

Cleveland State University, College of Science

Recommendations for Candidates Regarding the Dossier for Promotion

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
The Dossier Review Process	2
Checklist of Recommended Content of the Dossier	3
Section I. General Instructions for Constructing a Dossier Documenting Accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service	4
Section II. Recommendations for Documenting Accomplishments in Scholarship or Creative Work NOT YET DRAFTED	
Standards for Scholarship or Creative Work.....	
Standards for Teaching	
Evidence Supporting “Fully Competent” or “Sustained Excellence” in Teaching	
Section IV. Recommendations for Documenting Accomplishments in Service or “Outstanding Intellectual Leadership” NOT YET DRAFTED	
Standards for Service	
Standards for Outstanding Intellectual Leadership	
Evidence Supporting Accomplishments in Service or Outstanding Intellectual Leadership	
Appendices	
Appendix A: Excerpts from Source Documents Regarding “General Instructions for Constructing a Dossier Documenting Accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service”	
Appendix B: Excerpts from Source Documents Regarding “Documentation of Accomplishments in Teaching”	
Appendix C: Excerpts from Source Documents Regarding “Documentation of Accomplishments in Service” INCOMPLETE	
Appendix D: Excerpts from Source Documents Regarding “Documentation of Accomplishments in Scholarship or Creative Work” INCOMPLETE	

Introduction

This document was compiled by a Work Group of volunteers from the Faculty of the College of Science, many of whom have served on College and Departmental Peer Review Committees. Its purpose is to offer clarification and guidance to candidates for promotion in the College, in response to questions that have been raised about standards and practices for evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service.

Nothing in this document is intended to contradict standards or practices mandated or recommended by other sources, including the CSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement, memoranda issued by the Office of the University Provost, letters of appointment issued by the Dean of the College of Science, or departmental criteria for promotion. These sources have been referenced in this document, but candidates are urged to consult them for current information about standards and recommended practices.

The Dossier Review Process

The College of Science Peer Review Committee is one of three faculty groups charged with responsibility for reviewing the dossiers of candidates for promotion. At the department level, a departmental (*faculty*) PRC provides the first level of review, and forwards to the department chairperson a letter summarizing their findings and vote. The chairperson, after completing his or her review of the candidate's dossier, then prepares a letter to the Dean, which is forwarded, along with the dossier, to the College PRC, which consists of elected *faculty* representatives of each department in the College. The College PRC's findings and vote are summarized in a letter addressed to the Dean, who then reviews the dossier, and prepares a letter for the Provost containing conclusions and recommendations for the candidate. In the case of a "final" review (i.e., the promotion review, rather than the fourth and fifth year reviews), if there is disagreement as to whether the candidate should be recommended for promotion, then the third level of review – by the elected *faculty* members of the University PRC (UPRC) – is conducted before the candidate's dossier and letters are presented to the Provost. In addition, the Provost can refer any promotion/tenure case to the UPRC for additional review.

Thus, the College PRC might be viewed as a deliberative body of peers whose perspective of the candidate's accomplishments is both more distant from that of immediate departmental colleagues, and closer than that of colleagues representing more diverse units of the university. As such, the College PRC strives to apply several criteria in the process of dossier review: First, has the candidate met (or is the candidate making satisfactory progress toward meeting) the standards established by his or her own department for teaching, scholarship, and service? (With regard to scholarship, the College PRC recognizes that definitions of scholarly merit vary by discipline, and thus relies not only on departmental standards in its deliberations, but also on the interpretive context that should be supplied in the dossier by the candidate.) Second, do the letters prepared by the departmental PRC and chairperson indicate that the department's standards have been applied fairly? Third, does the dossier contain sufficient evidence to confirm that the candidate has met (or is making satisfactory progress toward meeting) the more general standards for promotion presented in college- and university-level standards (i.e., the CSU-AAUP contract, memoranda issued by the Provost's office, and Dean's letter of appointment)?

