



**FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
AGENDA**

Friday, May 4, 2018
Room L.61, New Building
9:30 am-1:00 pm

Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 11:30 am*

- I.** Welcome
- II.** Approval of Minutes
- III.** Service Committee Update
- IV.** Student Evaluation of Faculty – Report to College Council
- V.** Baumrin Proposal (Expanded Publication Categories)
- VI.** Systematic Feedback with Faculty (Personnel Process)
- VII.** Updates
 - First reading of bylaw change (College Council)
 - FPC Annual Outcomes Report
 - FPC process Report (Demographical data)
 - Workshop/Training for Evaluating Sources and Faculty Files
- VIII.** New Business and Announcements

Executive Session – Full Faculty Personnel Committee 11:40 am – 12:00 pm*

- I.** Year in Review

Notes:

***All times are approximate**

04/20/2018



FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

April 13, 2018

Room L.61, New Building

Open Meeting Minutes

NOT YET APPROVED – will be voted on at the 5/4/2018 FPC Meeting

Allison Pease (ENG), Marjorie Singer (Legal),

Open Meeting called to order at 9:39 am

I. Welcome

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion – RC, Second – SYC

Unanimous approval

III. Appeals: Update on submission to the College Council

AL recapping action discussed on moving bylaw change forward

IV. Student Evaluation of Faculty

AL submitted report on SEOF to Faculty Senate and College Council. There is also a motion to include 8-week sessions (Fall, Spring & Summer) in the personnel process (currently not happening). Motion to include 8-week session evaluations in the faculty personnel file so chairs and program directors can have access to review.

AC – How does the college pay for the sessions? (KB – College has contract with vendor - \$16,000 annually - covers 5 – 6 evaluation periods)

GG – Is there a peer observation of teaching for online courses

AL response: there should be, this should be coordinated by the department chairs. Graduate programs have a challenge because the program directors are not chairs, but they can consult with the chair.

AB – Guidelines in progress to address online course evaluation in a more systematic way.

JC – Are Graduate program directors conducting observations?

AL response– It is the role of the chair, but they can/have delegate to directors

V. CUNY Policies Regarding Standards and Rigor (Predatory Journals)

AL – CUNY and Inspector General wants to ensure that tenure and promotion decisions are not being based on faculty publishing in predatory journals. In a study of 7,000 faculty it was found that a nominal number, 21 works, were published in predatory journals.

- Provosts have been charged with addressing questions (handout provided in meeting)
- Requested a discussion about the questions and responses
- Forthcoming – chair, departmental P&B and FPC training (June 2018)

GG – Has CUNY released a definition of what a predatory Journal?

AL response: Librarian Faculty have a definition/ descriptors posted via library website (Library Faculty contacts: Ellen Sexton and Kathleen Collins). Dean of Research (Designee: Dan Stageman), Allison Pease and Library Faculty are working together to create a development plan.

AP – Librarian faculty are offering a workshop on navigating open access vs predatory journals. They have amazing amount of resources on their website. Forthcoming in late(r) Spring 2018.

AL – Analyses of reviews vary amongst review committees and department chair evaluations. Would like to see more development to have some standards of evaluating and reviewing the veracity of the publications. Trainings for chairs (encouraged to invite departmental P&B members) scheduled for 2nd week in June.

AL- reviews questions and her possible responses to questions sent by CUNY.

SB – There should be a review/revision of the FPPG to include or expand categories (with a key) for faculty to use on their CVs to notate peer review publications (i.e. blind, double-blind, etc.). Current categories in FPC guidelines are located in section I.B.3 (publication categories) on page 4 and section III.D (Glossary for Reporting Status of Publication and Works in Progress on page 24).

AL – CUNY culture/standard is one by which guidance is communicated in non-written form. It is hard to develop a standard for chairs and committees when feedback to faculty is not permitted to be communicated in writing (excluding annual evaluations and 4th year reviews)

AM – Another problem with the “oral tradition” is that recommendation/feedback from committees are not communicated directly to the candidate but funneled through the chair. Information can be lost in the transmission or lacking.

VI. New Business and Announcements

JC – Request to share information from appeals cases with review committee and resolution from President, how the President proceeded with recommendations for appeals committees.

AM/JH – would like to explore 1st or 2nd reporter being designated to meet/discuss with the faculty about FPC decision with chair present (JC – recommends it be the review committee chair)

AL – Awaiting report from Affirmative Action office on the personnel actions (process)

May 4th meeting agenda item: Systematic feedback in sharing information with faculty candidates

HP – Possibility of exploring the President sharing decision-making process when there is a choice to not accept the committee’s recommendation.

Open Meeting adjourned at 10:53 am

Report of the Joint Working Group Of The Faculty Personnel Committee and the Faculty Senate

Draft, November 29, 2017

At the September 15, 2017 meeting of the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) President Mason and Interim Provost Anne Lopes recommended to the (FPC) that an 8-member working group be formed to study ideas and make recommendations about service expectations in the reappointment, tenure and promotion process for faculty. The Faculty Personnel Guidelines (FPPG) identify teaching, scholarship and service as the three factors to consider in the process. Examples of service include membership on governance bodies like the Faculty Senate and the College Council, student advising including advising student clubs, as well as leadership rolls directing graduate programs and coordinating undergraduate majors.

The working group consists of five FPC members:

- Amy Green, Interdisciplinary Studies
- Jay Hamilton, Economics
- John Pittman, Philosophy
- Silvia Dapia Modern Languages and Literatures
- Jose Luis Morin, Latin American & Latina/o Studies

It also includes three faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate:

- Ned Benton, Public Management
- Chevy Alford, SEEK
- Belinda Rincon, Latin American & Latina/o Studies

At the first meeting of the group, Ned Benton was elected chair.

A. Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The college is experiencing a challenge that impairs our institutional effectiveness and our students' success. The challenge is evidenced by a shortage of faculty members willing and able to engage in important academic leadership, governance, service and student engagement positions and activities. Faculty also experience difficulty finding time for the key activities because of unrealistic instructional workload expectations. The Working Group (WG) recommends four initiatives to resolve this problem:

- Increase the number of professors so that more faculty are available to engage in the key activities.
- Revise instructional workload expectations so that faculty members have time to engage in the key activities.

- Revise the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines (FPPG) to encourage reasonable levels of engagement in the key activities by all faculty members at all stages of the personnel process.¹
- Revise the FPPG to encourage leadership, engagement and service at all stages of the faculty personnel process, and to recognize and reward exceptional leadership, engagement and service. This recognition is consistent with the concept of “judicious balance” articulated in the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice.²
- Continue to review the structures and processes of our governance and academic administrative committees, and ad hoc committees, so that they are efficient and productive.

Implementation of these recommendations will promote fairness and clarity, and will more fully distribute responsibilities for leadership, engagement and service across the entire faculty.

A.1 Importance of Leadership, Engagement and Service

Faculty leadership of and engagement with college governance, programs and services is critical to student success and overall college effectiveness, and involves the following critical elements of college services and operations:

- Student advising, both formally as elements of program administration, and also as extensions of classroom engagement;
- Faculty Senate and College Council
- At-large member of the FPC;
- College Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC)
- Alternate Member of the College Council
- UCASC Subcommittees membership
- Chairing UCASC Subcommittees
- Advising of student clubs
- Chairing of various ad hoc committees
- Participation in various ad hoc committees
- PSC-CUNY Research Foundation Board representation
- Department Chair
- Academic leader such as a Dean
- Organizing a college workshop or conference
- Organizing a professional conference

¹ Key sections of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice are presented in Appendix Three. Section 5.3.c required for untenured faculty in their second and subsequent year, “Service to the Institution: Effective service on departmental, college, and university committees.” Section 5.4 requires that candidates for promotion to Associate Professor meet all of the requirements for tenure, including a range of leadership, engagement and service requirements, and requires that candidates for Full Professor must meet the requirements for Associate Professor promotion. Thus, based on CUNY policy, there are no stages of the faculty personnel process where leadership, engagement and service are not expected.

² See Appendix Three, Section 5.4 of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice. The section affirms that “judgments on promotion shall be sufficiently flexible to allow for a judicious balance among excellence in teaching, scholarship, and other criteria.” The other criteria are a range of types of leadership, engagement and service.

- Leadership of an academic or professional organization
- Leadership roles for the Professional Staff Congress at the campus and/or CUNY level
- Service to community organizations related to college or discipline
- Representation of the college on CUNY and University Faculty Senate committees and projects
- Appearance in the news media or public events
- Service as an expert or monitor to governments and court cases
- Services as an elected or appointed public official (subject to CUNY rules)
- Student Advising
- Service in recruiting and admissions processes
- Development of curricular proposals
- Development of new academic program
- Conduct of Assessment initiatives
- Leadership of majors
- Leadership of minors and undergraduate certificate programs
- Leadership of graduate programs
- Leadership of online programs
- Leadership of graduate certificate programs
- Development and admin of non-research grants and programs

These are essential academic and student service functions that require leadership and engagement by faculty members who are experienced and technically competent and who can commit time and effort that the work involves. If we do not achieve necessary faculty leadership and engagement, ultimately it is the students who are adversely affected, because their opportunities for success inside and outside of the classroom are compromised.

These activities sometimes require service on a committee, but normally the service does not consist solely of service on a committee. For example, graduate program directors are members of the Committee on Graduate Studies, but their positions involve many other duties and responsibilities. Therefore, it is not appropriate to characterize faculty leadership, engagement and service as “committee work.”

A.2 Leadership, Engagement and Service Compression

Service compression occurs when some faculty members are expected to take on an excessive workload of leadership, engagement and service roles. This can result from three problems: a shortage of faculty members overall, significant numbers of faculty not engaging in leadership, engagement and service roles, and too many leadership roles and committee responsibilities.

JJCCJ has an extreme shortage of faculty members, and this is the primary reason for our service compression. The average SUNY senior college has 48.7 faculty members per 1,000 full-time-equivalent (FTE) students. The average CUNY senior college has 38.0 faculty members per 1,000 FTE students. JJCCJ has 34.6 faculty member per 1,000 FTE students. For JJCCJ to achieve the SUNY ratio, we would need 169 additional faculty members. The additional faculty members would not only improve our full-time faculty course coverage, but it would allow our faculty to fulfill the needs of the college and our students for faculty leadership, engagement and service.

The “Report on Mandated Committees” (RMC) completed in October 2016, identified that there were 197 “mandated committees.” Of these 12 were required by the College Council and 4 are required by the Charter, although 2 of the 4 do not involve faculty members. Other committees were departmental or program-based, voluntary working groups, and others that did not involve faculty members.

Overall, the RMC found 526 mandated committee memberships (page 12) requiring faculty members to serve. There were approximately 400 faculty members to fill the committee memberships. Some of the committees automatically share membership - Senate and College Council or Council of Chairs, Provost Advisory Committee, Faculty Personnel Committee and Budget Planning Committee. It is conceivable that if each faculty member joined one committee (unless, as a Chair or Program Director or Senator they are required to serve on multiple committees) that service obligations for the typical faculty member would not be unreasonable, if service on one committee is reasonable.

However that is not the case. The RMC documented that for small departments, the ratio of mandated committee membership to faculty members is as high as 5.5 to 1, and as low as .5 to 1.

