

Promotions and Tenure Report to the Provost

April 4, 2012

Introduction

The University Promotions and Tenure Committee (the Committee), a joint faculty and administrative committee, is responsible for rendering recommendations to the Provost and the President concerning cases of individual's promotion and tenure. The Committee is also charged with completing tasks assigned to it by administrators or the appropriate faculty governance unit. Faculty Handbook § 6.1. The 2011- 2012 Committee was charged by the Provost with the task of considering best practices to be used in the unit and University tenure and promotion process. This report addresses recommendations to improve the process employed by individual units to evaluate members of the faculty for promotion and tenure as well recommendations addressing how information can be best presented in the dossiers.

The report is written for two primary reasons. First, to provide future evaluation committees and candidates for promotion and/or tenure consideration examples of best practices, which will assist the Committee's evaluation of the candidates' dossier. Second, the report provides the Committee's answers to suggestions made by the Provost after observing committee deliberations for one year as well as issues that the committee has reflected upon. Some of these changes are designed to provide the Committee with better information about the evaluation provided by the unit.

It is not the intent of the Committee to recommend modifications to existing unit evaluation criteria for promotion and tenure, but to recommend improved procedural practice guidelines. Adoption of many of the recommendations will require amending the University guidelines contained in the Faculty Handbook. Since some units have incorporated University guidelines into their unit guidelines, changes to the University guidelines will necessitate changes to unit guidelines. This report is intended as the starting point for initiating the faculty governance process for consideration of Faculty Handbook amendments.

Although this report does not recommend changes to the University and/or unit promotion and tenure evaluation criteria, the Committee's consideration of cases from across the University has resulted in observations about promotion and tenure criteria. These observations are included in the report for discussion and consideration for inclusion in unit and/or University promotion and tenure evaluation criteria.

Recommendations

Background:

The tenure and promotion process is governed by University and unit guidelines. The University guidelines are included in the Faculty Handbook §§7.5.1, 7.5.2, 7.5.3, 7.5.4, and 7.5.5. Each unit has adopted specific guidelines and procedures that govern how faculty are evaluated for promotion and tenure. Most units have updated these policies in recent years.

Attachment A provides the most current procedures for submitting evaluation reports and dossiers to the Committee. A general outline of the process is included below:

- The faculty candidate prepares a self-evaluation.
- The unit evaluation committee is comprised of tenured faculty from the unit, a student and external faculty member from another unit. Faculty candidate participation in the selection process varies among the units, but in some units candidates select the committee members.
- An evaluation committee gathers relevant information on teaching, advising, scholarship and service and prepares a report analyzing whether the candidate meets the unit evaluation criteria. The evaluation committee makes a recommendation on promotion and/or tenure.
- The evaluation committee report is forwarded to the eligible voting faculty. The eligible faculty vote on the evaluation committee recommendation. In some but not all units, the faculty vote is preceded by a unit meeting to discuss the case. In other units, the committee report is made available for review and eligible faculty vote by submission.
- The evaluation committee report is submitted to the Department Chair, if applicable, and the Dean of the Unit. The Department Chair and the Dean each prepare a letter with their recommendations on promotion and tenure. The letters are reviewed by the candidate and included in the case dossier.
- The dossier is submitted to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Committee makes a recommendation on promotion and/or tenure. In some instances, the Committee sends requests for additional information from the unit before making a recommendation.
- The dossier and recommendations from all levels of consideration are referred to the Provost for recommendation and the President for decision.

I. Promotion and Tenure Committee Membership

The current Committee is composed of the following members:

1. Seven Tenured faculty members chosen as follows:
 - Three from the College of the Pacific, one from each Division.
 - Four from the other Schools and Colleges and the Library, however, no two of them shall be from the same School. The faculty members are nominated by the Professional Relations Committee and elected by the faculty at large for three year overlapping terms. No faculty member may be elected to serve for two consecutive terms. No school, other than the College of the Pacific, may have consecutive representation.
2. Two deans, appointed by the Provost: no dean may be appointed to serve two consecutive three year terms.
3. One student appointed by the ASUOP President.
4. The Provost, or the Associate Provost, or the Assistant Provost is an ex-officio, non-voting member.

