

Queens College Guidelines for Tenure/CCE and Promotion **Revised 10/2/2014**

These guidelines describe how Queens College implements criteria for tenure, CCE and promotion outlined in University policies, procedures and the [Bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees](#), particularly the Statement of the Board of Higher Education (now the CUNY Board of Trustees) on Academic Personnel Practice in the City University of New York, September 22, 1975 ([Statement](#)), the [Max-Kahn memo](#) and the collective bargaining agreement between the PSC/CUNY and the University ([CBA](#)) as well as in Queens College governance documents. These guidelines are intended for use both at the time of consideration for tenure, CCE and promotion, and in providing ongoing guidance to non-tenured, non-certificated or promotable faculty. Procedures for preparing tenure/CCE and promotion cases may be found [here](#).

The faculty, through the College P&B and other governance structures, are responsible for evaluating the performance of faculty, primarily according to the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service as specified by the Board of Trustees, and for making recommendations to the President regarding tenure, CCE and promotion. The Chair and Department P&B are also responsible for providing annual teaching observations, performance evaluations and reappointment recommendations. The standards associated with these reviews are progressively rigorous. (See Statement for reappointment criteria.) Recommendations for tenure, CCE and promotion are premised, in large part, on such evaluations, assessment of the candidate's record to date and future prospects. Though specific measures of quality and quantity of contributions vary by discipline, the College follows the general principles referenced above and described below.

I – Professorial Tenure and Promotion--Standards

These guidelines apply to faculty in professorial ranks. See Section IV for guidelines for CCE for lecturers and Section VI for Tenure and Promotion for College Laboratory Technicians.

Article 18.2 (a) of the CBA and the Statement list a number of elements to be used in evaluation of the teaching faculty. Several, including classroom instruction, student guidance, and course development, relate to teaching. Others, including administrative assignments and departmental, College, and university assignments, relate to service. Still others, including scholarly writing, creative works in the discipline, and public and professional activities in the field of specialty, relate to scholarship. Special circumstances of the candidate's situation not included above that are relevant should be considered, including lack of collegiality, excessive lateness, absences, failure to attend meetings or meet deadlines and other performance issues. Ongoing guidance should be provided to address any identified weaknesses. There is no guidance on the weighting of these elements; instead the Statement says "the faculty sets standards for its own qualifications, ethics and performance. The collegial body itself maintains such standards by the exercise of its own authority." With respect to promotion, the Statement indicates that judgments should be "sufficiently flexible to allow for a judicious balance among excellence in teaching, scholarship, and other criteria." The Max-Kahn memo further states: "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.”

1. Scholarship

A strong scholarly record is critical to a successful promotion and tenure case. The college will not grant tenure or promote without evidence of a strong, independent program of scholarship. The College has high expectations for the scholarship of its faculty. Quality is more important than quantity, though there must be sufficient quantity to demonstrate a good level of scholarly productivity. The significance of the work and the career trajectory are essential considerations. Candidates should be able to articulate and demonstrate continuous progress on their research plan associated with their scholarly work.

The following are the primary factors used to evaluate the quality of a scholarly record for tenure and promotion. The types of faculty scholarship will vary by discipline, but a uniformly high standard is maintained by the requirement that the significance of the scholarly work be validated and publicly communicated. In some fields, such validation and communication are conveyed via refereed journals, monographs and conference papers published in Proceedings volumes or as peer reviewed chapters in edited volumes; in others, exhibitions and performances are the primary scholarly product. Technological advances have made possible new media and new methods of presentation. Innovative venues and modes of presentation should not be excluded, but must be validated via experts in the field and other measures of external judgment. For tenure and promotion decisions, scholarship and creative activity are not merely to be enumerated, but carefully, objectively, and rigorously evaluated by qualified peers, optimally involving blind referee procedures or other objective external review as appropriate.

