

Pratt Institute Department of Mathematics and Science

Peer Review Committee Handbook

Handbook approved by the PRC 3-28-2017

Handbook and included *Standards* are to be used

for Faculty Action applications

received in Fall 2018

Table of Contents

What is this Handbook for?	2
What does the PRC do?	2
How the PRC makes its decisions	3
How this Handbook evolves	3
Peer Review Committee Procedures	5
Modification of the PRC Procedures	6
Peer Committee Mission, Roles & Duties	7
PRC Mission	7
Elected Members of the PRC	7
PRC Chairperson	8
Non-standing Peer Committee Members	8
Faculty Requests for Action: Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure	9
Receiving Requests for Action	9
Formation of Faculty Action Committees:	10
Response Letters and the Subsequent Administrative Review Process	11
Peer Observations	13
Requesting a Peer Observation	13
How a Peer Observation Happens	14
How Peer Observations Are Used	14
Appendices:	15
Appendix 1, Definition of Terms	15
Appendix 2, Full-Time Standards	17
Appendix 4, Guidelines for Observation of Faculty Members	22
Appendix 5, Applications to the PRC	24

What is this *Handbook* for?

This Handbook is designed to provide members of the Pratt Institute Department of Mathematics and Science with comprehensive information about the constitution of the *Peer Review Committee* (PRC), what work the PRC does, and how the PRC completes this work.

What does the PRC do?

The PRC is empowered under Article XVI of the Collective Bargaining Agreement to:

1. Develop *Standards* for **promotion** of all faculty and **reappointment** and the awarding of **tenure** to full-time faculty;
2. Receive applications for **promotion, reappointment, and tenure** (generically called “requests for action”);
3. Establish and follow procedures for evaluating each application for **promotion, reappointment, and tenure**;
4. Write a letter in response to each application (a “response letter”), which is forwarded to the Department Chairperson along with the faculty member’s application (the applicant’s “packet”, which also includes any letters of recommendation and will eventually include response letters from the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost).

In our department, evaluation of applications for **promotion, reappointment, and tenure** includes consideration of the applicant’s packet (see **Appendix 5, Applications to the PRC**), course evaluations, peer observations (see **Peer Observations**), and sometimes professional letters of recommendation. The current PRC will also consider materials generated by previous PRC’s in response to earlier requests from the applicant (*response letters* and *advisory letters*, see below).

In addition to its *response letter* delivered to the department chair, the PRC as a committee writes a confidential *advisory letter* in response to each application. In the case that an applicant is recommended by the current PRC for a particular action, the *advisory letter* may provide an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the applicant’s current achievement. It may also provide suggestions to guide the future work and achievement by the applicant. In the case that an applicant is not recommended by the current PRC for a particular action, the *advisory letter* serves to provide a frank assessment of why the application was not supported and what future work and achievements by the applicant would merit recommendation by the current PRC. *Advisory letters* are shared only with the PRC (current and future) and the applicant; they are *never shared with any level of the administration*.

The PRC maintains an encrypted digital archive of encrypted archive of all PRC-authored letters (advisory and response) and formal Peer Observation materials; this archive must be updated by the current PRC chair and passed on to future PRC chairs. This archive is confidential and

elements of this archive may only be shared with future PRC members when relevant to current requests for action.

How the PRC makes its decisions

The PRC is a democratically-constituted body wherein each elected member has an equal voice in all decisions (except where there is a conflict of interest, see the **Peer Review Committee Procedures** below). Whenever possible the PRC seeks to make decisions based on a consensus process, avoiding making decisions that enjoy support from only a marginal majority. In the case that a decision must be made and consensus cannot be reached, the will of the majority should be respected. In such cases the entire committee should stand in support of the decision, regardless of whether particular PRC members agree or disagree with this decision. Members of the PRC are elected by their peers, and while they need not (and in regard to requests for reappointment/promotion/tenure should not) poll this constituency when making decisions, PRC members should always keep in mind that they are elected to promote the interests of the collective department faculty and the overall mission of the department.

The PRC chair is charged with effectuating the established procedures and actions of the PRC. In this capacity it is sometimes necessary for the chair to make judgment calls about how to properly run the PRC. However, it is always preferable for the PRC chair to seek the input of standing PRC members before making particular decisions about how to deal with PRC responsibilities.

It is the right of the PRC to make modifications to this *Handbook* and the *Standards* it contains as well as to propose amended *Procedures* for faculty approval (see below). Whenever possible, the PRC should seek input and feedback from department faculty before making or proposing substantive changes to any component of this *Handbook*.

How this *Handbook* evolves

Each standing *Peer Review Committee* may modify any part of this *Handbook* in order to improve the workings of the PRC. Sections should be modified or added to make the work of the PRC more transparent, efficient, and fair. Modification of this *Handbook* should also ensure that the work of the PRC remains aligned with the mission of the Department of Mathematics and Science, which may also evolve over time.

All parts of this *Handbook* may be modified by a consensus vote of the PRC, with one exception. *Procedures* may only be changed by the majority vote of the faculty at large (see below, **Modification of the PRC Procedures**). Changes to this *Handbook* should only be made during the late Fall or early Spring semesters when the faculty at large can be informed of changes well before the ARPT action period at the beginning of the subsequent Fall semester.