The Committee is currently a joint faculty administrative committee. The Provost, Associate Provost or the Assistant Provost is a non-voting ex-officio member of the committee. The Provost has traditionally served as the ex-officio member and the two Deans, appointed by the Provost, are the administrative members. The Provost makes a recommendation to the President on each case separate from the Committee's recommendation. Faculty Handbook § 7.4.6 The University guidelines require independent review at each level of consideration with each individual only given one vote in the process.

Five main changes in membership are recommended with the major goal to make this a faculty committee. First, the two Deans should not be committee members. In each candidate's review, Deans have a significant role since it is their responsibility to write an independent review of the candidate, which is forwarded to the Committee in the candidate's dossier. Deans on the committee are required by Committee policy to recuse themselves when cases from their units are considered, limiting the Committees' access to particular expertise on individual files. Second, the Provost should not be a committee member since the Committee is advisory to the Provost and the President. It is considered advisable to have an Assistant Provost who has faculty status serve in a non-voting ex-officio capacity to both clarify process and provide a resource for policy as needed. Third, having at least one committee member with expertise in clinical education and one member with expertise in experimental education would be optimal and should be a consideration as ballots are being considered. Fourth, in line with the one university with three campuses concept, membership from the Sacramento Campus and the San Francisco Campus should be continuous. Fifth, the individual providing administrative support to the Academic Council should be present at the meetings to prepare the transmittal memorandum providing the recommendation of the Committee to the Provost.

Recommendation. The proposed Committee membership:

1. Nine tenured faculty members

- **Three from the College of the Pacific, one from each Division**
- **One from the Sacramento Campus**
- **One from the San Francisco Campus**
- **Four from the other Schools and Colleges and the Library, however, no two of them shall be from the same School.**

The faculty members are nominated by the Professional Relations Committee and elected by the faculty at large for three year overlapping terms. No faculty member may be elected to serve for two consecutive terms. No school, other than the College of the Pacific, the Sacramento Campus, and the San Francisco Campus, may have consecutive representation. In making nominations, the balance of the committee should be kept in mind to ensure experimental science expertise and clinical education expertise is maintained if not identified in other representatives.

- 2. An Assistant Provost who has faculty status, non-voting, ex-officio**
- 3. One student appointed by the ASUOP President**

The Committee should be staffed by the Academic Council's administrative support. Faculty Handbook § 6.3.5 Promotion and Tenure Committee should be amended as discussed above.

II. Evaluation Committee Report

Each level of review for promotion and/or tenure is independent but as outlined in the Faculty Handbook the primary responsibility for evaluating faculty performance lies with the unit evaluation committee. Faculty Handbook §7.5.5.a. The unit evaluation committee report is critical because it represents an evaluation by peers who have a unique understanding of the standards of the discipline and the mission of the unit.

The most useful evaluation committee reports provide a balanced analysis of whether a candidate's teaching, including advising, scholarship and service meets unit guidelines, rather than advocacy of a conclusion. The evaluation committee should provide a conclusion at the end of each section on teaching, scholarship and services as to whether the candidate meets or does not meet the standards for tenure and/or promotion. If the committee does not reach agreement on the conclusion in each section, the majority and minority opinions should be thoroughly analyzed. The inclusion of a minority view permits a balanced analysis for discussion by unit faculty and other levels of review. Unit guidelines vary on whether committee members vote on the report and promotion or tenure at the committee level or with unit faculty. If the committee members vote as a committee, their votes should be clearly indicated in the committee report.

Many dossiers provide evaluations or letters from former students, graduates and advisees. Evaluations from these groups should be conducted in an objective manner designed to secure a range of opinions about the candidate. For example, letters should request evaluation, feedback, or opinions about a candidate's teaching and/or advising and not merely letters of support. To ensure candid evaluation letters, candidates should not solicit evaluation letters but are free to solicit letters of support.

