



# Cleveland State University

engaged learning™

## Office of the Provost

**To:** Deans  
Joanne Goodell, Faculty Senate President  
Jeff Karem, CSU-AAUP President

**cc:** Task Force on the Application of Promotion and Tenure Standards and Processes  
*George Walker*

**From:** George E. Walker, Interim Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

**Date:** September 28, 2012

**Re:** Response to the Promotion and Tenure Task Force Final Report

---

The *Task Force* worked diligently over several months to review practices, policies, and procedures in departments across the University. Its members are to be commended for their efforts, and for their thoughtful, judicious recommendations. Their findings, as contained in the Final Report, reveal significant variations across campus in the data collected, the methodologies employed, and the procedures followed in several key areas that have a direct impact on promotion and tenure reviews at CSU. The interests of the entire campus community, including faculty facing reviews and their peers, chairs, and deans, are best served by the development and application of written, consistent, and transparent policies and procedures. With that in mind, I have reviewed the Task Force's recommendations, and I intend to accept most of them as outlined below.

### **I. Standards and Procedures for Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)**

Numerous variations and inconsistencies are documented in the Task Force report concerning the process for distribution and completion of the student questionnaires, the way in which the results are analyzed and reported, and use of the results at the department level, particularly in dossiers.

- A. **Process for conducting evaluations** – Deans are charged with ensuring that department chairs and faculty follow the Senate-approved UFAC recommendations for conducting evaluations. This information is to be communicated to all chairs immediately, so that the appropriate instructions are followed for the Fall 2012 course evaluation cycle. In addition to the original UFAC-recommended statement outlined in the report, the Task Force recommended that additional statements on the purpose of evaluations should be included (Recommendations 1-3 on SEIQ of the *Task Force Final Report*). Deans should ensure that these additional statements are included.

- B. **Analysis of SEIQ results** – I share the Task Force members’ concern with the current evaluation methodology including special concerns regarding online instruction. A committee will be convened as soon as practical to examine the SEIQs, develop a new common document, review methodology and analysis, and recommend changes, including norming and use of rolling means and response rates.
- C. **Use of student evaluations in dossiers for promotion and tenure** – Deans should work with college faculty and department chairs to implement the recommendations of the Task Force (8 and 9 in this section of the Final Report). Sections on teaching should be inclusive, detailed, and consistent; to ensure that these objectives are met, colleges should provide clear and explicit *written* guidelines to all faculty on what needs to be included in the dossier. These guidelines should be developed and disseminated to all departments by the end of the Fall 2012 semester.

## **II. Standards and Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Instruction**

Deans are asked to work with department chairs and faculty to develop and disseminate consistent peer evaluation policies. To the degree that they are applicable, the Task Force Recommendations 1 – 4 on Peer Evaluations should be explicitly and fully incorporated into each department’s written policies and procedures. Whenever possible, peer evaluations should be done by tenured faculty and with multiple evaluators. Deans are charged with ensuring that these policies are in place by the end of Fall 2012, so that they can be implemented by departments conducting evaluations in Spring 2013. The special challenges associated with peer evaluation of online instructors should be studied by the advisory committee on eLearning and they should present a series of recommendations by the end of the 2012 Fall semester.

## **III. Standards and Procedures for Obtaining External Reviews of Scholarship/Creative Activity**

The Task Force has documented the substantial variations among departments/schools or colleges in current practices and standards related to obtaining external reviews of scholarship/creative activity. Because of the critical role played by these external reviews in our promotion/tenure procedures, the Task Force has provided a series of detailed recommendations to provide consistency in the procedures for obtaining these reviews and to simultaneously ensure the standards associated with these reviews are uniform across the University. The Provost’s Office accepts these recommendations, with two changes. The PRCs are expected to obtain at least five evaluations from external reviewers. In the event that this is not possible, the PRCs will seek approval from the Provost’s Office for soliciting a minimum of three reviews. The College of Law will seek approval from the Provost’s Office by the end of Fall semester 2012 for a higher number of minimum and maximum external evaluations than those recommended by the Task Force, the recommendation will be consistent with national practices and include the rationale.

In general, external reviewers should be encouraged to provide a CV. However, the PRC should use publicly available information (through Internet search, for example) to initially assess the qualifications of the external reviewers. Deans are asked to work with department chairs and faculty to develop and disseminate policies incorporating the Task Force's recommendations, with the changes indicated.

As recommended by the Task Force, each Dean will establish a policy for providing an honorarium, if any, to external reviewers to be funded by the College, it is, therefore, understood that the amount of the honorarium may vary among the Colleges.

#### **IV. Standards and Procedures for Departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines**

The Provost strongly supports the Task Force recommendations 1-7 contained in the final report of the Task Force. The Provost's Office will be responsible for the implementation of the five year review and update of documents recommended by the Task Force. The implementation of the other six recommendations is the responsibility of the academic Deans cooperating with their department chair. The Provost's Office will review the schools/departments documents in each area to ensure implementation by the end of the Fall 2012 semester.