Peer Review Committee *Procedures*

(approved as of 2013-04-01)

The following rules are agreed upon for the operations of the Mathematics and Science Department's Peer Review Committee:

1. Five elected members from the full-time and part-time faculty shall comprise the department's peer review committee (PRC). Ideally, the committee should be representative of the full breadth of Mathematics and Science's full- and part-time faculty;
2. All faculty with three (or more) years of service in the department are eligible to submit their names for election, and serve on the PRC;
3. PRC elected terms are for two years; terms begin April 15th and end April 14th two years later. Faculty may serve as many terms or successive terms as they are duly elected for;
4. Nominations for service on the PRC shall be conducted before the end of March. Anyone may nominate (or self-nominate) an applicant by sending an email to the standing PRC chair. Elections shall be conducted by secret ballot before April 15th;
5. The standing PRC is charged with distributing ballots and statements from each applicant (up to one page, explaining applicant interest and qualifications to serve) to each faculty member who has taught at least one credit hour in the past two years. Each faculty vote for PRC member elections is weighted in proportion to the number of credit hours taught over the past two years, with course releases counted towards this total;
6. Before the end of the Spring semester, the elected PRC will select a chairperson who will act as the liaison between the PRC, the faculty, and the department chairperson;
7. Any faculty member wishing to apply for any ARPT action should not submit his or her name for election as PRC chairperson, or should step down if elected from service as the standing PRC chairperson during the year in which their application for ARPT action is being reviewed. ARPT actions include change in rank, change in status, and applications for reappointment;
8. The PRC chair shall remove members of the PRC from the committee reviewing an applicant if:
 - a. the member of the PRC is the applicant under consideration; or
 - b. the applicant is a family member or partner; or
 - c. the applicant has higher seniority in rank (but not status) or equal rank with fewer years of service. The intention of this guideline is to prevent PRC members from reviewing the applications of colleagues who might later be responsible for reviewing an analogous application from the sitting PRC member; or
 - d. if any other conflict of interest prevents fair assessment of the applicant.

9. If fewer than three standing PRC members are available to review a given application, the PRC chairperson may ask senior faculty members to serve as reviewers for that particular application.
10. To ensure that all faculty receive adequate feedback and that all decisions are substantiated, the PRC chair is charged with assuring that all letters produced by the PRC directly address the established PRC standards. This duty remains even if the chair recuses her/himself from the review of a particular applicant. In such a case, the chair should require that the standing committee write a letter that addresses the standards, but may not question the decision of the committee.

Modification of the PRC *Procedures*

Because the *Procedures* that govern the Mathematics & Science Peer Review Committee define how this committee is constituted, they may only be changed by a vote of the full standing faculty. Any changes in the *Procedures* should be proposed by the PRC after the committee has completed its work on ARPT actions in the Fall, and should leave adequate time for dialogue with the faculty at large. All active faculty (defined as those who have taught at least one credit hour in the past two years) will be provided with the opportunity to either accept or reject the proposed new *Procedures*. These will only be amended by the consent of a majority of voting faculty (each faculty vote is equally weighted, regardless of course load, status, or rank).

Peer Committee Mission, Roles & Duties

PRC Mission

The mission of the Department of Mathematics and Science Peer Review Committee (PRC) is to:

- ★ establish, maintain, and distribute Departmental *Standards* of eligibility, fitness and evaluation for faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure (ARPT);
- ★ observe and evaluate an applicant's classroom performance and competency on the occasion of a request for ARPT action;
- ★ apply the Departmental Standards and utilize the classroom performance evaluation to make recommendations to the Department Chair on individual faculty ARPT requests;
- ★ provide peer feedback which is relevant to career advancement and faculty performance in conjunction with the recommendation to the Department Chair.

The PRC is expected to apply "principled flexibility" in the interpretation of *Standards*, acting with sensitivity to the mission and needs of the Department, the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Institute, as its recommendations will be considered at all levels.

Elected Members of the PRC

As described above in the *Procedures*, elected members of the PRC are elected for two-year terms running from May through April. During their term, elected members of the committee will:

- ★ become familiar with this document, with particular emphasis on the Standards applied to each ARPT application, and to act as a point of contact for department faculty who may apply for an ARPT action;
- ★ perform informal or formal classroom observations of all faculty members who request an observation (as part of an ARPT request and/or to establish a record of teaching assessments) and submit *Classroom Observation Reports* to the PRC;
- ★ participate in the process of reviewing ARPT applications submitted to the PRC, including the writing of a response letter the department chair and the applicant, and an advisory letter to the applicant;
- ★ attend regular scheduled PRC meetings where the departmental ARPT process is assessed and -- if necessary -- amended; and
- ★ help facilitate fair elections for open PRC elected member positions.

PRC Chairperson

The chair of the PRC is elected yearly by the members of the PRC after each member election cycle held in April (see *Procedures* above). The chair should be elected before the end of May. The chair of the PRC will:

- ★ convene the PRC at an early date in the Fall semester to schedule applicant due dates and organize committee workflow;
- ★ communicate to all departmental faculty the schedule, process, and standards for ARPT applications and peer observations;
- ★ update the Faculty Union, department chair, the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Provost on the *Procedures* and *Standards* that will govern each year's ARPT application process, and assure that Pratt's Interfolio ARPT tool includes an up-to-date link to the current *Procedures and Standards* on the Faculty Union website;
- ★ function as the departmental administrator within Pratt's Interfolio ARPT tool (i.e., the person with the ability to establish electronic workflow, assure that ARPT templates are current and accessible, establish the PRC's deadline within Interfolio, and troubleshoot other Interfolio tasks relevant to routing an application to the PRC or to the department chair)
- ★ oversee the ARPT application process: maintaining the workflow and application template(s) in Pratt's Interfolio system; receiving applications and letters of recommendation (if applicable to the application at hand) via Interfolio; distributing the complete application packet to the committee via Interfolio; assigning PRC members to perform classroom observations; and convening PRC committees to discuss applications;
- ★ decide when PRC members need to be given access to response and/or advisory letters generated by previous requests for action by a given current applicant (note that it is not recommended that such confidential historical letters be distributed electronically).
- ★ oversee the production of letters to the department chair and applicant in response to each action requested, assuring that these letters address the *Standards* for each action;
- ★ deliver response letters to chair, applicant and union leadership via Pratt's Interfolio system, making sure to redact other confidential material generated by the PRC (e.g., Peer Observations that are not shared with administration; any record of PRC member deliberation on an applicant's packet);
- ★ deliver advisory letters to the applicant (as appropriate);
- ★ provide all new hires with a copy of this *Handbook* and information on the *Collective Bargaining Agreement*;
- ★ assess how the ARPT process is proceeding during the year and initiate dialogue within the PRC to fix any problems that arise and/or to make overall improvements;

