Procedures for Reviewing Purchase College Faculty for Reappointment and Promotion
Adopted September 20, 2006; Revised April 16, 2008

I. Introduction

This document was submitted to the Faculty-at-Large by the *ad hoc* committee charged with regularizing and codifying the review procedures for faculty across the College. The procedures outlined below were designed to strengthen faculty responsibility for and authority over the review process as set out under shared governance in the Policies of the Board of Trustees. The committee met several times as a group and consulted PPC members and colleagues across the campus.

The procedures and guidelines detailed in this document are intended to be fair, transparent, and easily implemented by candidates under review, local review committees (RCs, formerly DRCs), and administrators. It is expected that these procedures and guidelines will be incorporated into the Bylaws of the Faculty, and that they will be well-publicized and readily available (via the College web site and in Deans' offices) to all faculty members. The committee, in developing these procedures, has taken into account the exigencies of different units and the widely varying kinds of work done by faculty in all the diverse fields of endeavor represented in the College; we therefore expect these procedures and guidelines to be implemented consistently across the College.

II. Terms of Appointment

a. **Initial contracts and reappointment:** The agreement between SUNY and the UUP allows for one-, two-, or three-year appointments for junior faculty. For tenure track hires, we recommend initial three-year contracts, with two subsequent two-year contracts, except in unusual cases. Newly hired faculty members will be reviewed during their second year and at two-year intervals thereafter; thus, junior faculty members will have two years between reviews to meet expectations about teaching, scholarship, and service. If an initial three-year appointment isn't workable, we recommend an initial two-year appointment followed by a three-year appointment.[1]
b. **The appointment letter:** The appointment letter contains information about the review process and includes the date of the first review. It also informs the recipient that her / his responsibilities are in the domains of teaching, scholarship / professional activities, and community service.

III. Standardization of Letters in the Review Process

a. **From Dean to Faculty Member under Review** (See Appendix):

[1] These longer appointment terms will provide increased stability to the faculty body and to individual programs, and they will permit a reasonable time period for a faculty member to compile a review-worthy dossier. Finally, longer appointments will decrease the overall number of reviews.

This letter, which notifies a faculty member of an upcoming review, identifies the PPC representative overseeing the review and encourages the faculty member to consult with her / him. It also directs the faculty member to consult with her / his faculty mentor in preparing for the review. The letter describes, in broad terms, the contents of the review dossier to be submitted, and it directs the recipient to the sections of the Faculty-at-Large Bylaws (sections X and XI) that describe the procedures, standards, and criteria for reappointment and promotion. The timeline for the review process accompanies this letter.

b. From Dean to External Reviewers (See Appendix)

1. **Preliminary letter:** This letter is an initial invitation, generally sent after an informal agreement is reached by telephone. It informs evaluators about the review timeline and any honoraria they will receive. It also includes a copy of the CV of the person under review.
2. **Letter sent with file:** This letter accompanies the review file. It includes information about the character of Purchase College and describes the teaching and service responsibilities of faculty members as well as the expectations for scholarship and/or professional activities. It may include the Purchase College Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, with the relevant sections highlighted. The Dean's letter asks external evaluators to describe their relationship to the person under review, and asks them explicitly to state whether their familiarity would affect their ability to conduct an objective evaluation.

c. From Dean to RC: The charge letter sent to the RC specifies all the possible outcomes of the review: reappointment for one, two, or three years, promotion, tenure, non-renewal. The charge letter is accompanied by the review timeline and, to aid the review committee in its deliberations, the initial appointment letter.

IV. Information Provided to the Faculty Member Under Review

a. The appointment letter: This letter specifies the term of appointment and the responsibilities and obligations of the faculty member; it informs the recipient of any special conditions governing the appointment (see below, IX). It also informs the recipient of the dates of her / his first review and says that she / he will be assigned a faculty mentor upon arrival at Purchase.

b. Through the mentoring program: Each new faculty member is assigned a mentor who is trained to provide guidance through the first review process. The mentor meets with the new faculty member on a regular basis throughout the first year of her / his appointment and again just before and during the review process. The mentor ascertains that the faculty member under review has received a copy of the timeline and fully understands her/his responsibilities. The mentor guides the faculty member in the preparation of the review dossier and offers advice about what may be included and what must be included in the dossier.

c. From the Dean's office: The Dean's office serves as the intermediary

between the person under review and the RC and provides administrative support to the RC.