It is particularly important that the report analyze any teaching, scholarship or service challenges the evaluation committee has identified or that are contained in the dossier. Ignoring this aspect of the evaluation is not helpful to the consideration by the Committee and ultimately, the faculty candidate under review. The Committee frequently notes in the dossier areas where a faculty candidate has had challenges. However, the unit committee's analysis of these challenges is often missing from the report. An analysis of challenges faced by candidates and how the candidate has addressed any issue is critical and a highly positive factor to a balanced evaluation committee report.

In drafting the reports, evaluation committee chairs should remember the report will be reviewed by colleagues from outside the discipline. The report should avoid use of jargon specific to the discipline and should try to educate those outside the department about the discipline. It is also important that the report analyze the candidate in the context of unit and discipline teaching and advising, scholarship and service expectations.

Student evaluations of the candidate's teaching are critical to an evaluation of a candidate's teaching. Because of the disparity in guidelines across the University in the nature and expectations for teaching evaluations it is most helpful when evaluations are summarized and

compared to expectations and norms in the unit. A fair assessment of teaching requires a review of all of the courses taught during the entire period the candidate has taught at the University. A quantitative summary of all courses, comparing the candidate to unit norms, if norms are kept by the unit should be included in the dossier. Quantitative summaries are helpful for comparing candidates to unit norms but access to student comments is necessary to best understand students' perception of the course and the instructor. If possible, complete evaluations, including student comments, should also be included but often the number of courses taught during the relevant period will make that requirement unduly burdensome. In that case, the dossier should contain a fair sampling of course evaluations with student comments. The evaluation committee, rather than the candidate, should select the evaluation samples to be included in the dossier

Although student evaluations are critical to the evaluation process, peer evaluations of teaching are extremely helpful as they provide a different perspective of a faculty member's teaching skills. The most useful peer evaluations are based on observations or other direct evidence of teaching, e.g. review of syllabi or other teaching materials, rather than hearsay from other sources about the teaching of a faculty candidate. Evaluation of teaching should be based on evidence gathered in a systematical, fair method to ensure that accurate information is included in the report. The Committee has observed that some units allow peers to comment on a faculty candidate's teaching based on hearsay student and colleague statements. Such information is not helpful to an accurate assessment of teaching skills.

Under University guidelines advising is a part of teaching and should be addressed in each candidate's evaluation report. Advising responsibilities differ among the units so it is important that the evaluation committee report not simply provide a quantitative evaluation of advising but also describe the advising expectations for that unit..

University guidelines require that an evaluation committee normally include a student of the faculty member being evaluated. Faculty Handbook § 7.5.5.e. Evaluation committees of different units employ their student members in a variety of ways. One method that is not useful to the process is to include a student member's individual views of the faculty member's teaching. The subjective opinion of a single student does not provide objective evidence for the Committee to review.

The promotion and tenure process is controlled by both the University and unit guidelines. Many of the unit guidelines incorporate the language from the University guidelines but not all guidelines do. Providing a copy of all guidelines ensures that faculty candidates are made aware of the unit, and University evaluation criteria and process requirements.

As a reflection of the University's commitment to sustainability, most units have submitted materials in the dossier on flash drives as requested in Appendix, A. Such submissions allow easy access and reproduction for the Committee and subsequent reviews. All units should consider submitting the complete dossier electronically.

Recommendations:

- 1. 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. If the evaluation committee cannot reach agreement on an individual section, both the majority and minority views on the whether the candidate meets tenure and/or promotion should be included in the document. The report should clearly indicate whether committee members voted at the committee level or with unit faculty. Faculty Handbook § 7.5.5.c should be amended to include this provision.**
- 2. The evaluation committee report should include information that assists Committee members from other disciplines in understanding the discipline evaluation criteria standards. For example, in the scholarship section, when relevant, 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. 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.**
- 3. 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.**
- 4. Evaluation committee reports should clearly state the method of any peer teaching evaluation. 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 rather than hearsay reports from students or other colleagues. Faculty Handbook § 7.5.5.c should be amended to include this provision.**
- 5. 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.**

6. **Each unit should distribute a copy of the By-Laws of the University, College of the Pacific, if applicable, as well as the unit guidelines to faculty candidates for promotion and /or tenure at the time of hiring. Faculty Handbook § 7.5.5.b should be amended to include this provision.**
7. **All units should consider submitting the entire dossier electronically to the Provost's office.**

