

August 1, 2012

Final Report of the Task Force on the Application of Promotion and Tenure Standards and Processes

Preface

On July 12, 2011 the American Association of University Professors-CSU Chapter and Cleveland State University Administration signed a Memorandum of Understanding “regarding the development of specific criteria to assure University-wide application of standards for granting promotion and tenure (Article 12.13) as stipulated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement” between the two parties for the period from August 16, 2011 through August 15, 2014. The Memorandum contains three provisions, quoted in full:

1. A collaborative committee composed of an equal number of faculty appointed by the Faculty Senate after consultation with the CSU-AAUP and academic administrators appointed by the administration shall develop specific criteria to ensure uniformity and consistency in the application of promotion and tenure standards across the University. The committee shall review and recommend revisions/additions to the current process.
2. The committee shall submit its recommendations to the Provost on or before September 1, 2012.
3. The Provost shall take action on the report and recommendations within sixty (60) calendar days of receiving the same.

This Memorandum with signatures is reprinted on the back page of the booklet providing the text of the 2011-2014 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

On November 14, 2011 Provost Mearns issued a memorandum announcing the membership of the Task Force, consisting of five faculty (Thomas Buckley, Beth Ekelman, Debbie Jackson, Vicki Johnson, and Jill Rudd) and five administrators (Norbert Delatte, Benoy Joseph, Wendy Kellogg, William Morgan, and Crystal Weyman). Provost Mearns and Faculty Senate President Joanne Goodell agreed that Vice Provost Vijay Konangi would serve as a non-voting facilitator to the task force. Kevin O’Neill joined the Task Force in May as a replacement for Thomas Buckley.

In its initial discussions the Task Force identified four issues that it considered most problematic in the application of promotion and tenure standards and processes: the use of student evaluation of instruction to assess teaching competence, the use of peer observations to assess teaching competence, the use of external reviewers in the assessment of scholarship/creative activity, and the use of discipline and department/school specific criteria to operationalize the broad university-wide criteria for promotion and tenure that are contained in Article 12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the corresponding sections of the Faculty Personnel Policies. The Task Force examined each of these issues by first reviewing current practices, then

identifying best practices followed by a set of recommendations that would move the University toward the goal of a uniform application of standards and processes for promotion and tenure.

The Task Force met for one or two hours every three weeks during the spring semester, and every two weeks for two hours during the summer. Members collected information on existing standards and procedures across the university during the intervals between meetings, and deposited their documents and findings in a common “drop box.” The final report represents the unanimous consensus of all Task Force members.¹ The appendix, available online, contains the set of documents referenced in our report.

Task One. Standards and Procedures for Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)

The Task Force first examined the degree of consistency across campus in the standards and processes used to assess faculty instruction by students. The SEI has become a major piece of evidence presented in promotion and tenure dossiers to document the “fully competent,” “exceptional achievement,” and “sustained excellence” performance standards.

Fact finding

According to staff of the University Testing Center, each college² has its own SEIQ (Student Evaluation of Instruction Questionnaire) and these have been the same since 2002. The Testing Center is responsible for processing and preparing the SEIQ summary reports for each college. The comparison norms that are reported on each report were calculated by Institutional Research in 2002 using questionnaires from the previous five years (1997-2002). CLASS and COSHP have shared norms (they were a single college in 2002) for five levels of instruction – courses numbered 100, 200, 300-400, 500-600, and 700. The Committee noted that faculty throughout the university have expressed discontent with the current SEIQ norming process. COSHP requested the creation of separate, new norms in 2010 but this did not occur. Vice-Provost LaGrange is willing to assign any new analysis tasks that are recommended and approved to the Institutional Research staff.

The Task Force reviewed the “Memorandum and Recommendations for Enhancement of the Student Evaluation of Instruction Process” presented to Faculty Senate by the University Faculty Affairs Committee in March and April of 1999. The report includes recommendations for instrument construction, analysis and interpretation, distribution, and supplemental concerns. The full report is appended. Relevant provisions are as follows:

Instrument Construction: (1-4 approved March 17, 1999)

1. The set of standard data should be expanded to include the following information: (1) the type of course (lecture, lab, seminar); (2) whether the course is required or an elective; (3) the

¹ Timely staff support was provided by Kim Snell in the Provost’s office, Violet Lunder in the Faculty Senate office, Sharon Smith and Iris Zana of Testing Services, and Rosalyn Adams in the CLASS Dean’s office.

