

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - Eberhardt School of Business Faculty Responses

1. Under scholarship, **“At least two external letters evaluating the scholarship of faculty candidates for promotion and/or tenure should be required. The letter should review quality of the candidate’s scholarship and contribution to the discipline”**

Comments:

- a. This requirement may be helpful for certain type of research – such as unpublished monographs or self-published books; but it is redundant and unfair for candidates whose research has been published in peer-reviewed journals (PRJ). Acceptance by PRJ is an indication of a certain quality level, depending on the reputation of the journal. To published a paper in a quality PRJ, one goes through multiple rejections and/or revisions. When a paper is finally accepted, it is evidence that the paper has adequate quality acceptable by peers. The candidate should not be required to demonstrate the quality of his/her research one more time. The other recommendation **“the report should discuss the quality of the journals and presses published in, or conferences presented at; the significance of co-authorships and of first and last authorships, in the discipline”** should be sufficient to show the quality of the research published in such journals.
 - b. In terms of the strength of evidence for research quality, the external letters are far less than PRJ. For example, if a candidate had 10 PRJ publications, his/her research should have been reviewed by approximately 20 anonymous reviewers and 10 PRJ editors. Each of these individuals has expertise in the relevant discipline and spent time reading and critiquing the candidate’s research in the review process. Such evidence is much stronger than letters from 2 external reviewers, based on the vita and perception of the papers in a very short time (the P&T process has a very tight schedule, due to the many steps in the process). In addition, opinions from PRJ reviewers are normally verified and comapred to a second reviewer and by the editors to minimize any bias (both favorable or unfavorable). In contrary, there is no check-and-balance for the validity and quality of the external letters, whether they are favorable or unfavorable.
 - c. A strong candidate should have a continuous research stream, as stated in the guideline – **“A sustained record demonstrating high quality scholarship or artistic achievements in the field of academic appointment.”** That is, some research should be done or published 5 or more years before P&T. The value of the papers may be perceived differently by the external reviewers at the time of the evaluation.
 - d. If the external letters are included in the portfolio, the opinions of 2 persons might be given as much or even more weight than what has been shown in multiple years by multiple peer reviewers and editors on the quality perception of a candidate’s scholarship.
2. **“Units should employ a process that allows peers to base their evaluation on direct evidence, e.g. direct observation, review of video of faculty candidates’ teaching, review of teaching materials”**
 - a. The “direct evidence” should include anything that the candidate deems most important to his/her teaching approach. The examples listed (e.g., direct observation, video) are biased and favor traditional classroom-only approaches. It implies that “teaching” is lecturing or discussion. Good performance in the classroom means good teaching. This

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

might be true in some classes, but not for the others. For certain classes, lectures may be only a small part of the complete learning experience. For example, students could learn by reading, experimenting, working on projects, doing homework, and interact with the teachers outside of classrooms, either face to face, or electronically. Equating teaching to classroom performance, especially lecturing or discussion, is a very narrow definition of teaching. The new generation of students have access to a lot of high quality teaching videos on numerous subjects. For example, the Khan Academy received several million dollars from Bill Gates to create video lectures that intend to free teachers from repetitive “lecturing”, and allow them to work with students on thinking and solving problems. (<http://www.khanacademy.org/>).

- b. To consider peer evaluation as a legitimate part of the P&T process, it must possess sufficient statistical quality. Despite its problems, the existing student evaluations are conducted continuously over multiple years, in multiple sections, across multiple subjects, by hundreds of students using a common instrument. It is a longitudinal observations using a large sample (or population). Despite the belief that peer-evaluation is a good measure of teaching, lack of data due to small sample size makes it unreliable and inadmissible in the evaluation process. Most likely, peer evaluations are done by one or two peers, in one class, for one or two hours, in one semester over 5 or more years. The class, the day, and the observer are all selected by the candidate. The candidate is well prepared to be observed. Such data have no reliability due to its collection methods, sample size, and sampling procedure. There is not a rubric for evaluation, and there is also no baseline for comparison. Besides, in non-lecture type classes, the real learning can only be experienced by reading, studying, doing the projects, working the assignments, doing the research, studying for the exams, plus countless emails Q&As with the teacher. One or two hours of unprepared observation by a peer can only see the tip of an iceberg.
- c. Resource issue - to obtain usable peer-evaluation data, the data need to be collected
 - i. using multiple observers (selected by the committee, not the candidate)
 - ii. across all classes taught (every class is different)
 - iii. on multiple days (un-announced)
 - iv. continuously over multiple semesters

In addition, the peer evaluator must not only observe, he/she must also work on the projects and homework to actually experience the class. Assuming each candidate is only to be observed by two peers on two randomly selected days for each class taught per semester, 20 class visits would be needed per year per person.

3. **“soliciting students to interview or write letters for the faculty under review, a process should be employed to elicit a range of opinions and not simply supportive letters”**
 - a. The intention is good, but this type of data is biased, because the sampling frame would only contain the most recent students. In addition, it is most likely to be a convenience sample of one or 2 students. Why would this data be more valuable than the student evaluation done every year by all students? Realistically, how many students would write a letter to criticize a bad teacher? If we need more qualitative data, we should collect more written comments at the end of each semester, anonymously, from all students.
4. **Performance on both teaching and scholarship should be assessed continuously before the candidate applies for P&T.** Data should be collected and available to the candidate, before he or she applies for P&T. The P&T should conduct the evaluation, based on data collected over the years. The new recommendations mentioned above, collect only snapshot data at the time of P&T process. It introduces a great deal of uncertainty to the process. The snapshot data will be biased due to its timing, time constraints, and sampling issues. An applicant who performs well over the

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

years might be hurt by one or two external scholarship reviewers who holds higher standards than the UOP norm. (similarly, underperforming candidates might get good evaluations from external reviewers with lower standards) Teaching performance might also be perceived differently due to letters from a small selected group of recent students.

- 5. Timing of the new guideline implementation must be clearly stated.** The new recommendations, if adopted, should clearly state its effective date. Candidates should not be hold to the new standards for their performance during years before the new guideline. Sufficient time should be given to candidates to collect data that are not currently available.
- The strong bias (utter unfairness) of the committee composition has always bothered me. I simply cannot understand why some units are *guaranteed* representation, while others (read professional schools) *might* be represented. Removing deans is an excellent improvement, but why not complete the revision process and simply say each unit has one representative? I'd be OK if the College of the Pacific retains three members – still unfair but an improvement if others units get representatives. Think of how much more smoothly the process would have gone this year with the questions the committee had for our unit – if we would have had a representative on the committee to explain our process, there would have been no need for memos and questions back to the dean. By the way, why did those questions go to the dean and not to the faculty evaluation committee anyway?