Checklist of Recommended Content of the Dossier

(with references to pertinent sections of this document)

- Presented in *one* standard-size, 3-ring binder (4" or less) **(I)**
- Table of contents
- Dividers clearly marking sections:
 - Current Recommendation Letters
 - External Reviewer Letters
 - Curriculum Vitae (with home address)
 - Candidate's Summary Statement
 - Recommendation Letters from Prior Reviews
- Research and Publication (Scholarship or Creative Work) section:
 - Introduction
 - Letters or Other Explanation of Candidate's Contribution to Co-Authored Publications
 - Publications
 - Grants (funded and unfunded)
- Teaching section:
 - Introduction **(III B 1)**
 - Listing of Every Course Taught **(III B 2)**
 - Syllabi **(III B 3)**
 - Student Course Evaluation Results **(III B 4)**
 - Reports of Peer Evaluations of Teaching **(III B 5)**
 - Listing of Supervision or Mentoring Activities for Student Research, Teaching, or Clinical Practice **(III B 6)**
 - Examples of Innovative Instructional Materials or Practices, including New or Re-designed Courses **(III B 7)**
 - Evidence of Student Advising **(III B 8)**
 - Student Outcome Data **(III B 9)**
 - Publications or Grants Addressing Instructional Practices **(III B 10)**
- Service section:
 - Introduction
 - Service to the Department, College, and University
 - Service or Outstanding Intellectual Leadership in the Profession
 - Service to the Community

Section I.

General Instructions for Constructing a Dossier Documenting Accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

(Note: See Appendix A for relevant source documents)

Candidates are advised to create a file into which they can deposit materials that ultimately will be used for constructing a dossier for promotion. This means that, from the date of appointment to the CSU faculty – or from the date of last promotion – candidates should begin to plan for the dossier. Among other things, candidates should collect the one-page CEIQ student teaching evaluation summary pages for every course taught, as well as written reports prepared by colleagues following peer evaluations of teaching. In addition, candidates should collect copies of correspondence containing decisions regarding grant proposals (and, in the case of rejected proposals, a copy of the feedback accompanying the rejection), as well as reprints of published manuscripts, and letters (or other documentation) from co-authors attesting to the nature of the candidate's contribution to a publication.

The purpose of the candidate's Summary Statement, presented early in the dossier, is to summarize the candidate's major accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, and to show how these accomplishments satisfy the appropriate criteria in the CSU-AAUP collective bargaining agreement. Consequently, the candidate should consult the language of the bargaining agreement, and employ terms that clearly designate the criterion that is being discussed, such as "fully competent teacher." In the introduction to each of the dossier sections on teaching, scholarship, and service, the candidate can be more explicit in citing specific accomplishments documented in the corresponding section. In addition, the candidate should use the introduction to explain or provide a context for anomalous information. For example, if the candidate has used comparison data for teaching evaluations other than CEIQ means and quartiles, the reasons for these comparisons, as well as their data source, should be explained. Similarly, with respect to scholarship, the candidate may need to provide an explanation of research and publication "traditions" in one's own field (which will be subject to confirmation by external reviewers), such that co-authorship (rather than sole authorship) is a preferred format for presenting research results.

In most cases, candidates are tempted to include too much, rather than too little, documentation of accomplishments. Recalling the overall requirement for the dossier to consist of **one** binder no larger than four inches, the candidate must carefully select original materials that provide meaningful support to the case for promotion, or prepare appropriate summaries so as to conserve space. For example, thank-you notes from students should probably be excluded, although a handful of especially powerful testimonials might be photocopied and grouped together on several pages in the dossier. Similarly, although candidates must include copies of the CEIQ page summarizing student evaluations for every course taught, it is advisable to prepare a summary table that also may contain comparison data beyond the college means/quartiles presented on the CEIQ summary page.

Section II.

**General Instructions for Constructing a Dossier Documenting Accomplishments
in Scholarship or Creative Work**

(Note: See Appendix B for relevant source documents)

NOT YET DRAFTED

Section III. Recommendations for Documenting Accomplishments in Teaching

(Note: See Appendix C for relevant source documents)

III. A. Standards for Teaching

While departments vary in their expectations for scholarly accomplishments, standards for teaching more easily lend themselves to college-wide interpretation. Although candidates sometimes seek promotion on the primary basis of outstanding accomplishments as a teacher, the more customary role of the teaching portion of the dossier is to present “evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher” (for promotion to Associate Professor) or “evidence of sustained excellence in teaching” (for promotion to Professor), and this section offers advice for demonstrating that these standards have been met.

