

Faculty Senate Minutes #327

May 1, 2008

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (26): Erin Ackerman, Simon Baatz, Spiros Bakiras, Adam Berlin, Teresa Booker, Marvie Brooks, Elise Champeil, Edward Davenport, Virginia Diaz, Kirk Dombrowski, Janice Dunham, P. J. Gibson, Amy Green, Heather Holtman, Karen Kaplowitz, Richard Kempter, Ma'at Lewis-Coles, Vincent Maiorino, James Malone, Evan Mandery, Nick Petraco, Tanya Rodriguez, Nancy Ryba, Francis Sheehan, Shonna Trinch, Thalia Vrachopoulos

Absent (10): Myrna Archer, Dara Byrne, Marcia Esparza, DeeDee Falkenbach, Gail Garfield, Tim Horohoe, John Matteson, Patrick O'Hara, Rick Richardson, Raul Romero

Guest: Professor Ned Benton

Agenda

- 1. Adoption of the agenda**
- 2. Announcements & Reports**
- 3. Adoption of Minutes #326 of the April 9, 2008, meeting**
- 4. Election of University Faculty Senate delegates**
- 5. Honorary Degrees Committee election slate**
- 6. Location of academic departments when Phase II opens**
- 7. Allocation of College Council seats**
- 8. Final review the Draft Faculty Personnel Guidelines**
- 9. Review of the agenda of the May 14 meeting of the College Council**
- 10. New business**

1. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda, after being amended as proposed by the Executive Committee to add an item about the search process for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, was adopted.

2. Announcements & Reports

President Kaplowitz announced that the English Major had been approved at 80th St. and now goes to the Board of Regents in Albany for approval over the summer.

3. Adoption of Minutes #326 of the April 9, 2008, meeting

Minutes #326 of the April 9, 2008, meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved.

4. Election of University Faculty Senate delegates

A call for nominations and self-nominations was sent to the faculty about openings on the University Faculty Senate (UFS), which represents the faculty of the entire University. The call included the fact that delegates attend UFS meetings once a month on a Tuesday evening at the CUNY Graduate Center.

Professors Janice Dunham, Beverly Frazier, and Thomas Kubic were elected as John Jay delegates to the UFS. Professors Ned Benton, Jane Katz, and Nicholas Petraco were elected as alternate John Jay delegates to the UFS.

5. Approval of Honorary Degrees Committee election slate

An election slate comprising Professors Enrique Chavez-Arviso, Joshua Freilich, Elizabeth Hegeman, Jerry Markowitz, Gabrielle Salfati was approved for an election to fill the three positions on the Committee that become vacant this month. Those who are continuing to serve their 3-year terms are Professors Valerie Allen, George Andreopoulos, Amy Green, and Delores Jones-Brown.

6. Location of academic departments when Phase II opens

The Senate discussed issues related to the allocation of space in Phase II. The discussion was initiated by the relocation of the English Department to a building that is quite far from North Hall. This building, termed the Annex by the College administration, is on 54th Street between 12th and 11th Avenues. Also moved to the Annex is the Department of Foreign Languages and

Literature. The major concern of the faculty assigned to the Annex is that students do not come to such a distant and inconvenient location to meet with their professors. This was what the English Department faculty had predicted when they objected to this move. It was asserted that this is a terrible decision by the College administration to make in terms of student academic success. Furthermore, the English Department has a new major and the English Department faculty should be in close proximity to potential and new students.

Some of the faculty members' other concerns about the space are the physical hardship for the faculty that the distance from North Hall and from Haaren Hall creates; the isolation of the faculty assigned to the Annex; the isolation and lack of activity on the streets at night; and the lack of privacy and quiet because the walls of almost all the offices are only eight feet high and do not go to the very high ceiling. Since the lease does not permit students (except a few at a time) to enter the building, no classes can be held there.

The administration has explained that the two departments were assigned to the Annex because there are simply not enough offices in T Building or in North Hall or in any of the other facilities and these two departments match the amount of space that the 7th floor of the Annex provides.

Professor Ned Benton said there is space originally allocated in Phase II for the bookstore but which would now duplicate the bookstore we have at Westport. By taking a strong position now on centralizing all academic departments in Phase II, there is an opportunity to plan the conversion of the Phase II duplicate bookstore space into faculty offices. Professor Benton said we also need to ask for a restudy of the space to be used in Phase II, given all the recent and proposed changes at the College.

Senator Amy Green said that Phase II planning is clearly taking place without faculty involvement and we should take steps to change this. Senator Evan Mandery said that if a wrong decision has been made, such as moving the English Department off of our campus, and made without faculty involvement, then the faculty should demand that the decision be reversed.

Senator P. J. Gibson said that the English Department had been told a year ago that the move was a done deal. Then, she said, the members of the English Department learned that the lease had not even signed until the following fall.

Senator Ma'at Lewis-Coles said she had a more general question about the process for planning for Phase II: what is this process and are we satisfied with it?

A motion was made: Resolved, It is the position of the Faculty Senate that when Phase II opens, all academic departments shall be housed either in Phase II or in T Building, unless an academic department that is asked by the administration to be located elsewhere wishes to and agrees to be housed in that different location. The motion was seconded and was adopted by unanimous vote.

The Senate also adopted a motion calling upon the College administration, with the full participation of elected faculty leaders, to commission a study of the space needs and space utilization of John Jay and, especially, of Phase II. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote.

A motion was then made to call upon the administration to reverse the relocation of academic departments into the annex at 12th Avenue and 54th Street. President Kaplowitz asked that the motion be withdrawn until, at least, her next scheduled meeting with President Travis on May 5 and also at least until the Senate's meeting with President Travis and Provost Bowers on May 15, and also after consultation with the English and Foreign Language Departments.

Some Senators proposed that this issue should be placed on the agenda of the College Council. Others said the decision cannot be reversed because the College has already spent \$1.5 million in remodeling the space to fit the needs of the English Department and the Foreign Languages & Literature Department. Senator Mandery said that even if the proposal to reverse the decision cannot pass, it would be helpful to have the issue raised and brought to the College's attention. President Kaplowitz said that President Travis will be at our next Senate meeting and we can discuss this with him at that time. Senator Gibson said that she spoke to an officer of the Student Council who was astounded that the move was actually taking place. She said the students she has polled all say that they will not go to the Annex to meet with their professors. .