I cannot emphasize enough that ensuring representatives from each unit is mandatory in my opinion. The revision suggests that COP, Dentistry and Law will always have representatives, why not extend that privilege to all units? Because Law and Dentistry had strong advocates on the committee this year that recommended the change but we were denied having a representative (under the existing rules). So a biased committee produces a biased recommendation – no surprises there.

1. I'm concerned that the mandatory inclusion of the 3rd year report may detract from the developmental nature of the report and turn it into more of an evaluative report. The current report, at least in our unit, is not a public document unless the recipient chooses to make it public. It is between the faculty evaluation committee, the candidate and the dean. I'd prefer to keep it that way.
2. I am completely in favor of requiring people who vote no for tenure or promotion to explain the basis for the vote. This is especially true in promotion votes – if a person is denied a promotion, they certainly are entitled to know what they need to do differently in order to be successful if they are evaluated for promotion again a second time. Under the current system, there is no developmental aspect to the process, people who are denied promotion have no idea how or what to change.
3. I think the process described for getting external letters is not appropriate for an institution like us. We are not a research 1 university, which is the background of the current president and provost. They are simply taking requirements in place at their previous institutions and applying them here. It places an onerous burden on the faculty evaluation committee to have to solicit letters from people they don't know and with whom they have no working relationship. Then if the letters don't arrive in a timely fashion, whose fault is it? Does the committee need to pester outsiders? If the letter arrives late, can it still be sent to the university P&T committee? Apparently not, if the packet cannot be altered once submitted (a separate recommendation, VII of the report). This requirement would be sufficient to keep me from saying yes to being on the faculty evaluation committee.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

4. The inclusion of a statement on the quality of research is one idea we have debated many times since I've been on the faculty here. The bottom line is that we have never been able to come to any kind of agreement on what quality is. Even when a faculty member in the candidate's own area of expertise comments on the quality, faculty members outside of that area simply discount all research in that area. For example, in our case last year, the candidate had several publications in the top journals of the field ("A" level journals), yet the candidate received several "no" votes because people from other disciplines simply don't respect that area of research. Maybe there can be some agreement on what constitutes quality in units with departments of like-minded faculty members, but in a diverse unit like ours, all previous attempts have failed. And we have tried several times.
- I su. I also object to the recommendation that no School (other than COP, the Sacramento or SF campus) may have consecutive representation. The Eberhardt School is a longstanding central element of the core mission at Pacific and should have an ongoing institutionalized role in the promotion and tenure decisions of the University.
- The process being followed in the creation of this report is not in accordance with the Faculty Handbook, which states in Section 6.3.5, "In order to maintain consistent standards for promotions and tenure, the (P&T) Committee may recommend changes in such procedures and standards *to the individual units and to the PRC*" (emphasis added). By policy, this report should have been forwarded to the PRC for action, and then acted upon by Academic Council. It should not have emanated from the Provost's Office through the Deans, with faculty input to be transmitted back upward through the Deans.
- It is questionable if this is truly a "best practices" document, since it contains a limited review of practices at peer institutions that might have been instructive to Pacific.
- The timing of this document was unseemly, coming as it did on the heels (or in some instances prior to) the announcement of P&T outcomes for the 2011-2012 academic year. It appeared as though the process was more important than the notification of candidates, and it certainly suggested that the process that had just concluded may have been flawed! This was highly insensitive, and surely could have waited for the fall. PRC and Academic Council will be unable to take action on it before then in any event.
- There is a misstatement in paragraph three, where it says "Since some units have incorporated University guidelines into their unit guidelines..." It is policy that **all** units must incorporate University guidelines into their guidelines. This is why PRC/AC approval of guidelines exists.
- Re: Committee membership - The recommendations concerning committee membership are not particularly logical and seem to represent special interests. The move toward making it more of a faculty committee is a positive one. However, one wonders what could possibly elevate the need for a representation of clinical education **and** experimental education (maybe the latter should have read experimental science) above the need for subspecialty in any other discipline on campus? Why is it critical that some areas of the University have continual representation, whereas it is seen as imperative to limit other units so they can **never** have consecutive representation? (This is not a new problem, but if the committee membership is to be revisited, it is time to examine the logic of this policy.) Why are candidates from the excluded units left at the mercy of whatever year they happen to come up for review? What is fair about that? Moreover, with respect to experimental science, isn't the inclusion of representation of COP/natural sciences and the dental school (all of whom are highly trained in experimental science) enough? Finally, it doesn't seem like the three-city approach is really important; it is more important to have unit representation than geographic representation. The day may come when multiple dissimilar units are based in Sacramento or San Francisco and the meaninglessness of the geographic representation will become immediately apparent. If the Committee is to be

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

expanded, **why not have all units represented on a continuous basis?** This would only call for the addition of two people to an already large Committee. Alternatively, the Committee could have more of an at-large composition and a representative from each of the relevant units could be brought in for consultation during deliberation for its candidates. This would be much more equitable all around. It also may be incumbent upon the units to prepare some general documentation concerning the customs in their fields, rather than the current happenstance of having “someone to be there to explain,” -- or not, if you are not lucky. It seems like the problem of “representation” may be more a problem of the failure by units to write meaningful and self-contained evaluation reports.