At the junior level, quality is often demonstrated by the quality of the journals or presses in which the work appears or the quality of the exhibit or performance venue. At more senior levels, in addition to the quality of the journals/presses or venue, quality is measured by citations, reviews of published monographs, or other indicators of the impact of the work. For tenure and promotion decisions, impact or significance of scholarship is usually determined by the evaluations provided by external reviewers, and additional independent reviews of the work, for example, readers’ reports for submitted manuscripts are often also available and consulted. In addition to peer reviewed scholarship, articles, op-eds, entries, letters and blogs and the like in frequently published bulletins, periodicals, magazines, reviews and websites may evidence desired involvement in the field, but must be carefully evaluated to determine whether they warrant consideration as scholarship.

In disciplines where it is available, external funding can be viewed as a significant part of the scholarly record, depending on the relative size of the grant and the significance of the questions posed, and can also serve as an additional measure of the quality of the scholarship. In some fields, notably experimental laboratory sciences, research cannot continue without external funding, and in those fields, obtaining such funding may be a necessary condition for tenure. Where research funding is limited, the quality and quantity of grant applications and review ratings, rankings and comments concerning grant applications can be significant in evaluating scholarship.

The relationship of published work to the dissertation is an important issue. Major articles based on the dissertation carry less weight than major articles based on scholarship beyond the

dissertation, and a book based on the dissertation which shows significant extensions and revisions from the original work is regarded more highly than one that does not. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor require scholarship beyond the dissertation; evidence could include published article(s) or progress towards a new book on work significantly different from the thesis. For promotion to full Professor, it is further required that work beyond the dissertation is extensive and has come to fruition.

The scholarly record should provide clear evidence of new and creative work, independent thinking and scholarship. Although junior scholars often continue to produce work collaboratively with former thesis or post-doc advisors, the role of the candidate in the joint effort should be determined by the Chair, and it is important that the candidate establish a growing record of academic independence.

Academic independence also refers to the role that the candidate may play in collaborative work. Collaborative work is common in many disciplines, and accordingly, co-authored works are given serious weight. The norms in each discipline should be considered; in some fields, large collaborative projects are common, even necessary, given the nature of the work, but in others, solo authored work is expected. However, it is necessary to clarify the candidate's contributions; primarily technical contributions receive less weight than those that are more substantial. Distinctions should be made between "editing" volumes of others' work, and contributing one's own peer-reviewed writing/scholarship. The overall record should have a significant portion of works to which the candidate has made primary contributions.

In the creative and performing arts, tenure and promotion portfolios will reflect the faculty member's special focus and creative work, including conferences on the subject matter organized by the candidate, exhibitions and performances at prestigious venues and published reviews.

Invitations to speak at other institutions, at prestigious events and talks where acceptance to present a conference paper is based upon submission of a peer-reviewed abstract add to the scholarly record, but are not weighted as heavily as other measures of the record.

Honors and awards at national or international levels may be used as evidence of stature in the field but are not additional scholarly items, as they are presumably given for published work already a part of the record.

Guidance on scholarship in the pre-tenure and/or pre-promotion years: Note that tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty eligible for promotion should be provided with ongoing guidance about the scholarly expectations for tenure and/or promotion, both in terms of quantity and quality, and how their development measures up against those expectations. Non-tenured and promotable faculty should be asked to provide and regularly update their research plan. Each year, non-tenured and promotable faculty will be asked to submit an updated CV and evidence about their development in scholarship, teaching and service, and will meet with the chair for an annual evaluation conference, and receive a report on that conference. In the spring of the third year of the tenure track, a Third Year Review process will be conducted (see [CUNY policy](#)). The research plan should be included in the materials submitted by the faculty member for the annual evaluation conducted as part of the Third Year Review, along with the actual work product.

