

BARUCH COLLEGE POLICY FOR EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

I. Introduction: Purpose of External Peer Reviews.

External peer reviews will be solicited to assist the College in its review process for granting tenure and promotion and for appointing new faculty at the rank of Professor. External reviews increase our ability to obtain an objective, fair assessment of a candidate's scholarly contribution to his/her field, thereby adding credibility to the review process. External reviews are to be used as important documentation in the context of the Baruch personnel process; these reviews are not intended to establish the relative weight which is given to scholarship in the review process or to substitute for the Baruch collegial peer review process.

II. Process.

II. A. Overview: From Selection of Reviewers to Sending Materials. The goal is to receive five external peer reviews for every personnel action:

- The candidate, department chair and appropriate department committee will each recommend four potential reviewers in order of preference and will complete an information sheet about each recommended reviewer.
- After the right to strike names has been fulfilled, the Chair sends the recommended names to the Dean on the appropriate form. [The Dean will select four of the names if the candidate is the department chair.]
- After the Dean approves the recommended panel, the department chair will contact the first three choices from each list through approved letters which will include a c.v. of the candidate with a notation of what works will be sent for review. If necessary, the Chair will contact one or more of the remaining three names, respecting the intent to include reviewers from the candidate, department chair, and department committee. If necessary because of time constraints, and only after the letters are sent to potential reviewers, the Chair may contact reviewers by phone to obtain their response to the request.
- The Chair will compile a list of those who agree to serve and send that to the Dean. If an unusually large number agree to be reviewers, the Dean may shorten the list, but the final list is to represent the original sources of the recommendations.
- The final panel will be sent the review materials and asked to respond to specific inquiries; the inquiries must conform to the College's approved list or to an alternate necessary because of the discipline; alternates must be approved by the Dean.

II. A.I. Department Committee.

The Department Chair convenes a single meeting of all faculty who are eligible to serve on either the Promotion Committee or the Tenure Committee, including the Department Chair. This meeting may occur in May after the vote for department chair, if applicable, in late August or in early September of each year. The members of this joint committee meeting will elect a single Chair, who is not the Department Chair, from among the tenured full professors. This

Committee Chair's role is both administrative and collegial. The Chair has no special role on choosing the external reviewers, but insures that the process is appropriately thorough and consultative. The elected Chair serves as Chair of the Promotion Committee, as Chair of the Tenure Committee, and as Chair of the *ad hoc* Committee formed to nominate external reviewers for candidates seeking promotion to full professor.

After the Full Professor has been elected to Chair the Promotion, Tenure, and the ad hoc Committee for Promotion to Full Professor, the Department Chair excuses him or herself from meetings held to nominate external reviewers. The Department Chair nominates a separate list of external reviewers, and works with the elected Chair of the Department Committees to reconcile the numbers of nominees on those lists if any nominees are stricken with cause or are duplicates. The Department Chair does rejoin the Department Promotion and Tenure Committees with voice and vote when voting on candidates for promotion to Associate Professor or for tenure. In practice, many departments convene the Promotion Committee and the Tenure Committee in a single meeting if the membership of each committee is identical.

II. A. 2. Striking Names for Cause. The candidate, department chair, departmental committee, and Dean each may ask for names to be stricken for cause. The primary criteria for exclusion are that the person has insufficient standing in the appropriate discipline or that the reviewer could not be objective. To maintain a list from three sources, if names are stricken they will be replaced by the person or committee who recommended the names. The department chair will oversee this process. The Dean will arbitrate unresolved departmental disputes and the Provost will arbitrate unresolved disputes concerning the Deans' challenge(s).

II. A. 3. Qualifications of External Reviewers. External reviewers must be external to the CUNY system, must have major status as scholars and advanced standing in the appropriate field, and they must not have had a relationship with the candidate that would prevent an objective evaluation based on the merits of the works. The qualifications of each reviewer, matching these criteria, will be provided for every person recommended.

II. A. 4. Works to be Sent. All published **research and creativity activity** (as defined by the national standards for the discipline) are sent for reviews for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; works since promotion to Associate Professor are sent for a review for full Professor. Works listed "in progress" must be in a form suitable for review.

II. A. 5. Contact with Reviewers. All contacts with the reviewers will be through written communications which are approved by the Provost. The only exception is telephone contact by the Chair where such contact is necessary because of time restraints (see Para. II.A. para 3). External reviews are to be obtained only through this process; other evaluative materials which are not obtained through this process must be clearly separated from the external reviews obtained by the College process.

