

Section I - Promotion and Tenure Committee Membership				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
3	I - 1	<p>Nine tenured faculty members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be a faculty committee • Support removal of Deans • Do not like the concept of privileging certain disciplines recommend each school having ongoing representation • The non unit based faculty positions proposed are undesirable • There should be equal representation from each school • Does expanding the committee dilute the voice of the College • Unreasonable to have three representatives from COP 	<p>Provost endorses removal of deans from P and T committee. P and T committees are often better served by being smaller rather than larger to ensure more complete and uniform participation. Provost prefers committee make-up recommended by P and T.</p>
3	I - 2	An Assistant Provost who has faculty status, non-voting, ex- officio	No comments	Discussions should occur without Provost staff in the room. Comments should be reflected in a transmittal memo.
3	I - 3	One student appointed by the ASUOP President	Student adds little to this process	Student role is integral at the unit level, not sure of the contribution at the University PTC level
4	I - 4	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.	No comments	Agree

Section II - Evaluation Committee Report				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
6	II - 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.	Requested Clarification	A faculty member should only be allowed to vote once. This should be either at the unit level or the P and T level.
6	II - 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.	No Comments	Agree

6	II - 3	<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request clarification • Small numbers in certain types of classes require consideration • Evaluation of teaching should include more than student evaluations of teaching • Not sure more is necessary <p>student comments should be reviewed by faculty and department chair and considered in what is standard for the department but be omitted from the dossier</p>	<p>Ultimately Pacific should move toward on-line records of all course evaluations, which allows analysis by dept, school and university. When this occurs all teaching evaluations should be available to P and T committee. IR should do the departmental analysis to ensure comparability and validity.</p>
6	II - 4	<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer evaluation is labor intensive, do we have the resources to do this right? • Should be required but training will be necessary • Provost office should support training • Important to capture all elements of teaching when peer reviews are employed. • Important that it is not just a one time partial observation 	<p>Each unit should develop transparent rubrics for teaching excellence that is included in the dossier. Ultimately broader conversations are needed to consider a University wide metric for teaching excellence.</p>

6	II - 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit evaluation reports reflecting feedback in a balance fashion is a "great idea" • Student letters might introduce bias into process • Duplication of information and student evaluations are more useful 	Provost not enthusiastic about solicited student letters. Student input should be through an organized process, i.e., student course evaluation system.
7	II - 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.	No comments	Agree
7	II - 7	All units should consider submitting the entire dossier electronically to the Provost's office.	Should be electronic, we have the technology	This should be implemented as soon as possible
Section III - Inclusion of Third Year Review in Dossier				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
7	III - 1	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous pre-tenure review is important • Would only be useful in P/T denial • Inclusion may detract from the developmental nature of the report • Do not include 	Third year reviews would be helpful to understand appropriate/adequate mentoring and career development alignment with goals

Section IV - Independent Department Chair and/or Dean Letter				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
7	IV - 1	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New information not reviewed by the unit evaluation committee should not be included • Must be a transparent process 	Agree
Section V - Unit Meeting to Discuss Candidates				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
8	V - 1	Units should adopt a practice to capture the basis for negative and positive votes by eligible unit faculty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support this process • In order for a faculty member to vote he/she must have read the portfolio. • When a no vote is recorded an explanation of the rationale for the vote is beneficial 	Agree

8	V - 2	<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to have a candid discussion • This is a flawed concept, difficulty to maintain confidentiality--private interviews are far more valuable • Instead of a meeting all faculty should be interviewed privately and the vote and rational for the vote captured • Is this at the unit or school level? • Support this concept 	<p>The granting of tenure is one of the most critical decisions made by the faculty. It is a guarantee of life time employment and commits the university for over a million dollars during a career. Written documentation of all evidence in support of or against tenure should be provided. If confidentiality cannot be maintained in discussion, the Provost would like to see a different method for faculty to share opinions anonymously. The method should be up to the unit but could be electronic.</p>
8	V - 3	<p>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.</p>	No Comments	Agree

8	V - 4	<p>A brief transmittal memorandum summarizing the discussion, including capturing the minority voice (if present), should be included in the dossier.</p> <p>A provision on unit consideration of promotion and /or tenure should be included in the Faculty Handbook.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have a standard format • Adds to committee work without adding to the process • This information should have already been captured 	<p>Transmittal memo could be 1-2 paragraphs on faculty comments of strengths, weaknesses or other concerns. This info will not have been captured previously because the dean would not have been present at the faculty meeting to allow open discussion. This is particularly important in a mixed vote so that the reasons for the mixed vote are relayed upward.</p>
---	-------	--	---	--

