

Report of the 2020-21 University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Faculty Senate

Central Connecticut State University

May 3, 2021

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:

Steven Bernstein (Library)[†]
Joanne DiPlacido (Psychological Sciences)
Shelly Jones (Math)
Cherie King (Counselor Ed. & Family Therapy)[†]
Cara Mulcahy (Lit., Elementary, & Early Child. Ed.)
Joan Nicoll-Senft (Special Education & Interventions)

Shangho Park (Computer Electronics & Graphics Tech.)
Olga Petkova (Management Info. Systems)
Sinead Ruane (Management & Organization)
Nusser Raajpoot (Marketing)*
Robbin Smith (Political Science)
John Tully (History)*

[†] co-chairs

* Dr. Tully became Interim VP for Student Affairs and his seat was replaced by Dr. Raajpoot in the Spring Semester. Dr. Raajpoot who was the runner up in the election.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all meetings this year were virtual. The committee first met on November 13, 2020 to receive its charge from the Provost and the President. The Chief Human Resources Officer was also present. There was one applicant for fall 2020 tenure, so the committee began its work on November 20, 2020, at which time the candidate-submitted dossier and other materials were available for us to review.

After reviewing the applicant for fall tenure, the committee co-chairs met on December 29, 2020 to assign primary reviewers for applicants for spring 2021 tenure and/or promotion. The committee met again on February 5, 2021 to discuss initial portfolio reviews.

Candidates. In all, we reviewed the applications of 28 members of the faculty whose tenure and/or promotion are governed by the CSU-AAUP–BoT collective bargaining agreement (CBA).¹ Of these,

- 1 applied for tenure only;
- 11 applied for promotion only; and
- 16 applied for both tenure and promotion.

The volume of promotion and tenure requests is generally in line with recent years:

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	average
promotion	30	29	28	33	35	47	39	27	34
tenure	17	14	17	16	26	22	20	17	19

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](#).

totals	47	43	45	49	61	69	59	44	53
---------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Evaluation Procedure. All 11 committee members reviewed the summary materials submitted by each of the 28 candidates. Each of the eleven members of the P&T committee was assigned as a “primary reviewer” of the files of either four or five; each candidate was assigned two primary readers. Primary readers were assigned randomly, but adjustments were made to avoid conflicts of interest. Candidates’ materials were primarily made accessible through OneDrive with some stored in a room in Carroll Hall to which members of the committee had twenty-four-hour access. Most of the primary reviews were conducted during January.

Meetings. The committee met on February 5, 2021 to discuss the primary reviews.

The committee met three additional times during February. On two of these dates we conducted individual meetings with each of the 27 candidates. Each meeting was approximately fifteen minutes long. The committee also met on two separate dates with administrators as outlined in the [CCSU Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-track Teaching Faculty](#)² to discuss points of disagreement. The agenda of these meetings included dedicated time for deliberation regarding individual candidates by the committee after the administrators had left.

B. Statistical Summaries

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

	Athletics	Business	CLASS	Library	Counseling	SEPS	SEST	TOTALS
promotion only	1	1	2			3	4	11
promotion and tenure			10			4	2	16
tenure only		1						1
total applicants	1	2	12			7	6	28
total requests	1	2	22			11	8	44

II. Recommendations by subcategory

There was a high level of agreement among all four bodies making recommendations this year. Recommendations of Departmental Evaluation Committees (DECs) were positive in 41 of 44 cases

² [CCSU Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-track Teaching Faculty](#), most recently amended by the Faculty Senate on September 11, 2019:

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]

(93%); Deans³ made positive recommendations in 38 of 44 cases (86%); the P&T committee made positive recommendations in 39 of 44 cases (89%); and the Provost (or the applicable Vice President in the case of Athletics and Counseling) made positive recommendations in 38 of 44 cases (86%).

	promotion									tenure		
	to Professor / Coach IV / Counselor / Librarian / Trainer IV			to Associate Professor / Coach I, II, III / Associate Counselor / Associate Librarian Trainer I, II, III			all promotion requests			by gender		all
	M	F	sum	M	F	sum	M	F	sum	M	F	sum
applications	4	4	8	8	11	19	12	15	27	7	10	17
positive recommendations												
DEC	2	3	5	8	11	19	10	14	24	7	10	17
Dean ²	2	2	4	8	10	18	10	12	22	7	9	16
P&T	2	2	4	8	11	19	10	13	23	7	9	16
Provost ⁴	2	2	4	7	10	17	9	12	21	7	9	16

III. Requests discussed per § IV. C of the CCSU *Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-track Teaching Faculty*⁵

	P&T committee → Dean ⁶	Provost ⁶ → P&T committee
promotion	1	3
tenure		
totals	1	3

Ultimately, the recommendations of the Provost (or Vice President) and the committee concurred in 42 of 44 cases (95%); the committee and the Deans concurred in 43 out of 44 cases (98%).

