

Report of the 2013-14 University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Faculty Senate

Central Connecticut State University

April 30, 2014

A. Overview

Twelve members of the faculty served on the committee this year, including two who each served for one semester:

Helen Abadiano (Reading & Language Arts)

Richard Benfield (Geography)

Barbara Clark (Teacher Education) (Fall 2013)

Patrick Foster (Technology & Engineering Education)

Mark Jackson (Biology)

Martin Kapper (Biomolecular Sciences)

Daniel J. Miller (Management & Organization)

John Mitrano (Sociology)

Cara Mulcahy (Reading & Language Arts) (Spring 2014)

Donna Sims (Finance)

Barry Sponder (Educational Leadership)

Ewa Wolynska (Library)

The committee met in the fall to review the tenure applications of two candidates who had been appointed in the middle of an academic year. In the spring an additional 45 applications were evaluated. The following summary includes all 47 of these cases.

B. Statistical Summary

I. Requests by type (promotion, tenure, both) vs. School or Division

Thirty-three members of the faculty applied for promotion, tenure, or both, in the 2013-2014 academic year. **The committee considered 47 applications:**

	A&S	Library	Counseling	SEPS	SET	SoB	
promotion only	9	1		2	2	2	
tenure only			1	1		1	
both	7			5	2		all
total individuals	16	1	1	8	4	3	33
total requests	23	1	1	13	6	3	47

These figures are substantially smaller than last year, when 45 candidates made a total of 62 requests.

II. Recommendations by subcategory

Recommendations of Departmental Evaluation Committees (DECs) were positive in 43 of 47 cases (91%). Deans¹ and the **P&T committee made positive recommendations in 83% of cases:**

	promotion									tenure				
	Professor/ Counselor			Assoc. Professor / Librarian			all			by gender	by prepenultimate / penultimate status		all	
	M	F	sum	M	F	sum	M	F	sum	M	F	pre-penult.	penultimate	sum
applications	9	4	13	10	7	17	19	11	30	10	7	4	13	17
positive recommendations														
DEC	9	4	13	10	6	16	19	10	29	8	6	4	10	14
Dean	9	3	12	9	5	14	18	8	26	8	5	3	10	13
P&T	8	4	12	7	6	13	16	10	25	8	6	3	11	14
Provost	7	3	10	7	5	12	14	8	24	8	5	3	10	13

III. Requests discussed per § IV. B of the CCSU Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-track Teaching Faculty²

	P&T committee → Dean	Provost → P&T committee
promotion	6	4
tenure	1	1
total	7	5

Prior to making its final recommendations, the P&T committee identified seven cases (15%) in which we anticipated issuing a recommendation contradictory to that of the candidate's Dean. Pursuant to the policy noted above, we discussed each case in detail with the Dean. The same section of the policy applies to the Provost; he discussed with us five cases (11%) of potential disagreement.

Ultimately, the **recommendations of the Provost and the committee concurred in 43 cases (91%); the committee and the Deans concurred in 41 cases (87%).**

¹ "Deans" includes academic deans, administrative deans, and division directors.

² most recently amended by the Faculty Senate on May 10, 2010:

IV. C. Communication between levels regarding disagreement. In the case of disagreement at a higher level, consultation shall occur with the previous level before the recommendation is forwarded. That is, if a Dean disagrees with a Department recommendation, that Dean shall meet with the Department Evaluation Committee and Department Chair before forwarding a recommendation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee; if the Promotion and Tenure Committee disagrees with a Dean's recommendation, the committee shall meet with that Dean before forwarding a recommendation to the President. Finally, if the President (or designee) disagrees with the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation, the President (or designee) shall meet with that committee before issuing a final decision. In the case of disagreement with or need for clarification from any other level, consultation is permitted. [p.4-5]

IV. Itemization by Race and Ethnicity

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee Bylaws³ stipulate that the P&T Committee submit a “statistical summary of the year’s promotion and tenure cases, including breakdowns by gender and by race and ethnicity” based on “data provided by the University.”

Gender data was supplied by each academic unit except the School of Business. As chair I input the data missing in these three cases. Gender is specified under item II above.

Race/ethnicity data was provided only by the Library and by the School of Education and Professional Studies, for a total of nine candidates, or 27%. (This was an improvement over last year, when race/ethnicity was only provided for five candidates.) Whereas I felt safe identifying the gender of the three School of Business candidates, I declined to do the same for the race/ethnicity of the 24 candidates for whom this data was not provided. I can offer my anecdotal opinion that the racial/ethnic diversity among this year’s candidates was so slight that publishing data subdivided by race/ethnicity would be tantamount to identifying individuals.

C. Recommendations

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee Bylaws also require “an evaluation of the year’s process.” There are a number of issues relating to the promotion-and-tenure process which should be discussed between the faculty and the administration. In general these relate to (a) maintenance, handling, and duplication of materials submitted by promotion or tenure candidates; (b) the use of DEC Guidelines; and (c) communication among Human Resources, the AAUP, and the P&T committee.

These are not urgent issues, but the committee and the Provost agree that they are sufficient in quality and quantity that time should be set aside to discuss them.

Thus, the committee recommends the following resolution

- **that the President of the Faculty Senate appoint a working group to meet with the Provost to discuss issues including the three specified above; and that**
- **this meeting take place as reasonably long in advance as possible before the P&T committee reconvenes in the fall.**

Because such a meeting might or might not result in immediately implementable suggestions, we do not suggest that this group issue a report unless requested by the officers of the Senate.

Respectfully,

Patrick Foster, chair, 2013-14 University Promotion and Tenure Committee

³ most recently amended by the Faculty Senate on April 29, 2013:

[§6]g. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall each April present to the Senate and faculty a statistical summary of the year’s promotion and tenure cases, including breakdowns by gender and by race and ethnicity, and an evaluation of the year’s process. The Committee shall use data provided by the University administration, including the gender and race and ethnicity categories used by the administration, in preparation of the report. The Committee shall be mindful of privacy concerns; if, in the judgment of the Committee, breakdown of the data by gender or by race and ethnicity compromises individual identity of candidates, the Committee may combine minority categories and/or report data combined for periods of up to five years rather than just the current year. The report shall be followed by at least one open faculty forum. The President and/or Provost and the Deans should be involved in the public evaluation of the process.

A Resolution to Increase Communication between the Faculty and the Administration on Matters
Relating to the Process of Tenure and Promotion

WHEREAS the promotion-and-tenure process is among the most vital at CCSU; and

WHEREAS the 2013-2014 Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Provost concur that matters related to this process should be discussed between the Faculty and the Administration;

RESOLVED, that the President of the Faculty Senate appoint a working group to meet with the Provost to discuss the promotion-and-tenure process as soon as is practicable.