Ongoing guidance should address the importance of scholarly peer review of all publications, ideally blind, and other forms of external evaluation as appropriate. Guidance should also address the venues for publications and any concerns: for example, whether too many publications appear in one venue; whether the quality of the venues is not considered

sufficiently scholarly; whether works are duplicative of one another; and whether an appropriate proportion of work is rigorously peer reviewed. Guidance in creative fields where exhibitions and performances predominate should also stress the quality of the venues, external validation by experts in the field and other recognition of the work. These standards and guidance should be reflected in the written record, including annual evaluations and reappointment letters and the Third Year Report. Annual evaluations should be conducted for all tenured faculty members below the rank of full Professor and should address progress toward promotion. This guidance should address readiness for tenure and promotion; for example, whether a candidate for promotion to full Professor has sufficient evidence that scholarly work is significant and has had the kind of impact necessary, as evidenced by citations, reviews, etc.

Tenure track faculty should be assigned a faculty mentor to provide guidance on scholarship, teaching, and service. Some departments choose to assign separate mentors for teaching and scholarship. The faculty mentor, if not a member of the department P&B, does not typically participate in the evaluation process, but should be able to provide advice to the candidate on the research plan, appropriate venues, grantsmanship, etc.

Thus, guidance should be provided by the mentor, by the chair, and by the dean in consultation with the provost when writing reappointment letters and the Third Year Review memo to the faculty member. Any concerns should be raised early in the pre-tenure years, while the faculty member has time to address them, and should be shared with the dean and provost.

2. Teaching

A strong teaching record is vital to a successful tenure and promotion case. The College will not grant tenure or promote without evidence of effective teaching. Effective teaching is understood broadly to include breadth and level of teaching repertoire, curriculum planning, course design, student reaction and success, mentoring, and support to students outside the classroom. Evidence of success in these areas is judged using the following materials. (Departments and candidates may choose to include additional items.)

- a) **Portfolios.** In many cases a teaching portfolio is an excellent way to present a candidate's teaching record. A teaching portfolio may include various documents providing evidence of the candidate's engagement with teaching, such as: course syllabi, including course objectives, learning goals, and procedures for evaluations of student performance; readings and other assignments; examinations, including student answers; other examples of student work; etc.
- b) **Student evaluations.** Student course evaluations should be available for the previous four semesters for all courses taught at the College for untenured faculty and for tenured faculty seeking promotion. In assessing these evaluations, consideration may be given to the nature of the course (required vs. elective, undergraduate vs. graduate, number of students, etc.) and comparative statistics for other faculty. Although primary consideration will be given to student evaluations conducted by the College, supplemental departmental student evaluations may also be considered. Consideration may be given to the percent of students responding to determine if the evaluations accurately represent the views of students. Candidates should collect and present the student comments produced by the Senate's course evaluation process.
- c) **Peer reviews.** The CBA (Article 18.2 b.1) requires that all full-time untenured professorial faculty members must, and tenured faculty may, be observed for a full classroom period at least once a semester, in the first ten weeks of the semester. A full

classroom period is the full period that the class is scheduled, not the minimum period for which a class can be scheduled. These reviews are an important part of the candidate's record. Appropriate procedures, including those concerning 24 hour prior notice and timing, must be followed, as provided in the CBA. The reviewer should be provided with the course syllabus and, preferably, other materials, including a statement of course objectives and learning goals, before visiting a class. Especially in interdisciplinary courses, it may be useful to have peer reviews by faculty in different disciplines. Constructive evaluation is expected in the reviews. A written report must be filed, and a post observation conference must be held in accordance with the provisions of the CBA.

- d) **Mentoring record.** An important part of teaching responsibilities takes place outside class time. Advising students is a significant contribution to the College's teaching mission. Documentation of such efforts may include advising records, anecdotal evidence from students, and other materials.
- e) **Personal statement.** The candidate's personal statement should include a discussion of the teaching record, philosophy of teaching, measures taken to improve teaching, and the relationship between teaching and scholarship.

Evidence for a positive trajectory in teaching quality is expected. It is usual for faculty to show improvement in teaching over time as they gain experience and learn from feedback. Promotions require evidence of progressively higher achievements in teaching.