III. Inclusion of Third Year Review in Dossier

The University Guidelines require the third-year evaluation of tenure-track faculty. Faculty Handbook §7.5.3. Currently third-year reviews, and the Deans' summary are transmitted to the Provost. Third-year reviews are not a required component of the promotion and/or tenure dossier. Although third-year reviews are not required, some candidates submit their third-year review. The most frequent inclusion is in cases where a debate exists as to whether a candidate has remedied deficiencies identified in the third-year review. Additionally, references to a candidate's third-year review are contained in the dossier when Dean and chair's letters cite a portion of the third-year review. The current procedure creates inconsistency among candidate dossiers and provides information from the report selected by an administrator or the candidate. A balanced and fair use of the third-year review requires a consistent policy and the inclusion of the report in its entirety rather than portions of the report selected by letter writers. It would also be helpful for the Committee to have this document in the dossier so that the review can follow progress made in rectifying any identified weaknesses. Inclusion of the report allows the Committee to note when deficiencies were noted and whether assistance was provided to the candidate to overcome identified deficiencies.

Recommendation:

**The Third Year Review will be included in the candidate's dossier.
Faculty Handbook § 7.5.5.c should be amended to include this provision.**

IV. Independent Department Chair and/ or Dean Letter

In the review process of the candidate, a Dean's letter and in most cases, a Chairperson's letter is provided. Currently, some of these letters are very lengthy and mostly repeat what is in the file from the evaluation committee report. There is no need for the Dean or the Chair to repeat or summarize what is already in the file. The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent review of the candidate and not be a redundant document.

Recommendation:

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.

V. Unit Meeting to Discuss Candidates

Unit faculty are frequently in an excellent position to evaluate whether a faculty member under consideration for promotion and/or tenure meets the unit guidelines. Units have employed different methods to gather the opinion of voting eligible faculty. Typically, the opinion of the eligible unit faculty is conveyed in the dossiers by the unit vote which is included in the Dean's letter as outlined in Appendix A. Some units are still reporting the faculty vote in the evaluation report or the evaluation committee report. When there is not a unanimous vote by the unit, there is frequently no information in the dossier reporting the basis of the negative votes.

It would be extremely useful for the Committee to have the basis for negative assessments to be clearly articulated in the transmittal of the eligible faculty vote. In order to elicit the basis for eligible faculty votes, units should employ a process to gather all perspectives on a candidate. One alternative is having a meeting of unit faculty to discuss the candidate portfolios and capturing the points of discussion anonymously to be compiled as a transmittal memorandum from the unit. This would allow the full discussion to be related to the Dean and ultimately, the Committee so that the majority and minor discussions/points could be considered.

Recommendations:

- 1. Units should adopt a practice to capture the basis for negative and positive votes by eligible unit faculty.**
- 2. In most instances, a meeting to discuss the dossier and share information prior to taking the actual vote of the group is the most effective process. In cases where a group discussion is not possible, the unit must determine a process for sharing of opinions and incorporate this into the evaluation for Promotion and Tenure.**
- 3. To preserve the independent evaluation required at each stage of the tenure and promotion process, the Dean and the Chairperson, if the unit guidelines require the Chairperson to submit a separate recommendation, should not be present at the case discussion meeting.**
- 4. A brief transmittal memorandum summarizing the discussion, including capturing the minority voice (if present), should be included in the dossier.**

A provision on unit consideration of promotion and /or tenure should be included in the Faculty Handbook.

VI. External Letters

Many units include external letters in the dossier. Some letters are solicited as letters of support, by evaluation committees or the candidate. Other letters are evaluations of the candidate's scholarship, and others request an evaluation by an external review of whether the candidate meets the University and Unit guidelines for tenure and/or promotion. The Committee has found external letters that discuss quality of scholarship to be the most helpful. Evaluation letters that request the reviewer state whether the candidate meet the University and unit guidelines are not useful since external reviews are not familiar with University and unit standards. In particular, external reviewers will not have all the relevant information on a candidate's teaching, e.g. teaching evaluations. In order to produce an objective analysis of the candidate's teaching, scholarship and service, the unit evaluation committee should not solicit letters of support but letters of evaluation. Candidates would be free to provide letters of support for inclusion in the dossier if that practice is permitted by unit guidelines.

