

Report of the 2019-20 University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Faculty Senate

Central Connecticut State University

October 5, 2020

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:

Steven Bernstein (Library) [†]	Shangho Park (Computer Electronics and Graphics Technology)
Kuan-Pin Chiang (Marketing)	Olga Petkova (Management Information Systems)
Mary Collins (English)	Evelyn Phillips (Anthropology)
Patrick Foster (Technology and Engineering Education) [†]	Robbin Smith (Political Science)
Wangari Gichiru (Educational Leadership, Policy, and Instructional Technology)	John Tully (History)
Cara Mulcahy (Literacy, Elementary, and Early Childhood Education)	

†co-chairs

The committee met on November 15, 2019 to receive its charge from the Provost and the President. The Chief Human Resources Officer was also present. 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 41 members of the faculty whose tenure and/or promotion are governed by the CSU-AAUP–BoT collective bargaining agreement (CBA).¹ Of these,

- two applied for tenure only;
- 21 applied for promotion only; and
- 18 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	average
promotion	30	29	28	33	35	47	39	34
tenure	17	14	17	16	26	22	20	19
totals	47	43	45	49	61	69	59	53

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.

Evaluation Procedure. All 11 committee members reviewed the summary materials submitted by each of the 41 candidates. Each of the eleven members of the P&T committee was assigned as a “primary reviewer” of the files of either seven or eight candidates; each candidate was assigned two primary readers. Primary readers were assigned randomly, but adjustments were made to avoid conflicts of interest. Candidates’ materials were 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 3, 2020 to discuss the primary reviews. Based on this discussion, we decided that 11 candidates required further review. At least two secondary readers were assigned to review the files of each of these candidates.

The committee met three additional times during February. On three of these dates we conducted individual meetings with each of the 41 candidates. Each meeting was approximately ten minutes long. The committee also met on a separate date with an administrator as outlined in the [CCSU Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-track Teaching Faculty](#)². The agenda of this meeting included dedicated time for deliberation regarding individual candidates.

As required by the same section of our *Promotion and Tenure Policy*, the committee met with the Provost and the President in April to discuss one point of disagreement. The meeting was conducted via Webex®

B. Statistical Summaries

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

	Athletics	Business	CLASS	Library	Counseling	SEPS	SEST	TOTALS
promotion only	2	2	3			4	10	21
promotion and tenure		4	7			4	3	18
tenure only			1				1	2
total applicants	2	6	11			8	14	41
total requests	2	10	18			12	17	59

Notes.

1. We found that all the applicants for promotion were eligible for promotion based on their years in service.
2. This was the first year in which applicants were able to submit their materials electronically.
 - a. Nine of the 41 individual applicants submitted their materials via OneDrive™; the remainder submitted on paper
 - b. Of these nine, five were assistant professors and four were associate professors.

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]

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 58 of 59 cases (98%); Deans³ made positive recommendations in 55 of 59 cases (93%); the P&T committee made positive recommendations in 56 of 59 cases (95%); and the Provost (or the applicable Vice President in the case of Athletics and Counseling) made positive recommendations in 55 of 59 cases (93%).

	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	13	7	20	12	7	19	25	14	39	11	9	20
positive recommendations												
DEC	13	7	20	12	7	19	25	14	39	10	9	19
Dean ²	13	6	19	11	6	17	24	12	36	10	9	19
P&T	13	6	19	11	6	17	24	12	36	11	9	20
Provost ⁴	12	6	18	11	7	18	24	12	36	10	9	19

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	
tenure		1
totals	1	1

Ultimately, the recommendations of the Provost (or Vice President) and the committee concurred in 58 of 59 cases (98%); the committee and the Deans concurred at the same rate.

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

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		
	20	19	39	20	59

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 This committee has not yet 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 was successful, but it will be a year or two more before a fair assessment of this process is possible; that
- 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
- specific structures are put in place to ensure the efficient collection of ethnicity data required by our committee guidelines¹⁰ for the annual Senate report of this committee, including a meeting with the Vice President of Equity and Inclusion as soon as possible after this position is filled.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Foster and Steven Bernstein, co-chairs, on behalf of the 2019-20 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.

¹⁰ See [note 7](#) above.

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)