² In this report any reference to “college” includes the free-standing School of Nursing.

graduating class standing of the student; (4) whether the course is in the major; and (5) the expected letter grade.

2. Specifically designed scannable forms should be developed and used for instructional evaluation.
3. Composite (or overall course rating) scores should be replaced with area or cluster composites (e.g. instructor variables followed by course variables).
4. The scale and language of evaluation within an area or cluster of questions must be consistent.

Distribution, Administration, and Collection of the SEI: (1-4 approved April 14, 1999; 5 approved April 21, 2004)

1. "Course Evaluation Packets" will be prepared by a department administrative assistant or secretary for each course.* Course Evaluation packets are not to be assembled by the individual instructor. Each packet should consist of a completed cover sheet and scannable evaluation forms corresponding to the number of students registered. Before the end of the sixth week of the term, the Coordinator of SEI Activities will provide each department with a set of pre-printed labels containing the demographic for each course.

* In the cases of colleges not organized by departments, an appropriate staff person shall be assigned to conduct this task.

2. A prepared statement will be included in the Course Evaluation Packet. The statement, without any additional comments, will be read aloud prior to distributing the SEI. The statement will:
 - a. inform the class of the purpose of the evaluation,
 - b. state that the anonymity of their comments will be preserved,
 - c. explain that evaluations are not analyzed until after grades have been submitted,
 - d. note that evaluations will not be returned to the instructor until after the semester has ended.

The prepared statement will be printed at the top of the page containing evaluation questions.

3. Instructors may not be present in the class when the Student Evaluation of Instruction is conducted. Neither the instructor of the course nor the graduate assistant for the course may administer the SEI. Departments should develop and adhere to their own policies regarding who is qualified to administer, collect, and transport the SEI to the department office.
4. The departmental secretary or administrative assistant* will screen packets of SEIs to locate students' written comments. Student comments are to be separated from scantron forms.
 - a. The departmental administrative assistant or secretary will keep written comments on courses, separated by courses, in a secure location.
 - b. The departmental administrative assistant or secretary will deliver all course packets to the Coordinator of SEI Activities within 48 hours of receipt of completed forms.

- c. Upon receipt of the course ratings from the Coordinator of SEI Activities, the department administrative assistant or secretary will provide the instructor with the course ratings and student comments.
 - d. The question of who (instructor and/or department chair) gets the original and/or copies of student comments will be referred to the Contract Implementation Committee.
5. Student evaluations should be administered during the 12th week of a semester, or 4/5 of the way through a semester other than 15 weeks [In the ensuing discussion the Senate agreed that exceptions to this preferred timing are sometimes necessary].

Analysis and Interpretation of the SEI: (1-9 approved March 17, 1999)

1. The quartile ranking system should be replaced with one that is more sensitive for measuring teaching effectiveness - specifically, a percentile or decile scoring system should be used.
2. Statistical summaries of qualitative ratings should be presented. Scores and rankings should be accompanied by narrative statements that explain what the score means.
3. Subsets of norms should be developed to accommodate differences in class characteristics.
4. Ratings and rankings should be completed for both discrete questions (e.g. "the instructor was well prepared for class.") as well as for clusters of questions (e.g. the average of all items relating to the instructor, in contrast to the average of those relating to the course).
5. The algorithms for computation of scores should be retested for accuracy and reliability.
6. A mechanism should be available to generate longitudinal and/or cross-sectional analyses of instructional effectiveness.
7. Departments should process teaching evaluation packets promptly. Evaluations should be sent to the Testing Center within 48 hours of receiving them. Results of analyses should be provided to instructors before the middle of the following term.
8. The Student Evaluation of Instruction process should be institutionalized and centralized. The committee recommends that:
 - a. a faculty member - with course release time - serve as "Coordinator of SEI Activities" and be responsible for content matters related to the process;
 - b. additional funds be allocated to the Testing Center and earmarked for part-time staff, printing, and other operating expenses incurred in administering the SEI;
 - c. that the "Coordinator of SEI Activities" report to UFAC on content questions and issues but report to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs on administrative costs and operations of the SEI process.