- ★ be in dialogue with Union leadership and maintain up-to-date understanding of the *Collective Bargaining Agreement*¹; and
- ★ serve as the liaison of the PRC to members of the administration, including the department chair, the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Provost.
- ★ maintain electronic resources relevant to PRC function, including an archive of past PRC-produced letters, ARPT template(s) within Interfolio that can be viewed by departmental faculty, and an online presence accessible to all PRC members which includes the PRC calendar, the current CBA, and this *Handbook*.

Non-standing Peer Committee Members

When fewer than three elected members of the PRC can review a given application, the PRC chair will appoint an appropriate *non-standing peer committee member* to that applicant's *Faculty Action Committee* (see below). This non-standing member is tasked solely with the review of a particular application. During this review process, the non-standing committee member will:

- ★ become familiar with this document, with particular emphasis on the *Standards* applied to each ARPT application;
- ★ perform classroom observations and *Formal Peer Observation Reports* to the PRC (as necessary); and
- ★ participate in the process of reviewing ARPT applications of particular applicants to which the non-standing member has been assigned, including the writing of review letters to both the department chair and the applicant;

Faculty Requests for Action: Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Receiving Requests for Action

In the first week of each academic year, the chair of the PRC will announce, in the form of a letter to all department faculty, the onset of the Faculty ARPT season. This letter will include this Handbook, which includes the current Academic Year ARPT standards, will provide guidelines for submission via Interfolio of the ARPT application (also known as a “*request for action*”), and will provide the deadline by which the PRC should receive APRT applications via Interfolio. This letter may also provide details of the Institute Faculty Action calendar which is produced by the Office of the Provost, and which also includes deadlines for non-ARPT actions such as

¹ UFCT Collective Bargaining Agreement (effective 1-Sept-2011 - 31-August-2015, Memorandum of Understanding extending and amending the CBA through 2016-2021 approved by UFCT membership June 2016). Full CBA available at <http://www.pratt-union.org/contract/> ; MOU available at <http://www.pratt-union.org/wp-content/uploads/UFCT-MOU-2016-2021-signed-copy.pdf>

sabbatical applications. Finally, the letter will also ask that faculty who are considering ARPT application identify themselves to the PRC chair so that the appropriate review committees can be formed, Interfolio workflow can be established, and observations scheduled as soon as possible.

After receiving a *request for action* from a faculty applicant, the PRC chair will configure Interfolio to accept an application from the applicant, and upon receipt of this application, will assemble an *application dossier* for review by the PRC. A complete *application dossier* will contain:

1. The faculty applicant's complete application, which the applicant will upload to Interfolio (see **Appendix 5, Applications to the PRC**);
2. Past formal peer observation reports, including reports from an observation conducted in response to the application and the past two formal observations (see **Peer Observations** and the applicable **Full-time** or **Part-time Standards**). Please note that faculty applicants may request that additional observations beyond the last two formal observations be considered;
3. *Response* and *Advisory* letters generated by *Faculty Action Committees* (see below) in response to past applications (will not apply to first-time applicants);
4. **Student evaluations— collected by departmental administration—** of all courses taught by the applicant over the previous two years; and
5. Letters of recommendation arranged by the applicant but sent directly to the PRC Chair (*required* for some applications and *optional* if not explicitly required; please see the *Standards* that apply to your Faculty Action request).

Please note the requirement for student evaluations in item 4 above. We emphasize that these evaluations are coordinated by the department chair, not the PRC. The PRC will not consider an application for Faculty Action without a complete portfolio of student observations available from the department chair. Faculty should plan accordingly.

Please note that #2 and #3 will not be included in application packet forwarded to the Department Chair, Dean, Provost, and the Board of Trustees (in other words, administrative reviewers will have access to #1, #4, and #5). Applicants who wish that this material be considered throughout the process should make these materials part of the formal application.

Formation of *Faculty Action Committees*:

Review of each application dossier is conducted by *Faculty Action Committees* (FAC's). FAC's for each applicant are composed as follows:

1. The default FAC is composed of all standing members of the PRC; then
2. As necessary, standing PRC members are removed from the FAC as per the conflict-of-interest criteria defined in Provision 8 of the *Procedures* (see above); then

3. As necessary, non-standing PRC members are asked to serve on the FAC as per Provision 9 of the *Procedures* (see above).

Ideally, FAC's should be composed of five members. However, FAC's composed of only four or as few as three members are permitted. Applicants can notify the PRC chair at the time of application if the applicant believes that any member of the department should be excluded from the FAC. Such requests should be rare and accompanied by clear evidence that bias or other forms of conflict-of-interest prevent a given standing or non-standing member of the PRC from rendering fair judgment on the merits of the application. Exclusion of a particular faculty member from the FAC is at the discretion of the PRC Chair and should only be done based on clear and compelling evidence.