Guidance on teaching in the pre-tenure and/or pre-promotion years: Tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty eligible for promotion should be provided with ongoing guidance about their teaching materials and performance, including availability to students and support offered to students outside the classroom. These standards and guidance should be reflected in the written record, including annual evaluations, reappointment letters and the Third Year Report. Annual evaluations should be conducted for all tenured faculty members below the rank of full Professor and should continue to address teaching. In addition, the faculty mentor should provide ongoing guidance and assistance in the development of teaching skills. Faculty members should also be encouraged to take advantage of the resources offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning to help develop their teaching skills.

As with scholarship, guidance should be provided by the mentor, by the chair, and by the dean in consultation with the provost when writing reappointment letters and the Third Year Review memo to the faculty member. Any concerns should be raised early in the pre-tenure years, while the faculty member has time to address them, and should be shared with the dean and provost.

3. Service

All faculty members are expected to be involved in and contribute to the academic vitality of their department, division, College, and regional and national organizations. Less heavily weighted, but also considered, is service to the broader community in which the College is situated. Service expectations are progressive; while new faculty, especially those with no or little prior experience, should be spared onerous service responsibilities so they can develop their teaching repertoires and scholarly portfolios, faculty members are expected to take on more responsibility as they progress in the tenure track. For promotion to Associate Professor, candidates should show some College and professional service contributions, and for promotion

to full Professor, there should be a significant service record, such as contributions to the College, including committee work, accreditation activities, etc.

Guidance on service in the pre-tenure and/or pre-promotion years: Tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty eligible for promotion should be provided with ongoing guidance about their level of engagement in service. While active service should be encouraged, attention should be paid to any negative impact on scholarship and teaching from an overly high level of service activity as well. However, candidates not sufficiently engaged in service activities should be advised as well. Guidance should be given on the appropriate mix of service to the department, division, College, community and profession. These standards and guidance should be reflected in the written record, including annual evaluations, reappointment letters and the Third Year Report. In addition, the faculty mentor should provide guidance on service. Annual evaluations should be conducted for all faculty members below the rank of full Professor and should address service contributions.

II-Professorial Tenure and Promotion--Differences Between Tenure and Promotion

While judgments on tenure and promotion are two distinct acts, and while it is recognized that tenure is an “up or out” determination while promotion decisions can be deferred if necessary to develop a case, there is tremendous overlap between the two standards. When evaluating tenure and promotion at the same time, it should be noted that the distinctions between the two standards are of limited significance, especially in view of the seven-year tenure clock. In other words, now that candidates have six years to prepare for tenure review, there is an expectation that they have sufficient time to establish solid records as scholars and teachers for both tenure and promotion consideration. Therefore, the granting of tenure without promotion (for those hired at the assistant professor level), and the granting of promotion without tenure, should be an exceptional case.

Although consideration for tenure is normally scheduled at the same time as consideration for promotion to Associate Professor, there are differences between tenure and promotion in terms of the time period of work considered, and to some extent, in terms of the evaluation of published scholarship, forthcoming work, and “works in progress.” The critical difference between consideration for tenure and promotion when they are considered at the same time is the determination of what scholarly work should be considered, as outlined below.

1. For tenure:

- a) Consider the entire body of work of the candidate, including work done before arrival at Queens College;
- b) Evaluate published and forthcoming scholarship and works in progress for new and creative work.
- c) Given the seven-year clock, published scholarship is normally required. However, in certain fields, forthcoming work, *i.e.*, work that has been sufficiently developed and vetted, may be sufficient for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; for example, a book that is completely accepted for publication may suffice although it has not yet appeared in print. Additionally, works in progress that have been sent by the College to external referees so that their evaluations can be included in all steps of review (that is, by the time of the Department P&B deliberations), may be significant, although not

sufficient by themselves for tenure or promotion. Work in progress could augment a record of published or forthcoming work if those conditions are met.