II. B. Receipt and Distribution of Reviews. The reviews are sent to the Department Chair, who is responsible for maintaining their confidentiality and filing them in the administration file. All documentation, including letters and forms, related to external reviews are filed in the candidate's administration file.

II. B. 1. Availability of Reviews. The reviews and all related documentation will be made available through the procedures regulating administration files. The department Chair is responsible for the appropriate handling of all external reviews and related documentation.

II. B. 2. Letters Received after Departmental Vote. External review letters received after the departmental vote will be placed in the administration file labeled "letters received after departmental vote."

III. Supplements to This Policy.

A School or Department may prepare guidelines for implementation of the College's policy, but such guidelines will not supersede the College policy. All persons subject to the provisions of this policy are responsible for following the guidelines; the department Chairs/program Directors are responsible for ensuring that the department/program faculty have current copies of the policy and supplements. College-wide forms prepared for implementation of this policy are considered part of the policy.

[Rev. 7/94)

BARUCH COLLEGE POLICY FOR EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW
Outline of Procedure

<i>RECOMMENDING REVIEWERS</i>	1. Candidate, chair, and department committee each recommend four external reviewers in order of preference and fill out form for each. Candidate, chair, and committee each may strike names for cause. [See Forms ER-I A,B,C.]
<i>DEAN'S APPROVAL</i>	2. Chair prepares list of potential reviewers and reviews the list and qualifications with the Dean, who must approve the list. [See Form ER-2]
<i>CONTACTING REVIEWERS</i>	3. Chair sends the approved form letter and candidate's c.v. to the top 3 names from each source. [See Form ER-3]
<i>SELECTING REVIEWERS</i>	4. Chair notifies Dean of persons who agree to serve. If more than six agree, Dean may shorten the list. Dean returns list of reviewers to Chair, copy to Provost. [See Form ER-4]
<i>MATERIALS TO BE SENT</i>	5. All works since the last personnel action are sent to reviewers. 6. Chair sends materials to reviewers with form letter listing questions. [See Form ER-5]
<i>ADDITIONAL CONTACTS WITH REVIEWERS</i>	7. Chair tracks additional communications with reviewers and records them. [See Forms ER-1 A,B,C.]
<i>RECEIPT AND DISTRIBUTION OF REVIEWS</i>	8. Reviews are sent to the Chair, who attaches the original information sheet about the reviewer and files the review in the administration file. [See Forms ER 1.A,B,C.]

This outline is intended to supplement the full policy, which must be consulted for full details.

BARUCH COLLEGE POLICY FOR EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW ADVISORY NOTES

These notes amplify the intention of the "Policy for External Peer Review"

II. Process, Sec. A: Numbers of reviewers: source of final review panel

It cannot be determined in advance how many persons will agree to serve, or how many persons will send an evaluation after agreeing to do so. It is possible to have an unusually large number of reviews if evaluations are solicited from all nine persons; however, if only five persons are sent materials, one or more may fail to respond. The dean must exercise judgment on how many and which external reviewers are to be contacted after the Chair has determined which persons agree to serve. Once reviews have been obtained none can be excluded from the review process; if the full process, implemented in good faith with the goal of obtaining at least five reviews, yields more or less than five reviews, that result will not in itself be the basis for challenging the validity of the reviews which are included.

If persons from each of the three lists agree to serve, all three sources must be used. If all potential reviewers from one source decline to serve that source must be asked for additional suggestions; however, provided that a good faith effort has been made to obtain reviewers from the three sources, the lack of a review from any source will not in itself constitute an inappropriate selection of evaluators.

If the candidate is the department Chair, he/she will forward eight names to the Dean: four recommended by himself/herself and four by the department committee. The Dean will provide the additional four names. The right to strike for cause remains the same.

II. A.1. "For tenure and promotion...the senior ranking faculty member..."

To ensure that the list of reviewers is obtained from three independent sources, the senior ranking faculty member of the departmental committee who is not the department chair will preside over the process of obtaining the committee's recommendations. Since there is no department committee for promotion to full Professor, an ad hoc committee of Professors will be constituted for the purpose of implementing this process.

II.A.2. and II.A.3. "Striking for Cause..." and "Status of reviewers..."

The expertise and objectivity of the external reviewer are vital elements of the process. Usually reviewers are faculty in other universities at the rank of full Professor and with significant reputations in the field. When appropriate, professionals outside of academia with analogous seniority and reputation may be used. Reviewers from Baruch or any other CUNY college may not be used as external reviewers.

