

March 23, 2010

Memorandum

TO: College Deans and Department Chairs/School Directors
[Please distribute copies to all candidates for promotion and/or tenure and to PRC chairs]

FROM: Vijay Konangi, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Relations

SUBJECT: **Promotion/Tenure Dossiers**

This communication has been updated with suggestions and guidelines endorsed by the University-wide Peer Review Committee. Please read these materials carefully and distribute them to Department and College PRC members and all candidates for promotion and/or tenure.

According to Section 12.12A of the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, all faculty wishing to be considered for promotion and/or tenure should make appropriate notifications and submit a preliminary dossier suitable for external review by the first Monday in April. Between now and next September, therefore, candidates will be preparing their final dossiers, and PRCs will be soliciting external evaluations. With that in mind, I am pleased to offer some general guidelines for all concerned with the promotion/tenure process.

One former member of the UPRC, when asked by a candidate for promotion in his college for advice about constructing a successful dossier, referred to this document and said simply, "Get it, read it, believe it." He was underscoring the UPRC's strong admonition that serious candidates for promotion must pay particular attention to the appended guidelines with regard to documenting research and publication (see #3 below), and to the documentation of teaching competence/excellence, and to the guidelines for those who intend to seek promotion based primarily on teaching (see #5 below and attachments).

1. All dossiers ordinarily should be presented in **one** standard-size three-ring binder (4 inches or less), with dividers clearly marking the individual sections. Exceptions to this guideline might include the need to provide a lengthy manuscript, large-format published materials, or extensive documentation of teaching performance, though extraneous materials such as unfunded proposals, rejected manuscripts, and miscellaneous "works in progress" would not normally constitute such exceptions. A carefully prepared index to all materials in the dossier will appear at the front of the binder. Candidates are advised to include only materials that they expect reviewers to consider carefully.
2. The opening sections of the dossier must contain clearly marked space for the following: **(See attached "Guidelines" for PRCs and candidates for details.)**
 - a. Blank section for insertion of recommendations by PRC(s), Chair, and Dean (see #4 below).
 - b. Blank section for insertion of evaluations from External Referees. (The PRC which solicited the reviews should include a brief biographical sketch of each referee (not the vitae) and a brief statement explaining the process used for selecting the reviewers)
 - c. An up-to-date curriculum vitae that includes current home (mailing) address.

- d. A section containing copies of the recommendations and/or conclusions from the PRC(s), Department Chair/School Director from the fourth and fifth year reviews.
3. **Research and Publication.** Dossiers should provide clear explanations of the following: **(See attached “Guidelines” for PRCs and candidates.)**
- a. The quality of journals in which peer-reviewed scholarship appears (e.g., rating, rejection rate, citation frequency, etc.)
 - b. Candidates who submit co-authored materials for review (e.g., books, articles, papers) are also required to submit credible evidence attesting to the candidate’s specific contribution to the co-authored material. Article 12.13 B) of the collective bargaining agreement states, *inter alia*, that “Candidates for promotion/tenure who submit co-authored material for review shall also provide an explanation of their contribution to such materials.
4. Recommendations from PRCs, Chairs and Deans must do more than simply record the vote and/or the conclusion that has been reached; they must provide evidence of how or why the conclusion was reached. The most useful recommendations are well-thought-out assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in teaching, research, service, and intellectual leadership. A good recommendation, in short, will not only comment on the quantity of a candidate's work but will also offer a considered judgment of its quality. **(See attached “Guidelines” for Departmental and College PRCs.)**
5. Candidates are urged to pay particular attention to Collective Bargaining Agreement requirements with regard to teaching [Section 12.9 C (3) and (4)]. Promotion to Associate Professor is based on "evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher." Promotion to Professor is based on "evidence of sustained excellence in teaching." These are threshold requirements and, therefore, candidates must be sure that the evidence they present is convincing. Student evaluations are important, but raw data mean little unless accompanied by departmental and/or college norms. It is also useful to know how student evaluations are conducted. In addition, candidates might present copies of particularly useful syllabi and essays that they may have written about teaching. Candidates should also be sensitive to national accreditation standards regarding student outcome assessment; contributions to departmental activities in this area should be highlighted.
- Written assessments based on classroom/laboratory visitations by faculty peers and department chairs would also be useful. Peer evaluation should be longitudinal, based on a number of classroom visitations, rather than impressions recorded of a single visit. (See attached recommendations on how to document full competence, exceptional achievement, or sustained excellence in teaching.)
6. Please also review the attached material dealing with the matter of external letters of review.