- **Not advocating in unit evaluation reports, but instead reflecting feedback in a balanced fashion:** This is an absolutely great idea. In the past there has been a belief by some that the evaluation committees must take a position, and whole blocks of feedback and information are excluded from the report because they detract from the committee’s “conclusion.” This is then followed by a “surprise” in the faculty vote that “no one can explain.”
- **Agree with all recommendations concerning the committee report except #6, which is redundant:** Soliciting student letters about teaching really duplicates the extensive data collected in the student evaluation surveys, and is rarely helpful. Our unit used to do this and wisely eliminated the practice.
- **Unit meeting to discuss candidate:** The “big meeting” approach is quite flawed and inherently contradicts the later recommendation (VIII) concerning confidentiality. The risk of a lapse in confidentiality in this type of situation is very high, and at the same time, the likelihood of objective feedback is reduced. Private interviews are a far more reasonable and confidential approach. A group meeting discussing feedback concerning whether or not the evaluation committee report is accurately representative of the assessment of the faculty as a whole could be useful, but not as a means of obtaining initial input to the report.
- **External letters:** Let’s get real. This sounds like a process for an R1 institution. Although many people like to think that Pacific is significant in the world of scholarship (and in some rare cases it is), for the most part, we are not. It would be very difficult to support this type of random process due to the low visibility of much of the research coming out of Pacific. How will it reflect on a candidate when the requests for feedback are not answered? Who will pick the respondents? How will they be selected? How valuable will this information be? Is it worth the time and effort needed to obtain it? On balance, it seems this is unlikely to be a useful addition to the process.
- **Submission of new evidence:** There is no valid reason to prohibit applicants from submitting additional evidence during the process; in fact it is most fair to allow this. Give everyone the maximum chance; don’t deny them credit for a great publication that comes in a “day late!” Perhaps the procedures surrounding this need clarification, but prohibiting these additions does not sound like the solution.
- **Evaluation criteria:** The idea of “predictive value” in evaluation criteria is a very slippery slope. No one has a crystal ball. It is far more objective and appropriate to judge someone’s actual past record than what we think they “might do in the future.” I have seen this “expectation of the future” used as an excuse to vote against tenure/promote candidates on the flimsy and often prejudicial notion that “they are the ‘type’ to get this promotion/tenure and then do nothing in the future.” The only evidence of this would be if someone had weak training or showed disinterest in good teaching and therefore was unlikely to improve – but if that were the case, there application could be denied on the basis of actual performance to date. Short of this, the criterion of “prediction” is entirely subjective and can easily be abused in the evaluation process.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

- The overall tone in this document seems to be to put more obstacles in the way of P&T candidates and to make the process even more intensive, time-consuming and inhumane than it already is. Why must we take this approach? It is already the world's greatest "gotcha" game. Even successful candidates don't feel good coming out of it! This just seems like a bunch more rules to make it even less a celebration of achievement and more of a depressing ordeal. Why would we want to do this.
- I agree with the fundamental comment that this document and this process belong in the hands of the faculty and not the administrators/deans/provost.
- I would like to indicate strong support for the use of external letters in the peer review process for P&T. This is not the preserve only of tier one research institutions and is widely used in other less intensive research settings. Merely publishing in peer reviewed journals is not sufficient. Peer review in mid and low level journals may not mean much. The value of external letters is to help determine the quality of the journals and other publications. The candidate and the Dean should select half a dozen persons of equal or higher rank from equivalent or better institutions. If no agreement is possible, then the candidate and the Dean should each select at least 3 persons. Provisions should be made to permit use of "late" letters. I would also like to protest the unfair representation on the University P&T Committee. There should be equal representation from each school or else some sort of FTE (for tenured faculty) weighted system should be devised.
- How did the committee determine what are the "best practices?" Did it research the practices of other universities, or access literature on the subject?
- Promotion and Tenure Committee Membership - I wholeheartedly approve of removal of the deans and of the provost. This committee should represent the faculty and the faculty only. That said, I really don't like the proposed membership. It makes no sense to have representatives from Sacramento and San Francisco just to satisfy the "one-campus" mentality. Representatives should be selected based on the methods used in scholarship and in pedagogy, not on geography. Ideally, the committee should have representatives from the experimental and lab sciences, the social sciences, the health sciences, the fine arts, and the humanities. If this is not possible, then every school should be represented every year. Also, student representatives sound like a nice idea, but in practice they add little to the evaluation process. Many don't bother to show up on a regular basis, and when they do, they are not prepared.
- I see no reason to change § 7.5.5.c. Reasonable people should be able to agree on the proper committee without dictating. To start of the process with a committee challenge is not in the best interest of anyone.
- Peer review of teaching should be required for all units, and the handbook should be amended to reflect this. The provost's office should provide appropriate training on how to conduct peer review of teaching.
- Evaluation committee reports should provide objective evidence of teaching. In soliciting students to interview or write letters for the faculty under review, a process should be employed to elicit a range of opinions and not simply supportive letters. Comment: This is overkill, particularly if you are requiring years of teaching evaluations. What a waste of time.
- Electronic submission should be required of all units. We have the technology!
- Not all candidates will have a third-year review (re: The Third Year Review will be included in the candidate's dossier.).

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

- Deans and Department Chairs must be careful to avoid including information that was not available to the unit evaluation committee or to the voting faculty. As an example, the Dean should avoid inclusion of the results of annual merit reviews if these results are not part of the candidate's dossier, and were not available to the evaluation committee or to the voting faculty. The process should be fully transparent to all decision makers. (re: The Third Year Review will be included in the candidate's dossier.)
- Re: Unit Meeting to Discuss Candidates - The problem is not that the reasons for the negative votes are not captured, the problem is that unit evaluation committees often are biased, and fail to communicate opposing viewpoints in the evaluation report. The result is that everyone is "surprised" when the candidate who received a positive recommendation by the evaluation committee then receives a significant number of negative votes from the faculty. A public meeting is not likely to help this problem, because minority viewpoints are less likely to be expressed in a public meeting. Instead of a public meeting, all faculty should be interviewed privately, or be allowed to comment anonymously in writing, and all comments should be included verbatim in an appendix to the evaluation report. Of course, the anonymity of the commenting faculty should be preserved. This method will make it difficult for the evaluation committee to ignore significant numbers of negative comments, and will provide a basis of understanding for subsequent reviewers.
- Re: External Letters: First, we should be careful with this requirement. We are a relatively small teaching institution, and it might be difficult to find two reviewers who are willing to take the time to provide a quality review. Second, it should apply only to scholarship that hasn't undergone external peer review already. Any item in a peer reviewed journal has already been reviewed externally. Subjecting these items to a second review is a waste of time.
- Re: Transmittal Memoranda - The committee report already should include an executive summary. A transmittal memorandum adds to the committee work without adding any value to the process.
- Re: New Information After Submission of Dossier - Does this mean the University P&T Committee also will be prohibited from asking for additional information? This is a particularly nasty recommendation. Of course we should allow information to be added. It is typically additional scholarly items that are added. Quality scholarship rarely follows a precise timetable.
- Re: Confidentiality of Evaluation of Faculty - Past violations of confidentiality have arisen because of perceived biases on the part of department chairs, administrators, and P&T Committee members. While I wholeheartedly agree that confidentiality must be maintained, there also must be a mechanism that allows P&T Committee members or other reviewers to report potential biases and violations of process to the provost and the president before tenure and promotion decisions are made.
- Re: Unit Compliance Report to the Provost and the Professional Relations Committee - My comments: These issues should be discussed with the dean and with the faculty of the noncompliant unit. After all, it is the faculty who must agree on the unit guidelines.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – College of the Pacific