All persons who are suggested as reviewers must be counted on for an objective evaluation. Reviewers known to be antagonistic toward the candidate's scholarly viewpoint, independent of the quality of the work based on that viewpoint, should not be included, just as reviewers who would have reason for favorable bias to the candidate must be excluded (e.g., co-authors, co-investigators, the major professor, editors whose association with the works would interfere with an objective evaluation, close personal friends). Since we expect Baruch faculty to develop significant reputations, the fact that a reviewer knows the candidate or the candidate's work is not a *priori* cause for exclusion.

Each person responsible for the final list of reviewers has the right to strike the names of reviewers recommended by one of the other parties; however, the right to strike is limited to cases where there is cause based on the mismatch of a reviewer to the criteria. Since the two major criteria for reviewers are their status in the profession and their objectivity, those two issues also are the expected reasons to challenge a recommendation.

The supplemental documents (forms for preparing list of reviewers and letters sent to reviewers) must include a statement of the qualification of each reviewer; a request for confirmation of objectivity by the reviewer; and a signed statement by the candidate that, to the best of her/his knowledge, all reviewers are of appropriate status and have no relationship which would cause them not to be objective.

II.A.4. "All published works (as defined by the national standards for the discipline) are sent..."

All works which are noted by the candidate on her/his record must be available for review. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, all works will be sent for external review. For promotion to full Professor, all works completed since the last promotion will be sent for external review. The only exception to these rules is in cases where there is an extraordinary amount of material for review; such exceptions must be approved by the Dean and the Dean must approve the works which are selected to be sent. Works in progress can be listed only if the work completed to date is made available for review; works in progress can be sent for review only if approved by the Dean.

II.B. Receipt, Filing, Distribution of Reviews

As of the academic year 1994-95, upon the recommendation of a review panel consisting of the College chairs and members of the Faculty Senate, external reviews will be made available only to persons entitled to see the confidential administration file. All materials related to the external reviews and the process for obtaining the reviews are also placed in the administration file.

The integrity of the external review process will be impeded if there is a mixture of reviews obtained by the College's process and evaluations or reviews which were obtained without the safeguards of the College's process. Therefore, all external reviews obtained by the College's process will be identified and placed in the administration file; other evaluative statements which were not obtained by the College's confidential External Review Process must be placed in the personal file and such statements are not to be referenced as "external reviews" in any way that would imply that they were obtained through the College's external review process.

Since the College cannot control the reviewer's timing, reviews may come in after the deadline given to the reviewers, and after the department has voted. Since there must be a single practice - - to include all such reviews or none of them -- it has been decided that all reviews will be added to the administration file, but it must be clearly noted if the addition came after the department voted.

Revision of Original External Review Letter for promotion and tenure reviews adopted at College Personnel and Budget Committee meeting of December 7, 2004.

This version changes the practice to cover the complete body of work candidates have produced.

Letter of request from Chair to potential referees.

THIS IS THE LETTER TO BE USED FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW REQUESTS:

I am writing on behalf of the Department of.....[School Name] to request that you serve as a reviewer for [faculty member's name] who is being considered for [promotion, tenure]. {If tenure decision then insert:} Decisions on tenure and promotion are vital to the future of Baruch College, and our judgment is considerably informed by experts in candidates' disciplines who serve as external reviewers. **The tenure process is normally initiated in the fall of the candidate's sixth year, when we contact nominated external reviewers, and the tenure review itself occurs early in the fall of the candidate's seventh year.** We invite you to evaluate the published research/creative activity that this faculty member has produced. Your review will be kept confidential.

If you have an affiliation or connection with the candidate that might be construed as a conflict of interest, or that might compromise your objectivity, we request that you not to serve as a reviewer.

If you agree to be a reviewer, the documents that are checked off on the enclosed curriculum vitae will be sent to you. Reviews are requested by [date].

We hope that you will be able to serve in this very important capacity, and we thank you for the time that you are able to devote to this important process.

Please let me know if you are willing to serve as a reviewer. The department phone number is [(xxx)-xxx-xxxx].

Sincerely,

....., Chair

enc. C.V. [candidate's name]

[Form ER-3]

Rev. 6/14

Rev. 12/04

Letter revised 6/4/14

Letter to persons who have agreed to serve as reviewers.

THIS IS THE LETTER WHICH MUST BE USED UNLESS A SUBSTITUTE HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE DEAN

Thank you very much for agreeing to serve as a reviewer of the published research/creative activity of [candidate's name], who is being considered for [personnel action]. I enclose copies of the works that we ask you to review.