It should also be noted that the responses to the Mandated Committee Report survey on committee service received only 167 responses. If there are approximately 400 faculty members, but only 167 reported active committee memberships, is it reasonable to infer that a significant number of our faculty members are not engaged in any leadership or committee service?

If a significant proportion of our faculty are not serving in any leadership or representational roles, the result is even more “service compression” for the faculty members who are. The requirements of leadership, engagement and service for actively-serving faculty members may exceed what is a reasonable and judicious balance of teaching, scholarship, and leadership/engagement/service.

A.3 Efficiency and Productivity of Committees

The March 2015 Interim Chairs/Senate Report on College Organization concluded *“One of the concerns voiced by faculty is the amount of committee work, particularly redundant committee work, that faculty are engaged in. As noted above, fewer Ad Hoc committees would be beneficial, particularly where the committee is redundant with existing committees.”* (Page 7)

The report also observed *“First, over the years, various members of the administration have created and populated both ad hoc and permanent committees, often duplicative of existing committees, without going through governance. This is a violation of the most basic attributes of shared governance. Nevertheless, ceasing such actions does not require a revision of our Charter. Another concern involves faculty participation on existing Charter committees in a fashion that is redundant and wasteful. It is possible that charter revision could be implemented to address this issue – it would require a targeted examination of redundancies. It is also possible that it could be addressed through other means. For instance, managing meeting schedules and topics more effectively to reduce redundancy and increase efficiency would be worthwhile. Finally, similar to above are problems of less than optimal efficiency and effectiveness of existing Charter committees. However, it seems that it might be possible to resolve this issue by changes initiated by governance committees themselves, through their own working procedures and traditions.”* (Page 6)

The Working Group agrees that faculty leadership and governance engagement can be made more effective and efficient by improving the structure and procedures of the committees involved, and

eliminating unofficial committees that duplicate the work of official committees. However, we caution that the benefits of such streamlining are limited because most of the time and effort involved in academic leadership does not take place in committees, and some of the meetings are essential to academic governance.

A.4 Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines (FPPG) Exacerbate the Problem

The FPPG can be read to suggest that untenured faculty should only promise to engage in service after tenure – only a “commitment to service” - and that service after tenure is not a significant factor in promotion to associate or full professor. This interpretation exacerbates service compression by reducing the pool of faculty who think they are supposed to provide leadership, engagement and service. It also misinterprets the expectations clearly stated in the CUNY Manual of Faculty Personnel Practice. (CMFPP)

The FPPG states “III.E. 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 the ranks.” The CMFPP clearly requires “effective service on departmental, college, and university committees”³ for untenured faculty members.

Section 5.4 of the CMFPP also requires that candidates for promotion to Associate Professor meet all of the requirements for tenure, including a range of leadership, engagement and service requirements, and requires that candidates for Full Professor must meet the requirements for Associate Professor promotion. Thus, based on CUNY policy, there are no stages of the faculty personnel process where leadership, engagement and service are not expected.

If the FPPG is revised to clearly communicate the expectation that forms of leadership, engagement and service are required of all faculty members, but presents reasonable expectations for service appropriate to the faculty member’s stage in the process, the pool of faculty willing to provide various levels of leadership, engagement and service can be expanded.

B. Recommended changes to the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines

This section presents our recommended changes to the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines. (FPPG) Footnotes in this section are intended to be explanatory for this report, and are not intended to be incorporated into revision of the FPPG.

III.A. General Guidance for Candidates

The criteria used in making 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 purpose of this section is to provide guidance to the faculty - both those on personnel

³ See Appendix Three, Section 5.3.c which is the section of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice relating to second and subsequent re-appointment.

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 CUNY Code of Practice Regarding Instructional Staff Titles (Section 1.2) states: "...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 CUNY Code of Practice Regarding Instructional Staff Titles (Section 1.2) states: "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.

In considering individual cases extraordinary performance in one or more areas can sometimes be judiciously balanced to compensate for lesser or perceived lesser contributions in another area.⁴ Candidates and their chairs should identify in the Form C and in the Annual Evaluation when better performance in one area is presented as balancing for lesser performance in another area. When applied to tenure, this approach should be planned, identified, and documented in the Form C and annual reviews before or as a part of the fourth-year review for tenure. It should then be recognized and expectations clearly stated in that review.

The review committees should apply the same general categories of expectations, while taking into consideration departmental and disciplinary differences such as

- The developmental circumstances of the discipline or department such department size, and newness and growth rates of programs;
- Differences in academic norms and expectations between professional programs and disciplines and traditional academic programs and disciplines;
- Unique expectations for creative artists.

NOTE: No changes are proposed in this report for the section relating to instruction.

III.E. Service

III.E. 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 the ranks. While candidates for tenure

⁴ See Appendix Three, Section 5.4 of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice. The section affirms that "judgments on promotion shall be sufficiently flexible to allow for a judicious balance among excellence in teaching, scholarship, and other criteria." The other criteria are a range of types of leadership, engagement and service.

are expected to demonstrate a commitment to service during their first year, and in subsequent years provide effective service on departmental and college committees and engagement with students,⁵ candidates for Associate Professor should have an established record of leadership, engagement and service to the college community and/or university, as well the candidate's scholarly or professional community of practice. Candidates for full Professor should have established records of continuing and increasingly significant service to the college and to the outside community.

III.E.2. It is recognized throughout the college that certain activities and committees take a significant amount of time and energy and have a significant impact on the college community. These may include, but are not limited to:

- participation on the Faculty Senate and College Council (as department representative or at-large)
- at large member of the FPC;
- participation on the College Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC) and its subcommittees;
- advising of student clubs;
- Chairing of, and participation in, various ad hoc committees (such as Middle States)
- college representation on the PSC-CUNY Research Foundation;
- service as chair or college administrator;
- leadership and participation in conferences, colloquia, and symposia held at the college or the university; and
- participation on the University Faculty Senate

III.E.2 The following table lists examples of service and leadership roles for faculty members. The “*” under Pre-tenure indicates that the service example is appropriate for untenured candidates. Since all of the forms of service can be appropriate for Post-Tenure faculty, all have a “*” in the row. However, a “**” signifies that the mode of service represents leadership that is encouraged for a faculty member seeking promotion.

It is not intended that candidates undertake all of the indicated services. Rather, this is guidance as to examples of services that might be considered. Untenured faculty members might consider doing a range of activities such as a governance committee at one time and a curricular project at another time.

⁵ See Appendix Three. Section 5.3.c of the CMFPP requires for untenured faculty in their second and subsequent year, “Service to the Institution: Effective service on departmental, college, and university committees.”

Service Example	Pre-Tenure	Post-Tenure
Faculty Senate and College Council	*	*
At-large member of the FPC;		**
College Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC)	*	**
Alternate Member of the College Council	*	*
UCASC Subcommittees membership	*	*
Chairing UCASC Subcommittees		**
Advising of student clubs	*	*
Chairing of various ad hoc committees		*
Participation in various ad hoc committees	*	*
PSC-CUNY Research Foundation Board representation		*
Department Chair		**
Academic leader such as a Dean		**
Organizing a college workshop of conference	*	*
Organizing a professional conference	*	*
Leadership of an academic or professional organization		**
Leadership roles for the Professional Staff Congress at the campus and/or CUNY level		
Service to community organizations related to college or discipline		*
Representation of the college on CUNY and University Faculty Senate committees and projects		*
Appearance in the news media or public events	*	*
Service as an expert or monitor to governments and court cases	*	*
Services as an elected or appointed public official (subject to CUNY rules)		*
Student advising, both formally as elements of program administration, and also as extensions of classroom engagement	*	*
Service in recruiting and admissions processes	*	*
Development of curricular proposals	*	*
Development of new academic program		**
Conduct of Assessment initiatives	*	*
Leadership of majors		**
Leadership of minors and undergraduate certificate programs	*	*
Leadership of graduate programs		**
Leadership of online programs		**
Leadership of graduate certificate programs	*	*
Development and admin of non-research grants and programs	*	*

III.E.3. Candidates should clearly document the nature of their service on the Form C, and include it also in the self-evaluation narrative. Any published materials resulting from such service, for which the candidate is responsible, may be included in the file.

III.E.4. The name of the chairperson of the committees on which the candidate has served should be noted next to the name of the committee on the Form C. 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 committees at each level of the process. Candidates are also encouraged to document their file with letters that describe their service when extraordinary, such as letters of thanks from committee chairs or program managers.

III.E.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.

III.E.6. A candidate may offer evidence of pertinent and significant community and public service in support of reappointment, tenure or promotion. ~~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;~~
- ~~• Service to professional organizations related to the candidate's discipline or area of professional expertise;~~
- ~~• 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.~~

III.E.7 In a department, or a discipline within a larger department, with fewer than 5 faculty members supporting one or more academic programs, it may become necessary for untenured faculty members to serve in roles designated for faculty members seeking promotion or senior faculty members, in the table in III.E.2 above. IT may also become necessary for senior faculty members, in such departments or disciplines, to take on exceptional levels of leadership, engagement and service. When this takes place, the additional service should be taken into consideration as a basis for judicious balance in weighing teaching, scholarship and other factors.

Candidates and their chairs should identify in the Form C and in the Annual Evaluation when exceptional leadership, engagement and service expectations are presented in judicious balanced for lesser performance in another area. When applied to tenure, this approach should be planned, identified, and documented in the Form C and annual reviews before or as a part of the fourth-year review for tenure. It should then be recognized and expectations clearly stated in that review. The same level of documented guidance should be provided, and subsequently recognized, in cases for promotion.

Appendix One:

Answers To Questions Posted by the FPC and the Faculty Senate

Questions were posed by the FPC and the Faculty Senate. The working group provides answers to each question, and then proposing an amendment to the Faculty Personnel Guidelines that is consistent with the positions taken in answering the questions.

1. Questions posed by the FPC

1.a. How clear or unclear are the current guidelines?

They lack clarity. They are internally inconsistent. For example, paragraph III.E.6 about community and public services states that a candidate “may offer evidence” which is a vague expectation, and it refers only to “in support of reappointment” which implies that this type of service is not expected for tenure or promotion. They are also sometimes inconsistent with the CUNY Manual of Faculty Personnel Practice. (CMFPP) For example, the Manual⁶ states that service on departmental, college and university committees is expected for the second and subsequent reappointment. However the Manual subsequently states that for tenure the weight given to service factors can vary from case to case.

Another example is:

III.E.2. It is recognized throughout the college that certain activities and committees take a significant amount of time and energy and have a significant impact on the college community. These may include, but are not limited to:

It is not clear whether this paragraph is intended to encourage service to the listed committees, or to discourage candidates by warning that these committees can involve significant time and energy.

Another source of misunderstanding is that the FPPG section on service assumes that the “expectation for service increases as one moves up the ranks and with the granting of tenure.” Therefore the expectations for post-tenure service include the expectations for pre-tenure service. However, when some of the paragraphs are read alone, they can appear to say the post-tenure expectations only involve the additional expectations which primarily involve research.

The CUNY Manual of Faculty Personnel Practice (CMFPP) is also confusing and inconsistent. It requires “effective service on departmental, college and university committees” after the first reappointment⁷ but then states that service to the institution and service to the public are “supplementary considerations” in the award of tenure, and “the weight give to each may vary from case to case.”⁸

⁶ See Appendix Three, Section 5.3.c which is the section of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice relating to second and subsequent re-appointment.