Too frequently, even letters requesting an objective analysis of scholarship are requested from mentors rather than objective external experts in the discipline of the candidate. 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. The writer should be able to objectively evaluate the faculty candidate's research/publications/presentations and their contribution to the discipline. The Committee recognizes that in some disciplines, the pool of available evaluators is so small that at least some of the reviewers will have at least a professional relationship with the candidate, but that relationship should be clearly disclosed in the letter and an explanation in the unit evaluation committee report stating why the reviewer is the most appropriate person to review the candidate's scholarship.

To ensure that external reviews provide an honest assessment of the candidate's scholarship, confidentiality provisions should be included in external review solicitation letters.

Recommendations:

- 1. 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. Authors should not be mentors/friends. The relationship, if any, of the external reviewer to the candidate should be clearly indicated. If the reviewer has a relationship with the candidate, an explanation should be included in the unit evaluation committee report stating why the reviewer is the most appropriate person to review the candidate's scholarship.**
- 2. All letters should be confidential and the candidate should only view redacted letters that do not identify the institution or individual who wrote the letter**

3. **Letters should be requested by the chairperson of the evaluation committee or other relevant unit committee or individual, e.g. an evaluation review committee, and selected from a list compiled by the Department Chairperson, the candidate may provide names for potential reviewers but may not select the reviewers.**
4. **The candidate should see the list and have the opportunity to veto for cause a potential letter writer, but should not know who is ultimately requested to write a letter.**
5. **Letter writers should be given copies of the candidate's scholarship under consideration and the relevant unit guidelines. Reviewers should also receive a standard confidentiality form along with the standard request for evaluation of the candidate. ATTACHMENT B**
6. **In the dossier, the external evaluation letters should be separated from the other letters of support.**

The Faculty Handbook should be amended to include the above provisions on external reviews of scholarship.

VII. Transmittal Memoranda

When making a decision on promotions and tenure, the President must rely on the candidate dossier and the recommendations from each previous level of review. Votes by the unit faculty and the committee are provided but not the basis for those votes. A transmittal memorandum briefly summarizing the basis of votes, would better convey faculty recommendations on each candidate. Very often, the Committee receives the vote of the department or the unit faculty reported only as numbers received in a secret vote. The Committee needs both the majority and the minority opinions.

Recommendations:

1. **The unit committee report should include a transmittal memorandum. The transmittal memorandum should be prepared by the chair of the unit evaluation committee and should include the vote by eligible unit faculty and summarize the basis of majority and any minority views about whether the candidate meets the standards for teaching, scholarship and service. The summary of majority and minority opinions should be based on the discussion in the unit meeting or other process the unit employs to gather eligible unit faculty views. The transmittal memorandum should not disclose or be drafted in a way to identify the opinions of individual faculty members.**

- 2. For each case of promotion and/or tenure, the Committee should summarize the basis of the majority and any views about whether the candidate meets the standards for teaching, scholarship and service. The transmittal memorandum should be based on the Committee's discussion of the dossier. The transmittal memorandum should not disclose or be drafted in a way to identify the opinions of individual committee members. The transmittal memorandum should reflect the rationale for the vote and include all aspects, support and nonsupport of the vote.**

The Faculty Handbook should be amended to include a provision on transmittal memoranda.

VIII. New Information After Submission of Dossier

All dossiers are due in the Provost's office generally on the first Monday of November. A uniform submission date permits the committee to consider files and submit a recommendation in a timely fashion so that the Provost and President can make a decision on or before the end of the academic year.

After the dossiers are submitted some units and candidates have submitted additional information to the dossier, including a change in the units vote and/or recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. This purpose seems implicitly acceptable under the University guidelines.

There has been confusion about what new evidence should be submitted and whether units, chairs and deans should submit new recommendations after reviewing new information. Additional review at multiple levels delays the process at the University level and potentially compromises the ability of the Committee to complete their consideration of dossiers in a timely fashion.

