

Faculty Senate Resolution Number \_\_\_\_\_

To: Joe Bertolino, Ed.D., President, Southern Connecticut State University  
From: Natalie Starling, Ph.D., President, SCSU Faculty Senate

The attached Resolution of the Faculty Senate is entitled:

RESOLUTION Regarding \_\_\_\_\_

---

This Resolution was approved by Faculty Senate on: \_\_\_\_\_

- This Resolution is presented for APPROVAL  
 This Resolution is presented for INFORMATION

In accordance with the CSU-AAUP Contract (Article 5.10), "When the Senate makes a written recommendation to the President, the President shall acknowledge and respond to the recommendation in writing within fifteen (15) school days of receiving the Senate's recommendation. "

After considering this resolution, please indicate your action on this form and return it to the President of the Faculty Senate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Natalie Starling, Ph.D., President, Faculty Senate      Date

cc: Robert S. Prezant, Ph.D., Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

---

### ACTION OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

**Resolution for Approval:**

- Resolution APPROVED  
 Resolution DISAPPROVED (Provide comments below or attach statement)

**Resolution for Information:**

- Resolution NOTED (applies to Informational Resolutions only)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joe Bertolino, Ed.D., President, SCSU

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **Resolution Regarding Inclusions to the Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Renewal Procedures**

Whereas, Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) exists for the primary purpose of furthering academic excellence;

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty;

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate recognizes that, to further academic excellence, procedures for the evaluation of full-time faculty members for promotion and tenure, as well as renewal, need periodic review and revision;

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate was charged in Spring of 2020 to consider whether reducing, simplifying, and specifying the kinds and quantities of evidence to be included in a candidate's P&T file might remedy two perceived problems, namely file size and lack of clarity about what to include in the file;

Whereas, The Faculty Senate voted in May 2021 to charge the APC with proposing changes to the P&T and renewal process as follows: "In order to reduce file size (without instituting hard limits on page length, number of evidentiary items, etc.), provide more guidance on expected and accepted kinds and number of items of documentation for each evaluation category"; and

Whereas, Data gathered from multiple focus groups of constituents at all levels of the Promotion and Tenure process suggested that confusion over the proper form, content, and extent of evidentiary documentation exists, especially in the realm of overdocumentation; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That, effective beginning in the Fall semester of 2023, the Faculty Senate shall incorporate the attached text into the existing P&T guidebooks and to any future P&T guidebooks;

*Resolved*, That this incorporation shall take the form of an appendix, entitled "Appendix A. Supplemental Guidance on Form, Scope, and Nature of Evidentiary Documentation, Including Recommendations on Inappropriate Material for Inclusion";

*Resolved*, That this Appendix shall be noted in each of the P&T guidebooks by the addition of the following language in the form of a third paragraph in their "Documenting the Evidence" subsection: "Please See Appendix A for further suggestions on appropriate form, content, and extent of evidentiary documentation, including suggestions on material inappropriate for inclusion as evidentiary documentation."; and

*Resolved*, That this text shall be updated and revised in accordance with the revision schedule of each of the P&T guidebooks with the proviso that any change made to this Appendix in any one guidebook should be enacted in all others.

## Supplemental Guidance on Form, Scope, and Nature of Evidentiary Documentation, Including Recommendations on Inappropriate Material for Inclusion

General philosophy:

- It is important to note that any maximum or minimum inclusion requirements are purely guidelines to help candidates as they craft their own narrative. A candidate's portfolio is contractually mandated to be in their control. Only those documents required in contractual material and P&T documents are true requirements. And, while some of the suggestions in this document aim to help add definition to ambiguities, it can be in these very ambiguities that a candidate is able to describe their individual path at Southern.
- Put more pithily, quantity does not equate with quality, and brevity does not guarantee eloquence. It is in the hands of the candidate to shape their narrative. These guidelines are here to help the process of evidentiary selection be less excruciating. As a general principle, candidates should aim to present a streamlined depiction of your professional ethos that focuses on essentials rather than volume. Your selection of materials to document your career should emphasize concentration, concision, and quality over quantity and inclusion of unnecessary detail.
- Proviso: These guidelines, their order, their naming, and their content will apply differently with different classes of tenure-track faculty. Please refer to the AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement and official Promotion and Tenure documents to find advice on specific wording or weighting of categories.