UFAC will periodically review the process (perhaps every three years) as well as provide ongoing suggestions to the office managing the Student Evaluations of Instruction.

9. Current materials (sheets of questions and the green or blue test forms) should be replaced with a scannable score sheet.

Supplemental Concern Regarding Peer Observation of Instruction: (Approved March 17, 1999)

The peer evaluation process needs to be reviewed and strengthened. It should be used for both formative (for course design and construction) and summative (for analytic and comparative) purposes.

The Task Force next reviewed the SEIQ forms and instructions for all colleges. The 1999 UFAC report had expressed concerns about using a standard set of questions throughout the university as these might be insensitive to the “unique nature of the different colleges.” However, the Task Force noted that the questions on each college’s SEIQ were extremely similar in content and wording. These forms are appended.

The Task Force’s review of current procedures for administering the SEI indicated most colleges and departments followed closely the 1999-2004 Senate-approved SEI recommendations from UFAC. However, missing from many procedures was a statement of the purpose of the evaluation. This is a prepared statement intended to be included in the Course Evaluation Packet that must be read aloud prior to distributing the SEIQ and printed again at the top of the page containing the evaluation questions. The Task Force noted that the complete statement was not on any of the college SEIQs.

The Task Force also noted that colleges were not following the Analysis and Interpretation recommendations made in the 1999 UFAC report. This has led to inconsistencies in data reporting across the university.

One persistent issue is the frequent occurrence of low responses rates (under 60 percent), especially prevalent in the new distance education courses where students must complete the SEIQ online. Such response rates, assuming the likelihood that the nonresponse is nonrandom, make valid interpretations of student summary scores difficult.

The Task Force also noted that no SEI form currently exists that takes into consideration the new instructional issues of effective delivery of online education.

Recommendations

1. Colleges and departments/schools should be reminded of the Senate-approved UFAC recommendations for the SEI, and make adjustments in conducting the SEI as necessary. This will improve consistency across the colleges.
2. All SEIQs should include a prepared statement that is printed at the top of the page containing the evaluation questions. According to the original UFAC recommendation, the statement should contain the following:
 - Convey the purpose of the student evaluation (see next recommendation)
 - State that the anonymity of their responses will be preserved
 - Explain that evaluations are not analyzed until after grades have been submitted
 - Note that evaluations will not be returned to the instructor until after the semester has ended.

3. The Task Force recommends use of the following standard purpose statement, to be included directly on the SEIQ and read to the students prior to distributing the SEIQ:
 “The purpose of the SEIQ is for the student to provide constructive feedback to improve the learning experience at CSU.”
4. Because of the potential bias from low and uneven response rates, the Task Force recommends that response rates (students completing the SEIQ as a proportion of students completing the course) be routinely provided alongside any summary statistic calculated from those responses.
5. A University faculty committee should review the SEIQs used for online instruction and make recommendations for changes as appropriate. The committee should also provide recommendations to improve student response rates. The Provost may wish to assign this task to the new Advisory Committee on e-Learning.
6. Because there is significant discontent with the current SEIQ norming process and the SEIQ in general, the Task Force recommends
 - A University faculty committee be formed to reconcile the content of existing forms and to develop one common SEIQ that will be used across the University. Colleges, departments, and instructors may add additional questions to the SEIQ if they wish to do so. Members of the committee should include experts in teaching, survey research, and statistical analysis. Each college should be represented. There also should be an *ex officio* member from Institutional Research. The common SEIQ should then be reviewed by Faculty Senate for approval.
 - The faculty committee should review the 1999 UFAC recommendations for “Analysis and Interpretation of the Student Evaluation of Instruction” to determine if these should be implemented. If so, the committee should also determine, in consultation with Institutional Research, whether these analyses and interpretations are possible and feasible. If not, the committee should determine appropriate analyses and interpretations and make recommendations to Faculty Senate for approval.
7. The Task Force suggests that future comparison norms should be rolling five-year university and college means, calculated separately for different levels of courses.
8. Dossiers for promotion and/or tenure should include an inclusive report of all the candidate’s course SEIQs and their analysis and interpretation.
9. More broadly, the teaching section of a promotion and tenure dossier should include the SEIQ reports, peer evaluations, and an analysis and interpretation of the SEIQ reports and the peer evaluations. Other materials that will make the case that the faculty member meets the standards for teaching should also be included. The Provost memorandum that is distributed each spring contains several excellent suggestions of other supplemental materials that could