⁷ See Appendix Three, Section 5.3.c which is the section of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice relating to second and subsequent re-appointment.

⁸ See Appendix Three, Section 6 which is the section of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice relating to tenure.

Recommendation: We are proposing certain changes to improve the clarity of the FPPG. We recommend that when the CUNY Manual permits varying weights to factors as well as “a judicious balance among excellence in teaching, scholarship, and other criteria,” should offer guidance as to how this discretion will be applied.

1.b. Do we want a broader definition of service?

We do not propose a broader definition of service than is identified in the CUNY manual. CUNY policy on faculty appointment, tenure and promotion⁹ refers to three dimensions of service:

- 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 governance. Similarly, faculty contributions to student welfare, through service on committees or as an advisor to student organizations, should be recognized.”
- Service to Professional Societies: This is never precisely defined. It is actually identified as a form of scholarship but we believe that engagement with professional societies and communities of practice are also forms of service.
- 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.”

We generally support the initial statement on service in the Faculty Personnel Guidelines¹⁰:

III.E. 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 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 and to the outside community.

We particularly support the statement that “The expectation for service increases as one moves up the ranks and with the granting of tenure.” However we do not think that the guidelines reinforce this concept. We expect “a commitment to service” before tenure, and then we focus most on scholarship and teaching as factors in promotion. At what stage of the reappointment, promotion and tenure process is leadership, engagement and service a priority?

Recommendation: We recommend that service expectations at all levels of reappointment, promotion and tenure include the following three requirements, with a higher level of expectation for candidates for promotion:

- Service to the college and university through participation in governance and in the implementation of academic programs and services;

⁹ See Appendix Three, which is the section of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice relating to appointment, tenure, and promotion.

¹⁰ Sections III of the Faculty Personnel Guidelines are attached as Appendix Two.

- Service to the faculty member's department and academic programs, including student mentoring;
- Service to students directly and through engagement with student service organizations, including student mentoring;

In addition, the following two categories represent supplemental opportunities to demonstrate leadership, engagement and service:

- Service to the faculty member's professional organizations and communities of practice; and
- Service to the public.

Recommendation: We recommend that service expectations be defined at the pre-tenure level and that expectations for service should increase with the award of tenure and with promotion. A possible approach would be to include a table with examples of appropriate service at the pre-tenure level and appropriate service at the post-tenure level.

1.c. Should there be a difference between compensated and uncompensated service in the personnel process?

Service that is compensated, such as program leadership that is supported with partial reassignment from teaching, should qualify as service and should not be depreciated because of the teaching reassignment. To disqualify compensated service would be inconsistent with the CUNY policy: "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 governance."

Typically, service is compensation with reassignment from teaching involves substantial commitments of time and involves accountability for delivery of services and programmatic results. This is different from service on a committee where the responsibility is to offer advice and vote on actions implemented by others.

We recognize that the assessment of quality of service varies with the type of service involved.

A second issue involves the value of service by a dean who returns to the faculty. Does the dean's service count toward promotion in a subsequent personnel process, or is it excluded because the faculty member was serving as a dean at the time? We believe that it should count as service.

1.d. What are the differences in service expectations at each rank?

We support the FPC statement that "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 the ranks and with the granting of tenure."

For tenured faculty seeking promotion we believe that the following guidance from the CUNY policy applies: "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 governance. Similarity, faculty contributions

to student welfare, through service on committees or as an advisor to student organizations, should be recognized.”

Recommendation: We recommend that service expectations be defined at the pre-tenure level and that expectations for service should increase with the award of tenure and with promotion. A possible approach would be to include a table with examples of appropriate service at the pre-tenure level and appropriate service at the post-tenure level.

1.e. What is the relationship between service and faculty leadership: Chairing, Program Directorships, Faculty Senate Leadership, etc.?

Leadership of academic programs and departments, such as service as a department chair, major coordinator, or graduate program director are all forms of service. See our discussion in A.1.c above.

Recommendation: These forms of service should be expected after the award of tenure. The FPPG should include a table with examples of appropriate service at the pre-tenure level and appropriate service at the post-tenure level.

1.f. How does public and community service factor into service?

CUNY policy explains: “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.” It should be the responsibility of the candidate to explain how this service enhances the candidate’s scholarship, teaching and leadership and engagement and service.

If a candidate as a satisfactory record of department, college, university and professional leadership, engagement and service, lack of community service should not be treated as a deficiency.

1.g. How does professional service factor in? Editor of a journal or service to a professional association, for instance?

CUNY policy identifies “Participation in activities of professional societies” as one of the criteria for evaluation of candidate records. However it counts it as a form of scholarship.

To be consistent with that CUNY policy, editorial service for a journal should be considered a form of scholarship, but other activities such as leadership of an association or planning a conference should be considered forms of professional leadership, engagement and service. It should be recognized that in some cases these activities might count as scholarship and as leadership, engagement and service.

Recommendation: The FPPG should be revised to present service as editor of a journal as a form of scholarship and not a form of service.

1.h. Should we get away from the three-legged stool metaphor and think instead about a braid with three stands; by that is meant that we look at which strand/s are strongest? May outstanding performance in one area outweigh balance among the stands? We have historically only valued scholarship for promotion.

The WG believes that all metaphors involving physical objects are overly simplistic and mechanistic. We believe that it is best to discuss expectations as a rubric – a guide listing criteria for assessment.

The WG believes that both the FPPG and the CUNY manual authorize and expect that there be “judicious balance” in weighing the factors for reappointment, tenure and promotion. This means that better performance in one domain can compensate for lesser performance in another domain.

To the extent that the FPC has “historically only valued scholarship for promotion” this is inconsistent with the CMFPP and the FPPG. The belief that promotion to full professor is to be based only on scholarship is inconsistent with the CMFPP and the FPPG.

The FPC Guidelines state: “In considering individual cases extraordinary performance in one or more areas can sometimes compensate for lesser or perceived lesser contributions in another area. “

The CUNY Policy states: “The Board of Trustees fully supports the concept that the criteria established for reappointment and tenure apply equally to decisions on promotion. It also affirms the caution that judgments on promotion shall be sufficiently flexible to allow for a judicious balance among excellence in teaching, scholarship, and other criteria. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

Recommendation: The FPPG should advise candidates and their chairs to identify in the Form C and in the Annual Evaluation when better performance in one area is presented as compensating for lesser performance in another area. When applied to tenure, this approach should be planned, identified, and documented in the Form C and annual reviews before or as a part of the fourth-year review for tenure. It should then be recognized and expectations clearly stated in that review.

1.h. Should we look at service differently in large and small departments? How do we address these differences?

The WG believes that the service expectations should be comparable for all faculty members, regardless of the size, scope and complexity of department.

The best solution is for the college to be appropriately funded for the customary number of faculty members at SUNY colleges.

We also note that the workload challenges involve more than mandated committees, but also arise when a small department has a major, or minor, or certificate program.

1.i. Are there differences in service expectations between those to be used for reappointment and promotion?

See A.1.c above.

1.j. Do we need to look at a shift in how to balance scholarship and teaching in this process? Can we provide clear guidance to junior faculty about what counts as service?

The WG believes that the current workload expectation cannot be reconciled with CMFPP and FPPG expectations, and that reductions in teaching loads are necessary, accompanied by increases in the

numbers of faculty members consistent with CUNY and SUNY norms, and encouragement of leadership, engagement and service on the part of all members of the faculty.

Recommendation: The FPPG should include a table with examples of appropriate service at the pre-tenure level and appropriate service at the post-tenure level.

2. Questions Posed by the Faculty Senate

2.a If faculty leadership and engagement are essential to institutional effectiveness and student success, how can this be reinforced in the FPPG and implemented in the faculty personnel process?

Recommendation: The FPPG should include a table with examples of appropriate service at the pre-tenure level and appropriate service at the post-tenure level.

2.b At any point or points in the reappointment, tenure and promotion process, should expectations for faculty engagement, leadership and service be less important than expectations for teaching and scholarship?

We believe that the expectations for leadership, engagement and service should be stated and applied. Each category of expectation speaks for itself.

There is the possibility that better performance in one domain can be taken into consideration in assessing lesser performance in another domain. We discuss how to approach that in the response to 1.g above.

2.c If all that is expected of tenure candidates is a “commitment to service” what does this mean?

Section II.E.1 of the FPPC refers to this, implying that untenured faculty have no obligation to provide actual service, but rather have to credibly pledge to provide service at some point in the future.

The statement is clearly inconsistent with CUNY policy. For example, the Manual¹¹ states that service on departmental, college and university committees is expected for the second and subsequent reappointment.

Recommendation: The FPPG should include a table with examples of appropriate service at the pre-tenure level and appropriate service at the post-tenure level.

2.d If faculty leadership and engagement is essential to institutional effectiveness and student success, how do we assess the capacity of faculty members to provide leadership and engagement before we tenure them?

The WG believes that leadership and engagement can be demonstrated in the types of activities that we can list as examples of services for untenured faculty.

¹¹ See Appendix Three, Section 5.3.c which is the section of the CUNY Manual of General Policy on Academic Personnel Practice relating to second and subsequent re-appointment.

2.e If faculty leadership and engagement is essential to institutional effectiveness and student success, is it reasonable to require only a “demonstration of commitment” before tenure, and then to not consider it as an important faculty in promotion? When do we expect leadership and engagement to take place?

See 2.c and 2.d above.

2.f How can we support and reward faculty leadership and engagement?

The WG believes that faculty leadership, engagement and service are essential for institutional effectiveness as an academic institution and for student success.

It follows that we cannot achieve student success and institutional effectiveness if we relieve untenured faculty of any expectation to demonstrate leadership and engagement in the reappointment and tenure process, and then by relieve tenured faculty of any expectation to demonstrate leadership and engagement in the promotion process.

The WG also recognizes that for faculty lines are needed, and that if the college had number of faculty that corresponded to CUNY and SUNY norms, that service compression would be relieved – the essential roles and responsibilities of academic governance and student engagement - could be spread among a large number of faculty members.

We promote, support and reward faculty leadership by presenting and applying clear expectations, and by providing appropriate reassignment from instruction when a responsibility involves a substantial commitment of time and substantial responsibilities, and by valuing excellent performance in the faculty personnel process.

2.g How can we reconcile and balance competing expectations for teaching, scholarship and service?

See 2.f above

2.h The FPC Guidelines state: “In considering individual cases extraordinary performance in one or more areas can sometimes compensate for lesser or perceived lesser contributions in another area. “ If this is the case, can we offer guidance as to expectations for a candidate seeking promotion to full professor based on extraordinary performance in service and a lesser perceived contribution in scholarship?

See 1.g above.

2.i Can we offer guidance as to how, for a candidate seeking promotion to associate professor, extraordinary performance in teaching could be documented, and how that might compensate for lesser or perceived lesser contributions in scholarship?

See 1.g above.

2.j Could there be a template to structure chair’s evaluation so that all chairs deal with leadership and service in a basically consistent manner?

There should be guidance for chairs about how to assess service in the Annual Evaluation.