Students’ evaluations of a candidate’s teaching provided on the CEIQ are widely considered a key indicator of fully competent or sustained excellence in teaching. A standard for acceptability in this regard might be as follows: Students evaluate the course as one in which the overall instructor and course ratings are generally favorable (and, if possible, increasing) over time, falling at or above an average score earned within the department and college, and/or across similar courses, and/or across the same course taught by other instructors. In addition to the average rating of “this instructor” and “this course,” committees may review frequencies of various ratings (i.e., number of students awarding a rating of “excellent” for “this instructor” or “this course”) for evidence of competent and excellent teaching.

Note that, if a candidate were purposely to exclude particular reports of student or peer evaluations, reviewers will interpret this exclusion as an indicator that the reports contained unfavorable content. Moreover, at each level of review (i.e., department PRC, department chairperson, college PRC, college dean, and, if pertinent, university PRC and provost), additional relevant materials – including excluded evaluation records – may be requested and/or inserted into the dossier for review purposes.

III. B. Evidence Supporting “Fully Competent” or “Sustained Excellence” in Teaching

The “fully competent” teacher is one whose work as an instructor bears consistent evidence of effectiveness in accomplishing instructional goals. Such evidence consists of several types, including a listing of all courses taught by candidates over the period being reviewed, copies of course syllabi, student course evaluation results, peer evaluations of teaching, a listing of student research, teaching, or clinical practice supervision or mentoring activities, examples of innovative classroom materials or practices (including new or re-designed courses), student advising activities, student outcome data, and publications addressing instructional practices. To assist reviewers of the candidate’s work, it is important to open this section of the dossier with a statement of teaching philosophy and an overall summary of the content of this portion of the dossier.

III. B. (1) Introduction. The introduction introduces the reviewer to the content of this portion of the dossier by (a) explaining the candidate’s philosophy and goals for instruction; (b) summarizing the

content that will follow, including any major accomplishments that the candidate wishes to emphasize; and (c) placing in an appropriate context any anomalous content or data that the reviewer will encounter. For example, a candidate may have taught exclusively at the undergraduate or graduate level; taught primarily upper division or small classes; or had little opportunity for variety in teaching assignments as a result of departmental or program demands or constraints. In some cases, the candidate may not have been successful in obtaining peer evaluations of teaching due to limited colleague availability or willingness to conduct evaluations. (Department PRCs and chairpersons have been advised by the Provost's office that they should develop procedures for conducting peer evaluations of prospective candidates' teaching on an ongoing basis, well in advance of the year in which the dossier must be submitted. Accordingly, if this support is not provided to a prospective candidate at the department level, she or he should request guidance from the department chairperson; if unsuccessful, the appropriate associate dean of the candidate's college can be contacted for assistance.)

If a candidate has made notable efforts to enhance his or her teaching, such as participating in programs offered by the University Center for Teaching Excellence, these can be described in the introduction. Note, however, that efforts to improve teaching performance do not negate the requirement for the candidate to demonstrate successful instructional outcomes. Finally, if comparisons other than the college means and quartiles on the CEIQ have been employed, the candidate should explain in the introduction the method and reasons for its use.

III. B. (2) Listing of Courses Taught. Candidates should present a list of all the courses taught during every semester of the candidate's tenure at CSU, or since the candidate's most recent promotion. This list should not include supervision, mentoring, or advising of students engaged in undergraduate or graduate research, as these activities will be documented separately. However, it should include all courses taught during summer terms.