- On the issue of external letters some faculty expressed the redundancy of such letters since scholarship is peer-reviewed. Others suggested that the letters address the "body of work" and the importance of such work. Others doubted that 3-4 articles can be considered a "body of work". All agreed that external letters should be open to the candidate, but redacted.
- On the transmittal memorandum, faculty felt that the candidate must be able to view EVERY document in their binder, including the memorandum, and have an opportunity to respond.
- I think that the proposed changes are all fine. As we discussed the other day, the current committee composition was a compromise, with PRC not wanting any deans at all on the committee.
- I only have two substantive concerns. The recommendations are not necessarily written such that they could be placed directly into the document, and it isn't clear exactly where some of the recommendations would fit in the current text.
- All recommendations appear reasonable. One concern I have: Does the expansion of faculty representation from seven to nine on the P+T Committee dilute the role of COP as the most significant component of the University?
- I agree with many of the recommendations put forth in the document you have sent. I have a couple of further suggestions.
- All faculty qualified to vote in a department MUST READ the dossier/binder of the candidate up for P & T. The binder should be held by the department administrative assistant who will have faculty sign in and sign out, giving their name and the time in which they review the binder. (I know of situations where faculty members didn't read the material and still voted.)
- There should be some system of external verification available when articles/books etc. are claimed to be in process or in press, but do not as yet appear in print.
- It is my understanding from long traditions at other universities, that outside members who write with regard to merits of the candidates' scholarship/artistic endeavors, should not be people who served on the candidate's dissertation committee, or, in most cases, their former professors. (Letters of scholarly/artistic achievement at the point of tenure and promotion differ from letters written when someone goes on the job market and needs recommendations.)
- As I understand what is being recommended, when the binder and the report are turned in to the Dean that marks the end of when new information can be added. I would suggest that a precise deadline be given as to when a book or article under review or with the expectation of being published be allowed/or not allowed to be counted in the review process. There has been slippage, even an open-ended inclusion up to the point of the final deliberations of the P & T committee. An established deadline should be understood by all—from candidate, to review committee, to Dean, and to members of the all university P & T committee. Would save a lot of trouble and confusion.
- p. 1 and passim. The report is an excellent argument for the Oxford comma. Not using the Oxford comma obscures meaning in several instances.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

- p. 3. I understand the long-standing frustration of the clinical disciplines, but I'm concerned about privileging certain disciplines in the membership of P&T. Where to draw a line? How about studio- and performance-based education? As described the rotation scheme could seem like a game of Pacific roulette; in each year all but three of the schools will have members, so hope you don't come up the one year out of three that your unit is forced to sit out. If we are going to expand membership, why not go all the way and just include each of the schools?
- p. 5. I'm leery about quantitative summaries of student course evaluations. The validity of course evaluations as a measure of instructor effectiveness is, as far as I know, controversial and the correlation between evaluation scores and summaries, weak to moderate. Can't we do better?
- p.6 We should be careful about how we address the quality of scholarship as in recommendation 2. This seems to me to make more sense for some disciplines than for others.
- p. 11. A matter that we may need to address is the candidate's right to see and respond to the P&T Committee's report. Every step until then is transparent to the candidate. Should the candidate have a right to respond to P&T's recommendation, especially if it is different from the recommendations along the way?
- p. 11. I agree that we need a drop-dead date for submitting new material, but maybe Nov. 1 isn't it. Could it be Jan. 1 without upsetting the process?
- I had a chance to look over the P&T changes this morning. I think they're generally positive, but have one strong disagreement with them. While I understand the need to have some kind of universal policy on late additions to the binder, I think the committee has gone in the wrong direction on this one. The academic process is exceedingly slow, and I think faculty should have until the last minute to add anything possible to our binders. I think this is particularly important in "book fields" where one piece- like a contract, can really indicate the difference in someone making a substantial contribution to the field or not. As someone who has recently been through contract craziness, I know that 1) it can take a fairly unreasonable amount of time and 2) getting a second contract is much easier. Anyone who publishes a book will have a much easier time publishing a second book, and for that reason a contract seems like a good indication of future contributions as well as present ones. I think we should give our faculty every possible opportunity to succeed and not be so hung up on particulars as to deprive ourselves of people who add a lot to our university.
- I was going to start my response to this email with REALLY?! I know that you are trying to wrap things up before your departure but to ask us to respond fully to a 17 page single spaced memo on such important matters is asking too much. I just finished the semester, and I am so grateful to get to the summer and at last have time to finish my research, and you are asking for immediate feedback. Really? Please show a little understanding and let everyone know who wants this to move so quickly, not to rush this very important process.
- I haven't had time to do a careful read of this – but a quick read has made me rather concerned – and I would echo Lenzi's procedural concern in strong terms. This is something COP council needs to meet on.
- My general reaction – it looks a lot like a move back to the "bad old days" of the P&T committee "redoing" the unit evaluation. The P&T committee review must be merely procedural in nature – they cannot be revisiting the entire record and making substantive judgments about the candidates performance at the 11th hour. If there is serious disagreement about the candidate – or if the department/unit evaluations are problematic that is a Dean problem. The candidate cannot justly be held accountable for systemic problems at the unit/departmental level. Particularly at the last minute.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

