

## 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 or creative 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 and creative activity 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 a minimum of five external peer reviews for every personnel action requiring external evaluation.

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 Department 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 and notifies the Chair, the Dean will contact the twelve potential reviewers using approved letters that will include a CV of the candidate and a notation of what works will be sent for review. 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 that are included. If necessary because of time constraints, and only after the letters are sent to potential reviewers, the relevant Department Chair may contact reviewers by email to obtain their response to the request and, when appropriate, to thank them for their service. All email correspondence needs to copy the Dean's Office.

The Dean or Dean's designee will use Interfolio to track the names of those who agree to serve, sharing this information with the Department Chair. If more than six external reviewers agree to serve, the Dean may shorten the list, and alert external reviewers that their review is no longer needed, but the final list is to represent the original sources of the recommendations.

The final panel will be sent the review materials and the candidate's personal research statement and asked to respond to specific questions; the questions must conform to the College's approved letter to external reviewers, or to alternate questions necessary because of the discipline; alternates must be approved by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair.

**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

Adopted and approved by the Baruch College Personnel and Budget Committee on May 4, 2021.  
Rev: 7/94, 6/14, 9/16, 5/21, 5/24

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 in choosing the external reviewers, but ensures 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 must not have had a relationship with the candidate that would prevent an objective evaluation based on the merits of the works (e.g., recent co-authors, co-investigators, and co-editors, graduate advisor, classmates, familial relations, close personal friends, or other close connections). The qualifications of each reviewer, matching these criteria, will be provided for every person recommended.

**II. A. 4. Works to be Sent.** All relevant published research and creativity activity since hire, promotion, or the prior seven years, whichever is longer, 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. The candidate should include either their personal statement or a separate research statement specifically tailored for external review contextualizing the works to be sent.

**II. A. 5. Contact with Reviewers.** All contact with the reviewers will be initiated through written communications that are approved by the Provost or the Provost's designee. Email contact with the Dean's office or the Chair may take place where such contact is necessary because of time restraints or material requests (see Para. II.A. para 3). The Dean's Office is to be copied on all correspondence. External reviews are to be obtained only through this process; other evaluative materials that 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 Dean's Office via Interfolio and hard copy. All documentation, including letters, the candidate's research statement, and forms related to external reviews are maintained in Interfolio.

**II. B. 1. Availability of Reviews.** The reviews and all related documentation will be made available through the procedures regulating administration files.

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

## BARUCH COLLEGE POLICY FOR EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

- RECOMMENDING REVIEWERS*** 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 Form ER-1]
- DEAN'S APPROVAL*** 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]
- CONTACTING REVIEWERS*** 3. Dean sends the approved form letter and candidate's CV to the top 3 names from each source or to all twelve, if the dean so chooses.  
[See Form ER-3]
- SELECTING REVIEWERS*** 4. Dean monitors those who agree to serve. If more than six agree, Dean may shorten the list. Dean sends sends list of reviewers to Chair, copy to Provost.  
[See Form ER-4]
- MATERIALS TO BE SENT*** 5. All relevant published research and creativity activity since hire, promotion, or the prior seven years, whichever is longer, are sent.  
6. Dean sends materials to reviewers with form letter listing questions.  
[See Form ER-5]
- ADDITIONAL CONTACTS WITH REVIEWERS*** 7. Dean or Dean's designee (who may be the Chair) tracks additional communications with reviewers, records them.  
[See Form ER-1]
- RECEIPT AND DISTRIBUTION OF REVIEWS*** 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 Form ER-1]

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 twelve 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 Dean 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. Letters must be received within one year of the review being conducted.

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...a single Chair, who is not the Department Chair ..."

To ensure that the list of reviewers is obtained from three independent sources, the faculty member who is elected as Chair of the Department 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

Adopted and approved by the Baruch College Personnel and Budget Committee on May 4, 2021.  
Rev: 7/94, 6/14, 9/16, 5/21, 5/24

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 the 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.

The candidate should include either their personal statement or a separate research statement with the works provided to external reviewers.

#### 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 that 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.