Response Letters and the Subsequent Administrative Review Process

The PRC Chair distributes the *application dossier* to the appropriate FAC and arranges for a time for all members of that FAC to sit and review the evidence presented in that application. Based on a comparison of evidence presented to the appropriate *Standards* (see below), the FAC will decide whether or not to recommend the requested *faculty action*. In the case that the members of the FAC cannot reach consensus, a recommendation can only be issued with the support of a majority of FAC members, which translates to:

- Support from two out of three members of a three-member FAC (66% support); or
- Support from three out of four members of a four-member FAC (75% support); or
- Support from three out of five members of a five-member FAC (60% support).

After the FAC writes its *response letter* (see **What does the PRC do?** above), a complete application package is forwarded, via Interfolio, to the Chair of the Mathematics & Science Department. This package includes:

1. The faculty applicant's complete application (see **Appendix 5, Applications to the PRC**);
2. Letters of recommendation arranged by the applicant but sent directly to the PRC Chair (required for some applications, optional for others; please see the *Standards* that apply to your Faculty Action request); and
3. The FAC's *response letter*.

Please note that the FAC's assessment of all material that was part of the *application dossier* — but not necessarily listed above — will be included in the *response letter*.

After the FAC has rendered its decision, the applicant will promptly receive an *advisory letter* and, via Interfolio, a copy of the response letter that was forwarded to the Department Chair. *Advisory* letters are not sent by Interfolio. Applicants who wish to clarify anything written in the *advisory* or *response letters* should email the PRC Chair with a list of questions. The PRC Chair

may either answer these questions directly or convene the applicant's FAC to respond to the inquiry.

Upon receipt through Interfolio, the Department Chair will review the complete application package and write a letter that recommends either rejection or approval of the faculty action request. In agreeing or disagreeing with the PRC's response letter, the Department Chair should make specific reference to the *Standards*, as these remain the ultimate criteria by which the applicant's achievements should be judged². The Department Chair's written recommendation is attached to the complete application package and forwarded to the Dean via Interfolio; Interfolio will route a copy of the Chair's letter to the applicant.

If an applicant wishes to clarify and/or contest anything written in the Department Chair's letter, that applicant is entitled by the Collective Bargaining Agreement to "append and affix" a written statement to the application package via Interfolio.

The Dean will review the complete application package and write a letter that recommends either rejection or approval of the faculty action request. In agreeing or disagreeing with the PRC's *response letter*, the Dean should make specific reference to the *Standards*, as these remain the ultimate criteria by which the applicant's achievements should be judged³. The Dean's written recommendation is attached to the complete application package and forwarded to the Provost via Interfolio; Interfolio will route a copy of the Dean's letter to the applicant.

If an applicant wishes to clarify and/or contest anything written in the Dean's letter, that applicant is entitled by the Collective Bargaining Agreement to "append and affix" a written statement to the application package via Interfolio.

The Provost will review the complete application package and write a letter that recommends either rejection or approval of the faculty action request. In agreeing or disagreeing with the PRC's response letter, the Provost should make specific reference to the *Standards*, as these remain the ultimate criteria by which the applicant's achievements should be judged⁴. The Provost's written recommendation is attached to the complete application package and forwarded via Interfolio to the Board of Trustees. Interfolio will route a copy of the Provost's letter to the applicant.

² Administrators can invoke an additional criteria for assessing a recommendation: whether or not adequate courses are available should the applicant be approved for a given action. This criteria is rarely invoked and if invoked spuriously is grounds for a union grievance.

³ Administrators can invoke an additional criteria for assessing a recommendation: whether or not adequate courses are available should the applicant be approved for a given action. This criteria is rarely invoked and if invoked spuriously is grounds for a union grievance.

⁴ See previous footnote.

If an applicant wishes to clarify and/or contest anything written in the Provost's letter, that applicant is entitled by the Collective Bargaining Agreement to "append and affix" a written statement to the application package.

The Board of Trustees meet and render a final decision for each application for *faculty action*. The decision of the Board of Trustees is final.

Peer Observations

Peer observations are a critical component of the Peer Review Committee's work, as they represent one of the only means by which the quality of faculty teaching can be assessed and -- potentially -- improved. An ideal peer observation combines a frank assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the observed lesson with constructive suggestions for how the observed faculty member might improve teaching effectiveness. The standing PRC will use formal peer observation reports in conjunction with student evaluations and teaching materials submitted by the applicant to assess the applicant's teaching effectiveness.

Requesting a Peer Observation

At the beginning of both the Fall and Spring semesters, the PRC Chair will remind department members of the opportunity to request a peer observation. There are two kinds of peer observation that may be requested:

Formal Peer Observation: Faculty members should request *formal peer observations* in preparation for a present or future request for action. Although the observer need not be a member of the standing PRC, the PRC Chair will assign an observer who is senior to the faculty member to be observed in accordance with the PRC *Procedures conflict-of-interest guidelines*. As delineated in **Appendix 4** (Guidelines for Observation of Faculty Members), the observed faculty member has the right to request a meeting following the observation. A *formal peer observation* is submitted to the PRC Chair, who delivers them to the observed faculty member and archives the observation for a present or future request for action.

Informal Peer Observation: Faculty members may request *informal peer observations* in order to receive confidential and constructive feedback on their teaching; this feedback is completely separated from the PRC's function as the body reviewing requests for action. The PRC Chair will assign an observer; this observer need not be senior to the faculty member observed. As delineated in **Appendix 4** (Guidelines for Observation of Faculty Members), the observed faculty member has the right to request a meeting following the observation.

Requests for peer observation should be made via email to the PRC Chair and should include a list of preferred class sessions to be observed. For informal observations, the faculty member may request that a particular person be assigned to perform the observation.