Senator Mandery proposed that the Senate authorize President Kaplowitz to raise this issue with President Travis and ascertain whether an acceptable arrangement can be negotiated short of bringing this issue to the College Council. This passed by unanimous vote.

7. Allocation of additional faculty seats on next year's College Council: Executive Committee

Under the current, soon to be revised Charter, the faculty has 28 seats on the College Council. These 28 seats are currently being filled as follows: each of the 20 academic departments receives one seat on the College Council/Faculty Senate and the remaining eight seats are filled by an election by the Senate of at-large Senators to serve on the subsequent year's College Council.

If the Charter revisions are approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees in June and if the departmental reorganizations are also approved, the College Council will have 42 faculty seats and the College will have 23 academic departments. This means there will be 23 seats allocated to departments, 8 at-large seats, and 11 new additional seats to be allocated by any method chosen by the Faculty Senate.

The Senate Executive Committee proposed two possible courses of action: (1) the 11 largest departments – based on the number of full-time faculty in each department – be allocated a second seat each; or (2) the three largest departments each be allocated two additional seats

and the two next largest departments each be allocated one additional seat.

The Senate rejected both proposals and approved a newly made proposal whereby the Faculty Senate would instead issue a call for nominations and self-nominations to the entire full-time faculty and then the Faculty Senate at its May 15 meeting, in anticipation of the Board's approval of the charter revisions, would elect the additional 11 members. The vote was 24 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention.

In the meantime, a motion was made to elect Heather Holtman and Maki Haberfeld to the College Council and to call a special election for the other 9 seats. This passed without dissent.

8. Final review of the Draft Faculty Personnel Guidelines [Attachment A]

These Draft Personnel Guidelines [Attachment A] are scheduled to be voted on at the May 14th College Council meeting. Many changes were proposed without objection.

Senator Nancy Ryba questioned the rule disallowing letters of recommendation from co-authors. Senator Ryba said that although letters from co-authors are in general not appropriate, they may be appropriate under special circumstances. Senators Petraco, Champeil, and Lewis-Coles spoke about the fact that the situation with co-authors is different in different fields. Senator Petraco said he did not want to have to turn down the chance of working with the equivalent of Albert Einstein on a project, just because as a candidate for tenure or promotion he might later want to request a letter from him.

Senator Booker asked about the standards of proof faculty have to meet to demonstrate that they had, in fact, done the various things they say they have done on their CV, such as mentoring students.

9. Review of the agenda of the May 14 meeting of the College Council

In addition to approval of the Personnel Committee Guidelines (see item #8, above), the agenda includes: a proposal to revise the Deviant Behavior & Social Control Major; a revision of a drama course; proposals for new courses in Puerto Rican/Latin American Studies and in Philosophy; a cross listing proposal for a graduate course; a letter of intent for a Master of Arts in International Crime and Justice; a letter of intent for an Advanced Certificate in Forensic Accounting; approval by the faculty of the awarding of degrees to students certified by the Registrar as eligible to receive their degrees in May; and proposed Commencement Awards for graduating students as recommended by the appropriate College Council committee.

10. New business

The Senate concurred with the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that a call for self-nominations and nominations for faculty to serve on the Search Committee for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies shall take place now and that the Senate and Council of Chairs shall cast votes at the very beginning of the Fall semester, so that the Search Committee can begin its work as soon as the semester begins, as requested by Provost Bowers. The Senate also concurred that the procedures always followed until now by the Senate be followed again this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.



JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
FACULTY PERSONNEL PROCESS
GUIDELINES

*Version approved by the College Personnel and Budget
Committee
April 8, 2008*

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to the faculty - both those on personnel committees and those considering or coming up for personnel actions - on the process, documentation, and assessment criteria involved in the reappointment, tenure and promotion process at John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

The procedures and assessment criteria involved in making academic personnel recommendations and decisions are governed by the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of City University of New York, including the Manual of General Policy Section on Academic Personnel Practice. The College Charter further defines the structure, composition and responsibilities of the College governance bodies involved in the process, and the responsibilities of the college officials involved at each step in the process.

This document applies to members of the instructional staff in the following ranks: Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Distinguished Lecturer, Lecturer, Chief College Laboratory Technician, Senior College Laboratory Technician, and College Laboratory Technician.

All votes by the Committee on Faculty Personnel on personnel actions are advisory to the President of the College.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Candidate's File and the Form C

I.A The File

I.B The Form C

I.C The Outside Letters of Evaluation

I.D The Annual Conference and Annual Conference

Memorandum

II. The Personnel Process

- II.A General Guidance about the Process
- II.B Department Personnel Committees
- II.C Review Committees of the Committee on Faculty Personnel
- II.D The Committee on Faculty Personnel
- III. Guidance for Candidates and the Personnel Committees
 - III.A General Guidance for Candidates
 - III.B Teaching
 - III.C Research and Scholarship
 - III.D Service
 - III.E Lecturers and Instructors
- IV. Timetable
 - IV.A General Timetable for Preparation of the Record
 - IV.B Five Year Reappointment and Tenure Clock
 - IV.C Seven Year Reappointment and Tenure Clock

CUNY Resources

- Bylaws of the Board of Trustees
- Manual of General Policy: Academic Personnel Practice

Downloadable John Jay College Forms

- Form C as a DOC File
- Form C as a PDF file
- Curriculum Vitae Form as a PDF file

I. THE CANDIDATE'S FILE AND THE FORM C

I.A. The File

I.A.1 Before consideration for any personnel action, a candidate must submit to the Provost's Office an updated Form C which summarizes professional activity. The Form C is designed to provide each candidate for a personnel action with a vehicle to present to reviewing departmental and college personnel committees her/ his contributions in the three principal areas of scholarship, service and teaching. More fully than the CV, the Form C provides an opportunity to explain these contributions with special emphasis on contributions while at John Jay College.

I.A.2. A candidate for tenure, certification or promotion must also provide a CV (not required of candidates for reappointment).

