

## PT Recommendations Quick View Synopsis

Recommendations	Topic	School	Summary of Comments
I-1	committee structure	COP	with the expansion of faculty does this dilute the COP component
I-1	committee structure	BSE	supportive of new committee structure, removing the deans etc.
I-1	committee structure	COP	do not like the concept of privileging certain disciplines, would prefer each school having ongoing representation
I-1	committee structure	COP	like that it will be a faculty committee
I-1	committee structure	DEN	Support the five main recommendations
I-1	committee structure	DEN	The non unit based function oriented positions on the committee are undesirable
I-1	committee structure	ESB	each unit should have ongoing representation
I-1	committee structure	ESB	strongly oppose that each School does not have guaranteed representation
I-1	committee structure	ESB	move to more faculty is positive, but why not have all units represented on a continuous basis
I-1	committee structure	ESB	there should be equal representation from each school
I-1	committee structure	ESB	support removal of deans and Provost
I-1	committee structure	LIB	removal of deans is positive
I-1	committee structure	MUS	Conservatory should have on-going representation
I-1	committee structure	PHS	PHS should have a permanent seat on the committee
I-1	committee structure	SOECS	unreasonable to have three representatives from COP
I-1	committee structure	SOECS	each unit should have ongoing representation

## PT Recommendations Quick View Synopsis

Recommendations	Topic	School	Summary of Comments
	committee		
I-3	structure	ESB	student adds little to this process and each school should be represented
	teaching		
II-4	evaluations	COP	should include more than student evaluations
	teaching		
II-4	evaluations	COP	this needs work
	teaching		
II-4	evaluations	COP	not sure more is necessary
	teaching		
II-4	evaluations	MUS	in some disciplines numbers are so small need to address this
	teaching		
II-4	evaluations	MUS	need to strengthen information beyond student evaluations
	teaching		
II-4	evaluations	PHS	student comments be reviewed by faculty and department chair and considered in what is standard for the department but be omitted from the dossier
	peer evaluation		peer evaluation of teaching and examples of evidence to support discussion seems limited to traditional classroom lectures, needs to include what faculty identify as important in the course
II-5	teaching	ESB	to really be considered a peer review of teaching adequate time and "observations" of all aspects of the class must be captured
	peer evaluation		
II-5	teaching	ESB	do we have the resources to obtain usable peer-evaluation data. To do it right is very labor intensive
	peer evaluation		
II-5	teaching	ESB	should be required of all units, need training and provost office should support
	peer evaluation		
II-6	not advocating	ESB	unit evaluation reports reflecting feedback in a balance fashion is a "great idea"
II-6	student letters	ESB	soliciting student letters might introduce bias into evaluation process
	not advocating		
II-6	student letters	ESB	this is a duplication of information when student evaluations are more useful
II-6	student letters	PHS	redundant
II-8	submission	ESB	should be electronic we have the technology
III-1	3rd year review	BSE	rigorous pre-tenure review is important

## PT Recommendations Quick View Synopsis

Recommendations	Topic	School	Summary of Comments
III-1	3rd year review	DEN	would only be useful in a P/T denial mandatory inclusion of this report in the P&T portfolio may detract from the
III-1	3rd year review	ESB	developmental nature of the report
III-1	3rd year review	ESB	not all candidates have this majority of faculty feel this should not be included it is meant to be developmental
III-1	3rd year review	PHS	at the time of review
III-1	3rd Year review	DEN	do not include in the P&T report new information not reviewed by the unit evaluation committee should not be
IV-1	review process	ESB	included must be a transparent process
V-1	explanation of no vote	ESB	when a no vote is recorded in this process an explanation of the rational is very beneficial
V-1	faculty vote	COP	if a faculty member is going to vote on a candidate they must read the dossier the tenure vote should be only tenured faculty but promotion should not be limited
V-1	faculty vote	DEN	to only tenured faculty
V-2	unit meeting	BSE	difficult to have a candid discussion
V-2	unit meeting	ESB	should not start a committee selection out with a challenge process flawed concept, difficult to maintain confidentiality private interviews far more
V-2	unit meeting	ESB	valuable instead of a meeting all faculty should be interviewed privately and the vote and
V-2	unit meeting	ESB	rationale for it captured
V-2	unit meeting	MUS	in favor of this
V-2	unit meeting	PHS	meets but individual issues/information not discuss
V-2	unit meeting	PHS	is this at the departmental or school level candidate should be able to see every document and this would include the
V-4 & VII	transmittal memo	COP	transmittal memo agree that there needs to be a way to capture the reasons for a negative vote but
V-4 & VII	transmittal memo	DEN	does it need to be anonymous adds to the committee work without adding to the process, this information should
V-4 & VII	transmittal memo	ESB	already be captured
V-4 & VII	transmittal memo	MUS	should have standard consistent format