2.k Given the discipline cluster review committee structure, are the review committees expected to apply expectations consistently or are they permitted to hold to different interpretations of the guidance in the FPPC?

The review committees should apply the same general categories of expectations, while taking into consideration departmental and disciplinary differences such as

- The developmental circumstances of the discipline or department such department size, and newness and growth rates of programs;
- Differences in academic norms and expectations between professional programs and discipline and traditional academic programs and disciplines;
- Unique expectations for the creative artists.

Appendix Two: Section III of the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines

III. GUIDANCE FOR CANDIDATES AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEES

III.A. General Guidance for Candidates

The criteria used in making 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 purpose of this section is to provide guidance to the faculty - both those on personnel 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 CUNY Code of Practice Regarding Instructional Staff Titles (Section 1.2) states: "...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 CUNY Code of Practice Regarding Instructional Staff Titles (Section 1.2) states: "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.

In considering individual cases extraordinary performance in one or more areas can sometimes compensate for lesser or perceived lesser contributions in another area.

III.B. Teaching

III.B.1. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion depend upon the candidate having achieved clearly discernible effectiveness as a teacher. The two external criteria most frequently used in evaluating teaching effectiveness are student evaluations (written comments as well as numerical evaluations) and departmental peer observations. In addition, the candidate may present evidence of professional recognition for teaching in the form of awards and other professional honors. The candidate is also expected to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in the form C by providing evidence of achievement across a range of teaching-related activities.

III.B.2. Evidence that may be presented in making the case for the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher includes but is not limited to those activities listed below.

Evidence of Originality and Creativity in Teaching Practice:

- Development of new and well-received courses and innovative pedagogy (relevant syllabi should be included in the file);
- Development of effective techniques for teaching and academic support;
- Use of outcomes assessment strategies to measure student learning and enhance teaching;
- Effective use and incorporation of technology when appropriate.

Evidence of Mentoring:

- Sponsoring of students for awards, scholarships, student competitions; inclusion of students' writings in John Jay's *Finest* and other publications;
- Mentoring McNair or other undergraduate research scholars;
- Supervising senior theses, advising CUNY BA students, and directing independent studies;
- Seeking grants to promote research opportunities for students and to address students' academic needs (grant application/narrative must be in the file);
- Advising students (beyond major advisors who get released time for this activity);
- Mentoring and supervision of adjuncts and Graduate Teaching Fellows;
- Mentoring undergraduate and graduate students (including both master's and doctoral students) in scholarly and professional activities.

Evidence of Professional Development:

- Organizing and/or attending and participating in faculty development programs;
- Participating in the programs offered by the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and integrating the best practices learned into the courses taught; and
- Participation in and presentation at conferences on teaching and learning

Evidence of Teaching Breadth:

- Variety of courses taught;
- Engagement of students at differing levels of ability and preparation;
- Variety of teaching formats (e.g. hybrid, large lecture sections, small capstone seminar)

III.B.3. For faculty members in the Library Department, "teaching" is to be interpreted as "librarianship" to reflect the overall goals of the library including developing, organizing, preserving, maintaining, making accessible, and interpreting informational resources for teaching, learning, and research. This section addresses information literacy, collection development, reference and instruction, user services, information technology and application, library administration and management, special collections, and print and digital archives.

III.B.4. Department chairs are encouraged to incorporate discussion of the above factors when applicable into annual evaluations that can then be included in the candidate's personnel file. Candidates are urged to discuss their teaching philosophy and effectiveness in the Form C self-evaluation narrative.

III.B.5. Factors which might negatively affect a personnel action and suggest that a candidate needs to pay more attention to his/her teaching are:

- below average student numerical evaluations for the discipline and course involved, or consistently negative written comments;
- peer observations indicating less than effective competence/interest in teaching;
- inattention to persistent problems in teaching;
- lack of co-operation in meeting departmental scheduling needs;
- being unavailable to students during posted office hours;
- a record of coming late to class, leaving early, giving finals early etc. as this is registered in writing to the chair, dean, or Provost; and
- late submission of grades or inattention to incomplete grades.

III.C. Research and Scholarship

III.C.1. General Criteria

III.C.1.a. Research/publication is expected to be related to the candidate's field and make a contribution to scholarship. In the creative and educational fields, as per the CUNY Bylaws, forms of excellence other than scholarly print publication are recognized. For non-print works, documentation in the form of audio or video recordings, visual presentations, web-publications, etc., shall be provided in appropriate format to the Provost's Office. The Provost's Office will make these accessible to the members of the FPC by providing the necessary equipment. These works will be judged by the same criteria listed below for scholarship.

III.C.1.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 that 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.) In the Works in Progress section, candidates are encouraged to give as much specific information as possible as to the work's status (for example, "under contract with manuscript delivery date of August 20xx" for a book, or "forthcoming in spring 20xx issue" or "invited to revise and resubmit" for a journal article). Please refer to section III.D, Glossary for Reporting Status of Publications and Works in Progress.

III.C.1.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 or journalistic works. It is the responsibility of the candidate's chair, in developing the annual evaluation, to assess how the candidate's scholarship satisfies criteria of the candidate's department and discipline and how it demonstrates progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure relative to their time of service at the college. The candidate must also address these matters in the Form C. III.C.2. Standards for Scholarship: Tenure For tenure, peer reviewed scholarship in the form of articles, creative works appropriate to the discipline, a book or their equivalent is generally the best way to demonstrate scholarly achievement. Faculty approaching a tenure decision should recognize that evidence of scholarly production is important and that materials that have not been accepted for publication will be given little or no weight. The publication of a doctoral dissertation, in itself, as a book or as a series of refereed articles without significant expansion and/or development will generally not be

sufficient for tenure. Rather, it should be demonstrated to be a part of an ongoing program of research and scholarship.

III.C.3. Standards for Scholarship: Promotion to or Appointment as Associate Professor

As stated in the CUNY Code of Practice Regarding Instructional Staff Titles 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."

The expectations of candidates for promotion to or tenure as an Associate Professor are, of course, not as rigorous as those for subsequent promotion to full Professor. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor can demonstrate significant scholarly achievement and outside recognition through such publications as a scholarly book, articles in peer reviewed journals based on original research, and other scholarly and/ or professionally recognized publications and activities during the time the candidate has been an assistant professor.

Generally the best way for candidates for promotion to or tenure as an Associate Professor to demonstrate significant scholarly achievement is through publication of peer reviewed articles. As an alternative, a scholarly book published by a reputable academic publisher may by itself establish the necessary record of "significant achievement." In the absence of either a scholarly book or peer reviewed articles, other scholarly publications or creative works, or other significant academic contributions from among those listed below for full Professor may serve to demonstrate a record of scholarly achievement to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate the significance of her/ his contributions in the Form C self-evaluation section. Reputation in the field will be documented in part by the letters of external evaluation.

III.C.4. Standards for Scholarship: Promotion to or Appointment as Full Professor

General criteria for promotion to full Professor are stated in the CUNY Code of Practice Regarding Instructional Staff Titles. The CUNY Code of Practice Regarding Instructional Staff Titles requires 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.

III.C.4.a. For scholars (as opposed to creative artists), a scholarly book or the equivalent in scholarly peer-reviewed publications, based on original research is generally expected.

III.C.4.b. To assess the quality of the scholarship put forth by the candidate for promotion to full Professor, 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 Form C and, if desired, in an addendum to Form C called Citations.

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

III.C.4.c. For candidates for full Professor, an "established reputation for teaching and scholarship" can be demonstrated by publications other than a scholarly book. Guidelines regarding quality will be the same as those asked about a book. In terms of quantity, the equivalent of several substantial scholarly pieces since the last promotion is a general guideline. Work considered appropriate in this category might include but are not limited to:

- book chapters;
- co-authored books (It is the responsibility of the candidates to explain their role in the co-authored work);
- scholarly articles, including articles in the scholarship of teaching (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-publication 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 application 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).

III.C.4.d. In addition to the above, other evidence of scholarly achievement might include but not be limited to:

- presentations of scholarly papers at conferences in candidate's field; • 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 (these 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.

III.D. Glossary for Reporting Status of Publications and Works in Progress

The candidate is responsible for describing the status of publications and work in progress as explained in Section III.C.1.b. The following categories will be useful in characterizing the various stages of a work.

- **Published:** Indicate venue/press, date, page numbers
- **In Press:** Currently being physically or digitally produced for publication
- **Forthcoming:** This category is reserved for work that does not require any content revision by the author and does not require any further evaluation. It describes a state before the work is in press and includes fully accepted, fully complete works right before they go to press and works for which the author is reviewing proofs or preparing an index.
- **Revise and Resubmit:** The work has been evaluated and not yet accepted; the author has been asked to revise it and resubmit it to the journal or publisher that recommended revisions. The author should indicate whether he/she is in the process of revising or has already revised and resubmitted. This category excludes work that has been rejected, which the author is now revising with a view to submitting elsewhere. Work being revised for resubmission elsewhere should be indicated as “in progress.”
- **Submitted:** The manuscript has been sent to a journal/publisher; the author is awaiting response.
- **Under Contract:** The author has a signed contract from a press with a manuscript delivery date.
- **Proposed:** A book project in very early stage, manuscript not yet drafted, but publisher is evaluating the proposal.
- **In Progress:** The project is underway, but has not yet been submitted to or evaluated by a journal or press.

III.E. Service

III.E. 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 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 and to the outside community.

III.E.2. It is recognized throughout the college that certain activities and committees take a significant amount of time and energy and have a significant impact on the college community. These may include, but are not limited to:

- participation on the Faculty Senate and College Council (as department representative or at-large)
- at-large member of the FPC;

- participation on the College Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC) and its subcommittees;
- advising of student clubs;
- Chairing of, and participation in, various ad hoc committees (such as Middle States)
- college representation on the PSC-CUNY Research Foundation;
- service as chair or college administrator;
- leadership and participation in conferences, colloquia, and symposia held at the college or the university; and
- participation on the University Faculty Senate

III.E.3. Candidates should clearly document the nature of their service on the Form C, and include it also in the self-evaluation narrative. Any published materials resulting from such service, for which the candidate is responsible, may be included in the file.

III.E.4. The name of the chairperson of the committees on which the candidate has served should be noted next to the name of the committee on the Form C. 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 committees at each level of the process. Candidates are also encouraged to document their file with letters that describe their service when extraordinary, such as letters of thanks from committee chairs or program managers.

III.E.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.

III.E.6. A candidate 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;
- Service to professional organizations related to the candidate's discipline or area of professional expertise;
- 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.

III.F. Lecturers and Instructors

III.F.1. Lecturers

III.F.1.a. 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 obligation.

III.F.1.b. The guidance for reappointment of Lecturers is the same as for Assistant Professors, in all areas, except for scholarship, which is not required.

III.F.1.c. Lecturers are eligible for a Certificate of Continuous Employment (CCE) after five years of continuous service.

III.F.1.d. The College has the option to convert a Lecturer line to an Assistant Professor line, and, if the Lecturer holds a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree, to appoint the Lecturer to the Assistant Professor line. The action is initiated by the department and is subject to approval by the Provost and President, consistent with other standards and procedures for the appointment of Assistant Professors. However, the College does not have an obligation to move a Lecturer who has obtained a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree to an Assistant Professor title.