I.A.3. The candidate should also submit any other documentation that he/she considers relevant or that is requested by the committee. For particularly voluminous files, the candidate may wish to include a table of contents.

I.A.4. It is ultimately the responsibility of the candidate to put together his/her file so that it most accurately and positively reflects the case for affirmative personnel action(s.)

I.A.5. No material will be permitted to be placed in the candidate's file after the second week of the semester in which the candidate is being considered. However, the Chair shall bring to the attention of the Committee on Faculty Personnel additional appropriate materials provided there is adequate documentation, unless the material or information is seriously adverse to the candidate, in which case see Paragraph II.A.3.

I.B. The Form C

I.B.1. The Form C is designed to provide each candidate for a personnel action with a vehicle to present to reviewing departmental and college personnel committees her/ his contributions in the three principal areas of scholarship, service and teaching. More fully than the CV, the Form C provides an opportunity to explain these contributions with special emphasis on contributions while at John Jay College.

I.B.2. The Form C should clearly state the date of the last personnel action and should include only those materials since the last personnel action or for the previous seven years, whichever is longer. (The CV gives the candidate's entire career.) Candidates for reappointment, early tenure and/ or promotion shall list works released before the tenure track employment at John Jay, but these must be listed separately in a section following works which were released while at John Jay.

I.B.3. The "Publications" category should be divided and clearly labeled as follows

- Peer reviewed scholarly books
- Peer reviewed articles or equivalent works (such as peer reviewed performances, exhibitions etc.)
- Law review articles
- Peer reviewed book chapters
- Edited books
- Scholarly articles published in non-refereed journals
- Reviews
- Translations
- Other books
- Encyclopedia articles
- Articles in non-scholarly print (i.e. magazines, newsletters, non-scholarly journals, etc.)

- Reports (in-house, for agencies, etc.)
- Custom published works/self-published works (must be so identified)
- Reprints or performances
- Other scholarly technological products or creative works.

The above list is not intended to convey a hierarchy of importance of types of publications, and the list is not exhaustive.

For non-print works, documentation in the form of audio tapes, video tapes, visuals presentations, etc, should be made available in appropriate format to the Provost's Office. The Provost's Office will make these accessible by providing the necessary equipment to the members of the Committee on Faculty Personnel.

E-publications: In general e publications will conform to the categories listed above. The candidate should provide a print-out or a representative facsimile, not just a URL, for any e-publications.

Within each sub-category, material shall be listed in chronological order, with the most recent work first. All citations shall be complete, including page numbers. It is the responsibility of the candidate to make sure that the Form C has proper citations.

I.B.4. Candidates are strongly encouraged to review the Form C with their department chair before forwarding it to the Provost's Office.

I.B.5. The Self-Evaluation section of the Form C should be complete but concise, normally limited to 3 pages or fewer, single-spaced. The candidate's statement should address, but is not limited to, the following topics as appropriate to his or her case:

- the candidate's activities and accomplishments during the previous year, and how those activities and accomplishments contribute to the success of the department and the College;
- the candidate's accomplishments in the three areas of evaluation presented in section III herein: teaching, research and scholarship, and service;
- how the candidate's research and scholarship satisfies departmental or disciplinary criteria explained in II.B.1.c;
- extraordinary circumstances;
- significant aspects of service, research, scholarship or teaching which a reviewer might not otherwise understand;
- when the candidate is being considered for reappointment, an explanation of the candidate's plan or vision for the remaining years before tenure consideration; and
- when a candidate is being considered for tenure or promotion, a summary of accomplishments and contributions since initial appointment at John Jay or since the last promotion.

I.C. Outside Letters of Evaluation

I.C.1. General

I.C.1.a. A minimum of four and a maximum of six outside evaluations must be obtained for candidates for tenure (or certification) and for promotion. The Provost will solicit these letters.

I.C.1.b. The purpose of the outside letters of evaluation is to establish the reputation of the candidate beyond the college community with regard to the relevant criteria by which the candidacy will be evaluated. The letters should speak to these academic qualities specifically, and it is therefore suggested that they be solicited from academic persons. Candidates should keep this purpose in mind when proposing persons to write the letters.

I.C.1.c. An evaluator who has direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching, professional activities, etc., may also speak to that. In addition, the letters should specify the nature of the relationship of the evaluator to the candidate.

I.C.2. Selection of Outside Evaluators

I.C.2. a. The candidate and the candidate's Chair shall confer about the names of potential evaluators. If the candidate has an objection to any individual proposed as an evaluator by the Chair, the candidate shall submit that objection in writing to the Chair. The Chair shall forward the names of four to six potential evaluators, who have agreed to act as potential evaluators, to the Provost. If the Chair decides to forward the name(s) of any individual(s) to whom the candidate objected in writing, the letter of objection shall be attached to the outside evaluator's letter in the candidate's file.

I.C.2.b. If the candidate is a department Chair, then the Provost, in consultation with the department Personnel and Budget Committee, will supply the list of names which would otherwise have been submitted by the Chair.

I.C.2.c. Candidates and chairs are discouraged from proposing members of the John Jay College faculty as potential evaluators. In addition, names of evaluators should not include relatives or co-authors of the candidate. The evaluation letters are not to be letters of personal recommendation, but assessments of the scholarly quality and quantity of the candidate's work as it bears on the action for which the candidate is being considered. Candidates should know that letters of evaluation written by former professors of the candidate are usually weighted less favorably than letters of evaluation from others.

I.C.2.d. Evaluators from within CUNY:

- Tenure: Some letters must be from evaluators who are outside the CUNY system, although it is permissible for some to be from within CUNY.
- Promotion to Associate Professor: It is strongly suggested that at least two evaluators be from outside CUNY, as the burden is on the candidate to show that

his or her qualities are "respected outside his/her immediate academic community."

- Promotion to Full Professor: The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate "an established reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline." Therefore it is suggested that no more than one letter be from within CUNY.