be included within the dossier as evidence of meeting the teaching standards. Departments/schools/colleges may provide additional guidance.

Task Two. Standards and Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Instruction

The Task Force addressed this issue in the awareness that no university-wide action had been taken on the 1999 Senate recommendation (see supplemental concern quoted above) that “the peer evaluation process needs to be reviewed and strengthened.”

Fact finding

1. The Task Force members sent inquiries to deans, chairs, and/or chairs of PRCs to find out practices followed for peer review of teaching and their thoughts on the process. What was found were widely variable opinions about the value, utility and validity of peer observations, widely varying degrees of formalization of the observation methodology, varying degrees of candidate versus department/school control of the process, and a usually limited record of observations of candidates for full professor.
 - a. Given the diversity of the process within colleges and across the university, there are varying opinions regarding the usefulness of peer evaluations. Some PRCs and Chairs rely heavily on peer evaluations and some ignore them because they question the credibility of the evaluation.
 - b. Departments, Schools, and Colleges have different guidelines and procedures in place for peer evaluations: some have no procedures or guidelines in place, while others have some procedures and guidelines in place or have well-developed procedures and guidelines in place. There is significant diversity of procedures and guidelines. Some departments do not do peer evaluations of new faculty until the 3rd year of teaching.
 - c. Departments, Schools, and Colleges vary in terms of who is responsible for arranging peer evaluations. Some have the faculty member make arrangements and others have either the Chair of the department, Chair of the department PRC, or have a separate department committee make the arrangements for the faculty member.
 - d. Faculty seeking promotion to full professor often lack a sufficient longitudinal record of peer evaluations, and in some cases have had none at all in the dossier.

2. The Task Force reviewed the 1999 recommendation on peer evaluation procedures that the University Faculty Affairs Committee developed and Senate subsequently approved (see “Supplemental Concern” above for the exact wording of the recommendation). This statement noted seven problems and inconsistencies across campus with the current procedures:
 - a. Lack of instructor participation in the selection of the person(s) conducting the teaching evaluation.
 - b. How many evaluations of a particular course are appropriate.
 - c. What should be included in the peer evaluation.
 - d. The lack of procedures for evaluator/instructor meeting before and after the evaluation.
 - e. How much of a class must be observed.

- f. Provision for timely and useful feedback to instructor.
 - g. Inclusion in the record of instructor responses to written peer evaluations.
3. The Task Force also examined the information on peer evaluation contained in the UPRC Spring 2008 “Guidelines for Candidates” that is appended to the annual spring memo from the Provost’s office on tenure and promotion. This memo is sent to all College Deans and Department Chairs/School Directors, who in turn distribute the memo to all PRC chairs and all candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The guidelines suggest that the UPRC considers peer evaluations as important evidence to make the case that one has met or exceeded the threshold standards for teaching required for tenure and/or promotion. Such a record of peer evaluations should meet the following criteria:
 - a. Peer evaluations should be provided for several courses the candidate has taught.
 - b. Peer evaluations should be based on direct observations by colleagues at multiple meetings of each course.
 - c. Peer evaluations should be longitudinal (extending over several years, not just the year in which the candidate applies for promotion).
 - d. Candidates should consult their department chairperson/ school director and/or PRC chair to arrange the peer evaluations.
 4. The Task Force reviewed peer observation policies, procedures and forms that are currently in use across the university. While none of these fully meet all of the criteria and specifications noted above, most have been thoughtfully developed and provide useful examples for departments that have yet to prepare their own form and procedure. These sample documents are appended.
 5. The Task Force notes that no procedures are in place for peer evaluation of online instruction. One promising development is that the Advisory Committee on e-Learning that was established this past year has developed a new online peer evaluation of instructor and course that will be piloted by the School of Nursing. This is appended.