We ask you to address the following points in your review:

- [1] The significance of the issues addressed in the candidate's publications/significance of the candidate's creative activity;
- [2] The originality and quality of the research/of the creative activity;
- [3] The methodology used and its appropriateness;
- [4] The value of these works for peers;
- [5] The appropriateness and quality of the venues in which the works appeared;
- [6] Other comments about the work that may assist us.

If you have any affiliation or connection with the candidate, please describe that affiliation in your review. Unless you believe that your affiliation would interfere with objectivity, we would like to have your review. We remind you that your review will be kept confidential.

It is important that I receive your review by [date] so that we will be able conform to the College schedule for personnel decisions. Thank you for your willingness to lend your expertise to this important process.

Sincerely,

....., Chair

enc. Works of [faculty member's name]

[Form ER-5]

Rev 6/14

Adopted by CP&B 5/10/05

POTENTIAL EXTERNAL REVIEWERS I. NAMES RECOMMENDED BY CANDIDATE

Candidate's Name: _____

Name of potential reviewer: _____

Title of potential reviewer: _____

Institutional Affiliation: _____

Reason for Selection: What are the reviewer's qualifications?

The signatures below indicate that, according to the information available, this individual is considered an expert of advanced standing in a discipline appropriate for the review of this candidate's works and should be able to give an objective and unbiased evaluation. This individual: did not serve as the candidate's major professor or on the candidate's graduate committee; has no association with any journal or publisher that might interfere with an objective evaluation of the work(s); has no association with any person associated with the review process that might bias the evaluation; does not hold an academic viewpoint which would prevent a fair evaluation. This person has not been nor will be contacted to discuss this evaluation other than through the communications approved by the Provost.

Candidate Date Department Chair Date Department Committee Chair Date

Confidential Information

TRANSACTION	Dates
Letter requesting reviewer's service:	
Written Response: [will serve] [will not serve] Comments:	
Telephoned to obtain response: [will serve] [will not serve] Comments:	
Publications sent:	
Reminders sent: [written] [by telephone] Comments:	
Review Received: Comments:	

This form is to be attached to the List of Potential Reviewers sent to the Dean and attached to the review sent by this reviewer.

[Form ER-IA]

POTENTIAL EXTERNAL REVIEWERS II. NAMES RECOMMENDED BY DEPARTMENT CHAIR

Candidate's Name: _____

Name of potential reviewer: _____

Title of potential reviewer: _____

Institutional Affiliation: _____

Reason for Selection: What are the reviewer's qualifications?

The signatures below indicate that, according to the information available, this individual is considered an expert of advanced standing in a discipline appropriate for the review of this candidate's works and should be able to give an objective and unbiased evaluation. This individual: did not serve as the candidate's major professor or on the candidate's graduate committee; has no association with any journal or publisher that might interfere with an objective evaluation of the work(s); has no association with any person associated with the review process that might bias the evaluation; does not hold an academic viewpoint which would prevent a fair evaluation. This person has not been nor will be contacted to discuss this evaluation other than through the communications approved by the Provost.

Candidate Date Department Chair Date Department Committee Chair Date

Confidential Information

TRANSACTION	DATES
Letter requesting reviewer's service:	
Written Response: [will serve] [will not serve] Comments:	
Publications sent:	
Reminders sent: [written] [by telephone] Comments:	
Review Received: Comments:	

This form is to be attached to the List of Potential Reviewers sent to the Dean and attached to the review sent by this reviewer.

[Form ER-IB]

POTENTIAL EXTERNAL REVIEWERS III. NAMES RECOMMENDED BY DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE

Candidate's Name: _____

Name of potential reviewer: _____

Title of potential reviewer: _____

Institutional Affiliation: _____

Reason for Selection: What are the reviewer's qualifications?

The signatures below indicate that, according to the information available, this individual is considered an expert of advanced standing in a discipline appropriate for the review of this candidate's works and should be able to give an objective and unbiased evaluation. This individual: did not serve as the candidate's major professor or on the candidate's graduate committee; has no association with any journal or publisher that might interfere with an objective evaluation of the work(s); has no association with any person associated with the review process that might bias the evaluation; does not hold an academic viewpoint which would prevent a fair evaluation. This person has not been nor will be contacted to discuss this evaluation other than through the communications approved by the Provost.