I.C.2.e. Before April 15, the chair of the candidate's department will contact the four to six potential evaluators to determine if they are willing to write a letter of evaluation. The chair will forward the names of all who respond positively to the Office of the Provost by April 15. The Office of the Provost will send the candidate's packet to each evaluator. The evaluators will be requested to provide their evaluation letters by July 1. When a candidate is coming up for two actions, e.g., reappointment and promotion, or tenure and promotion, the evaluators will be asked to comment on both actions in the same letter.

I.C.2.f. The candidate and the Chair should be notified immediately if either the proposed evaluator declines to write an evaluation or the letter of evaluation has not reached the Provost by August 1. In either case, a substitute evaluator will be solicited by the Provost from the Chair in consultation with the candidate.

I.C.2.g. Material sent for evaluation is material produced since the last personnel action, or for the prior seven years, whichever is longer. The selection of the material to be sent to the evaluators shall be made by the candidate subject to final approval by the Provost. The package shall include a list of the material sent. A copy of the list shall be in the candidate's file.

I.D. The Annual Conference and Annual Conference Memorandum

I.D.1. The Annual Conference is a meeting between the candidate for promotion or reappointment and the department chair to assess the candidate's progress. The Chair may draft an Annual Evaluation Conference Memorandum before or after the meeting, and provide a copy to the candidate. The Annual Evaluation Conference takes place, after which the Chair finalizes the Memorandum and provides a signed copy to the candidate. The candidate must sign the memorandum, indicating that the candidate has read the memorandum and that the candidate understands that he or she may attach a statement containing comments and/or rebuttals. The Memorandum, along with any comments and/or rebuttals, is placed in the candidate's official file.

I.D.2. The Annual Evaluation Conference Memorandum is an appropriate place for the Chair to assess the accomplishments and activities of the candidate, and the assessment might include but is not limited to the following topics and issues:

- the candidate's activities and accomplishments during the previous year, and how those activities and accomplishments contribute to the success of the department and the College;

- the candidate's accomplishments in the three areas of evaluation presented in section III herein: teaching, research and scholarship, and service;
- how the candidate's research and scholarship satisfies departmental or disciplinary criteria explained in II.B.1.c;
- extraordinary circumstances;
- significant aspects of service, research, scholarship or teaching which a reviewer might not otherwise understand; and
- when the candidate is being considered for reappointment, an assessment of the candidate's plan or vision for the remaining years before tenure consideration.

II. THE PERSONNEL PROCESS

II.A. General Guidance about the Process

II.A.1. Those portions of all meetings of Departmental, Review and College Personnel Committees at which personnel actions are discussed are considered confidential. Members of the Committee on Faculty Personnel should be aware that discussing candidates outside Department Personnel, Review Committee and College Personnel meetings is not permitted and is considered by the College to constitute misconduct. The Board of Trustees, in the Manual of General Policy: Academic Personnel Practice, has stated with respect to confidentiality:

We likewise believe that it would be professional misconduct for a member of a P&B committee to disclose the substance or even the nature of the discussion at the P&B meeting. As far as the actions of a Department and /or its committees in respect to a candidate are concerned, only the Chairman of the Department should be empowered to discuss these actions with a candidate. As far as the actions of the college P&B committee, with respect to a candidate are concerned, only the president of the college or his designee should be empowered to discuss these actions with a candidate.

II.A.2. Only information contained in a candidate's file shall be considered in committee discussions or used in the evaluation of a candidate at any level, whether by the Department, Review, or College committees.

II.A.3. Once a file is closed, (See Paragraph I.A.4) if any member of the P&B committee becomes aware of seriously adverse information about a candidate not contained in the personnel file, he or she shall immediately bring the matter to the attention of the department chairperson, who shall contact the college's legal designee for guidance as to a) whether the information should be placed in the file; and b) what procedure if any should be followed.

II.A.4. Members of any departmental, review or College personnel committee must recuse themselves from any deliberation or vote when the case might create an impression that the candidate would improperly influence him or her or unduly enjoy his or her favor, or that the member is affected by the kinship, rank, position or influence of the candidate.

II.A.5. The specific votes taken in a candidate's case, whether at the Department Personnel and Budget Committee, a Review Committee of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, or at the Committee on Faculty Personnel, shall not be discussed with or disclosed to the candidate or any other person not having official access to the record of the case.

II.B. Department Personnel Committees

II.B.1. Department Personnel Committees meet in early September to vote on a candidate's reappointment, certification, tenure, or promotion, based on a review and discussion of the candidate's file. Each member of the Department Personnel Committee is obligated to review the entire official file of the candidate. The official file is in the Provost's Office.

II.B.2 The Department Personnel Committee may invite candidates to meet with the Committee, in its own or based on a request by the candidate, but such a meeting is at the discretion of the Committee.

II.B.3. As soon as possible, the department Chair will inform the candidate as to whether the Department Committee vote was negative or positive and the substance of the Committee's discussion. Actual vote counts shall not be communicated to the candidate. No other member of the committee is to discuss the Committee action with the candidate and it is not appropriate for candidates to request such discussion with any members of the Committee. The Chair shall offer appropriate guidance to the candidate consistent with section III.

II.B.4. In cases of consideration for promotion, if the vote of the department is not affirmative, the candidate must decide and inform the Chair as to whether to proceed with consideration of the case by the Committee on Faculty Personnel and its review committees.

II.B.5. The Department vote becomes incorporated into the candidate's file for the next committee level, the Review Committee. It is therefore imperative that Department Personnel Committees meet according to schedule so that the work of the Review Committee(s) will not be delayed.

II.C. Review Committees of the Committee on Faculty Personnel

Following action by departmental Personnel Committees, candidates' files are subject to review by the Review Committees of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, which is a College-wide committee.

II.C.1. Review Committees are subcommittees of the Committee on Faculty Personnel. Subject to II.C.3 below, there shall be three Review Committees: a Reappointments Review Committee, a Tenure Review Committee, and a Promotions and Waivers Review Committee.

II.C.2. The Provost shall make assignments to the Review Committees before the end of the academic year following departmental elections in May. In assigning faculty to the Review Committees, the Provost shall to the degree possible ensure that each review committee reflects diversity of disciplinary perspectives and provides for reasonable rotation of committee assignments. Personnel Committee members who do not hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor shall not be assigned to the Promotions Review Committee.