Recommendations

1. Peer evaluations should be used for both formative and summative purposes. Newly appointed instructors should receive peer evaluations during their first year(s) of teaching and these should be used for primarily formative purposes (to help them improve their teaching). The inclusion of these initial formative evaluations in the dossier should be left to the discretion of the candidate. Faculty who are seeking tenure should have 1-2 peer evaluations per year.
2. Peer evaluations will be more valid if they are done longitudinally. This means repeated evaluations of the candidate over time and also evaluations of the same instructional unit over time. Preference is for the candidate to have multiple reviewers, multiple observations, and multiple courses evaluated. For promotion to full professor, multiple peer evaluations will help demonstrate having met the standard of “sustained excellence” in teaching.
3. All departments and schools should develop and have in place written peer evaluation procedures and guidelines that have been approved by their respective faculty.
4. The written procedures and guidelines should address the following points:

- a. The selection of the faculty member (or committee) within the department or school who will coordinate all peer observation activities, often this being the department chair or department PRC chair.
 - b. The coordination activities should include procedures for scheduling evaluations and selecting peer evaluators in consultation with the candidate.
 - c. The guidelines should include content for observation and reporting that serve both formative and summative purposes.
 - d. A pre-observation meeting of the instructor and observer should be scheduled and held. The instructor should present the syllabus and the instructional goals for the course and the specific class. The observer should clarify the instructional considerations that will be evaluated.
 - e. A post-observation meeting of the instructor and observer should be scheduled and held. This should be a feedback session in which the observer shares and discusses the written evaluation with the instructor.
 - f. The observation should report on the following (language borrowed from the College of Education and Human Services Guidelines):
 1. Knowledge of the subject matter, including breadth and currency of knowledge of the discipline.
 2. Review of the organization and clarity of presentation and course materials (handouts, syllabi, powerpoints, etc).
 3. Attention to the ways in which the instructor engages students in the subject matter and addresses student questions, confusions, or challenges during the class.
 4. Use of written materials, visual aids, technology, etc to facilitate student learning.
 5. Capacity to foster a positive classroom climate which respects the dignity and integrity of each participant.
 6. Recommendations regarding both the strengths and weaknesses of the content and instructional methodology used in the classes observed.
 - g. Additional observation points should be added as desirable, taking into consideration any special teaching issues of the instructor's academic discipline.
5. A university faculty committee should recommend procedures for peer evaluation of online instruction. The Provost may wish to assign this task to the Advisory Committee on e-Learning, building on their ongoing pilot study of online peer evaluation of instructor and course being conducted in the School of Nursing.

Task Three. Standards and Procedures for Obtaining External Review of Scholarship/Creative Activity

External reviews are intended to permit a check on the validity of the university's multi-level internal review process, ideally providing a check against universal norms of the candidate's profession. Colleges and departments/schools vary in their ability to perform this critical phase of the review process.

Fact finding

The Task Force first reviewed the following two university documents that have set the standards and guided procedures for conducting external reviews of the scholarship and creative activity of tenure and promotion candidates: 1) three provisions in Article 12.12 of the CSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement; and 2) the UPRC’s checklist for soliciting external reviewers.