The promotion/tenure process is crucial to our individual colleagues; it is also vital to the life of the University. I look forward to working with each of you on this important matter in the months ahead.

VKK/lco

Attachments: *Guidelines for Departmental PRCs*
Guidelines for Candidates
Some Recommendations Concerning Demonstration of exceptional achievement, or sustained excellence in teaching
Some Expectations about a Teaching Track Dossier
Checklist for Peer Review Committee Letter Soliciting External Reviews
Sample Letter to External Reviewers

cc: Geoffrey S. Mearns, Interim Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
University Peer Review Committee

**GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTAL PRCs
(or College PRCs where there are no departmental PRCs)**

1. **Candidate's Obligations and Expectations:** Members of the PRC should carefully read the guidelines supplied to candidates, particularly those that recommend consultation between the candidate and the PRC.
2. **External Reviews:** PRCs should follow the attached guidelines for soliciting external reviews of candidates and should make clear to the reviewers what is expected of them, as illustrated in the attached sample letter to reviewers.
3. **PRC Recommendations:** Recommendations from PRCs must do more than simply record the vote and/or the conclusion that has been reached; they must provide evidence of how or why the conclusion was reached. Recommendations should be well-thought-out assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in teaching, scholarship, service, and [when appropriate] intellectual leadership. *The failure to present such a reasoned evaluation of the candidate's performance in each of these areas may result in less credence being given to the recommendation.*
4. **Scholarship and Creative Activity:** With regard to the candidate's scholarship, the PRC's recommendation should include the following items:
 - a. Information about the quality of the journal in which the candidate's work appears should be provided. Depending on the field, a list of "first tier" and "second tier" journals might be appropriate. The type of journal might also be relevant (e.g., research journals, practitioner journals, expository or educational journals). In any case, however, the quality of the journals must be addressed independently of the candidate's own assessment.
 - b. In the case of co-authored materials, the PRC has an obligation to see that the dossier contains independent evidence (not merely assertions by the candidate) attesting to the candidate's specific contribution to the co-authored material. Article 12.13 B) of the collective bargaining agreement states, *inter alia*, that "Candidates for promotion/tenure who submit co-authored material for review shall also provide an explanation of their contribution to such materials."
 - c. In cases where members of the PRC are co-authors of some of the candidate's work, the PRC's recommendation should state explicitly which members are co-authors and the number of articles on which they have collaborated with the candidate.
5. **Teaching:** Evidence of teaching competence and excellence that does not include peer evaluation [preferably longitudinal] should be regarded as incomplete. Since this is not something that can be done effectively on short notice, departments and PRCs should adopt procedures for doing this on an ongoing basis. Not to do so does a disservice to prospective candidates, whose dossiers, through no fault of their own, will be not complete.

GUIDELINES FOR CANDIDATES
(Recommended by the University Peer Review Committee Spring 2008)

1. **Format of Dossier:** All dossiers ordinarily should be presented in one standard sized three-ring binder (4 inches or less), with dividers clearly marking the individual sections. Exceptions to this guideline might include the need to provide a lengthy manuscript, large-format published materials, or extensive documentation of teaching performance, though extraneous materials such as unfunded proposals, rejected manuscripts, and miscellaneous “works in progress” would not normally constitute such exceptions. A table of contents should appear at the front of the binder.
2. **Contents of Dossier:** Candidates are advised to include only materials that they expect reviewers to consider carefully. At a minimum, the dossier should include the following items in separate sections:
 - a. A blank section for the insertion of recommendations by PRC(s), Chairperson, and Dean.
 - b. A blank section for the insertion of evaluations from external referees.
 - c. An up-to-date curriculum vitae, which includes current home (mailing) addresses.
 - d. The candidate’s summary statement on contributions to teaching, scholarship or creative activities, and service and how the candidate satisfies the appropriate criteria in the collective bargaining agreement. The summary should provide references to the supporting documentation to be found in the rest of the dossier.
 - e. A section containing copies of the recommendations and/or conclusions from the PRC(s), Department Chair/School Director, Dean from the fourth and fifth year reviews.
 - f. Separate sections with the supporting documentation (including a brief introduction to each) for teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service.
3. **Scholarship and Creative Activities:** Candidates should be aware that evaluators will have to make some judgment on the quality of the peer-reviewed journals in which their scholarship has been published. The type of journal may also be relevant (e.g., research journals, practitioner journals, expository or educational journals). Information that the candidate can supply in this regard is helpful, but not sufficient in itself. Candidates should consult with their departmental PRC or College PRC where there are no departmental PRCs (which has an obligation to include this information in their recommendation) as to what is appropriate.