Recommendation:

- 1. 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.**

IX. Confidentiality of Evaluation of Faculty

In the past, information about files and the tenure and evaluation process for individual candidates has been the subject of gossip and rumors. Discussions outside of the deliberation process are inappropriate and unfair to faculty candidates. Such discussions have also spread incorrect information about the process. The evaluation of candidates for tenure and/or promotion is a serious matter. Each level of review demands a critical and honest assessment of faculty colleagues. Every individual involved in the process must accept the responsibility to protect the integrity of every candidate and the process itself. To respect the candidate and the process all information associated with the review (thus, materials submitted by the candidate or others for review, or generated by the review process) must be regarded as strictly confidential by persons involved in the review. All matters related to the deliberations at all levels should

remain confidential. In addition, faculty candidates or members of the unit are discouraged from approaching committee members at any time concerning the disposition of their review and should understand that inquiries of this type are deemed entirely inappropriate. Confidentiality of the promotion and tenure process is to be respected forever, not just during that particular year of review.

Recommendation:

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

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

Each year, the Committee meets with the Provost for a final report on the actions taken by the Provost and the President in regard to the ultimate decision made on each candidate reviewed. At that meeting, a letter to the President covering issues identified by the Committee which need the potential attention of the President is finalized. But these issues do not involve issues where individual units are significantly out of compliance with the University guidelines for promotion and tenure. When a unit is not following the University or unit guidelines, a proper record is not gathered for the promotion and tenure process which results in a delay in the process when the committee requests additional information. Such a request may cause anxiety by candidates who may interpret a request by the Committee as evidence of a negative committee recommendation.

Recommendations:

- 1. In the final meeting, the Committee should discuss any units that are significantly in non-compliance with University guidelines. A specific description of the issue or issues should be developed.**
- 2. The Assistant Provost, ex-officio member of the Committee will contact the Dean of the unit involved and set up a meeting to discuss the issue with the chair or co-chairs of the Committee. At the meeting the Assistance Provost will take minutes of the meeting which would be forwarded to the PRC only in the case where unit standards would have to be amended in order to insure compliance with University guidelines. Faculty Handbook § 6.3.5 should be amended to include this provision.**

Evaluation Criteria

This report does not make recommendations for changes to unit or University evaluation criteria for promotion and tenure but the Committee has noted some issues that are relevant to unit and University guidelines.

Scholarship

The University guidelines require “A sustained record demonstrating high quality scholarship or artistic achievements in the field of academic appointment.” Faculty Handbook § 7.5.4.a The diversity of programs and disciplines at Pacific does not lend themselves to uniform scholarship and artistic achievement evaluation criteria. In lieu of uniformity, scholarship and artistic achievements should be evaluated across the units by comparable standards that reflect a uniform standard of quality and productivity. Most units currently have scholarship evaluation criteria that reflect high quality expectations of their discipline and are comparable to the standards of other units of the University. Some units, however, have scholarship evaluation criteria in which the scholarly expectations for productivity and quality are not comparable to other University units. Those units that are not comparable to University standards employ scholarship evaluation criteria that are exclusively quantitative and are well below the expectations employed by other units employing similar quantitative standards and peer/aspirant peer institutions.

Scholarship and artistic achievement evaluation criteria are designed to measure both productivity and quality under University guidelines, “evaluation of scholarly and artistic achievements should emphasize quality.” Faculty Handbook § 7.5.4.a Scholarship or artistic achievement criteria that are expressed exclusively in quantitative measures in guidelines do not adequately convey the University emphasis on quality. Quality scholarship is a university requirement for tenure and/or promotion and unit guidelines should clearly indicate what is valued in the discipline and what it means to be a faculty member of distinction in the discipline.

Similarly many unit scholarship and artistic achievement promotion and tenure evaluation criteria explicitly include a provision that evaluation requires consideration of the quantity and pattern of productivity, considering the quality of the scholarly and artistic achievement, indicate that scholarly growth will continue after promotion and/or tenure. Other units do not include such a provision. Considering the predictive value of scholarship and artistic achievement is a principle that should be consistently applied by units and should be clearly communicated to candidates for promotion and/or tenure by inclusion in University and/or unit guidelines.