III.F.1.e. A Lecturer with CCE may apply for appointment to the title of Assistant Professor. A Lecturer with CCE receives no service credit toward tenure. While working toward tenure in the Assistant Professor title, the lecturer with CCE is on leave from the Lecturer title and retains the right to return to the title with CCE.

III.F.1.f. 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 as explained in III.F.1.b above.

III.F.2. Instructors

III.F.2.a. The title of Instructor is used for full-time members of the faculty who are hired to teach and perform related faculty functions.

III.F.2.b. Full-time members of the faculty initially offered appointment as Assistant Professors must have completed the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree by September 1 of the year of their first appointment. If they have not completed the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree by that date, they will be appointed instead to the title of Instructor and if they do receive the Ph.D. during the ensuing year, their appointment will be upgraded to Assistant Professor. If this upgrade occurs after September 30 of the year of their first appointment, that year will not count toward tenure.

III.F.2.c. Those faculty initially offered appointment as Instructors may subsequently apply to become Assistant Professors if they complete the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree, provided that an assistant professor line in the discipline and/or department is available. The college does not have an obligation to move a faculty member offered appointment as an instructor who has obtained a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree to an Assistant Professor line.

III.F.2.d. The criteria for reappointment of Instructors are the same as for Assistant Professors, in all areas except for scholarship. With respect to scholarship, the following expectations apply: • active progress toward the award of a terminal degree that 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.

III.F.2.e. The title of Instructor can be held for no more than five years.

III.F.2.f. An Instructor may be appointed in the title Lecturer immediately following five years of continuous full-time service as an Instructor in the same department, in which case, at that time, he or she shall receive a CCE as a Lecturer. The appointment to Lecturer is an option, not a right, and is initiated by the department and is subject to approval by the Provost and President, consistent with other standards and procedures for the appointment of Lecturer. The department/college has the right to non-reappoint an Instructor who has not made satisfactory progress toward the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree or who has not satisfied other requirements of the position.

III.F.2.g. The FPC will apply the following standard of review in evaluating cases of conversion from Instructor to Lecturer:

- The performance of the candidate in the position of Instructor
 - The departmental need for a faculty member serving as a Lecturer
- The prospect of attainment of the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree shall not be a consideration, since the candidate has not succeeded for five years.

III.F.3. Waiver of Service Credit by Instructors and Lecturers III.F.3.a. An Instructor or Lecturer who has been appointed in the title Assistant Professor shall, by August 31st preceding the first full-year appointment to the title of Assistant Professor, state in writing his/her preference regarding whether or not he/she wishes to waive the contractually-authorized two (2) years of service credit toward tenure.

III.F.3.b. If the employee wishes the service credit waived and the President or the President's designee approves, the service credit shall be waived irrevocably. If the employee wishes to have the service credit applied or does not state a preference, the service credit shall apply. Approval or denial of this request (to waive the service credit) is not grievable.

III.G. College Laboratory Technicians III.G.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.

III.G.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.

III.G.3. Each department in which one or more College Laboratory Technicians or Senior College Laboratory Technicians are appointed shall develop a specific job description which will be related to the laboratory or technical requirements of each position.

III.G.4. Guidance for reappointment of a College Laboratory Technician is as follows:

- 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.

III.G.5. Guidance for reappointment of a Senior College Laboratory Technician is as follows:

- 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.

III.G.6. College Laboratory Technicians or Senior College Laboratory Technicians are eligible for tenure after five years of continuous service.

Appendix Three: CUNY Policy on Faculty Appointment and Promotion

CUNY Manual of General Policy
Article V: Faculty Staff and Administration
Policy 5.01 Academic Personnel Practice
Section 5.04 Appointment and Promotion

Note: Sentences explicitly referring to types of service have been emphasized in **bold** by the working group.

5.2 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 (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___):

a) Teaching Effectiveness: There are a variety of ways, including classroom observation, to evaluate this criterion. The evaluation, however, should extend beyond the classroom, since the faculty member's obligation to the students goes beyond normal class hours. Personnel committees should consider student evaluations as a factor in assessing the teaching effectiveness of an instructor. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

b) 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 (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___):

(i) Evidence of research in progress leading toward scholarly publication

(ii) Publication in professional journals

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

(iv) Development of improved instructional materials or methods

(v) Participation in activities of professional societies

c) **Service to the Institution: Since all full-time faculty members share broad responsibilities to the institution, work in departmental and college committees should be considered in overall evaluations. Although it is understood that not all junior faculty member 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. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)**

d) **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. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)**

5.3 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 (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___):

a) 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 needs of his or her students, assessment of student evaluations, and non-classroom efforts such as academic advisement. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

b) Scholarly and Professional Growth: Candidates for their 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, evidence of works in progress, significant performance of show credits or creative work, and improved instructional materials and techniques that have been found effective in the classroom either in the University or elsewhere. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

c) **Service to the Institution: Effective service on departmental, college, and university committees.** (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

d) **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 this contribution should not act to the disadvantage of any candidate for reappointment.** (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

Judgments on reappointment should be progressively rigorous. In the second and subsequent reappointments, a candidate should be able to demonstrate that he or she has realized some of his or her scholarly potential. Similarly, standards of acceptable performance as a teacher should be graduated to reflect the greater expectations of more experienced faculty members. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

5.4 Promotion

The Board of Trustees fully supports the concept that the criteria established for reappointment and tenure apply equally to decisions on promotion. **It also affirms the caution that judgments on promotion shall be sufficiently flexible to allow for a judicious balance among excellence in teaching, scholarship, and other criteria.** (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

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 grant tenure to those whose capacity for promotion to senior rank is judged to be limited. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

The criteria for promotion shall be as follows (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___):

a) Assistant Professor: 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. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

b) 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 for tenure. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

c) 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 or her discipline. The judgment on promotion shall consider primarily evidence of achievement in teaching and scholarship following the most recent promotion. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

6 Tenure

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. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

The criteria upon which decisions to grant tenure are based shall be follows (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___):

a) Teaching Effectiveness: Tenure appointments shall be made only when there is clear evidence of the individual's ability and diligence as a teacher. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

b) Scholarship and Professional Growth: Evidence of new and creative work shall be sought in the candidate's published research or in his or her instructional materials and techniques when he or she incorporates 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 joint effort, it is the responsibility of the department chairman to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

The following factors may be supplementary considerations in decisions on tenure. The weight accorded to each will vary from case to case. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

a) 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 governance. Similarity, faculty contributions to student welfare, through service on committees or as an advisor to student organizations, should be recognized. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

b) 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. (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___)

Tenure shall not normally be granted before the fifth annual reappointment. Only in exceptional cases may tenure be granted before that time—including cases when (BTM,1975,09-22,005,___):

a) Appointment to the faculty at the University requires the continuation of tenure previously awarded by another institution of higher learning

b) A prestigious fellowship valuable to the college concerned interrupts continuous service during the probationary period

c) Some extraordinary reason indicates that the college would be well served by the early grant of tenure

The Board of Trustees 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. 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. (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

When the Tenure Law and Board of Trustees 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, and flexibility of teaching staff are also relevant factors in coming to a decision concerning tenure. (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

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. (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

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 or her 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. (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

For all practical purposes, decisions as to tenure must be made within two and a half 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. (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

The Board of Trustees Bylaws charge 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." (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

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 Board of Trustees Bylaws provide for

written notice by 1 April if service is to be discontinued at the end of the third year. The spirit of the Board of Trustees Bylaws would indicate that a like disposition be made with respect to decisions at the end of the first and second year, where possible. (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

It is desirable that notice to a candidate of Board action with respect to his or her 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." (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

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. (BTM,1967,12-18,003,_B)

Appendix Four: Senate Statement on Faculty Leadership and Engagement

Statement on Faculty Leadership and Engagement

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Faculty Senate

Approved September 18, 2017

The Faculty Senate periodically adopts statements on important issues affecting the status of the faculty at John Jay College. In this statement, the Senate summarizes recommendations to support and improve faculty leadership of and engagement with college governance, programs and services.

A principle of shared governance is that *“Faculty shall have primary responsibility for curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process, and degree requirements, with the President rejecting recommendations in these areas only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty.”*¹²

Faculty leadership of and engagement with college governance, programs and services is critical to student success and overall college effectiveness, and involves the following critical elements of college services and operations:

- Student advising, both formally as elements of program administration, and also as extensions of classroom engagement;
- Participation in student recruiting and admissions processes;
- Participation in student programs and services including engagement with student clubs;
- Development and oversight of undergraduate and graduate curricular initiatives including the design and development of courses;
- Conduct of college assessment initiatives involving student learning and program improvement;
- Departmental administration of the faculty personnel process;
- Leadership of undergraduate majors, minors and certificate programs;
- Leadership of graduate degree programs and certificate programs;
- Conduct of college accreditation and program registration processes;
- Policy development and governance approval;
- Participation in strategic planning, financial planning and space planning;
- Representation of the college on CUNY and University Faculty Senate committees and projects;
- Participation in the development and administration on contract and grant programs for research but also for academic and student services;

These are essential academic and student service functions that require leadership and engagement by faculty members who are experienced and technically competent and who can commit time and effort that the work involves. If we do not achieve necessary faculty leadership and engagement, ultimately it is the students who are adversely affected, because their opportunities for success inside and outside of the classroom are compromised.

¹² Quoted from “Charter Study Group Draft of Proposed Principles of Shared Governance” May 27, 2016.

Because these services are critical to student success and college effectiveness, it is important that our policies and practices support and promote engagement with college governance, programs and services by all of our faculty members at all phases of their careers.

It is the view of the Faculty Senate that the College's commitment to and support of faculty leadership of and engagement with college governance, programs and services is critical to the success of the college, but ambivalently defined and weakly supported. This impairs faculty availability and commitment to key college governance and program delivery processes.

The following recommendations are intended to improve student success and college effectiveness by supporting and improving faculty leadership of and engagement with college governance, programs and services.

1. Recognize that faculty engagement with shared governance and leadership of academic departments and programs is essential to the success of the college.

Section III.E.1 of the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines (FPPG) refers to these faculty activities as "service" describes expectations for service that are considered in reappointment, promotion and tenure: *"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 term "service" does not capture the critical role of faculty in the governance of the college and in the administration of academic departments and in the delivery of academic programs and services to students. The term "service" is defined as "the action of helping or doing work for someone."¹³ While the non-instructional role of faculty in the college often involves working for others and helping others, it also involves leadership, management and decision making for key functions of the college.

Service is also sometimes characterized as "committee work." The mandate of the Task Force on Committees stated: *"Committee work constitutes an important dimension of College life. Much of the work of John Jay--and most academic institutions--is carried out by committees. At the College, committees are created in order to comply with governance requirements, which include CUNY's Bylaws, the College Charter and Bylaws as well as the governance mandates of the related entities, such as the Student Activities Association and the Auxiliary Services Corporation. Committees are also created in order to meet CUNY's operational requirements and in order to perform the work of the College, including through its many departments and operational divisions."* (Task Force report, October 2016, Page 2)

Characterizing the role of faculty as "committee work," in the governance of the college and in the administration of academic departments and in the delivery of academic programs and services, does not recognize the full responsibilities and workloads of faculty members. It does not recognize direct services to students in academic advising and engagement with student activities and clubs, and in appointed or elected academic leadership roles. Graduate Program Directors, for example, serve on the Committee on Graduate Studies, but this represents a small portion of the scope of their duties.