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](#).

⁵ See [note 2](#) above.

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.

IV. 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 item II above.

race / ethnicity	promotion			tenure	grand totals
	Professor / Coach IV / Counselor / Librarian / Trainer IV	Associate Professor / Coach I, II, III / Associate Counselor / Associate Librarian/ Trainer I, II, III	totals		
Asian	1	3	4	3	7
Black	0	2	2	1	3
Hispanic	0	1	1	1	2
White	7	13	20	12	32
	8	19	27	17	44

⁷ [Promotion and Tenure Committee bylaws](#) (October 17, 2006):

[§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.”

The then-outgoing co-chairs of this committee were appointed in 2019 to an *ad hoc* committee to review the Senate P&T policy.⁸ We do not know if this committee has met. We note that in 2014 this committee made a similar recommendation⁹ and that an ad-hoc committee was also appointed at that time. That committee apparently did not have any substantial meetings.

In lieu of reprinting our past recommendations, please see the attached addendum, to which we only add that:

- on-line review of applications has revealed substantial inconsistencies between departments and schools regarding organization of online file documents. We strongly recommend universal naming conventions and root-level file hierarchies for applicants to use to organize their portfolios;
- as online portfolio submissions increase, we recommend policies to assure security and confidentiality of documents;
- we strongly recommend that a meeting among the reconstituted P&T committee, representatives of the administration, and representatives of the AAUP be convened as soon as practicable after the new members of the committee are elected; and that
- we recommend that the Provost's office convene the committee as early as possible in the Fall for possible fall applicants

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Bernstein & Cherie King, co-chairs, on behalf of the 2020-21 University Promotion and Tenure Committee

⁸ item 3.a., [minutes](#) of the April 8, 2019 Faculty Senate meeting.

⁹ see [initial report](#), item 4.b. of the [minutes](#) of the May 5, 2014 meeting, at which a “recommendation for the Faculty Senate President to appoint a working group [was] approved unanimously.” See also the [minutes](#) of the September 29 2014 Senate meeting, at which time a [revised report](#) was accepted by the body.

Addendum: Non-implemented recommendations made by the CCSU P&T committee in its reports from 2010 to 2019.

I think this list is complete, but I may have omitted, discounted, or misrepresented some items. We should also go through the available minutes of Senate meetings to see what other ideas may have been discussed.

- to amend “**the forms used by the DEC and the Deans**” to include “simple check boxes for each article in the contract, and for the overall recommendation for each of the three levels of expectation.” (2010)
- to amend the **Senate P&T policy** to require the Department Chair, Dean, P&T committee, and the Provost, when disagreeing with (or seeking clarification about) the decision of the level immediately below, to “communicate in writing which of the five contractual areas will be under discussion for each candidate.” (3a, 2011)
- to state, perhaps in the **Senate P&T policy** that “it is the practice of the P&T to evaluate purely on the merits of the files and any additional information added by the candidates who appear before us;” and that the P&T committee does not “engage in any form of interaction nor enter into communication about the evaluation with any of the candidates, departmental or DEC members.” (2017, 2018)
- to review the **Senate P&T policy** in terms of treatment of publications in “vanity” or “predatory” presses (2019)
- to review the **Senate P&T policy** to answer this question: “must candidates meet expectations in all four areas in order to receive a positive recommendation?” (2019)
- to specify, perhaps in the **Senate P&T policy**, the role of DEC’s, the Dean, the P&T committee, and the Provost, in 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). (2019)
- to clarify, in both the **P&T bylaws** and the **Senate P&T policy**, whether the committee’s prerogative, on a yearly basis, in establishing “procedures for examining and discussing each candidate’s file,” and “the form of the recommendation” (in the bylaws) is superseded, or is superseded by, the Senate policy document. (re: the P&T committee’s responsibility to consider whether each candidate exceeded expectations in each contractual category) (2019)
- to amend the **P&T bylaws** “to limit the Committee to one member per Department.” (2a, 2011)