Page #	Recommendations	Section VI - External Letters		Provost's Response
		P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	

9	VI - 1	<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articles have already gone thru the peer review process--is this necessary? • This will require extra time and it is critical that the reviewers understand Pacific and the discipline. • Concern expressed that the external letters will unduly influence committees and/or overshadow years of publications in peer review journals • Not appropriate for Pacific-- not an R1 • Redundant since scholarship is peer reviewed • Value of research may be perceived differently by reviewers over time • Value is to help determine the quality of the journals and other publications 	<p>This is standard practice at most institutions. External reviewers provide a broader perspective than simply a publication. An external reviewer provides an important context for higher levels of review to evaluate the significance of the work.</p>
---	--------	---	---	---

9	VI - 2	<p>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</p>	No Comments	Agree
---	--------	---	-------------	-------

10	VI - 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not be member of dissertation committee or former professor, should not be mentors or friends • Assistant professors at other institutions not acceptable. • How would the committee know who is best suited for the role of reviewer 	It is important to identify peer reviewers who will provide a thoughtful nonbiased assessment of the quality of the scholarship and the contribution to the discipline
10	VI - 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate should be able to veto anyone on this list • Candidate should have an advisory role in selection of peers 	The candidate should have a voice in this process but not be the selector nor have the final list of reviewers. Agree that opportunity to veto should be provided.
10	VI - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reviewers should comment on the overall qualifications not just scholarship • Support for standard confidentiality forms • The reviewers should submit their CV along with letter • The reviewers should receive specific guidelines and questions to respond to • It is critical that the reviewers understand Pacific and the discipline • The debate over what is quality research is ongoing making it difficult to define and assess. 	To ensure that the reviewer be able to give an accurate, honest peer assessment it is imperative that the identity of the reviewer not be disclosed to the candidate at any point in the process. The candidate should see the letter with identifying information redacted.
10	VI - 6	In the dossier, the external evaluation letters should be separated from the other letters of support.	No Comments	Agree

Section VII - Transmittal Memoranda				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
10	VII - 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate should be able to see every document and this would include the transmittal memo. • The transmittal memo adds to the committee work without adding to the process • This information should already be captured. • The transmittal memos should have a consistent format. 	Candidate should see the transmittal letter from the unit to the dean. It adds to the process because it provides an opportunity to explain to all levels of review the faculty's view of the candidate and reasons for mixed votes, in particular.
11	VII - 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that there needs to be a way to capture the reasons for a negative vote but does it need to be anonymous? • Units in support of this concept. 	Provost feels it should be anonymous to encourage openness and forthright discussions without fear of the candidate attributing comments to an individual.

Section VIII - New Information After Submission of Dossier				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
11	VIII - 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline must be clear and consistent • Agree deadline is necessary but it should be later in the cycle --January 1? • No valid reason to prohibit this practice • New information should be allowed-- quality scholarship rarely follows a precise timetable • Important information may be missed if current practice is changed 	For fairness and equity of review a firm deadline is necessary. Should be prior to the start of the committee review of portfolios

Section IX -Confidentiality of Evaluation of Faculty				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
12	IX - 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.	Confidentiality must be maintained, but also need a mechanism to report potential biases and violations of process	Agree

Section X - Unit Compliance Report to the Provost and the Professional Relations Committee				
Page #	Recommendations	P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
12	X - 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.	No Comments	Agree. It is the responsibility of the dean and department chair to ensure process is followed
12	X - 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.	The FHB states that PTC can make recommendations to units and PRC	In the spirit of keeping the P and T committee a faculty only committee, the chair of P and T should refer any problems in procedure to the Assistant Provost for Faculty Affairs for follow up

Recommendations		Evaluation Criteria		
Page #		P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
13		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.	No Comments	Agree. There is no guarantee of tenure. Meeting minimum standards is an indication that an individual should be eligible to apply for tenure.
13		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.	No one has a crystal ball and it very difficult to predict what someone will do in the future with regards to scholarship and teaching	Every effort should be made to ensure that the candidate is on a productive sustainable path beyond the effort put forward to receive tenure.
Recommendations		Assessment		
Page #		P and T Committee Recommendations	Initial Faculty Feedback Summary	Provost's Response
14		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.	No Comments	Assessment is very important as Pacific seeks to develop a culture of evidence for continuous improvement. A faculty member's role in assessment at the course, program or unit level should be recognized and valued.