Candidate Date Department Chair Date Department Committee Chair Date

Confidential Information

TRANSACTION	DATES
Letter requesting reviewer's service:	
Written Response: [will serve] [will not serve] Comments:	
Telephoned to obtain response: [will serve] [will not serve] Comments:	
Publications sent:	
Reminders sent: [written] [by telephone] Comments:	
Review Received: Comments:	

This form is to be attached to the List of Potential Reviewers sent to the Dean and attached to the review sent by this reviewer.

[Form ER-IC]

BARUCH COLLEGE EXTERNAL REVIEW: LIST OF POTENTIAL REVIEWERS

**I. Names of persons who agreed to serve: report to Dean from Department Chair:
(To be sent within 7 days of receiving information)**

Candidate's Name

Department Chair Signature

(Give name and Institution)

FROM CANDIDATE'S LIST	FROM DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S LIST	FROM DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE'S LIST

If no more than 6 persons agree to serve, all will be sent the materials for review; if more than 6 persons agree, list additional names on continuation sheet and do not send materials out until Dean determines if the list should be shortened.

II. SELECTION OF REVIEWERS: To be used if more than 6 persons agreed to serve. (To be returned to Chair within 7 days of receipt of Part I.)

The following persons are to be sent the candidate's materials for review:

(Give name and Institution)

FROM CANDIDATE'S LIST FROM DEPARTMENT	FROM DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S LIST	COMMITTEE'S LIST

Dean's Signature

Date

BARUCH COLLEGE EXTERNAL REVIEW: LIST OF POTENTIAL REVIEWERS

**I. Names or persons who have been recommended: report to Dean from Department Chair:
(To be sent within 7 days of receiving information)**

Candidate's Name
(Give name and Institution)

Department Chair Signature

FROM CANDIDATE'S LIST	FROM DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S LIST	FROM DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE'S LIST

All copies of forms ER1-A,B,C must be sent with this list.

The Dean will notify the Chair that this list is acceptable or unacceptable. If unacceptable, the Dean and Chair must work together to achieve an acceptable list which reflects choices from the candidate, chair, and department committee, and which reflects the right to strike for cause (see Policy for details).

August 19, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO: Deans, SBUS and SLAS Department Chairs, SPA
Program Directors

FROM: Lois S. Cronholm, Provost

RE: External Review Process

Enclosed please find the current external review process, which has been revised from last year. Most of you participated in this revision, and know that it was the result of the consultations held at the end of the first year of this process. As a result of this consultation, several significant changes were made, along with some smaller variations. The major changes are:

1. A larger number of potential reviewers will be recommended initially.
2. The qualifications of the reviewers will be explained in writing and will become part of the record.
3. The reviews will be filed in the administration file, accessible only to qualified internal reviewers, and we will no longer place masked copies in the personal file.
4. We will no longer send reviewers forms to be filled out, but will specify the questions we want addressed in the letter to them.
5. A c.v. will be sent to the potential reviewers when they are asked to serve.
6. Some new forms were added; most were changed. It is important to replace the former packet with this current packet.

In addition, I would like to re-emphasize a point that was brought out at the meeting with the Chairs:

Candidates may not select certain articles to be sent. All published works are sent for reviews for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; works since promotion to Associate Professor are sent for a review for Professor.

We are pleased at the generally favorable reaction to this process, which worked so well only because of the diligence of the Chairs. If you have questions, please call Bob Ptachik.

August 19, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO: Baruch Faculty

FROM: Lois S. Cronholm, Provost

RE: External Review Process

When we initiated an external review process for personnel actions we agreed to review the process annually for the first three years. Accordingly, we convened a meeting of the Chairs, Deans, the original P & B subcommittee that drafted the first external review policy, and persons from the faculty Senate who had lead roles in the forums preceding implementing the policy.

Prior to this meeting we had invited every faculty member who had been reviewed under the policy to write a critique of the process, and we asked every department chair and the Executive Committees of each School to send commentary. All of the commentary which we received, including an extensive set of recommendations from the SLAS Executive Committee, were distributed to the persons attending the review meeting.

Extensive discussion was held over a full morning session, and a number of recommendations were acted on. Following this extensive process of review, the policy and accompanying documents was revised and sent for comments to all participants at the meeting. After comments were received, the policy and documents were again revised. This review body was advisory; every recommendation which received the majority support of the body was accepted and the changes made accordingly.

There are changes made in the policy as a result of this review, and we are convening a meeting of all persons who will be reviewed within the next year by this new procedure to explain the changes.

As always, I am pleased to hear your comments about the policy, the process, or whatever you would like to bring to my attention.