III. B. (3) Course Syllabi. Since the goals of a course may vary according to the content and structure of courses (e.g., lecture vs. lab or practicum courses), the course syllabus is a primary source of information about goals, and should be used as a vehicle to clearly describe those goals and the manner in which their attainment should be demonstrated by students. In considering a case for promotion, committees should be able to consult a representative course syllabus to learn about intended course goals, and to determine whether course-related activities and assignments are consistent with those goals. Candidates need not furnish copies of syllabi for every instance of a course that has been taught over the period being reviewed; however, *the most recent version of a course syllabus should be included.*

In general, a course syllabus should include the course title; location and time of sessions; instructor name and contact information (including office hours or provisions for meeting with students); instructional goals; textbooks and other required materials; course requirements and grading standards; typical or session-by-session listing of activities and topics, as appropriate; attendance policy; expectations for missed or late assignments or examinations; extra credit opportunities, if any; and a statement regarding access by persons with disabilities.

III. B. (4) Student Course Evaluation Results. Candidates should present in the dossier a copy of the one-page CEIQ summary for each course taught included in the above **Listing of Courses Taught**. They are encouraged to highlight data on these summary pages that may be especially supportive of their case for promotion (e.g., frequencies of specific ratings, such as “excellent”, for “this course” or “this instructor”). A table that summarizes all offerings of a given course is also desirable, since this can be used to demonstrate improvement in evaluation ratings over time. This table also should include reference norms that can be used for comparison purposes, such as the college mean and quartile, or average ratings earned by other instructors of the same or similar courses (blinded as to the identity of the other instructors); this information can be obtained from department chairpersons. When a comparison other than the college mean or quartile, or item frequencies, is used, the candidate should provide a rationale for the comparison method being used (typically, in the introduction to the teaching section of the dossier, as indicated above).

III. B. (5) Peer Evaluations of Teaching. Candidates are expected to furnish documentation of peer evaluations of teaching that have been conducted on a consistent and ongoing basis over time (“longitudinal”). Peer evaluation represents a comparison of a candidate’s teaching with the quality of teaching expected of a tenured faculty member; for an associate professor, this is defined as “fully competent,” and, for a professor, it is defined as “sustained excellence.”

It is difficult to specify the minimum number of peer evaluations that should be conducted, although these evaluations are especially important in situations where student evaluation results do not adequately demonstrate “full competence” or “sustained excellence” in teaching. Moreover, since the peer evaluation provides a valuable opportunity for candidates to receive feedback and mentoring for the improvement of teaching, the Peer Review Committee will likely regard a substantial number of peer evaluations as evidence that the candidate made appropriate efforts to enhance the quality of his or her teaching. In any case, the dossier should contain evidence of peer evaluations conducted no fewer than three years prior to the candidate’s request for promotion, and these evaluations should have been conducted across a reasonable variety of courses taught by the candidate (e.g., large lecture sections; seminars; labs; practica; upper and lower division; and so forth).

Peer evaluations of a given course should be conducted at least twice during the term, preferably near the beginning and end of the term. While the same peer evaluator should conduct at least two observations of a course within a given semester (and may evaluate the course over multiple offerings of the course over time), the candidate should ensure that the dossier contains evidence of evaluations conducted by multiple observers. Evaluations that fall short of these recommendations may be given lesser weight in the college PRC’s review.

Departments vary in their procedures for arranging peer evaluations (i.e., in some departments, chairpersons or PRCs may arrange for evaluations), but it is ultimately the responsibility of the candidate to arrange for observations and evaluations by peers. The protocol used by the peer evaluator can be selected and provided to the evaluator by the candidate, unless departmental policy or evaluator experience strongly supports the use of a particular format. Peer evaluators should be given a copy of the course syllabus, the evaluation protocol, and a brief description of the plan for the session to be

observed, if the observation is planned in advance. It is desirable for the peer evaluator to meet with the candidate subsequent to the evaluation in order to share feedback and advice, and a written copy of the evaluation report should be provided to the candidate as soon as possible after the evaluation has been conducted. Reports should include examples of both strengths and weakness in the candidate's teaching, and, whenever appropriate, recommendations for improvement.