Many of our *Standards* require that a *request for action* include a minimum number of formal peer observations. Faculty who intend to make a future *request for action* (and in particular untenured full-timers who are **required** to apply for reappointment every two years) should plan

accordingly, making sure to take advantage of the opportunity each semester to request a peer observation.

How a Peer Observation Happens

The PRC Chair will receive requests for observations each semester, and prioritize the requests based on how urgently they are needed for upcoming actions. The chair will then facilitate scheduling and arrangement of each observation based on this initial prioritization, including making both the observer and observed aware of **Appendix 4** (Guidelines for Observation of Faculty Members).

How Peer Observations Are Used

The PRC Chair will distribute the formal peer observations of each applicant to their ARPT committee during each action. The ARPT committee will use these peer observations in tandem with the applicant's student evaluations (and any other relevant information provided by the applicant) to generate a comprehensive assessment of the applicant's teaching performance relevant to the ARPT Standards. This final assessment of the applicant's teaching by the ARPT committee will be the only assessment that becomes part of their application packet. The individual formal peer observations will remain archived with the PRC Chair.

Appendices:

Appendix 1, Definition of Terms

There are two terms that apply to full-time and part-time faculty appointments: **Status** and **Rank**:

1. **Status**—indicates a faculty member’s employment level. At Pratt Institute, status titles include:
 - a. **Visiting**: Part-time teaching load limited to fifty percent of a full-time workload.
 - b. **Adjunct**: Part-time teaching load limited to seventy-five percent of a full-time workload. Benefits include: tuition remission and health coverage. As of the 2011-2015 contract, adjuncts are required to maintain a 50% load (i.e. 6 credits per semester) in order to retain this status.
 - c. **Adjunct w/CCE (Certificate of Continuous Employment)**: CCE is adjunct tenure status. “Every effort” is made to provide the CCE with “(3/4) of a full-time workload” [CBA 23.3(a)]. In addition to full tenure protections, benefits include: tuition remission, retirement/pension plan, and health coverage. In the event that a full-time position becomes available within one’s field of competence, the Adjunct w/CCE will be a finalist [CBA 23.1(a) (2)]. As of the 2011-2015 contract, adjuncts are required to maintain a 50% load (i.e. 6 credits per semester) in order to retain this status.
 - d. **Full-Time [tenure-track]**: Typically, the full-time tenure-track faculty member “will be formally reviewed for reappointment in the third and fifth year and for tenure in the seventh year” [CBA 16.5]. However, “each two years of prior full-time faculty service at an accredited college or university shall be credited as equivalent of one year full-time service at Pratt Institute for purposes of eligibility for tenure to a maximum of two years full-time service at Pratt” [CBA 30.4]. Benefits include: tuition remission, tuition exchange, retirement/pension plan, and health coverage.
 - e. **Full-Time [tenured]**: Typically, “full-time faculty members who have served in a continuous manner for a probationary period of seven (7) years shall be reappointed for an eighth year with tenure or shall receive a terminal contract” [CBA 30.4]. Past practice allows the full-time faculty member who held a CCE prior to their full-time appointment to resume their CCE status should they not be reappointed with tenure.
2. **Rank**—indicates a faculty member’s academic level. There are four ranks at Pratt Institute: **Instructor**, **Assistant Professor**, **Associate Professor**, and **[Full] Professor**.

An upgrade in employment level is referred to as a **Status Change** or **Change in Status**. An upgrade in rank is referred to as a **Promotion**.

Definitions consistent with UFCT Collective Bargaining Agreement (effective 1-Sept-2011 - 31-August-2015, Memorandum of Understanding extending and amending the CBA through 2016-2021 approved by UFCT membership June 2016). Full CBA available at <http://www.pratt-union.org/contract/> ; MOU available at <http://www.pratt-union.org/wp-content/uploads/UFCT-MOU-2016-2021-signed-copy.pdf>

Appendix 2, Full-Time Standards

Standards of Eligibility, Fitness and Evaluation for Full-time Faculty □ (Criteria for promotion, change of status, reappointment and tenure)

Criteria and Standards of Evaluation for Reappointment, Promotion and Change of Status: FULL-TIME applicants

In its continuing responsibility toward meeting the particular professional needs of the Department of Mathematics and Science, the PRC has striven to apply principled flexibility to its general criteria of merit. The following revised statement of policy is being made publicly available for discussion and use in making decisions regarding promotion and tenure within the FULL-TIME ranks.

Simultaneous applications for Promotion and Status Change are permitted.

I. Criteria for Reappointment (third and fifth year of Tenure-Track status):

- 1. Possession of a Ph.D. degree or its terminal equivalent in a field relevant to the mission of the department (e.g. D.Sc., D.Eng.).**

and

- 2. Demonstration of superior quality teaching.** A successful applicant for tenure-track reappointment will have a record of superior quality teaching, as established by peer observations and student evaluation forms. Applications for reappointment must include **three** formal peer observations (two from previous years and one performed at the time of application), and student evaluations for all courses taught over the preceding two years. Documented reports on guest lecture engagements, examples of student work, professional development in teaching, breadth of teaching, and introduction of novel courses will also be considered.

and

- 3. Evidence of progress towards envisioning and developing a body of scholarship.**

Examples include but are not limited to:

- Professional development such as participation in sponsored workshops in area of research expertise
- Development of a public mathematics and/or science initiative
- Active involvement in projects, publications, or other public work with collaborators within or beyond the mathematics & science disciplines
- Scholarly communication at conferences, workshops or professional publication in applicant's field of research
- Establishing a research agenda

- Submission of grant applications

and

4. **Evidence of engagement with opportunities for service on behalf of the Institute.** A successful applicant for promotion tenure-track reappointment will have become involved in service on academic committees (department or school or institute level) and/or involvement in Institute activities (searches and/or any assistance with department or school or Institute projects, programs and events). *Public service and public outreach can supplement, but not replace, service on behalf of the Institute.*

II. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (Full-Time Status):

1. **Possession of a Ph.D. degree or its terminal equivalent in a field relevant to the mission of the department (e.g. D.Sc., D.Eng.).**

and

2. **Demonstration of superior quality teaching.** A successful applicant for promotion for Associate Professor will normally be expected to have four to six years of superior quality teaching at the Assistant Professor rank as established by peer observations and student evaluation forms. Applications for this promotion must include at least **three** formal peer observations (two from previous years and one performed at the time of application), and student evaluations for all courses taught over the preceding two years. Documented reports on guest lecture engagements, examples of student work, professional development in teaching, breadth of teaching, and introduction of novel courses will also be considered.

and

3. **Evidence of scholarly achievements, as well as continued progress towards establishing a coherent body of scholarship.** Examples include but are not limited to:
 - Professional development such as participation in sponsored workshops in area of research expertise
 - Coordination and implementation of a public mathematics and/or science initiative
 - Completion of projects, publications, or other public work with collaborators within or beyond the mathematics & science disciplines
 - Scholarly communication at conferences and workshops
 - Professional publication in applicant's field of research
 - Establishing and pursuing a research agenda

- Funding of research through grants or other external sources

and

4. **A record of service on behalf of the Institute.** A successful applicant for promotion to Associate Professor will have a record of service on academic committees (department or school or Institute level) and involvement in Institute activities (searches and/or any assistance with department or school or Institute projects, programs and events). *Public service and public outreach can supplement, but not replace, service on behalf of the Institute.*

III. Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor (Full-Time Status):

1. **Demonstration of superior quality teaching.** A successful applicant for promotion for Full Professor will normally be expected to have four to six years of superior quality teaching at the Associate Professor rank as established by peer observations and student evaluation forms. Applications for this promotion must include **three** formal peer observations (two from previous years and one performed at the time of application) and student evaluations for all courses taught over the preceding two years. Documented reports on guest lecture engagements, examples of student work, professional development in teaching, breadth of teaching, and introduction of novel courses will also be considered.

and

2. **Continued scholarly achievements while serving at the Associate Professor rank.** Examples of achievements include but are not limited to:
 - Body of publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals and scholarly work of recognized distinction
 - Presentation of papers at conferences and/or seminars
 - Coordination and implementation of a public mathematics and/or science initiative
 - Completion of projects, publications, or other public work with collaborators within or beyond the mathematics & science disciplines
 - Publications in conference proceedings
 - Other published written materials either by or about the applicant
 - Awards and any other evidence of professional achievements
 - Outside of Institute recognition
 - Funding of research through grants or other external sources
 - Supervision of undergraduate or graduate students on research projects
 - Supervision of postdoctoral researchers

and

3. **A record of service at all levels on behalf of the Institute.** A successful applicant for promotion to Full Professor will have a record of service on academic committees (department and school and Institute level) and involvement in Institute activities (searches and/or any assistance with department or school or Institute projects, programs and events). *Public service and public outreach can supplement, but not replace, service on behalf of the Institute.*

IV. Criteria for Change in Status from Tenure-Track (Non-Tenured) to Tenured (must be filed IN or BEFORE the seventh year of Full-Time employment):

1. **Achievement of Associate Professor rank (or concurrent application for promotion to Associate Professor rank).**

and

2. **Demonstration of a consistent commitment to working alongside colleagues to identify and meet departmental needs.**

and

3. **Provision of evidence which suggests that the applicant possesses the capability and drive to potentially meet the criteria for promotion to Full Professor.**

and

4. **Inclusion of at least two professional letters of recommendation, by qualified peers from inside or outside the Institute, which attest to aspects of points 2 and 3 above.**

Appendix 3, Part-Time Standards

Standards of Eligibility, Fitness and Evaluation for Part-time Faculty (Criteria for promotion, change of status, reappointment and tenure)

Criteria and Standards of Evaluation for Promotion and Change of Status: PART-TIME applicants

In its continuing responsibility toward meeting the particular professional needs of the Department of Mathematics and Science, the PRC has striven to apply principled flexibility to its general criteria of merit. The following revised statement of policy is being made publicly available for discussion and use in making decisions regarding promotion and status within the PART-TIME ranks.

Simultaneous applications for Promotion and Status Change are permitted.

I. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor (Part-Time)

- 1. A graduate degree in a field relevant to the mission of the department.**

and

- 2. Demonstration of superior quality teaching.** A successful applicant for Assistant Professor will normally be expected to have three to five years of superior quality teaching at the Instructor level, as established by peer observations and student evaluation forms. Applications for this promotion must include at least **three** formal peer observations (two from previous years and one performed at the time of application), and student evaluations for all courses taught over the preceding two years. Documented reports on guest lecture engagements, examples of student work, professional development in teaching, breadth of teaching, and introduction of novel courses will also be considered.

and

- 3. Evidence of scholarly achievements.** Examples include but are not limited to:
 - Professional development such as participation in sponsored workshops in area of research expertise
 - Development of a public mathematics and/or science initiative
 - Active involvement in

- or 3. Evidence of engagement with opportunities for service on behalf of the Institute.**

A successful applicant for Assistant Professor (Visiting or Adjunct Status) will have become involved in service on academic committees (department or school or Institute level) and/or involvement in Institute activities (searches and/or any assistance with department or school or Institute

projects, publications, or other public work with collaborators within or beyond the mathematics & science disciplines