¹³ The Oxford Dictionaries

The need for engagement by faculty members is particularly necessary at John Jay College, because the college has few full-time faculty members compared to other colleges and universities of comparable enrollments and institutional profile. The College is also underfunded and under-staffed so there is little support for faculty in their leadership and governance roles.

2. Clarify Expectations for faculty engagement with shared governance and leadership of academic departments and programs in the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines.

The CUNY Code of Practice Regarding Instructional Staff Titles (Section 1.2) states: *"...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."* This implies that teaching must be "successful" and scholarship and creative achievement must be "productive" but that the remaining responsibilities for faculty involve demonstrating satisfactory qualities of personality and character and willingness to cooperate with others. If faculty leadership of and engagement with college governance, programs and services is critical to the success of a college, this language does not reflect this reality.

The language FPPG sets out additional tenure expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service. Teaching requires *"clearly discernible effectiveness."* The tenure expectation for scholarship states that *"peer reviewed scholarship in the form of articles, creative works appropriate to the discipline, a book or their equivalent is generally the best way to demonstrate scholarly achievement."*

However, for "service" the language is ambivalent, especially in the tenure process: *"III.E.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 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 and to the outside community."*

FPPG section III.W should be revised to clarify expectations for faculty members before and after tenure is granted.

Based on the current language of the FPPG, the implicit priority for untenured faculty is teaching and scholarship. This results in the following problems.

- If new faculty members are hired to fill gaps in academic program leadership and delivery, the faculty members hired to fill the gaps are not available to serve in roles involved academic leadership and program delivery until the after the 8-year tenure process is complete.
- During pre-tenure reappointment and tenure process, the candidate hired to fill a program leadership and delivery need focuses on teaching and scholarship and therefore cannot be assessed and evaluated as to how well the candidate performs in the program leadership and delivery role.
- Untenured faculty and not permitted to serve on faculty personnel committees, and if they are also discouraged from serving on the Faculty Senate and College Council, untenured faculty lack

any role in faculty personnel policy development and refinement , and lack any role in other policy development activities of the Senate and College Council.

3. Reconcile and Balance Competing Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship and Service

The 2013 Middle States Self Study (pp.71-72) explained: *“The dissatisfaction with teaching load and the anxiety over tenure and promotion point to a tension between the College’s research aspirations, its obligations as a teaching institution, and its need for faculty willing to serve the college community. It will be important in the years to come to strike a balance among these faculty activities—teaching, scholarship, and service—and to communicate clearly to faculty the expectation that ideally they will achieve a balance among these sometimes competing demands. We also need to shape the promotion and tenure process so that it recognizes that some candidates will excel in teaching, others in scholarship, and yet others in extraordinary service, and that distinction in one area will be rewarded as long as the faculty member shows sustained true commitment, energetic engagement, and high-quality achievement in the others.”*

The Faculty Senate supported this statement in 2013 and continues to support it today.

Workload mitigation or enhancement is central to balancing expectations. The changes in instructional workload expectations have to be sufficient to permit reasonable combinations of discernably effective teaching, demonstrated scholarly achievement, and significant faculty leadership of and engagement with college governance, programs and services. Reducing the standard teaching load to 3/3 is a good start but not sufficient.

4. Reward and support faculty engagement with shared governance and leadership of academic departments and programs.

Reward faculty engagement with shared governance and leadership in the reappointment, tenure and in the promotion process at all ranks, and encourage and support leadership roles in academic departments and programs with necessary instructional reassignment, support staff, access to funding and sufficient space.

To: The College Council

From: Anne Lopes, Interim Provost

Subject: Update on the Proposal to Evaluate All Courses Online

Date: March 2018

Background

In November 2014 the College Council voted to evaluate all online courses for a period of two years from spring 2015 through spring 2017, after which time the College Council would consider the trial period and vote on whether or not to conduct the student evaluation of faculty exclusively online. This document is intended to update the Council on the trial period in accordance with the memorandum submitted to the College Council on November 25, 2014 (the College Council Memo) by the Provost's Taskforce on the Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEOF) Online.

The Student Evaluation of Faculty was administered online using My Class Evaluation (a product of the vendor IOTA) from spring 2015 through spring 2017. During this period many of the goals specified in the fall 2014 proposal to the College Council were accomplished.

Results of the Trial Period

Optimal Response Rate: The College Council Memo stipulates that a response rate of 50% or greater is considered optimal for minimizing nonresponse bias and the pull of outliers. In the five semesters measured the response rate average is 56.5%, with a variance of only 1.17 (SP15=55.9%, F15=56.7%, SP16=57.1%, F16=57.9%, SP17=55.1%). To achieve this average Faculty Services has orchestrated general announcements from Student Affairs, five reminders per semester from Iota, posters mounted in each building of the college, postcards distributed to students 3 days per week during evaluation period, JMail, Facebook and Twitter campaigns, Student Government announcements, as well as kiosk and media wall announcements.

Rapid Access to Results: Faculty are given access to their evaluations within 6 weeks of the last grade submitted each semester.

Cost, Time, and Labor Effective: The total cost to administer online evaluations per year is \$52,060: \$16,000 to pay for the Iota evaluation platform and support, approximately \$35,360 in labor costs for two PT College Assistants in Faculty Services who work with all John Jay

offices and Iota to administer the evaluations, and \$700 of Metrocards and dining cards as incentives for student participation.

We cannot specify the total cost to the college of paper evaluations because there were at least 10 people from different offices for whose time we would need to account. From start to finish, the paper process involved staff from the Provost's Office, the Print Shop, the Testing Office, the Registrar, Facilities Management, and DoIT. The hourly costs of each of these individuals was far higher than that of a part-time college assistant, and the processing of paper evaluations took approximately 18 months. There was no one at the college whose job was solely dedicated to SEOF, thus the time for each of these individuals took them away from their primary job function and cost the college more per hour. There also is currently no one in the provost's office who can coordinate this undertaking given the scope of everyone's job responsibilities.

Specific Responses to Taskforce Memo of November 2014

Please refer to the College Council Memo, Appendix A, for a line by line account of the requested information to which this memo responds.

Courses

- Non-traditional courses evaluated: courses offered in non-traditional time frames (e.g. Any 8 week fall, spring, and summer sessions) were evaluated online. Faculty received reports from such courses, but these reports were not accessible to members of the personnel review committees.
- Online evaluations used in personnel process: the results of the online evaluation of all courses (online, hybrid, and face-to-face) offered in the traditional 15-week academic sessions were included in the personnel process.
- Separate evaluations for instructors in team-taught courses: for team taught courses, based on information provided by the registrar, separate evaluations were created for each professor identified by the department in the course schedule as teaching the course.
- Multi-component courses evaluated for each component: for courses with multiple components (such as science courses), separate evaluations were created for each component (e.g. Science of the 21st Century Lab, Science of the 21st Century Lecture, and Science of the 21st Century Recitation), based on information provided by the Registrar.

Process of Evaluation

- Spigot Feature: faculty have the ability to choose the time frame in which they wish to administer the evaluations by selecting an on/off feature (spigot). IOTA specifically created this feature for the college, and it is operable during the fall and spring semesters. The following percentage/number of sections used the spigot in each semester of administration:

Spring 2015

The Spigot feature was not available

Fall 2015

Sections in which spigot feature was used	4.5% (114/2535)
Spigot range 60 minutes – 10 days	3.8% (97/2535)
Spigot range set to the full evaluation period	0.7% (17/2535)

Spring 2016

Sections in which spigot feature was used:	3.5% (84/2403)
Spigot range 60 mins – 10 days:	2.9 % (69/2403)
Spigot range set to the full evaluation period:	0.6% (15/2403)

Fall 2016

Sections in which spigot feature was used:	3.1% (72/2317)
Spigot range 40 hours – 11 days:	2.7% (62/2317)
Spigot range set to the full evaluation period:	.4% (10/2317)

Spring 2017

Sections in which spigot feature was used:	2.8% (64/2325)
Spigot range 60 minutes – 11 days:	2.6% (61/2325)
Spigot range set to the full evaluation period:	.1% (3/2325)

- No spigot feature in courses less than 8 weeks: during summer 2016, the spigot feature was disabled. Implementation of the spigot is not practical for summer courses due to the brevity of the session and the concentration of class meetings during the weeks of the session. A uniform period during which evaluations are administered ensures that students experience as much of the course and the instructor as possible before providing feedback. In fall 2016 the Taskforce agreed the spigot feature would be used for any 8 – week and full semester course, including summer 8 - week courses.
- Evaluations completed in class: Faculty are required to provide time in class for students to complete and submit the online evaluation.
- Non-classroom venues for evaluation: During the administration period chosen by the faculty member, students have access to evaluating courses outside of class through the J-Stop, My Class Evaluation, email links, and Blackboard.
- Quick Guide provided to faculty: Faculty Services provides faculty with a Quick Guide for the online administration of the evaluations
- Only enrolled students evaluate: Students who officially withdraw from a course are removed from the final class list of students. These students are not given the opportunity to evaluate that course.
- Wi-fi available: Students have access to Wi-Fi, 3G and 4G in class as needed during the evaluation period.
- Blackboard Integration: Blackboard administrators ensure seamless functionality for faculty who choose to integrate the evaluation tool into their course shells.

Receipt of Results

- Acknowledge results: Faculty are asked to acknowledge receipt of their evaluation data within 90 days of results release. Acknowledgement in no way implies agreement with the results.
- Opportunity to respond: As with prior paper administration, faculty have the option to respond to the data and/or student comments. This feature is displayed on the member results reporting page, with the label “Add Comments.” These comments are only visible to the faculty member him/herself and any administrator, dean, chair or others allowed in the security matrix to see that individual’s results. No student will ever see any of the faculty rebuttals/responses.

Interpretation and Presentation of Results

- Mean scores of departments collected each semester: The college adopts a new mean score each semester for each academic department as we have always done with paper evaluations, and a new mean score for the college (overall) based on the data generated by the online administration.
- Graph and Text reports: Evaluation data reports are represented graphically and textually to allow for more meaningful interpretation.
- Image-based files are available to faculty and department chairs by logging into the IOTA system.

Encouraging Participation

- We incentivize student participation by the following:
 - Requiring faculty to conduct the evaluation in class with guided instructions for raising response rates.
 - Sending frequent reminders to students via social media and John Jay resources that they use widely (JayStop was the primary location spring 2015-17).
 - Organizing an iPad or unlimited Metrocard raffle, along with periodic raffles for John Jay merchandise.
- We support the faculty by the following:
 - Providing clear and concise instructions for online administration with guidance for raising rates of student participation.
 - Providing access to evaluation data and comments within one month of the release of all student grades for the semester.
 - Naming a tree in honor of the department with the highest rates of student participation. *[Tree naming with plaques has yet to occur. Departments were selected for plaques; however, orders are dependent on the Marketing department's order placement process – a certain number of plaques are required before they place an order from the campus.]*

Implementation Goals as Specified in 2014 Memo That Were Not Accomplished

Explanations for failure to reach goal are in bold

Courses

- Courses offered in 4-week time frames and winter sessions were not evaluated online.
Explanation: There is an additional fee for each evaluation period added to the six the college is allotted.