III. B. (6) Listing of Supervision or Mentoring Activities for Student Research, Teaching, or Clinical Practice. Candidates should present a list of all undergraduate and graduate students whose research has been mentored by the candidate. This list should indicate whether the student was enrolled in a research course or independent study (with course number); was engaged in research for an undergraduate or graduate thesis; conducted research for presentation or publication; or was engaged in research associated with a candidate's research grant. For students on whose graduate thesis or dissertation committees the candidate served (but especially chaired), it is helpful also to include the title of the thesis or dissertation, and the term in which the student graduated. Although it is not necessary to include in the dossier work products generated by the student's research activities (i.e., theses, dissertations, or papers), an abstract or other summary of the student's project might be included.

Evidence of the candidate's effective supervision or mentoring of students engaged in teaching should also be presented (including training or supervision of teaching assistants, or development of tutorial or recitation sections led by students). Finally, some faculty are engaged in the supervision of students' clinical activities, including client assessment and therapy, field work, and internship. In these cases, candidate's should present evidence of the nature and effectiveness of their supervision, including descriptions of innovations that may have enhanced students' clinical experiences (e.g., establishment of a campus clinic).

III. B. (7) Examples of Innovative Instructional Materials or Practices, including New or Re-designed Courses. Candidates are encouraged to present in the dossier evidence of accomplishments related to the enhancement of instruction in one's department or discipline. For example, a candidate may have trained departmental colleagues in the use of a particular form of instructional technology, or played a major role in developing procedures for evaluating student outcomes at the university, department, or program level. In addition, if a candidate is responsible for the development of new courses, has substantially re-designed existing courses, or has developed online or distance learning experiences, these accomplishments should be documented in the dossier. Ordinarily, a narrative description of the accomplishment will suffice, although candidates may also include objective evidence of the accomplishment (e.g., a letter of acknowledgment of the candidate's contribution).

III. B. (8) Evidence of Student Advising. While student advising is expected of every member of the faculty, candidates may have engaged in academic or career advising of an innovative or exemplary nature, and this fact should be documented in the dossier. Serving as the faculty advisor for a student organization that is related to academic or career interests is an example of "student advising", and might be considered "exemplary" if the candidate has assisted with the creation or substantial expansion of such an organization. Similarly, the candidate may have developed career planning

resources, such as orientation or internship programs, that should be documented as evidence of effective student advising.

III. B. (9) Student Outcome Data. Candidates are urged to include in the dossier evidence of successful student outcomes resulting from the candidate's instruction, including results of large-scale evaluations conducted by the university or an accrediting agency, as well as passage rates for national or other professional credentialing examinations. The specific contributions that the candidate has made to these outcomes should be described.

III. B. (10) Publications Addressing Instructional Practices. In some instances, candidates will have published manuscripts addressing instructional practices, whether in the form of research on the effectiveness of various practices or innovations, or as descriptions of methods to enhance the attainment of instructional outcomes. These publications should be documented as other forms of "scholarly accomplishments" would be (i.e., copies of the published manuscripts should be included in the dossier). Similarly, if candidates have pursued grant funding for instructional activities, this fact should be noted, along with information about the grant proposal and whether it was funded.

**Section IV. Recommendations for Documenting Accomplishments in Service and
Outstanding Intellectual Leadership**

(Note: See Appendix D for relevant source documents)

NOT YET DRAFTED

Appendix A

Excerpts from Source Documents Regarding General Instructions for Constructing a Dossier Documenting Accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

CSU-AAUP Agreement (2006 – 2009), Sections 12.9 C (3), (4) and (7); Section 12.11; Section 12.12

(3) Associate Professor. Appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor is based on evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher. In addition, the candidate shall demonstrate either:

- a. Significant scholarship or creative work in addition to his or her dissertation, although such scholarly work may be an extension or reworking of dissertation material, provided it demonstrates independent work; or
- b. outstanding intellectual leadership beyond the University community; or
- c. exceptional achievement as a teacher.

(4) Professor. Appointment or promotion to the rank of professor is based on evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. In addition, the candidate shall either:

- a. Have an outstanding record as a scholar or creative artist, or
- b. shall demonstrate sustained outstanding intellectual leadership in his or her field. Evidence of reputation in the discipline or a related discipline beyond the local community is required.

In rare instances, promotion to the rank of professor may be based in significant part upon sustained and generally acclaimed leadership in the realization of the mission of the University.