V. The Contents of the Dossier Submitted by the Person under Review

a. Self-evaluation: The faculty member under review submits a narrative account describing her / his accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship / artistic work / professional activities, and community service. The narrative is guided by the standards and criteria set forth in section XI of the Bylaws of the Faculty-at-Large. To the extent possible, the narrative is supported by documents, such as examples of teaching assignments, copies of publications or artistic work, etc.

Guidelines: The most important item in the dossier is the narrative statement, which may be in the form of a letter to the RC. The dossier also includes a current CV; a list of Purchase College faculty, students and graduates, staff, and administrators who might be contacted about the review; a list of four potential external evaluators, where relevant; teaching materials, including course descriptions, syllabi, and sample assignments where relevant or appropriate; samples of scholarly, creative, and other professional work; clips or excerpts from a representative selection of programs and reviews that document work done, especially for artists and performers whose work is neither tangible nor permanent. Syllabi and course descriptions may not be appropriate for performers and artists. Scholarly / professional activities are defined in Section XI of the Bylaws of the Faculty-at-Large.

***Budget for duplicating materials*:** Faculty in some units, such as Art and Design or Music, may incur substantial expenses in drawing together material to be sent to external evaluators. We recommend that the College set aside funds in the budgets of each unit to defray the cost of sending material to external evaluators. This practice is followed in some units (e.g., School of Humanities), but not others.

b. Direction in the conduct of the review: The person under review provides the names and contact information of students and alumni with whom she / he has worked closely, and when needed, of external evaluators appropriate for conducting a review of her / his scholarly / professional work. She / he also provides a brief statement defining her / his area of scholarly / professional activities to assist the RC. If the nature of the work is controversial, the faculty member under review may submit a statement of explanation and the names of potential reviewers who might be biased against her / his work.

VI. The RCS

a. Eligible Members: Faculty members not currently under review or serving on the PPC are eligible to serve on RCs. Fewer faculty will be eligible to serve on RCs that meet to select external reviewers prior to the academic year in which the review proper takes place. When the pool of faculty eligible to serve is too limited, a faculty member whose review is concluding in a given academic year may be named to a RC that will conduct its deliberations the following year, with the condition that the faculty member not participate until her / his review is complete.

b. Selection of RC Members:

1. Each unit holds a meeting of "eligible faculty" to select the members of RCs in that unit. The Dean (or Dean's office) informs faculty when the meeting of "eligibles" is to take place, but the Dean is not present at the meeting. The meeting of eligibles is chaired by the PPC representative of the unit, who has the list supplied by the Provost of eligible faculty across the College. The composition of review committees is prescribed in the Bylaws of the Faculty. The PPC representative asks for nominations of faculty chosen from among those eligible within and outside the unit.

2. To protect the integrity and fairness of the review process and guard against the appearance of bias, self-nomination for RCs is prohibited. A faculty member named to a RC should inform the PPC of any potential conflict of interest he / she might have or appear to have in regard to the person being reviewed and state whether he / she can fairly evaluate the person being reviewed.

3. The PPC representative designates a convener for each RC, usually the first name on the list of nominees and usually a member of the BOS of the person being reviewed. A chair is elected at the first meeting of the RC. Student members of the RC may be nominated at the meeting of eligibles or by consensus arrived at during the first meeting of the RC. When student members join the committee, the Chair informs them about the importance of confidentiality.

c. Role in the Review Process: The RC is the chief investigative body, and as such, is responsible for seeking out, compiling, and interpreting the documents that form the evidentiary basis of the review process. Thus, the RC seeks input from a wide and representative range of Purchase College faculty, students and graduates, and staff. The RC is responsible for selecting the students and colleagues within the College and the alumni from whom letters are solicited, and a dean may submit a request in writing to the RC for solicitation of letters from particular on-campus persons, should s/he wish. In addition, the RC is responsible for identifying and selecting external reviewers when needed. RCs are required to consult with deans regarding the list of proposed external evaluators as they seek to assemble the best possible list. The consultation process requires that (1) the RC meet with the Dean to go over the list of external reviewers before any request letters have been sent out; (2) the Dean submit recommendations for additional referees (if any) in writing, with brief bios of the recommended individuals and a

brief explanation of the rationale for the recommendation; (3) the RC consider the Dean's recommendations in making its final decision about external reviewers; (4) the Dean's request and the RC's response to it (especially if it is negative) should be summarized in the RC's letter to the Dean. The faculty member under review is not involved in the solicitation of any of these letters.