II.C.3. The Provost shall fairly distribute workload or reassign workload among existing committees provided that similar personnel actions are considered by the same committee.

II.C.4. Multiple actions: When a candidate is coming up for two actions, e.g., reappointment and promotion, or tenure and promotion, the two actions will be considered completely separately with no communication between the two relevant Review Committees.

II.C.5. Candidate files will be assigned at random to at least two faculty members on the Review Committee for presentation before the Review Committee. Members of the Review Committee shall not present candidates from their own departments.

II.C.6. The assigned presenters are responsible for a complete and thorough reading of each candidate's file. These assigned presenters will, independently of each other, present an evaluation of the candidate to the Review Committee. The presentation of the candidate at the Review Committee shall be an independent one, based solely on the candidate's file and without consultation or discussion with anyone else on or off the committee.

II.C.7. While only the two presenters are responsible for a complete and thorough reading of the file, all members of a Review Committee are obligated to review the files of all candidates who come before the Committee.

II.C.8. Candidates will be presented in alphabetical order by department and by name. In the Promotions Review Committee, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will be considered first, followed by candidates for promotion to Full Professor.

II.C.9. Any discussion of the action or the candidate outside the Review Committee constitutes a breach of confidentiality. If any problems or questions arise from a study of the material in the file, these should be presented only at the Review Committee and not discussed beforehand.

II.C.10. Chairs of candidates being considered by the Review Committee will be alerted by the Review Committee Chair to be available in case they are needed to provide information to the Committee. If any member of the Review Committee needs questions answered or points clarified about any candidate, the Chair of the candidate's department will be invited to appear before the committee. When the candidate him/herself is the

Chair, the Department Personnel Committee shall elect a member of the Department Personnel Committee who will appear in lieu of the Chair.

II.C.11. When there is one or more negative votes or abstentions at the department level, the Chair of the department must meet with the Review Committee to comment on the department vote. When the candidate him/herself is the Chair, the Department Personnel Committee shall elect a member of the Department Personnel Committee who will appear in lieu of the Chair.

II.C.12. The Chair of a candidate's department, whether a member of the Review Committee or called in by the Committee, will not make a presentation to the Review Committee, nor be present for discussion of the candidate by the Review Committee. A candidate's Chair or an at-large member from the candidate's department if a member of the Review Committee will be asked to leave the room during the discussion of their department's candidate, and they will not vote on the candidate. In the case of joint appointments, this will apply to both Chairs.

II.C.13. As soon as possible, but in any case prior to the next meeting at which the candidate will be considered, the Chair of the Review Committee will inform the Department Chair as to the Review Committee's vote and the substance of the discussion including the issues raised.

II.C.14. As soon as possible, the department Chair will inform the candidate as to whether the Review Committee vote was negative or positive and the substance of the Review Committee's discussion. Actual vote counts shall not be communicated to the candidate. No other member of the committee is to discuss the Review Committee action with the candidate and it is not appropriate for candidates to request such discussion with any members of the Committee. The Chair shall offer appropriate guidance to the candidate consistent with section III.

II.D. Committee on Faculty Personnel

II.D.1. All personnel actions are submitted to the Committee on Faculty Personnel for a vote. Both Fall and Spring meetings of the Committee on Faculty Personnel should be scheduled well in advance, no later than the third Monday in June so that they do not conflict with other college business, so that people can make their academic year plans accordingly, and so that there is maximum attendance at these meetings. A sufficient number of meetings shall be scheduled well in advance to handle all regular business and possible appeals.

II.D.2. For both Fall and Spring meetings, the Provost's Office shall send notices of meeting dates and the list of candidates to all members of the Committee, including the at-large members. Meetings of the Committee on Faculty Personnel should not be cancelled or rescheduled except in emergencies. All Committee members should be made aware of their obligation to stay for the entire meeting.

II.D.3. A quorum consisting of at least 85% of the members must be present to conduct business, so that a Candidate's vote is not adversely affected by absences. A case may be considered with the consent of the candidate's chair if 80% of the members are present, upon a two-thirds affirmative vote of those present.

II.D.4. Robert's Rules of Order, Revised will govern the proceedings of the Committee on Faculty Personnel and the Review Committees except as follows:

II.D.4.a. Members of the Committee on Faculty Personnel shall not make a motion to call the question when the Committee is considering individual personnel actions. If such a motion is introduced, the Chair shall rule the motion out of order. Full and unimpeded discussion and debate are imperative.

II.D.5. The Process of Consideration of Cases

II.D.5.a. Departmental and Presidential initial appointment actions are reported to the Committee on Faculty Personnel in a report which is periodically updated and circulated to the members. On request by any member, a case will be placed on the agenda of the Committee on Faculty Personnel for further consideration.

II.D.5.b. In any case where tenure reciprocity (based on tenure earned at another academic institution) is to be granted with the initial appointment, the candidate's CV will be circulated. On request by any member, the case will be placed on the agenda of the Committee on Faculty Personnel for consideration and vote.

II.D.5.c. The Committee on Faculty Personnel formally votes (ratifying the determinations made in II.D.5.a and II.D.5.b above) on all initial appointments during the first meeting of the subsequent Fall semester.

II.D.5.d. The five-year reappointment and tenure clock applies to tenure-track faculty members whose tenure-track service at John Jay began **before** the Fall of 2006 and those hired effective Fall, 2006 who elected the Five Year Tenure Clock. The following mode and schedule applies:

5-Year Tenure Calendar					
Service Year (during which the action takes place)	1	2	3	4	5
Action involves appointment to indicated year:	2	3	4	5	6 w/ tenure
Reappointment Committee completes full presentation in cases of departmental action including a negative vote or abstention, and votes on all cases.	X	X			
Reappointment Committee full presentation and vote on each case			X	X	
Tenure Committee full presentation and vote on each case				X	X
Committee on Faculty Personnel completes full presentation in cases with departmental or review committee action that include a negative vote or abstention.	X	X	X		

Committee on Faculty Personnel reviews and votes on each case	X	X	X	X	X	X
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