## PT Recommendations Quick View Synopsis

Recommendations	Topic	School	Summary of Comments
V-4 & VII	unit meeting and transmittal memo	LIB	support this
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	use caution with this conception, articles in peer reviewed journals have already been commented on
VI-1	external peer review	COP	redundant since scholarship is peer-reviewed
VI-1	external peer review	COP	should occur for publications in press or in process
VI-1	external peer review	DEN	should not be friends or mentors
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	external peer review letters are not necessary when research is published in peer reviewed journals
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	peer review journal publications more valuable than external peer review letters
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	value of research may be perceived differently over time by external reviewers
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	concern that weight of external review will overshadow a years of publications in peer review journals
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	important to review the portfolio in total, and not be unduly influenced by letters that may reflect a snapshot not a reflection of the work of the faculty member over time or from external reviewer not aligning with Pacific standards
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	not appropriate for Pacific, we are not an R1
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	Is this worth the time and energy Pacific is not an R1
VI-1	external peer review	ESB	strong support, value is to help determine the quality of the journals and other publications
VI-1	external peer review	LIB	concerned about the "peers and aspirants" would be limiting

## PT Recommendations Quick View Synopsis

Recommendations	Topic	School	Summary of Comments
VI-1	external peer review	MUS	friends and mentors should not supply letters however in a small field these lines may be blurred
VI-1	external peer review	PHS	many variable between even peer institutions -- this area needs more thought
VI-1	external peer review	PHS	needs more specificity
VI-3	external peer review	COP	should not be member of dissertation committee or former professors
VI-3	external peer review	COP	need to clearly state assistant professors at other institutions not acceptable
VI-3	external peer review	COP	how would the committee know who is best suited for the role of external reviewer
VI-4	external peer review	PHS	candidate should be able to veto anyone on an external peer review list
VI-4	external peer review	SOECS	the candidate should have an advisory role in selection of the peers
VI-5	external peer review	BSE	this will require extra time and it is critical that the reviewers understand Pacific and the discipline
VI-5	external peer review	DEN	should comment on the overall qualifications not just scholarship
VI-5	external peer review	DEN	support standard confidentiality forms
VI-5	external peer review	PHS	CV's should be submitted by external reviewers
VI-5	external peer review	PHS	specific guidelines and questions should be made available to external reviewers
VI-5	quality submission of new evidence	ESB	the debate over what is quality of research is ongoing making it difficult to define and assess
VII-1	quality submission of new evidence	PHS	recommendation needs clarification
VII-1	transmittal memo	PHS	define format

## PT Recommendations Quick View Synopsis

Recommendations	Topic	School	Summary of Comments
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	BSE	supportive of firm deadline for submission
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	COP	firm deadlines should be very clear
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	COP	agree we need a stop date for new submissions but could it be Jan 1?
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	COP	the faculty should have every opportunity to succeed and submissions should continue to be accepted
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	ESB	no valid reason to prohibit this practice
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	ESB	we should allow new information, quality scholarship rarely follows a precise timetable
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	LIB	do not support this recommendation but if it is going to come to be should be later in this cycle
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	MUS	should be allowed
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	MUS	concern that important information may not be reviewed if our current practice is discontinued
VIII-1	submission of new evidence	MUS	timeline must be clear and consistent
IX-1	confidentiality	ESB	confidentiality must be maintained, but also need a mechanism to report potential biases and violations of process
IX-1	confidentiality	MUS	YES
	best practice	ESB	did the committee really research best practices
	best practice	ESB	is this really a best practice doc? Seems to include limited outside info
	committee structure unit level	DEN	feel that the unit level committee should not be limited to tenured faculty only
	implementation time line	ESB	timing of implementation of guidelines must be clear
	predictive value	ESB	no one has a crystal ball and it is very difficult to predict what someone will do in the future with regards to teaching and scholarship

## PT Recommendations Quick View Synopsis

Recommendations	Topic	School	Summary of Comments
	process	BSE	critical that the process in clear to all involved
	PTC recommendation	COP	should these recommendations be available to the candidate as well since up to this point the process is transparent FHB PTC can make recommendations to units and PRC -- this report did not follow process
	report process	ESB	should only be procedural in nature
	role of PTC	COP	
	tone of process	ESB	seems to set more obstacles in candidates way and make less of a celebration
	Unit Evaluation committee	DEN	committee chair should give a summary of the committee's discussion
	Unit Evaluation committee	DEN	if no tenured faculty on cmte what is rational for students?
	implementation		
	time line	PHS	faculty should have four years advance notice
	promotion of non-tenure track	PHS	important to recognize full time non-tenure track appointments -- should they be evaluated by tenured faculty
	support for faculty	SOECS	if we are invested in the teacher-scholar model we need to invest in our faculty