(7) In addition, commitment to acceptable professional ethics and academic responsibility shall be a relevant consideration in appointments and promotion. The University will be guided by the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics in this regard.

12.11 Procedures for Fourth and Fifth Year Review

Assistant professors in their fourth and fifth years of full-time service shall submit a dossier setting forth their qualifications for promotion and tenure. Faculty credited with three years of prior service shall be exempt from submitting a dossier in their first year, but a fifth-year review of such faculty shall occur in the second year of service to CSU. Dossiers shall be submitted on or before October 7 of the fourth and fifth years to the Departmental PRC ... Failure to submit a dossier may result in the issuance of a terminal contract ...

Following review of the dossier (and other materials deemed relevant to the evaluation) by the appropriate Peer Review Committee (Department and/or College) and the Chair and the Dean, the faculty member shall be advised (1) that she or he is making substantial progress toward promotion and tenure, or (2) that she or he has a reasonable chance for promotion with additional effort, or (3) that she or he is unlikely to be promoted and that a nonreappointment recommendation may ensue ... Unless an assistant professor is recommended for promotion and tenure or is sent a notice of nonreappointment, the advice to the faculty member is to be deemed a current status report which is subject to revision in subsequent reviews.

12.12 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

A. Submission of the Dossier. Faculty wishing to be considered for promotion and/or tenure shall notify the Chair of the appropriate Peer Review Committee (Departmental or college) and submit a preliminary dossier suitable for external review by the first Monday in April of the previous academic year and a completed final dossier by the following September 8.

Memorandum regarding Promotion/Tenure Dossiers (Issued by Vijay Konangi, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Relations; April 18, 2008)

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:
 - a. Blank section for insertion of recommendations by PRC(s), Chair, and Dean.
 - 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. The candidate's summary statement on contributions to teaching, research or creative activities, and service, and how the candidate satisfies the appropriate criteria in the collective bargaining agreement. The summary should also 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 from the fourth and fifth year reviews.

Guidelines for Candidates (Recommended by the University Peer Review Committee, Spring, 2008)

f. Separate sections with the supporting documentation (including a brief introduction to each) for teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service.

Appendix B

Excerpts from Source Documents Regarding Documentation of Accomplishments in Scholarship or Creative Work

INCOMPLETE

CSU-AAUP Agreement (2006 – 2009), Sections 12.9 C (3) (a), C (4) (a); Section 12.13 B

(3) Associate Professor. Appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor is based on evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher. In addition, the candidate shall demonstrate either:

- a. Significant scholarship or creative work in addition to his or her dissertation, although such scholarly work may be an extension or reworking of dissertation material, provided it demonstrates independent work;
- b. Intellectual leadership ...; or
- c. Exceptional achievement as a teacher ...

(4) Professor. Appointment or promotion to the rank of professor is based on evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. In addition, the candidate shall either:

- a. Have an outstanding record as a scholar or creative artist ...; or
- b. Demonstrate a record of sustained outstanding intellectual leadership ...

12.13 Until such time as new standards are agreed upon, the following shall be considered in evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure:

B. Creative Achievement. The standard of scholarship requires a working commitment to inquiry and research and to creative achievement. The University obligation for the generation of new knowledge and practice imposes a responsibility for creativity, whether in inquiry and investigation, writing, design and production, or in the performing and fine arts. In the best of scholars and the best of teachers, creative inquiry is joined with effective classroom teaching. Candidates for promotion/tenure who submit co-authored material for review shall also provide an explanation of their contribution to

Appendix C

Excerpts from Source Documents Regarding Documentation of Accomplishments in Teaching

CSU-AAUP Agreement (2006 – 2009), Sections 12.9 C (3), (4), and (6); Section 12.13 A

(3) Associate Professor. Appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor is based on evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher. In addition, the candidate shall demonstrate either:

- a. Significant scholarship ...; or
- b. outstanding intellectual leadership ...; or
- c. exceptional achievement as a teacher.

(4) Professor. Appointment or promotion to the rank of professor is based on evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. In addition, the candidate shall either:

- a. Have an outstanding record as a scholar or creative artist, or
- b. shall demonstrate sustained outstanding intellectual leadership ...

