

Report of the 2018-19 University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Faculty Senate

Central Connecticut State University

May 6, 2019

Preliminary Report: Data to be added to Table V.

A. Overview

Eleven members of the faculty were elected by their peers to serve on the University Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee this year:

Carrie Andreoletti (Psychological Science) [†]	Mary McCarthy (Accounting)
Mary Collins (English)	Evelyn Phillips (Anthropology)
Kuan-Pin Chiang (Marketing)	Rachel Schwell (Mathematical Sciences)
Patrick Foster (Technology and Engineering Education) [†]	Jesse Turner (Literacy, Elementary, and Early Childhood Education)
Mathew Foust (Philosophy)	Ewa Wolynska (Library)
Wangari Gichiru (Educational Leadership, Policy, and Instructional Technology)	[†] co-chairs

The committee met on November 8, 2018 to receive its charge from the Provost and the President. There were no applicants for fall tenure, so the committee did not begin its work until late December, at which time the candidate-submitted dossiers and other materials were available for us to review.

Candidates. In all, we reviewed the applications of 50 members of the faculty whose tenure and/or promotion are governed by the CSU-AAUP–BoT collective bargaining agreement (CBA).¹ Of these,

- three applied for tenure only;
- 28 applied for promotion only; and
- 19 applied for both tenure and promotion.

The 47 promotion requests represented an increase over recent years:

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
promotion	30	29	28	33	35	47
tenure	17	14	17	16	26	22
totals	47	43	45	49	61	69

Evaluation Procedure. Each of the eleven members of the P&T committee was assigned as a “primary reviewer” of the files of either nine or ten candidates; each candidate was assigned two primary readers. Primary readers were assigned randomly, but adjustments were made to avoid

¹ articles 4.11 (teaching faculty), 6.8 (coaches), 6.9 (non-instructional athletic trainers), 7.3.1 (counseling faculty), and 8.3.1. (library faculty) in [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#) between Connecticut State University American Association of University Professors and Board of Trustees for Connecticut State University System, August 26, 2016 – August 26, 2021.

conflicts of interest. Candidates' materials were stored in a room in Carroll Hall to which members of the committee had twenty-four-hour access. All 11 committee members reviewed the summary materials submitted by each of the 50 candidates.

Meetings. The committee met on February 1, 2019 to discuss the primary reviews. Based on this discussion, we decided that 25 candidates required further review. Three or four secondary readers were assigned to review the files of each of these candidates. Also at this meeting, we elected not to use the “exceeds expectations” evaluation on the letters we would issue to candidates on March 1.

The committee met five times during February. On three of these dates we conducted individual meetings with 48 of the candidates. Each meeting was approximately ten minutes long. The committee also met on two other dates with a total of four administrators as outlined in section IV.C. of the [CCSU Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-track Teaching Faculty](#) as amended in 2017. The agenda of each of these meeting dates included dedicated time for deliberation regarding individual candidates.

Other activities. The co-chairs also met with the chair of the Information Technology Committee in November to discuss the implementation of online review of promotion and tenure requests. We then discussed the proposal via email with members of the P&T committee and communicated the committee's thoughts with the ITC chair. Each of the co-chairs attended one of the first-year faculty meetings, where we addressed their promotion and tenure questions. On March 25 the co-chairs appeared before the Senate to answer questions about the committee's decision not to use the “exceeds expectations” evaluation.²

B. Statistical Summaries

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

	Athletics	Business	CLASS	Library	Counseling	SEPS	SEST	TOTALS
promotion only	4	2	8	2	1	5	6	28
promotion and tenure			8	1		6	4	19
tenure only		1					2	3
total applicants	4	3	16	3	1	11	12	50
total requests	4	3	24	4	1	17	16	69

Note. Of the 47 promotion applicants, we found that two did not possess the years in service to be eligible for promotion. In addition, one of the 22 tenure applicants left CCSU between the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters. While all of these applications were duly reviewed by the committee, these three applicants are not included in some of the statistics which follow.

² item 4.a., [minutes](#) of the March 25 Faculty Senate meeting.

II. Recommendations by subcategory

Recommendations of Departmental Evaluation Committees (DECs) were positive in 65 of 69 cases (94%); Deans³ made positive recommendations in 60 of 69 cases (87%); **the P&T committee made positive recommendations in 56 of 66 cases (85%);** and the Provost (or the applicable Vice President in the case of Athletics and Counseling) made positive recommendations in 55 of 66 cases (83%)

	promotion									tenure				
	Professor / Coach IV / Counselor / Librarian / Trainer IV			Associate Professor / Coach A ~ III / Associate Counselor / Associate Librarian Trainer A ~ III			all			by gender	by prepenultimate / penultimate status		all	
	M	F	sum	M	F	sum	M	F	sum	M	F	pre-penultimate	penultimate	sum
applications	11	9	20	13	14	27	24	23	47*	12	10	12	10	22**
positive recommendations														
DEC	10	8	18	13	14	27	24	22	46	10	10	12	8	20
Dean ¹	10	8	18	9	13	22	19	21	40	9	10	11	8	19
P&T	9	5	13	12	13	25	20	17	37	8	10	10	8	18
Provost ⁴	9	5	13	11	13	25	19	17	36	8	10	10	8	18

*includes two candidates for promotion who did not possess the years in service to be eligible for promotion.