1.Selection of external evaluators: Typically, three external evaluations are conducted, although the RC may seek more, e.g., in cases where the work crosses traditional disciplinary boundaries or artistic genres. The RC forwards to the Dean the names of at least one external evaluator from the list provided by the person under review and at least one from outside that list; the Dean contacts the evaluators on behalf of the Committee. Often the RC makes informal contact with the prospective evaluator first. The RC compiles a list of alternatives in case evaluators decline; this list is provided to the Deans as needed. Faculty under review have no role in contacting external evaluators. External evaluators are asked about their familiarity with the person under review and asked explicitly to state whether any such familiarity would affect their ability to offer a fair-minded, objective evaluation of the work in question. In general, a person's doctoral dissertation supervisor should not be asked to serve as an external evaluator. An exception can be made if the evaluator's relationship with the person under review has substantially changed over the period of time. This exception would enable a RC to consult an evaluator who was once a teacher but has, by the time promotion to full professor is sought, become a colleague of the person under review.

2. Honoraria: Offering honoraria acknowledges the crucial role of external evaluations in the review process. The College currently has no policy on honoraria for external evaluations. When honoraria are sought, the procedure is so cumbersome that it is virtually impossible to implement. The College needs a clear policy on and procedures for requesting / sending honoraria. One possible model is that set out in the guidelines of the Association of Departments of English (available online: www.ade.org). To assure smooth implementation of the policy and procedures, we propose that the Provost's office set aside a fund for honoraria of $200 for all external evaluators.

3. Requests for more information: If the RC finds that the dossier is incomplete or missing important material, the chair of the RC asks the Dean's office to request additional material from the person under review.

d. Final Product: The RC ultimately produces a letter that describes and evaluates the performance of the person under review in the areas of teaching, scholarship / professional activities, and community service. The review letter is based on the evidence collected and puts forth a recommendation in accordance with the options specified in its charge letter from the dean. In exceptional cases, a reappointment RC may recommend promotion to Associate Professor. If a RC does not reach consensus, it is permissible for two or more differing letters to be drafted within the RC. All members of a RC must sign a letter.

e. Special Circumstances and Constraints:

1. Limited Eligible Members: In some cases, no one from the board of study of the person under review is eligible to serve on her / his RC. In such cases, the RC solicits letters from members of the BOS.

2. Letters to the File: To protect the integrity and fairness of the process and guard against the appearance of bias, members of a RC may not write letters to the RC. The views of committee members may be registered in the RC's letter to the Dean; the letter quotes the RC member by name and describes the RC member's familiarity with the work of the person under review and / or expertise in the area at issue. Names and other identifying information do not appear in the copy of the letter shown to the person under review; however, the identifying information is present in copies that proceed up the chain of the review process.

VII. The Personnel Policies Committee

a. Composition: Members of the PPC are tenured faculty nominated by the faculty in the units they represent, and elected by the faculty-at-large. PPC members serve for a maximum of three years, with terms staggered so that there are experienced members on the committee in any given year. The PPC elects its own chair; we recommend that the chair be a faculty member in the third year of her / his term. A faculty member who chairs the PPC has the option of extending her / his term for a fourth year.

b. Responsibilities in the Review Process: The PPC oversees the process to assure its accuracy, fairness, efficiency, integrity, and transparency as follows:

1. Checks charge letters against Provost's master list of faculty under review to assure letters have been sent out and are accurate.

2. Approves the composition of the RC.

3. Insures that the RC follows stated procedures in selection of external reviewers.

4. PPC Chair alerts members about the arrival of files and asks that they read through particular files before a given meeting.

5. Representative for each unit shepherds the files of faculty from her / his unit through the committee's deliberations.