- Scholarly communication at conferences and workshops
- Professional publication in applicant's field of research
- Establishing a research agenda
- Submission of grant applications

projects, programs and events). *Public service and public outreach can supplement, but not replace, service on behalf of the Institute.*

II. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (Part-Time)

1. **A graduate degree in a field relevant to the mission of the department.**

and

2. **Demonstration of superior quality teaching.** A successful applicant for Associate Professor will normally be expected to have four to six years of superior quality teaching at the Assistant Professor level, as established by peer observations and student evaluation forms. Applications for this promotion must include at least **three** formal peer observations (two from previous years and one performed at the time of application), and student evaluations for all courses taught over the preceding two years. Documented reports on guest lecture engagements, examples of student work, professional development in teaching, breadth of teaching, and introduction of novel courses will also be considered.

and

3. **Evidence of continuing scholarly achievements.** Examples include but are not limited to:
 - Professional development such as participation in sponsored workshops in area of research expertise
 - Coordination and implementation of a public mathematics and/or science initiative
- or 3. **A record of continuing service on behalf of the Institute.** A successful applicant for promotion to Associate Professor will have a record of service on academic committees (department or school or Institute level) and/or involvement in Institute activities (searches and/or any assistance with department or school or Institute projects, programs and events). *Public service and public outreach can*

- Completion of projects, publications, or other public work with collaborators within or beyond the mathematics & science disciplines
- Scholarly communication at conferences and workshops
- Professional publication in applicant's field of research
- Establishing a research agenda
- Submission of grant applications

supplement, but not replace, service on behalf of the Institute.

III. Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor (Part-Time)

1. **A graduate degree in a field relevant to the mission of the department.**

and

2. **Demonstration of superior quality teaching.** A successful applicant for promotion for Full Professor will normally be expected to have four to six years of superior quality teaching at the Associate Professor rank as established by peer observations and student evaluation forms. Applications for this promotion must include **three** formal peer observations (two from previous years and one performed at the time of application), and student evaluations for all courses taught over the preceding two years. Documented reports on guest lecture engagements, examples of student work, professional development in teaching, breadth of teaching, and introduction of novel courses will also be considered.

and

3. **Continued scholarly achievements while serving at the Associate Professor rank.** Examples of scholarly achievements include but are not limited to:
 - Body of publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals and scholarly work of recognized distinction
 - Coordination and implementation of a public mathematics and/or science initiative
 - Completion of projects, publications, or other public work with collaborators within or beyond the mathematics & science disciplines
 - Presentation of papers at conferences and/or seminars
 - Publications in conference proceedings

- Other published written materials either by or about the applicant
- Awards and any other evidence of professional achievements
- Outside of Institute recognition
- Funding of research through grants
- Supervision of undergraduate or graduate students on research projects
- Supervision of postdoctoral researchers

and

4. **A record of service on behalf of the Institute.** A successful applicant for promotion to Associate Professor will have a record of service on academic committees (department or school or Institute level) and/or involvement in Institute activities (searches and/or any assistance with department or school or Institute projects, programs and events). *Public service and public outreach can supplement, but not replace, service on behalf of the Institute.*

IV. Criteria for Change in Status from Visiting to Adjunct

1. **A graduate degree in a field relevant to the mission of the department.**

and

2. **Demonstration of superior quality teaching.** A successful applicant for Adjunct Status will normally be expected to have at least two years of superior quality teaching as a Visitor, as established by peer observations and student evaluation forms. Applications for this status change must include at least **three** formal peer observations (two from previous years and one performed at the time of application), and student evaluations for all courses taught over the preceding two years. Documented reports on guest lecture engagements, examples of student work, professional development in teaching, breadth of teaching, and introduction of novel courses will also be considered.

and

3. **Evidence of scholarly achievements.** Examples include but are not limited to:
- Professional development such as participation in sponsored workshops in area of research expertise
 - Development of a public mathematics and/or science initiative

- or** 3. **A record of service on behalf of the Institute.** A successful applicant for Adjunct Status will have a record of service on academic committees (department or school or Institute level) and involvement in Institute activities (searches and/or any assistance with department or school or Institute projects, programs and events). *Public service and public*

- Active involvement in projects, publications, or other public work with collaborators within or beyond the mathematics & science disciplines
- Scholarly communication at conferences and workshops
- Professional publication in applicant's field of research
- Establishing a research agenda
- Submission of grant applications

outreach can supplement, but not replace, service on behalf of the Institute.

V. Criteria for Conferral of CCE (Adjunct Status)

1. **Achievement of Adjunct Associate Professor status (or concurrent application for promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor status).**

and

2. **Demonstration of a consistent commitment to working alongside colleagues to identify and meet departmental needs**

and

3. **Provision of evidence which suggests that the applicant possesses the capability and drive to potentially meet the criteria for promotion to Adjunct [Full] Professor.**

and

4. **Inclusion of at least two professional letters of recommendation, by qualified peers from inside or outside the Institute, which speak to the applicant's qualifications relative to the criteria defined in points 2 and 3 above.**

Appendix 4, Guidelines for Observation of Faculty Members

Who to observe:

- ★ You will be assigned to observe a particular faculty member by the Peer Review Committee chair; the chair will also indicate the deadline for submitting your written report and whether or not the observation is *formal* or *informal*.
- ★ In accordance with the Peer Review Committee *Procedures*, you should only be performing *formal* observations of faculty members with lower seniority than your own. Any faculty member may perform an *informal* observation of any other faculty member.

When to observe:

- ★ Once you are assigned to make an observation, you should contact the faculty member; it is your responsibility to arrange a time that is mutually acceptable to you and the faculty member to be observed.
- ★ Unless otherwise requested by the Peer Review Committee, you should allow the faculty member to select the course and lesson that you will observe.
- ★ Prior to the lesson, **you must request a copy of the course syllabus** and any supporting readings or documents that may help you assess the lesson.