II.D.5.e. The seven-year reappointment and tenure clock applies to tenure-track faculty members whose tenure-track service at John Jay began **beginning or after** the Fall of 2007 and to those whose tenure track service began in Fall 2006 who elected the seven year clock. The following mode and schedule applies:

7-Year Tenure Calendar							
Service Year (during which the action takes place)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Action involves appointment to indicated year:	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 w/ tenure
Reappointment Committee completes full presentation in cases of departmental action including a negative vote or abstention, and votes on all cases.	X	X	X				
Reappointment Committee full presentation and vote on each case				X	X		
Tenure Committee full presentation and vote on each case						X	X
Committee on Faculty Personnel completes full presentation in cases with departmental or review committee action that include a negative vote or abstention.	X	X	X		X		
Committee on Faculty Personnel reviews and votes on each case	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

II.D.6. The order of consideration of candidates will be as follows:

- collective consideration of reappointments without any negative votes from Departmental Personnel Committees, as specified in the Tenure Calendar tables above, and provided that any member may call for individual consideration of individual cases;
- individual consideration of all other reappointment candidates; considered by rank;
- individual consideration of tenure candidates; considered by rank;
- individual consideration of candidates for promotion to Associate Professor; and
- individual consideration of candidates for promotion to Full Professor.

II.D.7. Candidates for action within each group will be presented in department alphabetical order, and by alphabetical order within each department. Reverse alphabetical order may be used upon a majority vote of those present. With the exception of first and second year collective reappointments, a candidate's Chair has the right to make the first presentation of a candidate, followed by a presentation by the Chair of the appropriate Review Committee who summarizes the discussion of the Review Committee. When the candidate for a personnel action is a department Chair, the candidate may select any other faculty member of the Committee on Faculty Personnel to act in lieu of the Chair in presenting the candidate's credentials to the Committee on Faculty Personnel.

II.D.8 Faculty members of the Committee on Faculty Personnel who hold the rank of Assistant Professor, or a lower rank, may not vote on candidates for appointment or promotion to Professor.

II.D.9. An absolute majority (50 percent +1 of the full P membership) is required for an affirmative recommendation to the President, but in reporting votes of the Committee on Faculty Personnel to the President and to the members of the Committee, the percentage proportion of the positive and the negative votes shall be provided along with the numbers.

II.D.10. All candidates for reappointment, tenure or certificate of continuous employment and/ or promotion who receive a negative vote, regardless of size of the vote of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, have the right to appeal to the Committee.

II.D.11. Notification of Candidates: Candidates will be notified by their department Chairs of the decision of the College Personnel Committee; the candidate is not to be told the actual vote.

II.D.12. Promotion and/ or early tenure candidates may withdraw at any point in the personnel process. Early tenure candidates who receive a negative vote at any stage in the consideration of their candidacy shall be voted on a second time on the question of their reappointment. When a candidate withdraws, votes taken up to that point remain part of the file.

II.D.13. Appeals process: Appeals of Committee on Faculty Personnel decisions shall be scheduled by the Provost. Appeals shall be scheduled during one of the dates established for meetings of the Committee on Faculty Personnel well in advance. Candidates appealing decisions of the Committee on Faculty Personnel shall have the right to make a 15 minute statement. All candidates who have exercised their right to appeal to the Committee on Faculty Personnel also have the right to appeal directly to the President.

II.D.14. Ultimately, the recommendations for reappointment, tenure, certification and promotion of the Committee on Faculty Personnel are approved or disapproved by the President, who decides which recommendations to forward to the CUNY Board of Trustees. The final decision is that of the Board of Trustees.

II.D.15. When the president is unavailable for a scheduled meeting of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, the Provost shall preside in her/ his place.

III. GUIDANCE FOR CANDIDATES AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEES

III.A. General Guidance for Candidates

The criteria used in making personnel recommendations and decisions are governed by the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of City University of New York, including the Manual of General Policy Section on Academic Personnel Practice. The purpose of this section is to provide guidance to the faculty - both those on personnel committees and those considering or coming up for personnel actions - on the factors they should take into account in demonstrating and assessing whether the criteria have been met.

Demonstrating professional and collegial behavior is a material factor in the assessment of a candidate's case. The Bylaws of the University (Section 11.7.B) further state: "*...the candidate must have demonstrated satisfactory qualities of personality and character, ability to teach successfully, interest in productive scholarship or creative achievement and willingness to cooperate with others for the good of the institution.*"

With respect to longevity and seniority as a factor in promotion, it is not the length of time in rank, but rather the quality of work since the last promotion that is germane. The Bylaws of the University (Section 11.7.B) state: "*Longevity and seniority alone shall not be sufficient for promotion.*"

For the first and second-year reappointments, candidates are expected to have made some progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure relative to their time of service at the College. For third and subsequent reappointments, candidates are expected to have made significant progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure relative to their time of service at the College.

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

III.B. Teaching

III.B.1. The two criteria most frequently used in evaluating teaching effectiveness are student evaluations (written comments as well as numerical evaluations) and departmental peer observations. In addition, the Personnel Committee may wish to consider other evidence relating to a candidate's success in teaching including:

III.B.2. Activities which may be presented in making the case for clear evidence of the individual's ability and diligence as a teacher (for the granting of tenure) continued effectiveness in teaching (for promotion to Associate Professor) or an established reputation for excellence in teaching (for promotion to Full Professor), include but are not limited to the criteria discussed below.

- developing of new and well received courses and innovative pedagogy (relevant syllabi should be included in the file). In evaluations for tenure and promotion, a candidate's instructional materials and techniques are considered to be scholarly work when they incorporate new ideas or scholarly research. Otherwise they are examined within the criteria of teaching;

- exhibiting teaching range and vitality by the number and variety of courses taught;
- attending and participating in faculty development programs;
- sponsoring of students for awards, scholarships, student competitions; inclusion of writings in John Jay's Finest, etc.;
- advising for theses, CUNY BA, independent studies (Theses are available in the Library; independent study papers are to be available in the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate studies and in the Office of Graduate Studies.);
- receiving professional recognition for teaching in form of awards, professional honors;
- seeking grants promoting research opportunities for students and addressing student concerns (grant application/narrative must be in the file);
- advising students (beyond major advisors who get released time for this);
- participating in the programs offered by the Center for the Advancement of Teaching;
- mentoring and supervision of adjuncts;
- mentoring undergraduate and graduate students (including both masters and doctoral students) in scholarly and professional activities;
- development of effective techniques for teaching and educational support;
- contributing to publication in pedagogical journals;
- outreach to other educational institutions;
- demonstrating the use of outcomes assessment strategies to measure student learning;
- use and incorporation of technology in teaching; and
- compliance with formally adopted and promulgated teaching policies and practice expectations of the College and of the department and programs in which the candidate teaches.