In the case of co-authored publications, candidates should identify, as explicitly as possible, their contributions. Furthermore, the dossier must contain independent evidence (i.e., not simply statements by the candidate) attesting to the candidate’s specific contribution to the co-authored material. Candidates should consult with their departmental PRC or College PRC in Colleges which do not use Department PRCs to ensure that such evidence is included in the dossier. Article 12.13 B) of the collective bargaining agreement states, *inter alia*, that “Candidates for promotion/tenure who submit co-authored material for review shall also provide an explanation of their contribution to such materials.”
4. **Teaching:** Candidates should pay particular attention to the Collective Bargaining Agreement requirements with regard to teaching [Sections 12.9 C (3) and (4)]. Promotion to Associate Professor is based on “evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher.” Promotion to Professor is based on “evidence of sustained excellence in teaching.” These are threshold requirements and, therefore, candidates must be sure that the evidence they present is convincing. At a minimum, such evidence should include:
 - a. **Student evaluations** in courses the candidate has taught, presented in summary form [raw data and unstructured student responses should not be in the dossier]. This summary should include appropriate comparisons with departmental and/or College norms. In addition it would be helpful to provide comparisons with similar courses, i.e., to compare large freshman courses, junior and senior level courses specific to the major, seminar-type courses, elearning courses, laboratory courses, honors courses, etc. The summary should also indicate the type of course being evaluated, since, for example, ratings in new or innovative courses may not be particularly high. The same may be true of large introductory sections or in other situations.

- b. **Peer evaluations** in several courses the candidate has taught. These evaluations should be based on direct observation by colleagues at multiple meetings of each class. Furthermore, these evaluations should be longitudinal (extending over several years, not just the year in which the candidate applies for promotion). Candidates should consult their department chairperson/school director and/or PRC to arrange for such peer evaluations.

In addition to these minimum requirements, candidates should consider submitting additional evidence, if this will strengthen their cases. A number of possibilities are suggested in the attached “Some Recommendations Concerning Demonstration of “Full Competence”, “Exceptional Achievement”, or “Sustained Excellence” in the Area of Teaching.”

Candidates in the College of Education and Human Services (or other colleges, if appropriate) who plan to apply for promotion in the “teaching track” should consult the attached statement “Some Expectations About a Teaching Track Dossier.”

**SOME RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING DEMONSTRATION OF “FULL COMPETENCE”,
“EXCEPTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT”, OR “SUSTAINED EXCELLENCE” IN THE AREA OF TEACHING
(Recommended by the University Peer Review Committee, Spring 2008)**

Since teaching is a sine qua non for promotion and tenure, you should seriously consider including the following information in your dossier, whether or not teaching is your major area of strength:

1. A complete list of all courses taught at CSU (and elsewhere, if they are part of the information for your probationary period). Indicate whether each course is at the undergraduate or graduate level (or both).
2. Copies of syllabi for the latest offering of each course. (Include older syllabi only if you are making a case for course improvement in one or more courses).
3. Summaries of student evaluations for all courses taught. These evaluations should be presented in summary form--the raw unstructured student responses should not be in the dossier--and be discussed on a comparative basis (e.g., comparison with your departmental colleagues and/or the College and/or the University). One would normally expect scores at or above the department mean, and one would also normally expect to see improvement over time. Scores in new or innovative courses may not be high, and thus the type of course being evaluated should be taken into account – it is your responsibility to provide such an explanation if you feel it to be appropriate.
4. Longitudinal peer evaluations of your teaching in more than one course. These evaluations should be based on direct observation by colleagues at multiple meetings of each class. Furthermore, these evaluations should be longitudinal (extending over several years, not just the year in which you apply for promotion).
5. Demonstrated evidence of teaching large introductory-level sections in an effective manner.
6. Evidence of development of new courses or workshops and/or the substantial redesign of existing courses.
7. Evidence of effectively advising students on an extensive basis on academic matters and career possibilities.
8. Highly effective non-classroom instructional/supervisory activities (dissertations, theses, clinical supervision, independent study, tutorials, training and supervision of teaching assistants).
9. Accounts of innovations in curriculum and/or delivery systems (e.g. eLearning).
10. Demonstrated evidence of the incorporation of student outcome assessment measures into course syllabi.

