

Report of the 2021-2022 University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Faculty Senate
Central Connecticut State University
May 1, 2023

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:

Mark Jackson (Biology) [†]	Mark Cistulli (Marketing)
Stephen Adair (Sociology) [†]	Sharon Clapp (Librarian)
Heidi Hughes (Management & Organization)	Susan Koski (Criminology & Criminal Justice)
Joanne Leon (Social Work)	Julia Blau (Psychological Science)
Guy Crundwell (Chemistry & Biochemistry)	Luz Amaya (Engineering)
	Jacob Werblow (Educational Leadership)

[†] co-chairs

All meetings this year were virtual. The committee first met on December 2, 2022 to receive its charge from the Provost and the President. The Chief Human Resources Officer was also present. There were no applicants for Fall 2022 tenure, so the committee began its work on December 21, 2021 to begin review of Spring candidates.

Candidates. In all, we reviewed the applications of 31 members of the faculty whose tenure and/or promotion are governed by the CSU-AAUP–BoT collective bargaining agreement (CBA).¹ Of these,

- 4 applied for tenure only;
- 17 applied for promotion only; and
- 10 applied for both tenure and promotion.

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

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	average
promotion	28	33	35	47	39	27	29	27	33
tenure	17	16	26	22	20	17	15	14	18
totals	45	49	61	69	59	44	44	31	

Evaluation Procedure. All 11 committee members reviewed the summary materials submitted by each of the 33 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

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.

two primary readers. Primary readers were assigned randomly, but adjustments were made to avoid conflicts of interest. Candidates' materials were made accessible through Interfolio, except for one portfolio that was in OneDrive. Most of the primary reviews were conducted during December and January.

Meetings. The committee met using Microsoft Teams on February 2 & 3, 2023 to discuss the primary reviews.

Candidate interviews were conducted via Microsoft teams on Feb 6 & Feb 9, 2023. The committee met three additional times during February. All 33 individual meetings with each of the 33 candidates met with the committee for approximately fifteen minutes. 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. Final recommendations were completed on February 28, 2022 and submitted to the Provost.

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	3	4	1	1	3	4	17
promotion and tenure	0	1	5	0	1	1	2	10
tenure only	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
total applicants	1	7	10	1	2	4	6	31
total requests	1	8	15	1	3	5	8	40

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 39 of 40 cases (98%); Deans³ made positive recommendations in 38 of 40 cases (95%); the P&T committee made positive recommendations in 38 of 40 cases (95%); and the Provost (or the applicable Vice President in the case of Athletics and Counseling) made positive recommendations in 38 of 40 cases (95%).

	promotion	tenure
--	-----------	--------

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]

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

	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	10	8	18	8	2	10	18	10	28	10	4	14
Recommendations												
DEC	10	8	18	8	2	10	18	10	28	10	4	14
Dean	10	8	18	8	2	10	18	10	28	10	4	14
P&T	8	8	16	8	2	10	16	10	26	10	4	14
Provost	8	8	16	8	2	10	16	10	26	10	4	14

III. Requests discussed per Section IV.C of the CCSU Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty

	P&T committee → Dean	Provost-P&T committee
Promotion	5	4
Tenure	2	2
totals	7	6

Ultimately, the recommendations of the provost (or Vice President) and the committee concurred in 40 of 40 cases (100%). The committee and the Deans concurred in 35 of 40 cases (88%).

IV. Itemization by Race and Ethnicity

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee bylaws⁴ 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.”

⁴ [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.

Gender is specified under item II above.

Race/ ethnicity	Promotions			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	3	3	6	5	11
Black	1	0	1	0	1
Hispanic	1	3	4	3	7
White	11	4	15	6	16
Totals	16	8	26	14	40

C. Recommendations

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

This was the first year that Interfolio was used for candidate portfolios. In general, it worked extremely well from the perspective of the committee. Items were very easy to access because every portfolio was organized identically, which was a dramatic improvement on the OneDrive portfolios used for the last few years. It could be slow at times, but the committee found it easy to work with. There are a few recommendations that we have for improvements.

1. Provide a specific section on the form asking if the candidate is being recommended for promotion using comparable standards (CBA 5.3.5) . DEC's should also be reminded that their letter should explicitly address requirements for comparable standards.
2. A heading for years in rank and years of service for people going up for full professor, counselor, etc.
3. The requirement for a P&T Letter for submission of the case from P&T to Provost should be eliminated. It duplicates the information that is already provided on the required form indicating review of each category and the overall recommendation. However, a way to easily inform the candidate of the P&T decisions needs to be created.
4. An additional folder should be added to the portfolio to allow the candidate to post updates or rebuttals at specific times.

The final comment is not specific to Interfolio but is about the specific presentation of information. The Faculty Senate Guidelines on the structure of the candidate portfolio (III. 4.c) state that there should be “statistical summaries of student opinion survey data for the period concerning the evaluation”. Many portfolios contain a simple dump of the raw pdf files from MyCourseEval without any attempt to provide a summary for the committee. Candidates should be reminded that it is generally in their best

interest to make it as easy as possible for the committee to review their portfolio by providing meaningful summaries.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Jackson and Stephen Adair, co-chairs, on behalf of the 2022-23 University Promotion and Tenure Committee