6. Traditional practice has been that PPC representatives draft letters for faculty from their units.

7. PPC has authority over any procedural questions or anomalies.

c. Role in Reviews of Part-Time Faculty: The PPC reviews the files of adjunct- and part-time faculty for procedural issues only. The PPC does not review the scholarship / professional activities of part-time and adjunct faculty.

d. Role in Reviews of Full-Time Faculty: The PPC reviews the files of full-time faculty for procedural and substantive issues. The PPC review of substantive issues need not duplicate the entire RC review.

e. Prerogatives and Constraints:

1. PPC has a fixed meeting time (traditionally Wednesday at 3:00 or 4:30); thus, it is inadvisable to elect PPC members who cannot meet at that time.

2. PPC members are not eligible to serve on RCs, and it has been practice that they are not allowed to contribute individual letters to RCs' files. In extraordinary circumstances, an exception can be made and a letter sought from a PPC member.
3. The PPC is charged in the by-laws with looking at searches as well as reviews. This matter will be addressed in a separate document at a later time.

VIII. Procedures for and Rules about Adding Material to a File:

a. The timeline dictates that the person under review submit her / his file on the first day of academic obligation. Thereafter, a faculty member under review may submit additional material that resolves or consolidates the status of work submitted in the original file. For example, if a book manuscript is submitted with the file, and the book is later accepted by a publisher, the letter from the publisher may be added to the file.
b.The RC, while deliberating, may also request, via the Dean's office, additional material from the person under review.
c. It is expected that the RC will collect the material needed at all levels of review; the Dean, the PPC, the Provost, or the President may request additional information. The RC chair (and a member of both sides if there is a dissenting/minority letter) is informed of additions to the file.

IX. Access of Review Committees to Earlier Reviews

RCs may have access to previous reviews in order to document progress and development in the career of the person being reviewed. It is advised that RCs consult material in the files of a previous review after they have substantially completed their own evaluation of the person being reviewed.

X. Faculty Members with Joint Appointments in Other Units

Faculty who also have staff appointments (e.g. in a BOS and another unit such as the Neuberger or PAC) need to be fully part of and integrated with both units, not just one. The faculty member / staff member will be reviewed both by a RC with respect to criteria enumerated in the By-Laws and procedures to be adopted by the Faculty-at-Large and according to the procedures of the other unit.

a. The review process for persons with dual appointments is specified in the appointment letter: The clearer the appointment letter, the smoother the review process. The PPC should be consulted before dual appointments are created or, where this is not possible, should vet the appointment letter before it is sent out. To ensure an orderly and transparent review process, the appointment letter clearly specifies (1) the appointee's eligibility for leaves and sabbaticals; (2) the College's expectations about the appointee's professional activities: professional activities on campus and beyond, e.g., publication, conference presentations, work

on artistic juries, peer review for scholarly journals or university presses; (3) expectations about service to the Purchase community.

b. Charge letters to RC: The charge letter to the RC corresponds to and refers the committee to the appointment letter. The charge letter explicitly states what the RC reviews: teaching, scholarship or other professional activity, service. If "professional activity" includes work done on campus, the RC may take that work into account. Charge letters to RCs of faculty members who also have staff appointments should instruct committees not to penalize those under review for fulfilling their obligations to the other units to which they belong.

c. PPC Recommendation: Whereas faculty reviews begin with peer review in the RCs, reviews in the Neuberger and PAC are not peer reviews; rather, staff members are evaluated each year in relation to the performance programs they are given. To protect the confidentiality and integrity of the faculty review process, confidential letters written by the members of the RC and PPC are not read by members of other units. Rather, for faculty members who also hold staff appointments, there are two parallel review processes that converge in the Provost's office. The Provost makes a recommendation to the President based on the parallel reviews.

Developed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Faculty Review Procedures

Committee Members: Louise Yelin, Literature, Chair; Carol Bankerd, Design; Larry Clark, Dance; Jan Factor, Biology; Steve Lubin, Music; Greg Taylor, Film; Ronnie Halperin, Psychology, Faculty Presiding Officer, *ex-officio*.