General Guidelines on selecting evidentiary material for all sections:

- In accordance with Faculty Senate document *SCSU FACULTY SENATE P&T PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY*, portfolios should include:
  - Candidate's CIF (N.B. the CIF is mandatory; a candidate may include a CV as well, but not to the exclusion of the CIF);
  - A personal statement;
  - Statements for each area; for more detailed guidance on what should be included in each area, please see individual breakdowns below;
  - Pieces of evidence in each area of evaluation, calibrated to accord with section weight, relative importance of key achievements, and Departmental Guidelines;
  - Pursuant to documented P&T restrictions on individual letter writers' positions, letters of support, internal and external; Include external letters from faculty and scholars attesting to the impact the candidate has created for their professional discipline/field and society.
- Evidentiary documentation should be in support of an overarching contextualizing narrative, therefore:
  - Candidates should provide in their personal statements:
    - a clear summary of their areas of growth;
    - a clear, narratively-focused overview of their professional practice.
  - Evidence of Teaching/Professional (e.g. Coaching, Counseling, Library) Philosophy:

- Significant emphasis should be placed on candidates' narrative, including teaching or professional philosophy and effectiveness;
    - Candidates should favor a brief overview of all their work/courses over an in-depth focus on one representative project/course;
    - Candidates may consider highlighting, where appropriate, evolution of your praxis (i.e. pedagogy, course format and content, etc.) over time.
  - Primacy in selection and inclusion of evidentiary documentation should be afforded to narratively significant goals, tasks, achievements, and memberships.
    - Candidates should document key achievements highlighted in their narratives with evidence; but
    - They should not include trivial or extraneous documents that support self-evident or disciplinary-standard points (e.g. professional membership receipts, leaflets or handouts from talks, conference badges, etc.);
    - Likewise, they should not distract from their narrative through unnecessary redundancy in file. Avoid attaching the same or similar pieces of evidentiary documentation both within and across sections (e.g. very similar syllabi for the same or similar courses). Instead include a smaller number of unique, representative pieces of documentation.
  - Attention to evidentiary documentation should be afforded to each area in roughly the weight each category applies to the individual.
- In cases of collaborative projects, candidates must distinguish their individual contributions from those of their collaborators in any documentation.

#### Guidelines for Specific Evaluative Categories:

##### *Load Credit*

- Evidence of Load Credit will vary depending upon the candidate's duties (Teaching, Coaching, Counseling, Library, etc.).
- Documents that might serve as efficient measures of participation include:
  - Teaching Practice:
    - Paragraph explaining each course taught;
    - Syllabi and assignments or activities for courses.
  - Teaching and/or Course assessment:
    - Other forms of student comments on course or teaching;
    - Observations from the DEC or other departmental colleagues;
    - Qualitative or narrative self-reflection of professional practice on the basis of student opinion surveys.
  - Documents recording primary duties outside of teaching:
    - Administrative documents (e.g. spreadsheet excerpts; planning documents; policy documents, quantitative statistics, etc.)

- Student advising and mentorship:
  - Examples of unsolicited student feedback (thank you notes, e-mails, et al.) that demonstrate how the candidates help students outside of the classroom through office hours, advising, and mentorship.
- Do not include:
  - Avoid duplication of evidentiary materials (e.g. syllabi from the same semester or syllabi for the same class with little to no substantial change).

#### Creative Activity

- Include:
  - Documents that might serve as efficient measures of participation include:
    - PDFs or a stable, unrestricted hyperlink (e.g. permalink, doi) of peer-reviewed, bibliographic work (e.g. sample chapters of monographic work, authored chapters in edited volumes, significant paratextual contributions to edited volumes, published articles in peer-reviewed, non-predatory journals, et al.);
    - Evidence of exhibition, public performance, or juried review of or community engagement with candidate's creative work. (e.g. programs, media reviews, media write-ups, public recordings, et al.).
  - Creative activities should be cited on a candidate's CIF:
    - Creative work, when cited in the CIF or CV, should be fully cited and follow the approved citation style for the discipline, including page numbers where appropriate;
    - Insofar as this data is consistent with departmental or disciplinary practice, citations of creative output may include citation metrics .
- Note on Predatory Journals and Conferences:
  - Candidates are broadly encouraged not to include works published in known predatory outlets. For resources on this, the following links give lists of known predatory journals and a perspective on how to identify predatory tactics and avoid exploitation, respectively: <https://bealllist.net/> and <https://instr.iastate.libguides.com/predatory/intro>. But what constitutes criteria for defining predatory outlets may vary by discipline. Please consult with your department, DEC, or departmental guidelines for more specific, disciplinary-oriented advice on advisable and inadvisable outlets for creative activity.

#### University Service

- Include:
  - Evidence of active and qualitatively-rich participation at departmental, school, university, and/or system level.
  - Documents that might serve as measures of participation include (APC formulation):
    - Documents, including resolutions, authored, coauthored, or compiled as part of service work;

- Recommended maximum of one (1) letter of support per committee.
- Do not include:
  - Inclusive meeting leaflets, notes, minutes, or agendas.

#### Professional Service

- Include:
  - Evidence of active and qualitatively-rich participation in professional organizations appropriate to the candidate's disciplinary expertise.
  - Documents that might serve as measures of participation include:
    - Brief documentation of professional organization and committee membership; conferences, workshops, roundtables, and professionally relevant academic or community events attended or organized. Include dates for such events, if possible;
    - Documents authored, coauthored, or compiled as part of service work;
    - Recommended maximum of one (1) letter of support per committee or professional organization.
- Do not include:
  - Receipts, badges, etc. from conference attendance, or other extraneous documentation.