- d) Correspondence with prospective publishers, such as letters of intent and pre-contracts, may be included if supported by the work to which it refers.

2. For promotion:

- a) Consider primarily work accomplished while at Queens College that follows the most recent of the initial appointment or last promotion at Queens College, even if there has been a grant of tenure subsequent to the initial appointment or most recent promotion. However, if a candidate has had prior academic experience and is being considered for tenure and promotion earlier than the seventh year, in addition to considering the entire body of work for tenure, for promotion, prior work before coming to Queens College may be weighed more. It is, however, critical that productivity at Queens College be demonstrated.
- b) Given the seven-year clock for tenure, and the standards for promotion to Associate Professor and full Professor, peer-reviewed published work or work completely accepted for publication (or creative performances or exhibitions in appropriate fields completed and externally recognized) is essential.
- c) Forthcoming articles or books should be as complete as possible, reviewed, and accepted by a reputable publisher in time to be included in all steps of review, that is, by the time of the Department P&B deliberations.
- d) Works in progress showing future directions in scholarly output can also be considered.
- e) Exclude published work considered in a previous promotion (including one at the same time as tenure). However, works in progress at the previous promotion that resulted in the subsequent publishing of the manuscripts are appropriately considered. Consideration should be given to the degree of new work since the last promotion.

III – Professorial Tenure and Promotion – Special Cases

1. Promotion before Tenure

Requests for promotion may occasionally be made for candidates who do not yet have tenure. In considering such requests, note that it is difficult to deny tenure to a candidate who has received a promotion before the granting of tenure, and a positive recommendation for promotion could undermine the standing of a subsequent recommendation against granting tenure. In view of this, promotion before tenure should be considered only in very special circumstances. Such a promotion should be supported by scholarly or creative work completed and externally recognized subsequent to the initial appointment.

2. Early Tenure

The grant of early tenure is reserved for exceptional cases, namely, where there is a “substantial” or “extraordinary” reason the College would “be well served by such an early grant of tenure.” One such circumstance would be when a faculty member has made extraordinary accomplishments; another would be if the faculty member has an offer letter from a peer institution. (See the Statement as well as the [Chancellor’s guidance of January 1, 2005](#). Other limited circumstances where the grant of early tenure may be appropriate include interruption of service by a fellowship deemed to be valuable to the College, or tenure or tenure track experience at another accredited institution of higher learning.) Any indication to consider a

faculty member for early tenure (either orally or in writing) should, therefore be the exception, not the rule, and must be properly vetted. Care must be taken to be clear that we are agreeing to *consider* one for, not to assure, tenure.

If an offer of early tenure consideration is contemplated at the offer-letter stage, a supplementary letter offering early consideration for tenure should be written, after obtaining written approval from the Provost. A [model letter](#) is posted on the Provost's website. The letter should specify that while consideration for early tenure is contemplated because of the body of work already created by the faculty, the commitment to early tenure consideration is dependent on continued productivity. Circumstances that may warrant an offer of consideration for early tenure at this stage may include extensive productivity in a tenure-track position at another institution that evidences a significant trajectory in terms of grants or publications.

If an offer of early tenure consideration is being contemplated after the time of hire, a letter should be written outlining the commitment to *consider* the candidate for early tenure, after securing written approval from the Provost. A [model letter](#) is posted on the Provost's website. Circumstances that may warrant an offer of consideration for early tenure during employment include the risk of losing extraordinarily productive faculty members being recruited by other institutions.

Those deliberating the award of tenure must, consistent with the standards for tenure, look at the entire body of the candidate's work, including work at Queens College, in order to evaluate the candidate's continued productivity along the previously established career trajectory, and must also assess whether the grant of early tenure is in the best interests of the College.

If early tenure is not granted, those deliberating should give guidance for what is lacking.