- If the P&T committee wants to do serious objective evaluation of teaching – I guess they'd have to look at a honking big pile of student work, because, frankly, letters etc are neither objective, nor generally representative. There is a substantial and growing literature on the problems with survey evaluations of teaching – and ours, (except for maybe in psychology where they do this kind of thing as a part of their discipline) suck. Most COP departments don't even do any statistical analyses of the evaluations – or correct for small class sizes, or do ANYTHING meaningful with the data. We just do textbook-bad tabulations of data. Yikes. Oh, but then the P&T committee would have to be qualified to evaluate that work in the discipline at introductory or slightly higher levels – which they are all (or all but one!) not qualified to do! I am ranting a bit here, but hope I am making my point. I am also dubious about faculty observations of each other.
- I like making it a faculty committee – the provost gets three bites at the apple now, as I read it, and the "lucky" deans on P&T get two.
- Of course, the President/Provost still get the only vote that counts, and aren't accountable to anyone for it. But that's not really within the scope of this revision.
- Honestly – this needs much more discussion than a quick email over mother's day weekend.
- I am not sure why additional feedback on teaching is necessary in addition to reports on teaching by observers, colleagues and student evaluations. Also, who is going to solicit additional feedback? The chair of the candidate's committee? The candidate herself? The two students who write summary teaching reports for the candidate? The teaching evaluations already present a range of opinions on the candidate's teaching, so I am not sure why additional feedback from students is necessary. From the manner in which the change above is worded, it seems that most candidates pick supporters to counter-balance some negative opinions in their end-of-semester evaluations. This tendency might pose problems. Also: Why are undergraduates even involved in the tenure evaluation of a faculty member (except through their written evaluations at the end of the semester)? The end-of semester evaluations might prove the most structured and least impressionistic, since they address the particularities of a learning experience.
- The guidelines should state clearly that assistant professors at other institutions are not the best choices for evaluating a candidate; nor are former dissertation advisors, childhood friends, etc. I am not sure why the outside evaluators cannot be academic friends or mentors at other universities than the candidate's PhD-granting institution (as long as they are experts in the candidate's field and preferably senior scholars).
- How would the committee know who are the people best suited to evaluate the candidate? It would be more meaningful that the list of potential references be provided by the candidate herself. This would make the veto unnecessary. Someone working on Chinese-American poets should not be obligated to research medieval scholarship to try to figure out which scholars are best suitable to evaluate the candidate, only to find out that the candidate vetoes them. This policy seems unduly complicated and better suited for research universities than small colleges where each department often has just one specialist per field. The inside person evaluating the candidate's research should also take into consideration reviews of the candidate's work in major journals / research forums in addition to the outside letters. This strategy would provide specific feedback from multiple sources.
- Tom, I think that the proposed changes are all fine. As we discussed the other day, the current committee composition was a compromise, with PRC not wanting any deans at all on the committee

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – School of Education Faculty Council

Benerd School of Education Faculty are, in general, supportive of the new proposed promotion and tenure guidelines. The BSE faculty are revising unit guidelines to increase both rigor and clarity of expectations in all area and are happy that the University is, simultaneously, revising guidelines for processes.

Faculty were sent the proposed guidelines via e-mail in mid-April and invited to review and submit comments. One faculty submitted written comments, basically stating that he was supportive of “virtually any approach as long as it’s clear and well articulated.”

During the May 1, 2012 faculty council, the chair of the faculty and the dean asked for discussion and feedback on the proposed guidelines. Dr. Linda Webster, School of Education representative and member of the current P & T committee led a discussion that focused on the following

Key Ideas Endorsed by Faculty

Faculty are fully supportive of:

- Revised “constitution” of the P & T Committee (removing deans, etc.);
- Holding to a firm deadline for submission of all material;
- Efforts to clarify processes and to establish more regular processes across units.

Points of Concern Raised by Faculty

Faculty, while not opposing any changes, raised concerns about:

- Sending scholarship to external reviewers. Faculty were concerned about the extra time involved in this mandated step. They also stated that it will be critical that external reviewers understand the University of the Pacific and our expectations. Faculty further noted that the proposed new guidelines for the BSE will specify that peer reviewed scholarly publications (primarily journal articles) are required for promotion and tenure This requirement means that the scholarship of all candidates (assuming that their work has been accepted for publication) automatically involves external peer review. There was mention that mandating that scholarship be reviewed a second time by sending it to another external reviewer is, in some sense, redundant. Faculty wondered how the committee would view less than flattering review of an article that had been accepted in a peer review journal. (The question was asked, “How would the committee determine which external reviewers should be ‘trusted’ if one reviewer is critical of an article that another thought was worthy of publication?”) Finally, faculty expressed some concerns about external reviewers who might have an ideological or theoretical perspective different from those of the faculty under review.
- The idea of whole faculty meeting to review the file with a transmittal letter emerging from that meeting. The BSE is a small unit with few tenured faculty. There is a high degree of collaboration and mutual support among the faculty. There was concern that it might be difficult to have a candid discussion in a group meeting and that faculty might be hesitant to be honestly or

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

openly critical and/or to admit that they were going to vote against someone. At the same time faculty, acknowledged the need for more transparency in the process. Faculty brainstormed several solutions including:

- Holding a group discussion but allowing faculty to vote privately and via written ballot and asking faculty to make comments on their ballot.
- Preparing generic (majority/minority reports) that capture the thinking of faculty but that avoid – to the greatest extent possible – identifying specific faculty.
- Because the BSE is a small unit (8 tenured faculty), there are some ongoing concerns about the complexities of creating committees for third year and tenure and promotion reviews and the work that often falls to a few individuals. Faculty discussed the importance of all faculty in the unit having a shared understanding of standards, processes, etc. reviews and the work that often falls to a few individuals. This, in the view of faculty, would help to ensure that untenured faculty received consistent messages about priorities, expectations, deadlines, etc.

General Comments:

Faculty made the following general comments:

- Regardless of the processes approved, mentoring of new and untenured faculty is going to be critical to ensure their readiness.
- Rigorous pre-tenure reviews will continue to be very important in the process. Faculty fully endorsed tough, candid, and specific pre-tenure reviews.
- The processes need to be clear to all involved. Special attention should be paid to timelines, etc., especially if scholarship is sent to external reviewers. This will add a degree of complexity and will require advance planning

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – PHS

Page 3, Section I. Promotion and Tenure Committee

- There are 7 schools outside of Dental, Law, and the College (Research & Grad Studies has no FTE faculty). This provides the college with three seats on the committee (one for each division, i.e., Natural Science, Social Science, and Humanities) leaving 4 spaces for the other 7 schools to share. PHS is lumped in with the other 7 schools that are all based on undergraduate education with the exception of those few graduate programs within these schools. Due to the limits of consecutive representation, PHS would have no representation on the committee for three year and potentially 6 year stretches.
- Faculty feel that PHS should have the a permanent seat on the University P & T Committee due to: 1) only professional program on the Stockton campus which creates unique complex issues including but not limited to service and support; 2) PHS is the second largest academic unit and has complex issues related to professional and graduate education as well as having tenured and non-tenured, full and part-time clinical and experiential faculty, including remote (regional full-time faculty); 3) PHS has had a unique and nationally recognized introductory and advanced clinical experience program that is both remote (12 regions) and local.
- The statement “balance should be kept in mind” is vague and does not hold anyone to anything. It is not binding. This should be made more explicit or removed.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