1) Basic contract provisions (3) on the external review process:

<p>12.12 PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE</p> <p><u>A Submission of the Dossier</u></p> <p>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. (1)</p>	
<p><u>C Functions of Peer Review Committees (PRC), Chairs and Deans</u></p> <p>(1) The PRC shall consider all dossiers submitted by candidates for promotion and/or tenure, and shall be responsible for securing external reviews of the candidate's scholarship in a timely manner. The PRC may also consider additional materials it deems relevant to the evaluation. All materials considered at each stage of the promotion and tenure process shall be forwarded for consideration to the next stage in the process. (2)</p> <p>(4) The Dean will submit to the Provost his/her recommendation on each candidate no later than November 25. The recommendation shall be accompanied by the candidate's dossier and the recommendations of the PRCs and the Chair. Copies of the Dean's recommendation shall be sent to the PRCs, the Chair and the candidate. At this point, candidates may make a written request to the Provost for copies of letters from external referees. (3)</p>	

2) Guidelines on the external review process from the Provost office’s annual spring memorandum to Chairs/Directors, Deans, PRC chairs, and candidates:

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.

The Task Force contacted all departments/schools or colleges to determine current actual practices regarding external reviews. While most academic units reported that they followed the guidelines above, there were substantial variations.

1. Only a few departments/schools or colleges have written external review guidelines that are separate from the above two documents. The guidelines provide further detail in specifying professionally appropriate external reviewers.
2. Not all departments/schools adhere to the arm's length policy recommended by the Provost's Office. A small number have had candidates contact external reviewers directly.
3. Not all departments/schools have successfully secured the minimum of three external review letters for a candidate. This situation does not seem to occur frequently, but it has occurred.
4. Departments/schools vary in what is considered the optimal number of external review letters to be secured for candidates. Most consider three sufficient, some want as many as ten.

5. Some candidates have had access to their external review letters before the review process has been completed, in violation of the Article 12.12 C4 of the contract, sometimes as early as the same time that the PRC receives them.
6. PRCs vary in how they choose external reviewers – e.g., some use Carnegie Classifications, choose reviewers who are known experts in the field of study, or allow non-academics as external reviewers. The methods used in determining how PRCs determine that an institution or reviewer is acceptable are often not clear.
7. Most PRCs follow a collegial process with the candidate in terms of identifying potential external reviewers as suggested by the Provost/ UPRC guidelines. However, some PRCs maintain the right to add to the list without the candidate’s input or knowledge of who is added.
8. PRCs are not consistently including CVs or biographies of external reviewers in the candidate’s dossier as a method of establishing the appropriateness and qualifications of the external reviewer.
9. In soliciting and instructing external reviewers, most department/school or college PRCs follow the template letter provided by the Provost provided in the annual spring mailing. There have been instances when a PRC has developed its own letter.
10. Currently there are no templates available for reviews of faculty seeking promotion and tenure based on teaching/clinical expertise or in furtherance of the University mission.
11. Some departments/schools do not reveal the identities of the external reviewers in their letters to the Chair/Director in an effort to protect the confidentiality of the external reviewers. Other PRCs identify the external reviewers and provide a brief summary of the reviewers’ qualifications within the PRC letter.
12. The content of the “preliminary dossier suitable for external review” varies across departments/schools and colleges. At least one department has candidates prepare the entire dossier (teaching, research, and service) which is sent in its entirety, while others have candidates prepare a dossier with a current CV, personal statement, and sampling of scholarship. Some departments have candidates prepare different dossiers suitable for external review by different specialists, should the candidate have more than one specialization.
13. In the College of Business, only the college PRC is involved with the candidates in the selection of external reviewers.

Recommendations

Each department/school or college (when the college has no department PRCs) should develop and make available to candidates written guidelines regarding the external review process. The guidelines should incorporate the material in the two statements presented above (from Article 12.12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the UPRC Checklist). The draft of the guidelines should be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Affairs committees of the respective colleges. The Task Force recommends the following additional considerations be included:

1. Reviewer impartiality. Define the “arm’s length” standard that is used to determine the potential reviewer’s impartiality. The Task Force recommends the following considerations when drafting procedures:
 - The reviewer:
 - Cannot have been a co-author or collaborator on any project with the candidate
 - Cannot have been a mentor or professor in any institution during the time the candidate received a degree or other form of professional training
 - Cannot be someone in a position to receive some advantage or benefit beyond the honorarium based on the outcome of the candidate’s review.
 - Evidence of arm’s-length impartiality requires a written statement of such from the reviewer within his/her review letter and from the candidate during the process of developing the list of potential reviewers.
 - Candidates should refrain from any direct or indirect contact with a potential external reviewer.