III.B.3. It is advisable that department Chairs incorporate these factors in the annual evaluations as one way of making them part of the Candidate's personnel file.

III.B.4. Factors which might negatively affect a personnel action and suggest that a candidate needs to pay more attention to his/her teaching are:

- below average student numerical evaluations for the discipline and course involved, or consistently negative written comments;
- peer observations indicating less than effective competence/interest in teaching;
- inattention to persistent problems in teaching;
- lack of co-operation meeting departmental scheduling needs.
- being unavailable to students during posted office hours;
- a record of coming late to class, leaving early, giving finals early etc. as this is registered in writing to the Chair or dean;
- late submission of grades or inattention to incomplete grades; and
- non-compliance with formally adopted and promulgated teaching policies and practice expectations of the College and of the department and programs in which the candidate teaches.

III.B.5. Grade reports: To help inform discussion of student evaluation scores of faculty, grade distribution statistics for all faculty must be available for reference by all personnel committees.

III.C. Research and Scholarship

III.C.1. General Criteria

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

III.C.1.b. Publications submitted in support of an application are to be in published form (with the exceptions for creative artists noted above), or in galleys or page proofs. Works not at that stage should not be listed as publications, but as Works in Progress. (For a journal article, if galleys are not available an acceptance letter from the editor of the journal would be acceptable.)

III.C.1.c. It is recognized that different disciplines have different criteria by which to assess excellence, such as the role of multiple authorship and the length of articles, or the value and nature of the candidate's artistic works. It is the responsibility of the candidate's chair, in developing the annual evaluation, to assess how the candidate's research and scholarship satisfies criteria of the candidate's department and discipline.

III.C.1.d. General criteria for promotion to Associate Professor are stated in the CUNY Bylaws. In addition to the qualifications required of an Assistant Professor, an Associate Professor must "possess a record of significant achievement in his/her field or profession, or as a college or university administrator. There shall be evidence that his/her alertness and intellectual energy are respected outside his/her own immediate academic community."

III.C.1.e. General criteria for promotion to Full Professor are stated in the CUNY Bylaws. The CUNY Bylaws require of a Full Professor, a "record of exceptional intellectual, educational, or artistic achievement and an established reputation for excellence in teaching and scholarship in his/her discipline." The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that excellence by a substantial and ongoing quantity and quality of research/publication.

III.C.2. Guidelines for judging scholarship: Granting tenure as Assistant Professor

For tenure as an Assistant Professor peer reviewed scholarship in the form of articles, creative works appropriate to the discipline, a book or their equivalent are generally the best way to demonstrate scholarly achievement. Faculty approaching a tenure decision should recognize that evidence of scholarly production is important and that materials that have not been accepted for publication will be given little or no weight. The publication of a doctoral dissertation, in itself, as a book or as a series of refereed articles without significant expansion and/or development will generally not be sufficient for tenure. Rather, it should be demonstrated to be a part of an ongoing program of research and scholarship.

III.C.3. Guidelines for judging scholarship: Promotion to Associate Professor

As stated in the CUNY Bylaws an Associate Professor must "possess a record of significant achievement in his/her field or profession, or as a college or university administrator. There shall be evidence that his/her alertness and intellectual energy are respected outside his/her own immediate academic community."

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

Generally the best way for candidates for promotion to Associate Professor to demonstrate significant scholarly achievement is through publication of peer reviewed articles. As an alternative a scholarly book published by a reputable academic publisher may by itself establish the necessary record of "significant achievement." In the absence of either a scholarly book or peer reviewed articles, other scholarly publications or creative works, a record of presentations at regional, national and international academic conferences or other significant academic contributions from among those listed below for Full Professor may serve to demonstrate the necessary record of scholarly achievement for promotion to Associate Professor. The burden is on the candidate to demonstrate the significance of her/ his contributions in the Form C Self-evaluation section.

III.C.4. Guidelines for judging scholarship: Promotion to or Tenure as Full Professor

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

III.C.4.b. To assess the quality of the scholarship put forth by the candidate for promotion to Full Professor, the following will serve as guidelines for evaluation:

- The topic of the publication is significant to the academic community or the discipline involved.

- The research is original and/or the work contains new (original) ideas or significant new interpretations.
- The work meets appropriate scholarly standards: surveys the literature, uses serious methodology, contains complex ideas, moves the field or discipline ahead.
- The publisher has a reputation for scholarly publishing and subjects manuscripts to a pre-publication review process.
- While the length of a piece of work is not, by itself, an indication of quality or its lack, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that his/her body of work is "substantial."
- Scholarly or professional reviews, citations of work in the discipline, and scholarly funding are several ways of judging scholarly contribution. If a book has received reviews, either pre- or post-publication, these should be part of the candidate's file. Similarly, citations of one's work may be noted, both in the self-evaluation part of the Form C and, if desired, in an addendum to Form C called Citations.

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

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

- book chapters;
- a co-authored book (The nature of the candidate's contribution should be clearly stated in the file);
- scholarly articles (substantial articles published in journals in the candidate's field with a national reputation and external review process);
- edited books (nature of the editing should be clearly stated and address the questions of originality of conception, editor's role in conceptualizing the project, integration of the articles with an introduction, extensive editing, etc.);
- textbooks in the candidate's field (The appropriate weight given to a textbook can be established through evidence in the form of either pre-publication or post-publication reviews attesting to the book's quality, demonstrated familiarity with the literature in the field, and/ or innovative approaches and/ or through a record of adoptions of the text by significant academic institutions and/ or inclusion in major university libraries and/ or through publication of later editions.)
- scholarly and educational grant applications (information on the outcome of the application, and the narratives from the application should be included in the file. For applications that were not funded, the candidate may wish to supply positive reviews).