Page 6, Section II. Evaluation Committee Report

2. Re: The evaluation committee report should reflect the agreed conclusion of committee members on whether the faculty candidate meets the tenure and/or promotion standards for each section; teaching, scholarship and service. - Request clarification if this means that the unit faculty vote on each standard separately: service/scholarship/teaching.
4. Re: 7.5.5.b change - Summary data for all courses evaluated by students during the evaluation period should be included in the dossier. Students who comment usually have a strong opinion, either negative or positive, otherwise they make no comment. These comments can unfairly skew objectivity. PHS faculty recommend that student comments be reviewed by the faculty and department chair and considered in what is standard for the department but be omitted from the dossier. #4 also recommends that "Summary data for all courses evaluated by students ...should be included; but later in the paragraph states "...should include samples of student evaluations." This needs to be clarified and consistent.
5. Re: Evaluation committee reports should clearly state the method of any peer teaching evaluation. - Remove student letters. Students have input in writing the evaluation committee report through the student representative on the committee. With student representation, this becomes redundant.
6. Re: Evaluation committee reports should provide objective evidence of teaching. - Take item 6 out because the first sentence and the 2nd sentence encourages negativity. If kept in, student's letters should be blinded because the faculty are teaching these students and therefore are still evaluating them. Could create problems with objectivity.

Page 7, Section III. Inclusion of Third Year Review in Dossier

- The majority of faculty (with some exceptions) feel the third year review materials should not be included in the P & T dossier, as this document is for faculty guidance as they move toward promotion and tenure. If items in the third year review are relevant, they should be addressed in the report of the Chair of Dean.

Page 8, Section V. Unit Meeting to Discuss Candidates

1. It has been the practice in PHS for department faculty to not discuss their individual issues/information with the dossier or justification for their vote. We would need make some changes in our process.
2. Clarification is needed to determine if this would be expected in a department faculty evaluation or in the school committee discussion. Currently these discussions take place in the School committee meeting but not in a meeting of the department tenured faculty.
3. Currently the department chair (if serving as the ad-hoc committee chair) presents his/her faculty's dossier to the school committee. Prior to that meeting, the department chair's recommendation is included in the dossier. Although the school committee has faculty representation elected by each department, it remains administratively heavy. Perhaps a review of the school's P & T committee structure should take place.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

Page 9, Section VI. External Letters

1. Faculty going forward for tenure and/or promotion should be made aware of any changes to guidelines and processes at least four years in advance of their presentation date in order to prepare for guidelines.
2. External reviewers should submit a current C.V. to enable determine of their qualifications for this peer review.
3. Clarification requested of who makes recommendations to department chair of list of potential external reviewers i.e., candidate or another expert in the field. If candidate – could provide the chair a list of qualified peers which when combined with the list from the chair could provide a pool for chair to solicit external review and recommendations.
4. Candidate and ad-hoc committee members should be able to approve or veto any person on the external peer list.
5. In addition, provide specific guidelines and questions to the external reviewer for the evaluation process.
6. A few PHS faculty members questioned the use of outside reviewers due to the many variables between even peer universities in practice, research perspectives, and circumstances of research. Faculty felt that this paragraph needed to be more specific.

Page 10, Section VII. Transmittal Memoranda

- Clearly define what is called the transmittal memorandum and what format is required for submission (binder or electronic or both). The inclusion of a thumb drive may be preferred and if so, should it include the entire dossier or just the key evaluation documents.

Page 11, Section VIII. New Information After Submission of Dossier

- Although it is unfair to call unit evaluation committees back to review additional materials, some publication decisions and deadlines are made after the summer when much work is done on the dossiers and deadlines of dossiers to units are looming. A short delay in notification of acceptance of a publication could make a huge difference between “submitted” and “accepted” work. Also, request clarification as to which “committee” this recommendation is referring to, i.e. ad-hoc, school, or university committee.

Page 12, Section X. Unit Compliance Report to the Provost and the Professional Relations Committee

- PHS Faculty felt it was important here to advocate for full time non-tenure track faculty who are often lumped in with adjunct faculty. It is important to clearly define positions and represent faculty who are full-time, non-tenure track fairly, i.e. faculty in clinical settings and qualified for promotion, such as those in Pharmacy, Physical Therapy, Speech-Language Pathology, Dental, and other health care practitioners. Assure proper representation and evaluation to review non-tenure track faculty. Consider: Should non-tenure track faculty be evaluated by tenure-track faculty (tenure-track faculty are not evaluated by non-tenure track faculty).

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – McGeorge

Draft reviewed with Thom Main, Chair of EPT, and he in turn discussed it with Ruth Jones, who has just served on the University Committee. We did not feel the need to have a full faculty vetting at this stage, because we believe that the law school practice and procedures are largely in accord with the proposals. Should this project advance to the next stage, I will ask the incoming Chair of EPT, Leslie Jacobs, to ensure that the full faculty reviews the proposal and submits specific comments to me.

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – Conservatory

- Quite a dense document to go over(!) Everything I read makes sense and I have no objections or specific comments.
- Wow, this is quite a lot to go through, but in general, I think it is well considered and worth supporting.
- Ultimately, it means the process and role of the Conservatory Faculty Evaluation team will be expanded, for instance to include more observation and peer review as ongoing pillars of what we do.
- It should result in improved teaching and learning, which when coupled with our assessment plan and "closing the loop" to confirm educational effectiveness, we will improve!
- These revisions are generally necessary and uncontroversial. I fully agree with the recommendations on the committee makeup, distribution of bylaws at hiring, and confidentiality.
- It seems good to have student evaluations handled more by the unit committee. I have some trepidation about comparing teaching only to unit norms (do we not hope that all of our teachers are above average teachers?) but I expect that the way student evaluations are used does not represent a change in procedure.
- I agree that mentors/friends should not provide letters. However, in a small field it can be very difficult to distinguish between mentors, colleagues, and friends. I would hope that someone who has provided editorial, job search, or other advice, or who has shared a meal with the candidate, would not be disqualified as a "mentor" in the first or "friend" in the second case. One would then be indeed limited after an active 5 years in a small field.
- On adding to a dossier after Nov. 1: I agree that the committee should not be delayed in its voting or deliberation, but I would be concerned if the committee/provost could not learn about 1) a delayed publication that had suddenly been accepted, 2) a major fellowship or prize,

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

or, conversely, 3) a strongly negative teaching encounter or student experience, or 4) evidence of scholarly fraud, after the Nov. 1 deadline. I would agree that unit and committee votes should not be changed with additional information, but couldn't additional information still be provided usefully? For example, if the transmittal of the basis of votes were improved as recommended here, the following situation could happen: if the faculty had a strong minority 'no' on a candidate because of a lack of recent publications, but a publication were announced after Nov. 1, the provost would then have information that would potentially allay the concerns raised by the minority.