If you are considering designating teaching as your area of strength, you should be aware that attitudes toward this option vary considerably across the University; you would be well advised to speak with colleagues in your department and College and take into account their advice in making this decision. If your chosen area of strength for promotion to associate professor is teaching (which requires evidence of “exceptional achievement” in teaching), or if you are seeking promotion to the rank of professor (which requires evidence of “sustained excellence in teaching”), you will need to demonstrate a higher level of achievement in teaching than simply “full competence”. After all, most college professors consider themselves to be excellent teachers. The case you make will need to be especially rigorous.

The following list indicates various types of information that might help you do so. It is meant to suggest some of the means by which a case for high performance in the area of teaching might be documented and argued. It is not meant to be a rigid inventory of prescriptions, and no single candidate would be expected to document effectiveness in every area.

1. Published journal articles about some aspect of your teaching (such articles would be documented in the same fashion as other professional publications).
2. Curriculum products (e.g., textbooks, software, simulations, exercises) that have been published or adopted by others.
3. Funded grants related to teaching (such grants would be documented in the same fashion as research grants).

4. Detailed accounts of courses developed for and offered via eLearning modalities (e.g. web-based, hybrid, and/or IVDL).
5. Descriptions of course modifications made for the purpose of participating in Learning Communities at CSU.
6. Descriptions of co-teaching activities, including statements from one's co-teachers regarding course design and division of labor.
7. Requests for teaching assistance from others (e.g., teaching consultations, teaching demonstrations).
8. Examples of students who have excelled in your field in advanced courses or after graduation due to your influence.
9. Demonstration of significant course redesign that has resulted in excellent student learning outcomes.
10. Awards for excellence in teaching by the College, University, or professional organizations.
11. Significant innovations and applications of technology and eLearning (beyond the mundane level).
12. Statements about your teaching achievements from administrators and peers at CSU and elsewhere.
13. Self-reflections about philosophy, growth, and improvement as a teacher (the CSU Center for Teaching Excellence offers a program to assist with this process).

Teaching portfolios have been recommended as one way of documenting excellence in teaching. You may want to review *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching* (1991), by Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education).

SOME EXPECTATIONS ABOUT A TEACHING TRACK DOSSIER
Adapted from Recommendations by the University Personnel Committee
January 1995

Assumption: Gaining promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure should be attainable, but should not be considered an easy or inferior track.

Guiding Principles for Dossier Review: Two guiding principles for teaching track dossier review that are analogous to those currently used in the scholarship track are that the candidate must demonstrate that his/her teaching is an intellectually demanding activity, and that some product must be available for peer review. In addition, documentation of outstanding classroom performance and appropriateness of teaching materials should be provided. The dossier should also address the candidate's contribution to departmental activities with regard to student outcome assessment and elearning, if appropriate.

Teaching as an Intellectually Demanding Activity: Excellent teaching is intellectually challenging because it requires thoughtful preparation and planning, on-the-spot classroom performance, and serious reflection about this preparation, planning and performance. When reading a dossier, the reviewers should be able to recognize and appreciate this intellectual activity.

A teaching portfolio would be the basis for demonstrating this. This portfolio should not be just a laundry list of "things I did in my classroom" but should reflect some coherence of ideas and activities. This requirement could be demonstrated in a number of ways. For example, the candidate could articulate his/her teaching philosophy and explain how it relates to his/her classroom performance. Or, the candidate could document how his/her contributions to pedagogy have changed over time because of recent theory, research, and/or reflection on his/her own practice.

A Product for External Peer Review: Promotion on the basis of teaching should require a product, beyond classroom teaching, that can be peer-reviewed in a similar manner to the review of scholarship. The product could be journal articles about some aspect related to one's teaching but could also include curriculum-related products (including software and textbooks) and funded external grants related to teaching. In other words, the candidate needs to demonstrate his/her contributions and the impact of those contributions to the pedagogy in his/her discipline. The range of acceptable journals should be broad.

External peer reviewers selected for evaluation of a teaching dossier should have expertise in college teaching. The criteria traditionally used for selecting external peer reviewers stress expertise in traditional scholarship, but this scholarly distinction may not necessarily be relevant when evaluating excellence in teaching.

Documentation of Classroom Performance: Classroom performance should be evaluated by a reliable and valid student evaluation instrument. This should also include systematic peer evaluation by CSU faculty. Departments and Colleges need to institute consistent policies for both student and peer evaluation.