Units that currently employ an exclusive quantitative measure should consider inclusion of a provision that meeting the quantitative measures is a minimum achievement for consideration for promotion and/or tenure but that meeting the department's minimum quantitative standards does not entitle the candidate to a positive recommendation, in that high quality scholarship is required in addition to meeting any quantitative requirement.

Units should consider whether their current scholarship and artistic achievement evaluation criteria adequately consider the predictive value of scholarship and artistic achievements and whether there is an indication that scholarly growth will continue under tenure.

Assessment

The University has adopted assessment principles into the most recent mission statement. Some units have incorporated an evaluation of how or whether a faculty member has incorporated assessment into his or her courses. Other units should consider the extent that assessment is relevant to faculty evaluations.

**Promotion and Tenure Committee
Procedures for Submitting Evaluation Reports**

Prepared by: Office of the Provost

Updated: September 2009

Procedures for Candidates

All of the candidate's primary materials should be included in one 3-ring binder to promote better organization and clarity. Please do not use sheet protectors.

The contents that are required in the binder are the following:

- A statement indicating if you prefer to be reviewed by either the old or new guidelines
- A narrative of your self-evaluation which addresses; teaching, philosophy, scholarship and/or creative activity, service to a unit, the university, community, profession or discipline
- A statement on your role and any evaluation of this role in advising students
- A dated signature of the faculty member being evaluated should be included on the cover sheet to indicate that the faculty member has read the entire portfolio including unit committee's report and the dean's evaluation, and has had the required number of days to respond
- A current curriculum vita
- Course/teaching evaluations and summary data
- Selective samples (or appropriate representation) of scholarship and/or creative activity should be included
- Inclusion of any congratulatory letters should be highly selective

Procedures for Committee:

- Untenured faculty members should not serve on promotion or tenure review committees.
- Units and departments should include a statement in the candidate's portfolio which clarifies how the unit and department weighs teaching, scholarship and service and how those standards apply in regard to this particular candidate conducted over several years
- A summary of student evaluations must be included in the candidate's portfolio along with a summary of how these evaluations compare to other faculty members within that department/unit reflect the range of credited course work for which the candidate is responsible
- Should analyze and contextualize the nature and significance of the candidate's teaching, scholarship and service in relationship to the standards and expectations of the candidate's department and discipline

- A section on the candidate's performance in regard to student advising
- Statements regarding the candidate's strengths and areas of potential growth
- Include evidence that colleagues within the department have provided evaluation comments
- All tenured members of the department or unit should vote on the candidate's readiness for promotion and/or tenure unless the promotion and tenure vote has been delegated to a particular committee, or an explanation should be given as to why a vote was not cast by a particular faculty member. The results of the vote should be included in the committee's report
- The report should be signed and dated by all committee members and forwarded to your Dean's office

Please refer to the unit guidelines and (7.4 & 7.5) the Faculty Handbook for the complete procedures.

Procedures for Dean/Unit:

1. Must include a signed and dated cover sheet
2. Ensure that all items on the Promotions and Tenure checklist have been addressed in the candidate's portfolio
3. A signed and dated recommendation letter from the dean, with a clear recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure is required
4. Dean's office will forward an electronic copy of the following files to the Provost Office via USB flash drive:
 - a. Committee's Evaluation
 - b. Dean's Letter
 - c. Curriculum Vitae
 - d. Chair's Letter
 - e. Self Evaluation

Please Note: Supplemental documentation may be submitted to one's Promotion and Tenure binder. Supplemental material will have to go through each step of the evaluation process with time for review by the candidate, the evaluation committee, department chair (if appropriate) and the unit/dean. This process must allow the candidate time for a final review and/or comment on any material which will be added to his/her portfolio.

ATTACHMENT B

The University of California's confidentiality policy regarding external letters of recommendation:

Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation in accordance with California law and University policy, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

The University of the Pacific's attorney would have to develop a like document for use by the units.