promotion shall be as follows:

a) to assistant professor (technically a new appointment) - The candidate must possess the Ph.D. degree and submit evidence of qualification to meet, in due time, the standards required for the first reappointment. Those persons without the Ph.D. currently holding positions as assistant professors and instructors at the community colleges shall not be affected by this provision.

b) to associate professor - The candidate shall present evidence of scholarly achievement following the most recent promotion, in addition to evidence of continued effectiveness in teaching; the candidate should thus meet the qualifications required above (IV,2) for tenure.

c) to professor - The candidate must meet all the qualifications for an associate professor, in addition to having an established reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his discipline. The judgment on promotion shall consider primarily evidence of achievement in teaching and scholarship following the most recent promotion.

Adopted by the Board of Trustees at its meeting of September 22, 1975, Cal. No. 5

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Administrative Council Dated: November 7, 1958

From: Mrs. Max and Mr. Kahn Re : Appointment and Tenure procedures with respect to the instructional staff

A number of cases have arisen in court and elsewhere that have raised questions concerning the procedures used in recommending appointments, reappointments and tenure on the instructional staff. In view of these "clouds on the horizon no larger than a man's hand," it may be helpful to have this review of the legal and procedural basis upon which instructional appointments are made and tenure is granted.

### APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

Under the provisions of the New York State Constitution (Art. V, Sec. 6), all appointments and promotions in the public service must be made according to merit and fitness to be ascertained, as far as practicable, by examination which, as far as practicable, shall be competitive.

The legislature has determined that in the case of appointments and promotions in the instructional staff of the Board of Higher Education, the board shall determine to what extent examinations are practicable to ascertain merit and fitness and, in so far as examinations are deemed practicable, to what extent such examinations should be competitive (Education Law, Sec. 6206, subd. 7). To that end the board appointed a committee which investigated the practicability of holding examinations with respect to positions on the instructional staff. On the basis of a study of college practices throughout the country, the committee submitted a report (1941 Minutes of the Board of Higher Education, p. 341, April 28, 1941) recommending that competitive examinations be deemed impracticable for certain instructional position and that procedures for recruitment and scrutiny by college faculty committees and college officers be used in lieu of formal examinations. The committee stated (p. 347) :

\* \* \* The bylaws of the Board have been made explicit in prescribing the procedure by which recommendations for appointment to the instructional staff are made. It is a procedure involving an analysis and evaluation of the professional records and achievements of the applicants involved by a Committee of the department, by a joint committee of heads of all departments and by the president of the college. The education, graduate work, publications, teaching experience, research record and numerous other factors evaluated by the Faculty committees and the President in considering candidates for positions are referred to in some detail in the communication from the presidents of the city colleges as set forth in Appendix B. It is definitely and

clearly a procedure that is equivalent, at the least, to an unassembled civil service examination.

With the cooperation of the faculties the present bylaws were formulated setting up appointment committees in the departments, review by college committees and the president, and final approval by the board.

The underlying assumptions which justify the procedures established by the bylaws are:

1. That there is a thorough search for the best possible person for the post.
2. That sources most likely to produce suitable candidates are solicited (other colleges, professional associations, recommendations from professional sources, etc.).
3. That an evaluation is made by the appropriate faculty committee of those recommended, as well as those who have themselves filed applications.

Procedurally, it is desirable that written material listing the candidate's training and experience and recommendations from those professionally qualified to pass upon his work be kept on file and be of sufficient quality so that if they were reviewed by someone else with knowledge and experience, that person or agency could reasonably come to the same conclusion as the faculty committee. It would be helpful to have this written material retained for at least one year beyond the date when the candidate's services are terminated. If an appeal concerning the termination of such services is pending, this written material should be retained at least until the appeal is disposed of.

## TENURE

The bylaws provide that reappointment on annual salary to certain instructional titles for a fourth full year shall carry with it tenure on the instructional staff (sec. 11.2). Since we do not have formal examinations prior to initial appointment, the probationary period is intended to be an integral part of the examination process. Hence it is important that each department arrange orderly and specific procedures for evaluation of each probationer.