How to observe:

- ★ The observer shall be present for the entirety of the class being observed, and shall not intrude in any way into the faculty member's management of the class.
- ★ The observed faculty member has the right to request that the class observation be followed by a meeting between the observer and observed faculty member; at this conference the observer should present his or her comments to the faculty member and allow time for questions or discussion.

Format of the observation:

- ★ The Peer Review Committee will provide an observation form which can be used as a template for your report. However, there is no required format for the observation report. It should be written in an organized manner that highlights how well the faculty member met all of the criteria listed below.
- ★ It is suggested that the observation report include (but not be limited to) the observer's assessment of the following aspects of the observed lesson:
 1. The faculty member's knowledge of the subject
 2. The faculty member's preparedness for class
 3. The faculty member's method of presentation
 4. The faculty member's clarity of presentation
 5. The faculty member's use of various teaching methods to build student understanding of key concepts

6. The faculty member's interaction with his/her students
 7. The nature and degree of student response to the lesson, appropriate to the format of the presentation
 8. The tone, energy level, and overall mood of the class
 9. The lesson's relevance to the goals and objectives of the course as articulated in the syllabus for the class
- ★ For more information on the department's definition of quality teaching, please see the Peer Review Committee's document on **Standards for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure**.

How to submit a formal observation:

- ★ Formal observation reports should be submitted to chair of the Peer Review Committee by the prescribed deadline. Informal observations reports should be submitted solely to the observed faculty member.
- ★ The preferred format for your observation is PDF, and the preferred method of delivery is via email to the committee chair (formal) or observed faculty member (informal).
- ★ A copy of formal observation reports shall be given to the observed faculty member by the Peer Review Committee chair; the faculty member will have the opportunity to append or affix his or her comments.

A Final Note: Observers are reminded that there is no ideal class and that teaching styles may vary and still be pedagogically sound. Also, different subjects and lessons may be effectively presented in different formats (class discussion, lecture, group work, etc.) and therefore any individual class should be evaluated in terms of (1) the faculty member's pedagogical objectives for that class, and (2) the degree of success achieved in realizing those objectives.

Appendix 5, Applications to the PRC

Each applicant is expected to provide clear evidence that he/she has met the Standards (see **Appendices 2 & 3**) for the requested Faculty Action. The PRC committee asks that you assume all responsibility for bringing to light your accomplishments and qualifications.

The following guidelines apply to both part- and full-time applicants for all actions:

A complete application to the PRC must include the following materials uploaded through Interfolio...

- ★ **Letter of Application:** A letter addressed to the chair of the PRC which should clearly state the desired faculty action (promotion, change of status, reappointment and/or tenure), as well as speak to the applicant's role, experience, and achievements at Pratt Institute **as they explicitly align with the relevant ARPT standards;**
- ★ **CV/Resume:** A complete, up-to-date record of the applicant's educational, employment, professional and service record that clearly indicates present rank/status and number of years served at current and previous levels;
- ★ **Evidence of Teaching Performance:** Applicants are required to include: 1) a list of courses taught at Pratt over the past two years; and 2) syllabi for each of these courses. It is also helpful for the PRC to receive a representative sample of major assignment guidelines, major assessments, student work, and other evidence of effective teaching.
- ★ **Evidence of Applicant's Work (comprising Scholarly Achievement and Service):** Applicants are required to provide evidence of scholarly achievement and/or service as described in the relevant criteria for action ("And" generally applies to Full-Time applicants and those at higher faculty rank, while "or" generally applies to Part-Time applicants at lower ranks.) Such documentation should include copies of publications, links to online publications, and announcements/program entries for conference and other talks.

Many types of evidence could be relevant for the categories of Teaching Performance, Scholarly Achievement and Service. And though there are specific required components (i.e., the list of courses and the course syllabi) that must be present in the evidence of Teaching Performance, this category can also be quite accommodating of *additional* materials. ***It is up to the faculty applicant to categorize and contextualize all materials in a manner that best aligns to the relevant criteria for ARPT action.***

The PRC appreciates a comprehensive yet concise and well-organized application.

In addition:

- ★ **Applications for *Full-Time Tenure and Adjunct Status with CCE* must make arrangements for at least two professional letters of recommendation.** Please alert the chair of the Peer Review Committee as to the contact information for the recommender. The PRC chair will provide the recommenders with a link to the Interfolio interface so that they can upload their letters.

How to submit your application

Beginning Fall 2018, all Pratt departments will be using the Interfolio digital tool for faculty actions. Every faculty member has an Interfolio account as part of their “OneKey” access for this purpose. Through Interfolio, you should have access to the current Handbook (i.e., this document), as well as a “template” that roughly corresponds to the requirements set forth above in this Appendix. After you notify the PRC Chair of your intent to submit an application, the PRC Chair will assure that the Interfolio template conforms to the structural requirements for the specific action you seek (e.g., some applications may require outside letters of recommendation, and some may not).

Note that Pratt has contracted with Interfolio to provide technical support for faculty applicants, and many pathways for assistance are available within Interfolio itself. The PRC strongly encourages the applicant to reach out to Interfolio for assistance, if needed. A link to their technical support is prominent within the Interfolio interface.

Application Deadlines

Application deadlines are based on the Institute’s calendar and will be made known to all Mathematics and Science faculty as early as possible at the beginning of the academic year. **These dates will be reflected here when known.**

Questions

Please feel free to consult the chair of the PRC with any questions about the faculty action process. The AY2017-2018 chair is Damon Chaky; the AY2018-2019 chair is **to be determined.**