2. Reviewer competence and appropriateness. Departments/schools should describe the process to be used in developing the list of external reviewers. The Task Force recommends the following considerations when drafting procedures:
 - Describe how external reviewers are identified (*e.g.*, acceptable Carnegie classifications, faculty rank above candidate, use of reviewers from appropriate nonacademic institutions, from at least three different institutions, having acknowledged expertise or leadership in the candidate’s discipline or field of inquiry/creative achievement, or having acknowledged expertise as a college teacher or clinician).
 - Describe the ways that PRCs should provide evidence of external reviewer qualifications. This committee recommends that PRCs include reviewer CVs or some publicly available biographical statement in the candidate’s dossier.
 - Describe the degree to which the candidate participated in choosing the final list of acceptable reviewers, including whether or under what circumstances the candidate may have requested the removal of a reviewer from the list. Under no circumstances shall an external dossier be sent to a reviewer not on the final list.
 - Describe how the PRC determines which reviewers to use on the final acceptable list. Are all reviewers on the list sent the external review document, or do PRCs select from the list? If so, specify how the PRC decides which reviewers to use.
 - Describe how the PRC contacts the reviewer in a neutral manner so that the PRC communications do not influence the reviewer. Indicate the nature of any preliminary telephone calls or emails prior to the formal letter of invitation.

3. Number of letters. Determine the recommended number (minimum and maximum) of external reviews that should be secured. The Task Force recommends three as the minimum, from three different institutions, and six as the maximum, from six institutions.

4. Content of solicitation letter.
 - In most instances letters should conform closely to the external review letter template for assessment of scholarship as appended to the annual spring memorandum from the Provost's office. The Provost's template letter has been reviewed and approved by the Legal Department.
 - The Provost's Office should also make available template letters for external review of candidates seeking promotion on other criteria, such as exceptional achievement as a teacher and clinical supervisor, exceptional achievement as a teacher, outstanding leadership in the field, or leadership in the realization of the mission of the University.

5. External reviewer confidentiality.
 - Each college should determine and then indicate in the policy statement whether or not external reviewer names can be included in the review letters prepared by PRCs, chairs/directors, and deans, in order to assure consistency of practice within each college.
 - PRCs and candidates must follow the contract provision regarding how and when a candidate may view his/her external review letters (Article 12.12 C 4).

6. Content of external review dossier. The Task Force recommends that each PRC include in its guidelines the recommended content of an external review dossier based on the criteria applicable to its particular candidates. The Task Force recommends the following:
 - a. Candidates seeking promotion and tenure based on scholarship should include:
 1. A Current CV
 2. A personal statement that
 - Explains the professional significance of the candidate's creative achievement as evidenced in the published (or otherwise professionally certified) work included in the dossier.
 - Documents the level of professional recognition of the candidate's work, preferably with reference to objective criteria that assess the quality of the publication outlet (for journals this could be impact scores, acceptance rates, rankings within the discipline, etc) or the reputation/stature of the exhibition or production/performance venue.
 - Explains how the work extends beyond the dissertation, in the case of any project whose content appears similar or related to the dissertation topic
 - Explains the candidate's contribution to any co-authored or other collaborative work.
 - More generally, the statement should assist the external reviewer in assessing the candidate's work based on the criteria he/she has been asked to use in the letter of solicitation, e.g., quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements.

3. Copies or reproductions of one's scholarship, research, or other creative activity.
 - Products included should be sufficient in number and quality to meet the minimum standards for promotion as specified by current criteria of one's academic unit.
 - When the candidate has material that exceeds the minimum standards, the candidate should select work that best exemplifies his/her primary research/creative activity, that has been more rigorously peer-reviewed (based on the journal quality or professional prominence of a review outlet, e.g., book or artistic product), and for which the candidate has made substantial contributions.