When the Tenure Law and bylaws were framed, there was general agreement among representatives of the faculty and the board that appointment of an instructor for one year, or two years, or three years did not carry with it a presumption of tenure. There was agreement that the best possible persons should be sought and that tenure should be recommended not on the basis of ability to meet minimum qualifications, but on a high standard of excellence and increasing usefulness as a teacher and scholar. Hence non-reappointment for a second, or a third, or a fourth year does not necessarily depend upon poor performance. The possibility of securing a more qualified candidate a year later, or two years later *may* very well be a factor in deciding upon reappointment or non-reappointment of an existing instructor, conditions of enrolment, budget, flexibility of teaching staff are also relevant factors in coming to a decision concerning tenure.



However, it is important that there be available objective evaluations which justify whatever conclusion the committee comes to. There is, of course, difference of opinion with respect to the relative weight that should be assigned to visits to classrooms, teaching ability, research, publications, enrolment in an instructor's course, opinions of colleagues and students, and other criteria. However, whatever criteria are used, they should provide an objective and subjective record which, if reviewed by someone else, would indicate a reasonable basis for the determination of the department committee.

Since few of us have infallible memories which can recall oral reports or views with complete accuracy, provision should be made for written reports. The fact that the candidate's competence and abilities have been discussed with him and that he has been given an indication wherever possible of the areas of his weaknesses and strengths should be noted in a written memorandum. There are numerous objective and subjective values that go into a determination of a candidate's ability and though it may sometimes be difficult to be specific, every effort should be made to minimize the subjective criteria and to test those that are used by submission to a committee for determination.

For all practical purposes, decisions as to tenure must be made within 2 years after a candidate's appointment. Since there is a time interval before evaluation can begin, the period of observation is relatively short. Accordingly, observations and evaluations, once begun, should be consistent and consecutive, rather than sporadic. Notes concerning such evaluations should be made at the time of the evaluation and placed on file.

Bylaw sec. 9.2 charges the Chairman of a Department with the responsibility "for assuring careful observation and guidance of those members of the instructional staff of the department who are on temporary appointment. The chairman of the department, when recommending such temporary appointees for a permanent appointment shall make full report to the president and the committee on faculty personnel and budget regarding the appointees' teacher qualifications and classroom work, the relationship of said appointees with their students and colleagues, and their professional and creative work."

Each candidate should be informed as early as possible of the intention not to reappoint him for the succeeding year if such non-reappointment is probable. The bylaws provide for written notice by April 1st if service is to be discontinued at the end of the third year. The spirit of the bylaws would indicate that a like disposition be made with respect to decisions at the end of the first and second year, where possible.

It is desirable that notice to a candidate of board action with respect to his appointment for the first, second and third year indicate that the appointment is of a temporary nature, stating the terminal date of the appointment and adding "that services beyond the period indicated in the notice of appointment are possible only if the Board takes affirmative action to that effect" (Sec. 11.7).

No procedure or machinery is infallible. It is inevitable that questions will be raised concerning determinations affecting faculty appointments and tenure. From time to time dissatisfied candidates attack the procedures which lead to determinations of non-reappointment. If tangible and objective records exist upon which the determinations attacked were based, such attacks could be confidently met. It is reasonable to assume that where the procedures heretofore outlined are followed, the determinations of faculty agencies will provide a constructive basis upon which those determinations can be justified.

NOTE: The Bylaws sections referred to in the original November 7, 1958 memorandum have been changed to the current Bylaws sections.

## **APPENDIX B / NEW YORK CITY COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES**

### **1. Documents (Available online from the OFSR Webpage – Policies Tab)**

College Governance Plan  
College Bylaws

### **2. Forms (Available online from the OFSR Webpage – Forms Tab)**

Professional Activity Report and Self Evaluation (PARSE)  
Professional Development Plan (PDP)  
Annual Evaluation Form  
Candidate’s Request for Personnel Action (RPA)  
Peer Committee Report Cover Page  
Application for Fellowship Leave  
Application for Scholarly Incentive Award  
Curriculum Vitae Form

**Office of Faculty and Staff Relations:** <http://www.citytech.cuny.edu/>

---