Evaluation of Classroom Materials: The materials used in the classroom should be evaluated by multiple peers to judge whether the syllabi are comprehensive, the readings reflect current knowledge in the field, and the assignments and tests are appropriate. Generally this review could be conducted by colleagues at CSU, but in rare cases some courses are so specialized that peers with expertise in the area may have to be sought from other institutions.

CHECKLIST FOR PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE LETTER SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWS

Several issues have come to the attention of the University Peer Review Committee with regard to the letters to external reviewers who will evaluate the scholarship or teaching credentials of candidates for promotion/tenure. The checklist below is to alert the Departmental PRCs, or the College PRCs where there are no departmental PRCs, to these issues. These are issues which the PRC must address in drafting the letter to the outside reviewer.

1. **Selection of External Reviewers.** The candidate may provide the PRC with the names of recommended external reviewers. The PRC will independently develop an additional list from among authorities in the candidate's field of expertise. The PRC may consult the department chair/school director as appropriate. A completed list of external reviewers will be submitted by the PRC to the candidate, who may advise the PRC that some of the names should be deleted if he/she feels the suggested reviewer is not qualified to render an objective assessment. The process of identifying suitable reviewers is expected to be a collegial and collaborative process between the candidate and the PRC. However, according to Article 12.12 C (1) of the collective bargaining agreement it is the responsibility of the **PRC** to obtain external reviews. A minimum of three external reviewers will be identified by the PRC from the candidate's and PRC's lists of names to review the candidate's materials. Normally, one would not expect to see more than one reviewer from the same department within a given institution for any single candidate.
2. **Confidentiality.** Since letters from external referees become part of a candidate's dossier, and since the dossier is considered to be a public record, confidentiality may not be promised to external reviewers.
3. **Scholarly and Pedagogical Contributions.** Letters are to request evaluations of the candidate's scholarly and/or pedagogical contributions to the field. Comments on the candidate's service are appropriate only if the reviewer knows of them from personal experience. It is not appropriate to ask whether the candidate would be promoted at the reviewer's institution or any other university.

The UPRC prefers reviewer comments which are explicit as to the significance and influence of the candidate's work on his/her discipline, and detailed as to the nature of the contribution.

4. **Materials Sent.** It should be clear to all parties what materials are sent to the reviewers. The reviewer should receive enough scholarly or teaching materials to be able to evaluate the candidate's contribution, but not so much that the reviewer has to waste a lot of time wading through the materials. Elements of scholarly productivity or teaching effectiveness, which are essential to the case, should be included, and the selected list should certainly be checked with the candidate for completeness.

SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

[Date]

Appropriate inside address

Dear _____:

In response to his/her request for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (Professor), the Peer Review Committee of the College/Department of _____ has initiated an external review of Dr. _____'s credentials. Having identified you as a leader in the candidate's field, the Committee is grateful for your willingness to provide a candid evaluation of Dr. _____'s professional accomplishments based on an analysis of his/her curriculum vitae and a representative sampling of his/her work.

More specifically, as Dr. _____ has purposely selected the enclosed materials in an effort to demonstrate *significant scholarship beyond publication of material contained in his/her dissertation (an outstanding record as a scholar)*, we are most interested in your assessment of the quality and impact of his/her scholarly and creative achievements. Put another way, of what importance has

Dr. _____'s work been to the field of _____? Is it original and innovative or relatively commonplace and inconsequential? What is its potential—both realized and unrealized—for advancing theory, research, or practice? Has Dr. _____ attained a position of academic distinction as evidenced by publication in highly regarded, refereed journals and presentation at major conferences?

In sum, we are requesting an appraisal that focuses on the candidate's record of performance as a scholar, rather than his/her teaching or service contributions. Moreover, we would prefer that you *not* comment on Dr. _____'s eligibility for tenure and/or promotion at Cleveland State or any other university.

Your letter will become part of the documentation that those charged with responsibility for making recommendations regarding the candidate's qualifications for promotion and tenure will examine. In keeping with Supreme Court rulings and Ohio law, please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

In order that we may meet University deadlines governing our internal review process, we ask that you forward your comments to us by **Date** _____. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is provided for your convenience.

Again, many thanks for your assistance; your kindness in agreeing to evaluate Dr. _____'s materials is most appreciated. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (216) _____ - _____.

Sincerely,

Chairperson, Department of _____

Chairperson, Department Peer Review Committee

Enclosures