- b. Candidates seeking promotion and tenure based on teaching and clinical supervision should follow the guidelines developed by the UPRC in a Spring, 2008 memorandum entitled "Some Recommendations Concerning Demonstration of Full Competence, Exceptional Achievement, or Sustained Excellence in the Area of Teaching," attached to the Provost Office's annual spring memorandum (appended). The external review document should include the following:
 1. A current CV
 2. A personal statement that documents exceptional achievement as a teacher or as a teacher and clinical supervisor
 3. Samples of teaching materials and evidence of exceptional teaching.
 4. If clinical faculty, samples of materials and evidence of exceptional achievement as a clinical supervisor
 5. Analyses of peer evaluations and student evaluations

- c. When written guidelines are not feasible because of the infrequency of the particular promotion case (such as outstanding intellectual leadership; sustained and generally acclaimed leadership in the mission of the University), procedures should be set in place for the candidate to communicate with the PRC and chair/director about the review materials that should be presented in the dossier.

7. The Task Force recommends that colleges should consider providing external reviewers an honorarium for their time, a modest sum of perhaps 200 dollars. If this practice should be followed, the intention should be communicated in the invitation letter, with the statement that the honorarium of a specified amount will be paid to the reviewer upon receipt of the reviewer's letter.

Task Four. Standards and Procedures for Departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

The Collective Bargaining Agreement contains general language on promotion and tenure standards that can be applied universally to faculty across all academic disciplines. The expectation, however, is that each department/school or discipline within a department will have explicit criteria that define those universal standards for the particular discipline.

Fact finding

In some but not all colleges there are department or school-level statements that detail criteria for tenure and promotion across the three areas of scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service. Most of these were prepared or revised in response to a request made by Provost Chin Kuo in a memo dated December 4, 2004. A few have been subsequently prepared or revised. In some colleges a single statement exists for the college as a whole. The purpose of the statements is to provide guidance about the discipline-specific performance expectations that would normally fulfill the more general criteria for tenure and promotion that are stated in Article 12.9.C.3-7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

At the request of Provost Kuo, the statements were intended to express performance expectations that would be consistent with those at comparable peer institutions. In a few cases the peer institutions that were surveyed have been included in the document. In other cases reference has been made to the guidelines provided by the professional association of the relevant discipline(s).

These performance expectations usually include the expected quality and/or quantity of published scholarship or other creative activity, and sometimes also the expected evidence about one's instruction in order to demonstrate that one is "fully competent" or has attained "sustained excellence" or "exceptional achievement."

The available statements are appended.

Recommendations

1. Each academic department or School in the university should have as part of its official governance documents (either as part of its bylaws or an attachment to them) a statement that specifies the general criteria for tenure and promotion applicable to faculty members who belong to that department's/school's academic discipline(s).
2. This statement should be made available to all incoming faculty.
3. This statement should serve as a central decisional guideline by the department/school chairs/directors and department/school or college Peer Review committees in their review of a candidate's eligibility for tenure and promotion.
4. In colleges that have a College Peer Review committee in addition to departmental/school committees, both the college committee and the dean should consult these departmental/school guidelines to make certain they are being consistently applied across departments/schools in their college.

5. There needs to be a mechanism in place for periodic review and updating of these documents, given that performance standards and the types of evidence that measure these standards do change over time. We suggest that this mechanism be activated from the Provost's office and be applied university-wide to all academic units. Every five years may be the right interval.
6. Any revisions to departmental/school statements should be reviewed and approved by the faculty within the department/school and the Faculty Affairs committee of the respective college (or by whatever other standing committee of the college is responsible for review and approval of departmental/school bylaws).
7. When revised statements have been approved by the relevant college body, they should be implemented for newly hired faculty and for any current faculty who choose to be reviewed on the basis of the new statement. Otherwise current faculty should have the option to be reviewed by the statement in effect when they first held their current faculty rank.

List of Appendices

1. 1999-2004 University Faculty Affairs Committee Reports on Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) and Associated Faculty Senate Minutes
2. College SEI Forms
3. Annual Spring memorandum from the Provost's Office on Promotion/Tenure Dossiers, with Seven Attachments
4. Examples of Peer Observation Forms and Statements of Colleges and/or Departments
5. 2004 Memorandum from Provost Chin Kuo on Review of Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
6. Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of Colleges and/or Departments