3. Immediate Tenure

If a department wishes to bring a new faculty member in with immediate tenure, in addition to approval by the dean, provost and president, the Committee of Seven must make a positive recommendation to the President. If the faculty member is below the rank of full Professor and/or did not previously hold tenure at another institution, a waiver of the bylaws will be required. Consult your dean about the procedure. An abbreviated version of the normal process may be followed, but the department should prepare the Candidate's CV and Personal Statement, Confidential Department Reports, and should submit the applicant's materials to the Committee. In addition to the reference letters submitted by the applicant, some additional outside letters should be solicited.

4. Librarians

Library faculty (not faculty in GSLIS) are covered by these guidelines, except that Library Effectiveness is substituted for teaching effectiveness (as per the [Library Department's Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, 1997](#)). Research and scholarship in a major area of librarianship (e.g., collection development, reference and instruction, user services, information technology and application, library administration and management) or in an appropriate subject is an important criterion for tenure and promotion for all library faculty. Professional service, demonstrated through significant leadership on the national level, and which advances the library profession, may replace research and scholarship as an important factor in determining tenure and promotion. Candidates for tenure and promotion must be active

in all three areas (library effectiveness, research and scholarship, and service) but must show distinction in two of the evaluated areas (one of which must include library effectiveness).

5. Lecturers with CCE Appointed as Assistant Professors

Article 22.4 of the CBA provides: “budgetary considerations shall not constitute a ground for withholding appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor of a certificated lecturer who has earned a doctorate and has been recommended as qualified for such appointment in accordance with established criteria and procedures.” The practice has been that the lecturer may take leave from the certificated lecturership during the pre-tenure years in the assistant professor position. All criteria outlined above apply to the consideration for tenure and promotion to associate professor, except that if tenure is not granted, the faculty member may revert to the title of lecturer.

6. Non-certificated Lecturers or Instructors Appointed as Assistant Professors

Article 9.8 of the CBA provides that “Instructors and non-certificated Lecturers with four or more years of continuous full-time service in those titles immediately preceding appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor” may receive two years of service credit toward the achievement of tenure in the title Assistant Professor. By August 31, preceding the first full-year appointment to the title Assistant Professor, the employee shall state, in writing, whether or not he/she wishes to waive the service credit toward tenure provided in the previous paragraph. If the employee wishes to waive the credit, and the President or his or her designee approves, the waiver is irrevocable. All criteria outlined above apply to the consideration for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

IV – Lecturers: Standards for CCE

*These guidelines apply to CCE (Certificate of Continuous Employment) for Lecturers. Please note that Lecturers are considered for CCE in their **fifth** full year of service, not the seventh, as with professorial faculty.*

Section 11.27 A of the Bylaws states: “Lecturers (full-time) shall perform teaching and related faculty functions on a full-time basis.” As the main obligation of lecturers is teaching, the quality of their teaching should be the primary basis for considering the award of CCE to Lecturers. Article 18.2 (a) of the CBA lists a number of elements to be used in evaluation of the teaching faculty. Several, including classroom instruction, student guidance, and course development, relate to teaching. Others, including administrative assignments and departmental, College, and CUNY assignments, relate to service. Still others, including scholarly writing, creative works in the discipline, and public and professional activities in the field of specialty, relate to scholarship. (A footnote points out that Lecturers are not required to have a research commitment.) Special circumstances of the candidate’s situation not included above that are relevant should be considered, including lack of collegiality, excessive lateness, absences, failure to attend meetings or meet deadlines and other performance issues. Ongoing guidance should be provided to address any identified weaknesses.

1. Teaching

A strong teaching record is vital to a successful CCE case. The College will not grant CCE without evidence of effective teaching. Effective teaching is understood broadly to include breadth and level of teaching repertoire, curriculum planning, course design, student reaction and success, mentoring, and support to students outside the classroom. Evidence of success in these areas is judged using the following materials. (Departments and candidates may choose to include additional items.)