**includes one candidate for tenure who left CCSU between the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters.

Observations:

- We received 20 applications for promotion to the rank of Professor, Coach/Trainer IV, Librarian, or Counselor. We recommended five of the nine women who applied (56%) and nine of the 11 men (82%).
- Twelve of 22 tenure applications (55%) were from candidates not in their penultimate semester.
- We made positive recommendations for eight of the 12 men who applied for tenure (67%) and for all 11 women who applied for tenure (100%).

³ "Deans" includes academic deans, administrative deans, and division directors.

⁴ or the applicable Vice President in the case of Athletics and Counseling; see last footnote under Table 1 (p. 19) of the [CBA](#).

III. Requests discussed per § IV. B of the CCSU Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-track Teaching Faculty⁵

	P&T committee →Dean ⁶	Provost ⁵ → P&T committee
promotion	11	12
tenure	1	1
totals	12	13

Prior to making its final recommendations, the P&T committee identified 12 cases (18%) in which we anticipated issuing a recommendation contradictory to that of the candidate's Dean or Director. 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 and to the applicable vice president in the case of Coaches, Trainers, and Counselors; in total we discussed with us 13 cases (18%) of potential disagreement.

Ultimately, the **recommendations of the Provost (or Vice President) and the committee concurred in 65 cases (98%); the committee and the Deans concurred in 54 cases (82%).**

IV. Itemization by Voting Pattern

The following tables indicate the frequency of DEC→Dean→P&T→Provost⁵ voting patterns.

Promotion

voting pattern				gender		frequency
DEC	Dean	P&T	Provost	M	F	
Y	Y	Y	Y	17	17	34
Y	Y	N	N	3	3	6
Y	N	Y	Y	2	1	3
Y	N	Y	N	1		1
N	N	N	N		1	1
Y	Y	N/A*	N/A*	1	1	2
totals				24	23	47

*two candidates for promotion did not possess the years in service to be eligible for promotion.

Tenure

voting pattern				gender		frequency
DEC	Dean	P&T	Provost	M	F	
Y	Y	Y	Y	8	10	18
Y	Y	N	N	1		1
N	N	N	N	2		2
Y	N	N/A**	N/A**	1		1
totals				12	10	22

**one candidate for tenure left CCSU between the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters.

⁵ [CCSU Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-track Teaching Faculty](#), most recently amended by the Faculty Senate on September 25, 2017:

IV. C. Communication between levels regarding disagreement. 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... [p.4]

⁶ "Dean" indicates academic deans, administrative deans, and division directors; "Provost" indicates the Provost or the applicable Vice President in the case of Athletics and Counseling.

V. Itemization by Race and Ethnicity

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee bylaws⁷ 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 is specified under items II and IV above.

Race/ethnicity data was provided only by Athletics, for a total of four candidates. We declined guess the race/ethnicity of remaining candidates. **We have requested the necessary information from the Office of Diversity and Equity.**

race / ethnicity	promotion			tenure	grand totals
	Professor / Coach IV / Counselor / Librarian / Trainer IV	Associate Professor / Coach A ~ III / Associate Counselor / Associate Librarian/ Trainer A ~ III	totals		
	20	27	47	22	

⁷ [Promotion and Tenure Committee bylaws](#) (April 13, 2015):

[§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.

C. Recommendations

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee Bylaws also require “an evaluation of the year's process.”

- **We have the following suggestions for DEC's.**
 - Carefully counsel candidates as to their eligibility for promotion. This is a delineated contractual responsibility of the DEC.⁸ In the case of any uncertainty, we urge you to check with the AAUP or with the university's Human Resources Department.
 - When discussing candidates' attainment of standards in a contractual area (e.g., load-credit activity), clearly state whether the candidate meets the standard or does not. Avoid terminology like “Dr. X minimally meets the standard for Load-Credit Activity.”
 - Review the department's guidelines for tenure and promotion.
 - We noticed variance between the committee recommendations of some candidates and the stated expectations in their department guidelines, particularly in the creative activity category.
 - Consider recognizing or incorporating the Guidelines for Documenting Community Engaged Research, Teaching, and Service in the department's guidelines.
- **We have the following suggestions for the Senate.**
 - Review the Senate P&T policy, taking the following into consideration.
 - Treatment of publications in “vanity” or “predatory” presses
 - Clarification of the relationship between evaluations of the “contractual categories” (load-credit activity, creative activity, productive service to the department and university, and professional activity) and the overall promotion and/or tenure recommendation. Specifically, must candidates meet expectations in all four areas in order to receive a positive recommendation?
 - Clarification of the P&T committee's responsibility to consider whether each candidate exceeded expectations in each contractual category
 - Explicit specification of the process for deciding whether a candidate who does not meet ordinary standards for promotion (CBA articles 5.3.1 through 5.3.4) possesses “comparable standards” (CBA 5.3.5).

The co-chairs of this committee have been appointed to an *ad hoc* committee to review the Senate P&T policy.⁹

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Foster and Carrie Andreoletti, co-chairs, on behalf of the 2018-19 University Promotion and Tenure Committee

⁸ per article 4.11.3 of the [CBA](#).

⁹ item 3.a., [minutes](#) of the April 8 Faculty Senate meeting.