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

- ongoing presentations of scholarly papers at national and regional meetings in candidate's field (to be considered, papers should be included in the file);
- editorship of a scholarly or professional journal;
- positions as discussant or Chair of panel at regional, national or international meetings in the candidate's field;
- papers included in conference proceedings (note if proceedings were refereed)
- professional positions in one's field,, i.e. officer of national or regional association;
- leadership in training workshops in candidate's field;
- invited talks in Candidate's field (these should be included in file to be considered),
- special exhibits organized by the candidate;
- organization of scholarly conferences; and
- research notes, published letters to editors of scholarly journals, reviews, newsletter articles, media appearances, etc.
- instructional material or techniques that incorporate new ideas or scholarly research

III.D. Service

III.D. 1. Department, College and University service is recognized as important in considering a candidate for promotion to either Associate or Full Professor, as well as in reappointment and the granting of tenure. The expectation for service increases as one moves up the ranks. While candidates for tenure are expected to demonstrate a commitment to service, candidates for Associate Professor should have an established record of service to the College community and/ or University. Candidates for Full Professor should have established records of continuing and increasingly significant service to the College and to the outside community.

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

- participation on the Faculty Senate and College Council (as department representative or at-large)
- at-large member of the Committee on Faculty Personnel;
- participation on the College Curriculum committee and its subcommittees;
- advising of Student Clubs;
- Chairing of, and participation in, various ad hoc committees (such as Middle States)
- college representation on the PSC-CUNY Research Foundation;
- service as Chair or College administrator;

- leadership and participation in conferences, colloquia, and symposia held at the College or the University; and
- participation on the University Faculty Senate

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

III.D.4.. The name of the Chairperson of the committees on which the candidate has served should be noted next to the name of the committee on the Form C. The department Chair will be responsible for contacting the Chairs of those committees for comments on the candidate's contribution. It is appropriate that this information be shared with the personnel committees at each level of the process.

III.D.5. Service thus consists of not merely being a formal member of a committee, but will be evaluated in terms of level of work involved, attendance, participation, and contribution.

III.D.6. A candidate may offer evidence of pertinent and significant community and public service in support of reappointment. Evidence of such service may include, but not be limited to:

- Service provided to community organizations with purposes broadly related to the mission of the College and the areas of focus of the College's academic programs;
- Service to professional organizations related to the candidate's discipline or area of professional expertise;
- Providing public information and education through the news media;
- Providing public education by appearing in public events, documentaries and other means of public information;
- Service to the Federal, state and local government in special roles such as an advisor, expert, mediator, or compliance monitor; and
- Service as an elected or appointed public official, or as a governance board member for an independent organization, provided that the service can be rendered in a manner that complies with applicable CUNY regulations.

III.E. Lecturers and Instructors

III.E.1. The title of Lecturer is used for full-time members of the faculty who are hired to teach and perform related faculty functions. but who do not have a research commitment.

III.E.2. The guidance for reappointment of Lecturers is the same as for Assistant Professors, in all areas except for research and scholarship, which is not required.

III.E.3. Lecturers are eligible for a Certificate of Continuous Employment after five years of continuous service.

III.E.4. The Distinguished Lecturer title is a full-time non-tenure-bearing faculty title.

Distinguished Lecturers are eligible for annual reappointment but may not serve in the title for more than a total of five years. The guidance for reappointment for Distinguished Lecturers is the same as for Lecturers as explained in III.E.B above.

III.E.5. The title of Instructor is used for full-time members of the faculty who are hired to teach and perform related faculty functions, and who are expected to qualify for appointment as Assistant Professor within five years of initial appointment.

III.E.6. The guidance for reappointment of Instructors is the same as for Assistant Professors, in all areas except for research and scholarship. With respect to research and scholarship, the following expectations apply:

- active progress toward the award of a terminal degree which would qualify the candidate for appointment as Assistant Professor within five years of initial appointment;
- demonstration of the capacity to maintain an active research program.

Appointment for the sixth year is conditioned on attainment of the terminal degree necessary to qualify for appointment as Assistant Professor.

IV. Timelines

IV.A. General Timetable for Preparation of the Record

For full-time faculty members in professorial titles, and for full-time lecturers, instructors, and college laboratory technicians, reappointment, tenure, appointment, appointment with a Certificate of Continuous Employment, and promotion are considered by a series of committees. Since the committees - beginning with Department Personnel Committees - meet in early September, the candidate should start organizing his/her material the previous Spring. Promotion candidates are required to have their complete file in the Provost's Office by June 1; reappointment and tenure candidates by September 1. The procedures for obtaining outside letters of evaluation have a separate timetable. (See Section I.C of this document.)

IV.B. Five-Year Reappointment and Tenure Clock

The five-year reappointment and tenure clock applies to tenure-track faculty members whose tenure-track service at John Jay began before the Fall of 2006 and those hired effective Fall, 2006 who elected the Five Year Tenure Clock. The following schedule applies:

Service Year	Reappointment For	Form C Deadline	Decision Schedule
1st year of service	2nd year	Early February	Spring
2nd year of	3rd year	Early September	Late Fall

service			
3rd year of service	4th year	Early September	Late Fall
4th year of service	5th year	Early September	Late Fall
5th year of service	6th year - with tenure	Early September	Late Fall

IV.C. Seven-Year Reappointment and Tenure Clock

The seven-year reappointment and tenure clock applies to tenure-track faculty members whose tenure-track service at John Jay began Fall of 2007 or after and to those whose tenure track service began in Fall 2006 who elected the seven year clock. The following schedule applies:

Service Year	Reappointment For	Form C Deadline	Decision Schedule
1st year of service	2nd year	Early February	Spring
2nd year of service	3rd year	Early September	Late Fall
3rd year of service	4th year	Early September	Late Fall
4th year of service	5th year	Early September	Late Fall
5th year of service	6th year	Early September	Late Fall
6th year of service	7th year	Early September	Late Fall
7th year of service	8th year - with tenure	Early September	Late Fall