- I am concerned that, without some official mechanism to allow items of major (say, newsworthy) importance, positive or negative, to influence the tenure outcome, a ludicrous situation could arise (a Nobel prize winner denied tenure; an exposed plagiarist granted it). Less hypothetically, it could actually inflame the tendency to rely on rumor and gossip in evaluation (e.g. did you hear about the teaching award so-and-so won in December?) instead of on the actual dossier. Obviously, in any case, the rules should be clearly set down.
- Overall, I think the P & T has done a remarkable job in putting this document together. I have only one criticism. I don't think enough has been addressed in this document to adequately fix the overall problem with have with student evaluations. It is a critical component in the P + T process, and yet we still struggle to get a sampling of students that is adequate enough to accurately reflect the reality in the classroom. The problem is somewhat addressed in the pasted section below
 - Summary data for all courses evaluated by students during the evaluation period should be included in the dossier. The summary of evaluations should compare the candidate's scores with the norms in the unit, if the unit compiles unit norms and this should be completed by a member of the evaluation committee. The candidate's dossier should also include a sample of student evaluations, including student comments. The evaluation sample of courses will be submitted by the evaluation committee for inclusion in the dossier. The sample should represent a significant sample of the depth and breadth of the courses taught during the evaluation period. Faculty Handbook § 7.5.5.b should be amended to include this provision.

We have such a wildly fluctuating set of numbers with student responses, it would be a monumental task for a committee member to determine what the unit norms would be, and even then, it would not reflect what is happening in the class room. I believe we should aspire to have a certain percentage of students respond to the surveys, and if the numbers are not large enough, we should NOT use them. Too often, one or two students either over inflate the data or worse yet, sabotage the data in a way that does not reflect the quality of teaching. In committees, we cannot vote on an item unless we have a quorum. I believe a quorum should be established so that the data is more useful. Perhaps then the university will be forced into more creative ways to get students to respond to surveys. At the very least, there should be a description in the document which includes a statement of admission of the inefficacy of the student evaluations.

- I agree with all recommendations, but regarding the third one: The same thing could be said about having a permanent COM rep. Every years I have served on the COM-Eval cmte, we had to meet with members of the University Eval cmte to explain our candidates' work. In recent years, when discussing with Giulio anticipated issues with the dossier we were preparing, he would say "Not to worry, I will be there to explain", as he is serving on that cmte. But this comment in itself rests my case ;-)
- I do not agree with this rec, since when did an evaluate determine the exact composition of his/her eval cmte ? We provide a short list of candidates who understand our work and the Dean and Unit-eval cmte makes the final decision. IN the preceding set of rec. they pointed out the

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

importance of having members on the Un-Eval cmte from not-well- understood areas to help the members of the cmte better understand certain files, well, it is the same idea, when evaluated I want fellows who at least understand the specific of my areas on the cmte, with the understanding that the final say on the composition of the cmte will be made by my Dean and Unit-Eval cmte's members

- Summary data for all courses evaluated by students during the evaluation period should be included in the dossier. The summary of evaluations should compare the candidate's scores with the norms in the unit, if the unit compiles unit norms and this should be completed by a member of the evaluation committee. -> *This is a weird comment, I promise not to ask my Mother to do it, seriously, what is the point with this comment ?*
- Evaluation committee reports should provide objective evidence of teaching. In soliciting students to interview or write letters for the faculty under review, a process should be employed to elicit a range of opinions and not simply supportive letters. Such information should be balanced with all input from objective sources. Faculty Handbook § 7.5.5. c should be amended to include this provision. > *Are they suggesting that an evaluation form will be created for that purpose ?*
- The Department Chairperson (where applicable) reviews the evidence and writes a letter which includes an independent review and recommendation. The Dean reviews all the evidence including the Chairperson's letter, if available, but should write a letter communicating a recommendation based on an independent review. The letter should clearly describe the candidate's contribution to the field. Additionally, if areas needing improvement were identified in the third-year review, all efforts applied to address these should be included. This recommendation should be included in the Provost's handout, attached to this document as Attachment A, and any other resources developed and provided to units, administrators and candidates. > *This is a silly recommendation. It is the goal and purpose of the entire evaluation process to produce a thorough review. In the case that the Dean and/or Chair agree(s) with the cmte's rec. it would be silly to expect of the Dean and/or Chair to have their own 'independent' review, but I see the necessity of this step in the case that the Dean and/or Chairperson were to disagree with the rec. of the cmte OR if the rec. of the cmte was half-split.*
- We used to have a process in the COM where all tenured faculty members were expected to consider a candidate's dossier and then write out: our impression and recommendation that were used by the cmte to write out the final report. I was serving on the COM-Eval cmte when we were informed to scarp that system to adopt the University's one, where Faculty members who do not serve on the cmte were now voting on the --cmte's recommendation/report--. I am all in favor of an all-inclusive process, but I am just flabbergasted by the cmte's change of heart on this issue.
- The Faculty Handbook should be amended to include a provision on transmittal memoranda. > *Are they suggesting that a standard form will be created for that purpose ? It should be.*
- After the dossier has been sent to the Provost's office no additional information can be added to the dossier. The Faculty Handbook should be amended to include a provision on transmittal memos. > *I agree with that, but the COM will need to adopt a clear timeline indicating the deadline for each step of the process for each party involved in the process. Every year I have served on the COM- Eval cmte, the members of the eval. cmte have worked catch up. There was no clear calendar and no clear schedule. For fairness sake for the evaluate who will not be able to amend their submitted file, we need to have a well define process time-wise.*
- Each faculty member involved in tenure and/or promotion evaluation of candidates shall respect the absolute confidentiality of all candidates. Faculty should not identify or reveal any other information about candidates before or after the case is considered, unless required to do so by

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

law. Units should consider including a similar provision in their unit guidelines. The Faculty Handbook should be amended to include a confidentiality provision. > *Yes!*

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – Library

In response to the Provost's email of 4/14/2012 to the deans soliciting feedback from the deans and from faculty on the draft P&T Draft Best Practices Report, the University Library faculty met on April 25, 2012. The feedback resulting from this discussion is presented below. The University Library Dean and Faculty understand that this is the first-round of feedback before a more thorough review by Academic Council in Fall 2012.

Overall, there is strong agreement that this is a timely, much-needed document; the recommendations on the membership of the P&T Committee are viewed as positive, particularly the suggestion for the removal of double jeopardy by having no deans participate on the P&T Committee.