APPENDIX: Templates for Letters in the Review Process

The samples below are templates supplied by the Provost's Office. The committee recommends that these letters be amended as follows:

- Dean's Letter to the Faculty Member: Encourage consultation with faculty mentor and remind candidate that Review Procedures (once these are adopted by the Faculty-at-Large) are posted on the College web site.
- Dean's Letter (with file) to external evaluators: Include description of Purchase College. The letter asks evaluators if the faculty member's work would merit tenure at their institutions; it should also ask evaluators whether the faculty member's work would merit tenure in institutions comparable to Purchase.

1. Dean's Letter Notifying Faculty Member of Upcoming Review

March 22, 2006 [at the latest]

Name
Address

Dear XXXX:

In accordance with the Faculty By-Laws of Purchase College, this is your official notification that you are being reviewed, during this academic year, (2006-07), for [tenure and/or promotion] to [Associate or Full] Professor.

Please submit an updated *curriculum vitae* and list of at least three names of individuals who may be used as external referees to review your scholarly / professional work and submit an evaluation. Please also include their contact information. One or more of your suggestions will be used, if they agree to serve in this role. The remaining referees will be selected by the RC in consultation with the Dean. This list is due to my office by **April 7, 2006.**

You will be required to supply the following for your complete review file by **August 21, 2006**, the first day of faculty obligation for AY 2006-07.

- Updated *curriculum vitae*
- Candidate's statement, including a discussion of your contributions to the three aspects of our academic mission: teaching, scholarship / professional / artistic activities, and community service
- Materials documenting your teaching effectiveness including course syllabi, where relevant
- Scholarly documents or products of your professional activities since last review
- Names of faculty and staff outside your school, and names of alumni/ae and students (with contact information) with whom you have worked closely.

As you prepare your materials, I recommend that you consult Article XI of the *Bylaws of the Faculty of Purchase College,* which contains the criteria for reappointment and promotion of faculty, for further guidance in how to construct your statement and file. The timetable calls for the Divisional Review Committee to submit its recommendation to me by December 7, 2006. Your file then goes to the Personnel Policies Committee by January 22, 2007, and to the Provost by March 10, 2007. You should receive written notification from the President no later than August 31, 2007. If you have any questions or desire further information concerning the review process, please do not hesitate to call me. Our PPC representative is xxxx. You may also contact her / him for guidance in the process.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

2. Dean's Letter (on behalf of RC) Asking External Evaluators to Participate: Simultaneous email and snail mail

June 1, 2006 [at the latest]

Dear Professor _____:

Our departmental personnel committee is evaluating Professor xxxxxxxxxx for [tenure and/or promotion] to [associate/full] professor. University personnel procedures require us to solicit objective letters of evaluation from recognized experts in the candidate's area of [scholarship/artistic achievement]. I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the corpus of Professor xxxxxxx's [scholarly work / professional activities].

I enclose for your information a copy of Professor XXX's *curriculum vitae*.
I would be most grateful for the valuable insight you can provide to our evaluation, and I hope that your schedule will allow you to aid us in this important task. I can assure you that your identity and evaluation will remain confidential, unless you release your letter for the candidate's information by filling out a form we will send you with the review materials. If you do not return the form, your comments will not be released to the candidate.

Although we will not need your letter until October 15th and would not plan to send all of the relevant review materials to you until the end of August, we hope to secure your commitment now. I would appreciate your letting me know within the next two weeks if you will be able to assist us in this process. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

3. Dean's Letter to External Evaluators sent with Review Dossier

Dear Professor _____:

Thank you for agreeing earlier this summer to review Professor XXX for [tenure and/ or promotion] to [associate/full] professor. I enclose an updated *curriculum vitae* for your information and copies of the materials for review. Please describe in what capacity, if any, you know the candidate. We ask that you assess the overall quality of Professor Xxx's work and its contributions to the discipline [disciplines, fields, etc.]. To what degree is Professor Xxx's work original and creative? What is its significance as [a scholarly contribution/professional activity] both to the special area and the general subject? Given the information you have, where would you rank Xxx as a [scholar and researcher/creative artist] relative to others you know of similar ages and backgrounds within the subject area? Are you aware of any contributions to the field, besides [scholarly/artistic] works, made by Professor Xxx, as for example activities in learned societies, conferences, and the like? Have these activities promoted teaching and scholarship in the discipline? In your opinion, would his/her [scholarship / artistic work / professional activity] merit promotion/tenure at your institution?

Sincerely,