In rare instances, promotion to the rank of professor may be based in significant part upon sustained and generally acclaimed leadership in the realization of the mission of the University.

(6) Exceptional achievement as a teacher for the purpose of these rules refers to outstanding performance as a teacher in the classroom, significant accomplishments in the development of courses and teaching methods, and significant contributions through the preparation of teaching materials. Evidence of good teaching may include longitudinal peer evaluations, student evaluations, teaching portfolios, papers, reports, and other materials submitted for this purpose.

12.13 Until such time as new standards are agreed upon, the following shall be considered in evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure:

- A. Teaching. The highest standards are comprehensive knowledge of the field of study, thorough preparation, intense interest in students as well as sensitivity to student interest, open-mindedness, independence and integrity, and above all, intellectual enthusiasm which is transmitted to students.

Personnel Policies and Bylaws (“Green Book”, May, 2005)

The following Personnel Policies and Bylaws apply to members of the Bargaining Unit only insofar as they deal with areas not covered by the CSU-AAUP Bargaining Agreement currently in effect. In any case in which there is a conflict between these policies and the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Collective Bargaining Agreement supersedes.

8.1.2. A.

- 1) Standards of Professional Merit
 - 1.a) *Teaching.* The highest standards are comprehensive knowledge of the field of study, thorough preparation, intense interest in students as well as sensitivity to student interest, open-mindedness, independence and integrity, and above all, intellectual enthusiasm that is transmitted to students.
 - 2) The evaluation of faculty members shall be based upon the standards of professional merit and the standards of academic rank set forth in Sections 8.1.2(A)(1) and 8.1.2(A)(3) and 8.1.2(A)(4) of these policies. The Chairpersons shall annually attempt to reach agreement with each faculty member concerning goals based on these standards. If a goals statement is developed, it will serve at least in part as the basis for evaluation of the faculty member for promotion and tenure. Any agreement on goals between the Chairperson and a faculty member will be communicated in writing promptly to the faculty member and to the members of the Personnel Action Committee responsible for the evaluation of the faculty member for promotion or tenure.
 - 4.c) *Associate Professor.* Appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor is based on evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher. In addition, the candidate shall demonstrate significant scholarship beyond publication of material contained in his or her dissertation, or outstanding intellectual leadership beyond the University community, or exceptional achievement as a teacher. Only in rare cases may promotion to associate professor occur before the beginning of the fourth year in rank as assistant professor.
 - 6) Exceptional achievement as a teacher for the purposes of these rules means outstanding classroom performance plus a significant contribution to good teaching evidenced by papers, reports, or other materials that can be evaluated.

Memorandum regarding Promotion/Tenure Dossiers (Issued by Vijay Konangi, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Relations; April 18, 2008)

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 comparisons to 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. Candidates should provide evidence consistent with Article 12.9 C (6) of the collective bargaining agreement.

Written assessments based on classroom/laboratory visitations by faculty peers and department chairs would also be useful. Peer evaluations should be longitudinal, based on a number of classroom visitations, rather than impressions recorded of a single visit.

Guidelines for Departmental PRCs (Attachment to Memorandum regarding Promotion/Tenure Dossiers issued by Vijay Konangi, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Relations; April 18, 2008)

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)

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 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, e-learning 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.”

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., e-Learning).
10. Demonstrated evidence of the incorporation of student outcome assessment measures into course syllabi.

Appendix D

Excerpts from Source Documents Regarding Documentation of Accomplishments in Service and Outstanding Intellectual Leadership

INCOMPLETE

CSU-AAUP Agreement (2006 – 2009), Sections ----; Section 12.13 C

12.13 Until such time as new standards are agreed upon, the following shall be considered in evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure:

C. Professional service. A University faculty member is a “citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution,” according to the 1940 joint AAUP/AAC Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. After a period of personal growth and development as a teacher and creative scholar, a faculty member may properly be expected to assume increased responsibility, in keeping with the faculty members’ professional interests, for the government of the University, the standards of the faculty member’s discipline, and the welfare of the civic community.