- a) **Portfolios.** In many cases, a teaching portfolio is an excellent way to present a candidate's teaching record. A teaching portfolio may include various documents providing evidence of the candidate's engagement with teaching, such as: course syllabi, including course objectives, learning goals, and procedures for evaluations of student performance; readings and other assignments; examinations, including student answers; other examples of student work; etc.
- f) b) **Student evaluations.** Student course evaluations should be available for the previous four semesters for all courses taught at the College for Lecturers without CCE. In assessing these evaluations, consideration may be given to the nature of the course (required vs. elective, undergraduate vs. graduate, number of students, etc.) and comparative statistics for other faculty. Although primary consideration will be given to student evaluations conducted by the College, supplemental departmental student evaluations may also be considered. Consideration may be given to the percent of students responding to determine if the evaluations accurately represent the views of students. Candidates should collect and present the student comments produced by the Senate's course evaluation process.
- c) **Peer reviews.** The CBA (Article 18.2 b.1) requires that all full-time Lecturers without CCE be observed for a full classroom period at least once a semester. A full classroom period is the full period that the class is scheduled, not the minimum period for which a class can be scheduled. These reviews are an important part of the candidate's record. Appropriate procedures, including those concerning 24 hour prior notice and timing, must be followed, as provided in the CBA. The reviewer should be provided with the course syllabus and, preferably, other materials, including a statement of course objectives and learning goals, before visiting a class. Especially in interdisciplinary courses, it may be useful to have peer reviews by faculty in different disciplines. Constructive evaluation is expected in the reviews. A written report must be filed, and a post observation conference must be held in accordance with the provisions of the CBA.
- d) **Mentoring record.** An important part of teaching responsibilities takes place outside class time. Advising students is a significant contribution to the College's teaching mission. Documentation of such efforts may include advising records, anecdotal evidence from students, and other materials.
- e) **Personal statement.** The candidate's personal statement should include a discussion of the teaching record, philosophy of teaching, measures taken to improve teaching, and the relationship between teaching and scholarship and/or professional development.

Evidence for a positive trajectory in teaching quality is expected. It is usual for faculty to show improvement in teaching over time as they gain experience and learn from feedback. Faculty are encouraged to use the resources of the Center for Teaching and Learning to develop their teaching skills.

2. Service

Lecturers are expected to be involved in and contribute to the academic vitality of their department, division, College, and regional and national organizations.

3. Scholarship and Professional Development

Lecturers are expected to demonstrate a scholarly record and/or professional development, although not necessarily a research commitment. At Queens College, this requirement has been met by art exhibits, theatrical productions, materials for student learning such as textbooks, study guides, and course documents, and public and professional activities in the field of specialty as well as by more traditional scholarship--scholarly writing and creative works in the discipline. Lecturers are expected to continue to develop professionally, remaining up to date in their field, following its scholarly literature, and participating in conferences.

4. Guidance in the Pre-CCE Years

Lecturers who do not yet hold CCE should be provided with ongoing guidance about their teaching materials and performance, including availability to students and support offered to students outside the classroom, on their service activities, including the appropriate level of service activity and the appropriate mix of service to the department, division, College, community and profession and on their professional development and/or scholarly activities in order to ensure that Lecturers continue to develop professionally and to keep up with their disciplines in ways that will improve and inform their teaching. These standards and guidance should be reflected in the written record, including annual evaluations and reappointment letters. Guidance should be provided by the chair, and by the dean in consultation with the provost when writing reappointment letters. Any concerns should be raised early in the pre-CCE years, while the faculty member has time to address them, and should be shared with the dean and provost.