Interpretation and Presentation of Results

- It was stipulated that the data for each course, including any rebuttal by the faculty member, will be contained in a single image-based file, and the image-based files for individual faculty members may be stored in the personnel file and/or the Faculty Internet Document Organizer (FIDO), a password protected system. ***Explanation: Single image-based files are available for viewing by logging on to My Class Evaluation. Currently, IOTA does not have a mechanism to download and save. However, an individual faculty member may use the internet search engine (e.g. Google Chrome, FireFox) printer options to save and download in PDF format.***

- IOTA will store and maintain the raw data while in its possession as a file permanently anonymized by random codes, and transmit such file for statistical research purposes to John Jay along with the image-based file for each evaluation, accessible only to Office of the Provost staff and authorized research personnel in password protected form. ***Explanation: Work has not begun on this item. IOTA does not recommend this approach. Presently, the raw data includes identifying information as it is the only way authorized staff in the Office of the Provost can conduct spot checks. Only authorized personnel in the Office of the Provost have access to all raw data. An individual faculty member has access to his/her raw data.***
- In our workshops with faculty up for personnel actions, we will include a segment on accessing, interpreting, and presenting the data so as to communicate the quality and effectiveness of their teaching. ***Explanation: there has been no apparent demand for this service.***

Encouraging Participation

- Rebranding the tool with the help of the Student Council to invite enthusiastic participation by connecting the process to iconic, spirited symbols such as “Li'l Jay” and the Bloodhound. ***Explanation: Collaboration with Student Council to create a rebranding tool has not been addressed. A second SEOF Coordinator was hired in August 2016 to liaise with the Student Council to increase student participation in the online evaluation of faculty through rebranding and whatever else the students may recommend.***
- By fall 2015, allowing faculty to send out a midterm evaluation/assessment so that they receive feedback on their teaching during the course of a semester. The resultant data will be available only to the faculty member and will not be accessed or used by the personnel committee or department chairs. ***Explanation: Midterm evaluations are not currently part of the contract with IOTA. There is an additional fee for each evaluation period added to the six the college is allotted. Faculty can administer mid-term evaluations in their courses whenever they wish using paper, SurveyMonkey, or other means.***

Assessment Goals as Specified in 2014 Memo That Were Not Accomplished

Response Rate/Rate of Participation

- Generalizable surveys will be administered to faculty with high rates of participation (75% and above) to learn about their promising and best practices. We will work with the Provost's Taskforce on the SEOF Online to develop these surveys. Generalizable surveys will be administered to faculty with low rates of participation (25% and below) to learn about the obstacles to obtaining high rates of participation. We will work with the Provost's Taskforce on the SEOF Online to develop these surveys. ***Explanation: Data file created with list of faculty with high and low rates of participation. Survey not designed or administered.***
- For a limited number of courses suggested by the Provost's Taskforce, we will test whether our experience accords with the research findings that quality of written comments stays the same or increases online. We will designate test sections of the same course taught by the same professor during one or more semesters of the online pilot. One section will use paper; one will use online evaluation. We will then compare word count and sentence length.

(Research design suggested by Keith Markus, Chair of the College Council Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee) ***Explanation: no faculty member has agreed to take on this task and Faculty Services does not have the expertise.***

- After year one of the pilot, the Provost's Taskforce on the SEOF Online will meet to examine and determine if setting a reliable/valid response rate is necessary, and if so, to set that rate.

Explanation: The Provost and Manager of Faculty Services met with several members of the Taskforce in fall 2016; no rate was targeted.

Responder Outlier Potential

- To determine whether online produces more outlier responses than paper, we will compare online to paper in a limited number of courses in which we will match sections of the same course taught by the same professor. One section will use paper; one will use online. We will compare the percent of "1" responses and the percent of "5" responses out of all the responses. We will compare the percent of students responding all "1" or all "5" across questions. We will compare 1 and 5 response distributions across paper and online. (Research design suggested by Keith Markus, Chair of the College Council Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee) ***Explanation: The Office of the Provost is unable conduct this research given limited staff and the amount of labor involved in the project. If this is a critical matter, we welcome suggestions on how to accomplish it.***

Recommendation

Based on the above report, I recommend that we continue the online student evaluation of faculty. John Jay College of Criminal Justice's experience, timely reports, cost, and national best practice information underscore this assessment. I also recommend that the Provost's Taskforce for SEOF Online work further with IOTA to customize the system further to meet the faculty's information needs, especially with regard to review.

,

APPENDIX A – The College Council Memo November 2014

To: The College Council

From: Professor Jay Hamilton on Behalf of the Members of the Provost's Taskforce on the Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEOF) Online¹

Date: November 25, 2014

Proposal to Evaluate All Courses Online for a Period of Two Years

Effective: Spring 2015

Be it resolved to conduct the student evaluation of faculty exclusively online for a period of two years using the current questionnaire and the current online vendor, IOTA, beginning in spring 2015 and continuing through spring 2017.

Be it further resolved that the College Council will consider and vote at its October 2017 meeting whether to continue to conduct the student evaluation of faculty exclusively online or whether to revert to an all paper administration, except for online and hybrid courses where online administration is necessary.

Be it further resolved that the proposal will be implemented as follows:

Courses:

- Courses offered in non-traditional time frames (e.g. 8 weeks, 4 weeks) and courses offered in the summer and winter sessions will be evaluated online, but the results of these evaluations will not be included in the personnel process. Faculty will, however, receive reports from such courses, but these reports will not be accessible to members of the personnel review committees.
- The results of the online evaluation of all courses (online, hybrid, and face-to-face) offered in the traditional 15-week academic sessions will be included in the personnel process.
- For team taught courses, based on information provided by the registrar, we will create a separate evaluation for each professor identified by the department in the course schedule as teaching the course.
- For courses with multiple components (such as science courses), we will create a separate evaluation for each component (e.g. Science of the 21st Century Lab, Science of the 21st Century Lecture, and Science of the 21st Century Recitation), based on information provided by the Registrar.

¹ Current members of the Provost's Task Force, inclusive of members of the Faculty Senate Task Force*: Katarzyna Celinska* (Faculty, Law & Police Science), Shuki Cohen (Faculty, Psychology), Jay Hamilton (Chair, Economics), Allison Kavey (Chair, History), Anthony Marcus (Chair, Anthropology), Aida Martinez-Gomez (Faculty, Modern Languages), David Munns* (Faculty, History), Adam Stone (Registrar), Gregory Umbach* (Faculty, History), Roberto Visani (Chair, Art & Music), Ying Wang (Staff, Enrollment Management), and Faika Kabir (Student Council).

Leaders of various governance groups also provided information that shaped the proposal: Sandrine Dikambi (HEO Council), Jonathan Jacobs (Council of Chairs), Karen Kaplowitz (Faculty Senate), Jane Katz (Council of Chairs) and Francis Sheehan (Faculty Senate).

Process of Evaluation:

- We will continue to administer the student evaluation of faculty during a two week period. However, faculty will be able to choose the week in which they wish to administer the evaluations by selecting an on/off feature (spigot). Once a selection is made and the data provided to the vendor, no more changes can be permitted.
- Faculty will be required to provide time in class for students to complete and submit the online evaluation.
- During the administration period chosen by the faculty member, students will continue to have access to evaluating courses outside of class through the J-Stop, My Class Evaluation, email links, and Blackboard.
- We will continue to provide faculty with a Quick Guide for the online administration of the evaluations, and expect that they will read the Quick Guide instructions to students on the day of the administration.
- Students who officially withdraw from a course will not be given the opportunity to evaluate that course.
- IT will ensure that students have access to Wi-Fi, 3G and 4G in class as needed during the evaluation period.
- Blackboard administrators will ensure seamless functionality for faculty who choose to integrate the evaluation tool into their course shells.

Receipt of Results:

- Faculty will have the option to acknowledge receipt of their evaluation data. When faculty sign into “My Class Evaluation” (IOTA) they will see a button on their member results reporting page that will ask them to acknowledge receipt of results. Acknowledgement in no way implies agreement with the results.
- As with prior paper administration, faculty will have the option to respond to the data and/or student comments. This feature will also be displayed on the member results reporting page, with the label “Add Comments.” These comments will only be visible to the faculty member him/herself and any administrator, dean, chair or others allowed in the security matrix to see that individual’s results. No student will ever see any of the faculty rebuttals/responses.

Interpretation and Presentation of Results:

- The college will continue to adopt a new mean score each semester for each academic department as we have always done with paper evaluations, and a new mean score for the college (overall) based on the data generated by the online administration. The overall college and department mean scores are used as a context for understanding individual scores. Computing this anew each semester protects the faculty and takes account of the ups and downs in overall scores and trends during a particular semester.
- Evaluation data reports will be represented graphically and textually to allow for more meaningful interpretation. We will provide the numerical data in the form of bar graphs, with the mean score marked on the graphs. We will run reports using scatterplots to track comments and highlight outliers. This augmented representation of data will be instructive for both faculty and the personnel review committees by offering a more comprehensible and transparent narrative of teaching over time.
- The data for each course evaluated online, including any rebuttal by the faculty member, will be contained in a single image-based file. The image-based files for individual faculty members may be stored in the personnel file and/or the Faculty Internet Document Organizer (FIDO), a password protected system.
- Faculty will access their image-based files by logging into the IOTA system. Chairs will also access the files for their faculty by logging into the IOTA system.

- IOTA will store and maintain the raw data while in its possession as a file permanently anonymized by random codes, and transmit such file for statistical research purposes to John Jay along with the image-based file for each evaluation, accessible only to Office of the Provost staff and authorized research personnel in password protected form. In our workshops with faculty up for personnel actions, we will include a segment on accessing, interpreting, and presenting the data so as to communicate the quality and effectiveness of their teaching.

Encouraging Participation:

Looking at the experience of Brooklyn College, our own experience with the pilot programs, the literature on the implementation of online systems in other institutions, we believe that in the two years of full implementation, we will achieve response rates that satisfy our faculty. Our current response rate, when compared to other institutions, suggests that we are moving in that direction:

Institution	All Paper Administration	All Online Administration
University of Oregon	Did not collect response rates of paper, but “volume of evaluations collected has skyrocketed since going online” from 32,00 Scantron forms in Winter 2007 to 84,728 evaluations completed on line in Winter 2013	Average online response rate 78-79%
Brooklyn College	67.63% in fall 2004	77.2% in fall 2011
College of Staten Island ²	Average of 60%	43% in spring 2014 (second semester of all online administration)
John Jay College	67.2% in spring 2012	50% in spring 2014

- We will incentivize student participation by the following:
 - Requiring faculty to conduct the evaluation in class with guided instructions for raising response rates.
 - Reserving a row in various computer labs for submission of student evaluations during the evaluation period.
 - Sending frequent reminders to students via social media and John Jay resources that they use widely (Twitter, Facebook, email, and prime real estate on the John Jay website).
 - Organizing an iPad raffle, along with periodic raffles for bookstore vouchers and John Jay merchandise.
 - Rebranding the tool with the help of the Student Council to invite enthusiastic participation by connecting the process to iconic, spirited symbols such as “Li'l Jay” and the Bloodhound.