As to the recommendation (P9) regarding External Letters, in particular the sentence, "The committee feels objectivity is better achieved when letters are sought from peers/aspirant peers at the level or above that of the candidates seeking advancement" (Sec VI, par 2), the Library faculty and dean felt that this statement needed some clarification (e.g., Does this reference—"peers/aspirant peers"—mean institutional or individual peers?) It was the Library faculty's feeling that this consideration, while important, is more critical to the process when it applies to evaluation for tenure rather than promotion. For example, the academic library profession, in particular, has a number of professionals making important contributions to professional research and practice despite the size of their home institution, and it would be a disservice to a University Library candidate if this were not taken into consideration.

As to the recommendation (P10) regarding the "Transmittal memo" reflecting the discussion of the unit faculty prior to voting on tenure or promotion, the Library faculty and dean support this recommendation and feel that prior to submission of this transmittal memo the draft should be reviewed for accuracy by the unit's voting members.

As to the recommendation that no new evidence be submitted after the candidate's file goes to the Provost's office (p 11), the University Library faculty felt this restriction was too rigid, and that more flexibility should depend upon the judgment of the Dean, given the circumstances of the case under review. If there is to be a "hard deadline" for submission of evidence after the Provost's deadline, the Library faculty and dean agree it should be closer to when review by the P&T Committee is actually underway. There is also a strong feeling that only material mentioned by the candidate in his/her narrative review should be make an allowed under this exception, as evidence of the quality of scholarly work being considered. It should be clear in any revision of the P&T guidelines any exceptions or appeals that are possible. Further, any additional items added to a dossier after the deadline should include a cover sheet confirming awareness of all parties involved in review.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

Please let me know if you have questions or need clarification on any of the above. We look forward to the full review by Pacific faculty and administration in fall 2012.

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – SOECS

Here is a summary of essential comments from the School of Engineering and Computer Science:

- Having three members on the committee from COP is unreasonable: COP influence on the committee needs to be brought in-line with those of other schools. COP has plenty of influence on the process. P&T Committee is just one vote in the whole process: this includes unit committee vote, department vote, chair vote, dean vote, and provost decision.
- Each School should have at least one member on the P&T University-wide committee. It would be very difficult for members from other Schools to properly judge teaching and research activities of candidates from SOECS.
- The candidate should have some advisory role in selecting the P&T committee members and in seeking external letters and comments. Currently, the faculty member has too much influence on some of these crucial activities.
- If the University is serious about teacher-scholar model, we need to be sure we are providing adequate support and resources for a faculty member to be able to undertake research and scholarly activities.

There were some comments about the issue of norms in the unit about course evaluation and peer teaching evaluation. I felt that such things are best addressed at the School/College level and are not necessarily issues that can be resolved at the University level.

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – SIS

All looks good to SIS. They appreciated the development of a common transparent process.

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

Discussion of Proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines-

Arthur A. Dugoni School of Dentistry

Faculty responses

General comments

- We support the idea of having a more standardized process across all schools and colleges in how the unit reviews are conducted and more transparency with the University P&T committee.
- We like the fact that we will have representation from our school and that we may have consecutive representation.
- If the majority and minority views were summarized, the voting would not be anonymous, this is OK and many of our faculty would like to keep the process transparent in terms of recording votes.
- Overall, the document needs to be clear and not leave any procedures open for interpretation
- Although the tenured faculty only votes for tenure decisions, there is concern among several dental school faculty about excluding non-tenured faculty from the unit committee. This may be managed by having the student and untenured members being non-voting members of the unit committee. There is more to clarify and standardize here between all units.

I. Promotion and Tenure Committee Membership

- The committee wants the have permanent “expertise in clinical education and one member with expertise in experimental education.” This seems strange to me, and very undesirable. It gives one academic discipline undue and undesirable influence on the process.
- Because we have a larger number of non-tenured, part-time faculty than most units, our FAPT committee should not be limited to tenured faculty only.
- We support the 5 main changes to membership of the P&T Committee, and the recommendation.

II. Evaluation Committee Report

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

- At P & T Committee level, committee chair should give a summary of the committee's discussion of strengths and weaknesses of a candidate. OK to send the dossiers electronically.
- Re: candidate reviews letter from dean, etc. How does this affect confidentiality? Does it set up a situation where the candidate will be "lobbying" the dean?
- The evaluation committee data to be assessed should include a letter from the Department Chair with his/her recommendations.

III. Inclusion of Third Year Review in Dossier

- No to inclusion of 3rd year review in the P & T report.
- Inclusion of the 3 year review, or other interim reviews, in the dossier would, in my opinion, only be useful if the candidate is denied P or T. The interim information would provide a documented sequence leading to the denial. It would be superfluous information for an approved P or T.

IV. Independent Department Chair and/ or Dean Letter

- We support that the Dean should write an independent review after all committee work is completed and any necessary votes are taken, but prior to submission of the dossier to the University committee.

V. Unit Meeting to Discuss Candidates

- Agree that there needs to be some way to capture the reasons for negative votes of the eligible unit faculty (in the case of Pacific-Dugoni this is all of the tenured faculty) but must this be done anonymously?
- The tenured faculty then vote on tenure applications; appointment and promotion applications should not require an only tenured faculty vote.

VI. External Letters

- The external letters should remain the same as we do them currently...they should comment on the overall qualifications of the candidate, not just candidate's scholarship.
- Authors should not be mentors/friends is OK.
- We support having standard confidentiality forms and requests for evaluations between the different units.

VI. Transmittal Memoranda

Initial Faculty Feedback (Complete comments)

- Accepted manuscripts, which were in the submitted category in the original dossier, should be allowed. Submitted does not really have any weight, but if they are then accepted it should be noted.

VII. New Information After Submission of Dossier

- No comments

VIII. Confidentiality of Evaluation of Faculty

- No comments

IX. Unit Compliance Report to the Provost and the Professional Relations Committee

- It recommends that in the final meeting, the Committee should discuss any units that are significantly in non-compliance with University guidelines, and that a specific description of the issue or issues should be developed. This should be sorted out when it does not bear on someone's tenure. If I understand it correctly, it would muddy the waters quite a bit.

Evaluation Criteria

- Criteria Section: Scholarship recommendations OK; There is concern with the Assessment section recommendations.

Attachment A

- There was strong concern from several faculty and Department Chairs that all members serving on the P & T Committee must be tenured.
- No untenured faculty on the committee seems OK, but why have students (P2, bottom, #3) on any of these committees? It seems inappropriate to have students voting on faculty tenure, although of course their input is very important during the process.