V – Instructors: Consideration for Conversion to Lecturer with CCE

Article 12.6 of the CBA provides that “an Instructor may be appointed in the title Lecturer immediately preceded by five years of continuous fulltime service as an Instructor in the same department, in which case he or she shall receive a Certificate of Continuous Employment as a Lecturer.” Therefore it is critical that Instructors receive the same guidance, mentoring and evaluation as Lecturers, if appointment as Lecturer with CCE is contemplated, since the standards outlined in IV above will apply at the time of CCE consideration (in the fall of the fifth full year of continuous employment as Instructor). **Prior to consideration for CCE, the President must approve any request for conversion of the Instructor position (maximum of five years) to Lecturer with CCE.**

VI - College Laboratory Technicians (CLTs): Tenure and Promotion

*Please note that consideration for tenure for CLTs occurs in the **fifth** full year of service, not the seventh, as with professorial faculty. Also note that consideration for promotion must be approved by the CLT Committee, as well as the Committee of Seven, College P&B, CUNY, etc.*

The CLT Committee is chaired by the Dean of Mathematics and Natural Sciences and the membership consists of one chair from each division, elected by the College P&B.

1. Performance for Tenure

Details of duties must be clearly and completely outlined at the point of hire for persons in the CLT title. Usually, these duties involve providing service, either for students in a variety of “laboratory” type courses, or for faculty in the performance of both their teaching and scholarly duties. Candidates for tenure in such a position must demonstrate excellence in performance of these duties and do so in a professional and courteous manner. Special circumstances of the candidate’s situation not included above that are relevant should be considered, including lack of collegiality, excessive lateness, absences, failure to attend meetings or meet deadlines and other performance issues. Ongoing guidance should be provided to address any identified weaknesses.

Determination of “satisfactorily complete and timely manner” is assessed by consultation among:

- a) the direct supervisor, often a senior or chief CLT,
- b) the direct faculty supervisor,
- c) the Department Chair,

with additional input from other faculty in the Department as well as consultation with a record of student notes (if appropriate). It would be appropriate for the candidate CLT to maintain a log of efforts performed in their role for the review of their total performance.

The candidate should also demonstrate willingness, capability and creativity in performing the prescribed duties of the position with an eye to increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the work of the Department.

Guidance to CLTs in the pre-tenure years: CLTs who are candidates for tenure should receive ongoing guidance on the adequacy of the performance of their duties and suggestions for improvement. These standards and guidance should be reflected in the written record, including annual evaluations and reappointment letters.

2. Performance for Promotion

Promotion in the ranks of CLT requires more than mere performance of the assigned duties. The candidate must show an understanding of the overarching purpose of the job and needs of the Department. The candidate must have demonstrated their interest in and capability for performing duties beyond those required by their current position, and have demonstrated willingness and ability to handle increasingly complex and/or managerial or supervisory tasks.

Promotion in the CLT series requires a demonstration that a proposed increase in responsibilities conforms to the Bylaws definition of the higher CLT title, as well as creation of a new position in the higher title. A change of title may not be based on longevity or seniority. The CLT Committee will look for a data-based reason for the proposed new position, in accordance with CUNY policy. Departments should develop their proposals in consultation with their dean. The CLT Committee will only consider recommendations that come with a positive recommendation from the Dean. A statement of justification for the establishment of a Senior CLT or Chief CLT line should demonstrate that use of either title is required as defined by the

Bylaws, based on a proposed increase in job responsibilities. Upon a positive recommendation of the CLT Committee, the case must be considered by the Committee of Seven and the College P&B. CUNY guidelines recommend no more than 30% of CLTs hold the Senior CLT title at any college and 10% hold the Chief CLT, and this may also be considered in the decision process, but is not a hard and fast cap.

Guidance to CLTs in the pre-promotion years: CLTs who are candidates for promotion should receive ongoing guidance on the development of the skills and capabilities needed for promotion, and suggestions for further development of those skills. These standards and guidance should be reflected in the written record. Continued annual evaluations should be conducted even after tenure is granted.

3. Professional Development for Tenure or Promotion

As the CLT is a provider of service to students and faculty within a Department, the candidate is expected to be able to learn and develop abilities to deal with changes in the nature of equipment and services used in the discipline of the Department. Ongoing guidance on professional development should be provided to CLTs who are candidates for tenure or promotion and should be reflected in annual evaluations and reappointment letters.