² The College of Staten Island (CSI) transitioned from paper to online in fall 2013, with no pilot period. While participation rates were lower than on paper, CSI saw a 6% increase in the student rate of participation in its second semester of online evaluation implementation.

- We will support the faculty by the following:
 - Providing clear and concise instructions for online administration with guidance for raising rates of student participation.
 - Providing access to evaluation data and comments within one month of the release of all student grades for the semester.
 - By fall 2015, allowing faculty to send out a midterm evaluation/assessment so that they receive feedback on their teaching during the course of a semester. The resultant data will be available only to the faculty member and will not be accessed or used by the personnel committee or department chairs.
 - Midterm assessments accustom students to offering faculty feedback; this translates to higher rates of student participation during the end of term administration of student evaluations. Continuing to name a tree in honor of the department with the highest rates of student participation.

After year one of this implementation plan, it will be revised in consultation with the Provost's Taskforce on the SEOF Online, based on our experience with the process and information derived from our assessment activities.

Be it further resolved that the implementation of the proposal will be assessed as follows: In consultation with the Provost's Taskforce on the SEOF Online each fall of the all-online pilot, the Office of the Provost will present an assessment report to College Council. This report will be given at a fall 2015 and a fall 2016 meeting of the College Council and shared with other governance bodies at their request (Faculty Senate, Council of Chairs, HEO Council, & Student Council). A final report will be issued after the spring 2017 administration as a basis for the College Council consideration at its October 2017 meeting of whether to convert to an entirely online evaluation or revert to all paper (except for online and hybrid courses).

Response Rate/Rate of Participation

A response rate of **50%** or greater is considered optimal for minimizing nonresponse bias and the pull of outliers (see Draugalis & Plaza, 2009). In spring 2014, we achieved a 50% response rate in classes evaluated online. We will work to achieve and surpass this response rate throughout the two-year pilot.

- We will track response rates by instructor and course, and we will provide the overall response rate each semester of the pilot.
- Generalizable surveys will be administered to faculty with high rates of participation (75% and above) to learn about their promising and best practices. We will work with the Provost's Taskforce on the SEOF Online to develop these surveys. Generalizable surveys will be administered to faculty with low rates of participation (25% and below) to learn about the obstacles to obtaining high rates of participation. We will work with the Provost's Taskforce on the SEOF Online to develop these surveys.
- For a limited number of courses suggested by the Provost's Taskforce, we will test whether our experience accords with the research findings that quality of written comments stays the same or increases online. We will designate test sections of the same course taught by the same professor during one or more semesters of the online pilot. One section will use paper; one will use online evaluation. We will then compare word count and sentence length. (Research design suggested by Keith Markus, Chair of the College Council Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee)
- After year one of the pilot, the Provost's Taskforce on the SEOF Online will meet to examine and determine if setting a reliable/valid response rate is necessary, and if so, to set that rate.

Responder Outlier Potential

To determine whether online produces more outlier responses than paper, we will compare online to paper in a limited number of courses in which we will match sections of the same course taught by the same professor. One section will use paper; one will use online. We will compare the percent of “1” responses and the percent of “5” responses out of all the responses. We will compare the percent of students responding all “1” or all “5” across questions. We will compare 1 and 5 response distributions across paper and online. (Research design suggested by Keith Markus, Chair of the College Council Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee)

Technology

- Academic Affairs and IT will keep track of access issues. Academic Affairs and IOTA will provide data on the nature of all technical difficulties, so that they can be addressed in the subsequent administration.
- The Provost’s Taskforce on the SEOF Online will assess two technologically based implementation goals:
 - the functionality and security of the single, image-based file
 - the functionality of the on/off feature (spigot) that allows faculty to select the period (date range) during which they offer and administer online student evaluations.

After year one of this assessment plan, the plan will be reviewed and revised in consultation with the Provost’s Taskforce on the SEOF Online, based on our experience during the year and the usefulness of the data collected. Additional assessment measures will be developed, as needed, for year two of the program.

Rationale:

The college has evaluated the pros and cons of using paper and online questionnaires to review courses during a four-year pilot of online evaluations. We have identified the following advantages of using an online tool:

For Students:

1. Ability to complete their questionnaires in a secure online environment that authenticates respondent identities, prevents duplicate submissions, and generally guards against misuse.
2. Convenience of completing their questionnaires through the J-Stop with direct access to the evaluation questionnaire through single sign-on, or directly from links within emails sent by IOTA.
3. Much like paper, the ability to submit their questionnaires during class time, using their own mobile devices, a provision that raises response rates.

For Faculty and Chairs:

1. More timely feedback; on average one year for paper versus one month for online evaluation feedback.
2. Presentation of the responses and comments in ways that are useful to faculty and allow for more meaningful interpretation of data through various graphic aids. This will be instructive for personnel process reviews, offering a more comprehensible and transparent narrative for standard deviations and outliers.

3. Ability to keep track of teaching effectiveness over time, allowing faculty to have a long view of how their student evaluations intersect with their self-assessments of progress in improving teaching and learning.
4. The ability to review statistical data and commentary remotely, providing e-signature and submission to the personnel file without onsite appointments with the Office of the Provost.

For the College:

1. Cost effective. We will be able to reduce the number of vendors required to support the process from three to one. We will contract with the current online vendor, IOTA, and continue to use its product, My Class Evaluation, since it is reasonably priced and has proven very effective, and has accommodated all of our faculty and committee design requests in an effort to support our personnel process and faculty teaching improvement. The college will save approximately \$16,000 a year in direct costs by going online.
2. Reduction of the burden on staff. Presently there are 7 offices required to manage the paper process: Testing, Registrar, Provost's Office, Facilities, Information Technology, Security, and Student Affairs, with some staff spending hundreds of hours on their part of the process. Online administration and data collection will require little to no involvement of most of the aforementioned offices.
3. Support of our school-wide efforts to go-green.

Submitted for discussion at May 4, 2018 Faculty Personnel Committee Meeting

Submitted by:

Seth Baumrin, Associate Professor & Chair of Communication and Theater Arts

The Key resembles a list of abbreviations one might find in the front material of a book.

Key:

DB – Double Blind Peer Review

BP -- Blind Peer Review

ER – Editorial Review

INV – Invited

FA – First Author

VN – Vanity

CP – Conference Proceedings

ENC – Encyclopedia

CR – Commissioned Report

BC – Book Chapter

BR – Book Review

These are the most common categories according to my experience when evaluating the so-called quality and integrity of the journals cited in cvs of candidates for promotion and tenure. I do not include book presses but similar guidelines could apply.

Hereunder I submit my own cv as an example of the key's usage. I do not include my encyclopedia entries or book/performance reviews because in my cv they constitute different categories. But in instances when a candidate groups all publications together the key is useful when discovering quality, integrity, and genre of publication.

Articles in Peer Reviewed National and International Journals

“Ukrainian Contemporary Theatre as Cultural Renewal: Interview with Volodymyr Kuchynskyi, March 2015” *European Stages*, vol. 9. CUNY-GSUC (May 2017). ER

“Subpoetics International: A Boat Constructed While on Water”

<http://howlround.com/subpoetics-international-a-boat-constructed-while-on-water> (February 2017). BP

“Trace Elements of Kyivan Modernism: The Les Kurbas Legacy in 21st Century Ukrainian Performance – March 2015” in *Tension and Recognition*. University of Wrocław Polish Philology Institute Department of Theory of Culture and Performing Arts (forthcoming) BP

- “Performances at a Symposium ‘Theatre as a Laboratory for Community Interaction’ at Odin Teatret, Holstebro, Denmark, May 2014” *European Stages*, vol. 4. CUNY-GSUC (May 2015). ER
- “Theatre Ethics and the Performer’s Amoral Duties: An Axiology for the Actor” full length version in Polish. *The Game* a publication of *The Polish Journal of Philosophy* (No. 7/1 2013) Jagiellonian University, Cracow, (2014), 110-18. DB
- “Theatre Ethics and the Performer’s Amoral Duties: An Axiology for the Actor” short version in English in *Tension and Recognition*. University of Wrocław Polish Philology Institute Department of Theory of Culture and Performing Arts (2014), 281-294. PR
- “Why Theatre Matters to Criminal Justice Students: A Discussion between Seth Baumrin and Karen Malpede” *Howlround: a Journal of Theater Commons at Emerson College* <http://www.howlround.com/about/> (September 2012). PR
- “An Appeal to my Colleagues: The Institute for Crimes against Culture” [Address to the “In Place of War” Conference: Prishtina, Kosovo June 2010] in *Theatre and Nationalism*. eds. James Thompson and Jeton Neziraj. IPOW & Qendra multimedia: Kosovo, 2011. CP
- “Interview with Torgeir Wethal” *Odin Teatret Archives*. ed. Mirella Schino, Holstebro DK, 2010. ER
- “Where is my Grotowski? The Masquerade Plays On.” *New Theatre Quarterly*, Cambridge University Press, November 2009, 360-62. DB
- “Ketmanship in Opole: Jerzy Grotowski and the Price of Free Expression.” *The Drama Review* (T- 204) Winter 2009, 49-77. DB
- “Les Kurbas Theatre, Lviv, 2008.” *Slavic and Eastern European Performance*, Spring, 2009, 29-38. DB
- “Performances at the Headquarters of Paratheatre!?! The Centre for Study of Jerzy Grotowski’s Work and for Cultural and Theatrical Research in Transformation.” *Slavic and Eastern European Performance*, Winter, 2007, 31-40. DB
- “Report on the IV World Congress of the International University Theatre Association in Krakow, Poland March 21-25, 2001.” With Nora Glickman in *Slavic and Eastern European Performance*, Winter 2002, 82-89. DB
- “No Longer in Search of an Author, a Character Defines Herself; Pirandello’s *Six Characters in Search of an Author* Viewed within the Context of Eugenio Barba’s Experimental Performance Methodology.” *Modern Drama*, volume 44, number 2, 2002, 174-87. DB
- “Jig Cook: Stage Manager for an American Renaissance.” *Journal of American Drama and Theatre*. Fall 2000, 55-74. DB
- “My Grandfather Konstantin Sergeievich: Interview with Eugenio Barba” *Transmission*. ed. Thomas Leabhart. *Mime Journal*, 1998/1999, 29-51. PR
- “Eugenio Barba - Odin Teatret 1992” *Western European Stages*, Fall 1992, 5-7. ER
- “The Roots of Modern Drama” in *College Knowledge and Reading Strategy*, fourth edition. eds. Joseph Evering, Jose Fabara, Jason Kittler, Ernest Nieretka, and George Sussman. Pearson: Boston, 2008. BC/INV
- “Anarcho-Radical Roots—Opole to Oslo to Holstebro 1959-69; Eugenio Barba’s Early Experimental Theatre as Intervention.” Book chapter in *Vectors of the Radical: Textual*

Exchange, Global Radicalism, and the 60s. ed. Mike Sell, an edition of *Works and Days* 39/40, Vol. 20 Nos. 1 & 2, ed. David Downing. Indiana University Press, 2002. DB

“Eugenio Barba and Professional Identity: Transcultural Actor Training” in *Theatre Without Frontiers*. eds. Maria S. Horne, Jean-Marc Larrue, and Claude Schumacher. International Association of University Theatres, Vox Theatri: Valleyfield, Quebec, 2001: 24-40. 2001. DB