<div align="center">

P&T Committee Report 2020-2021

April 2021

</div>

Members:

Darlene Amendolair (Chair)
Elizabeth Cole (Co-Chair)
Greta Freeman
Mohammad Hameed
Mary Lou Hightower
Ann Hoover
Camile McCutcheon
Andrew Myers
Anslem Omoike

1. Reviewed 15 Files Reviewed

   a. Ten to Associate Professor

   b. Five to Full Professor

2. P&T Committee elected a Co-chair at the first meeting. The Co-Chair works with the Chair throughout the year to create a smooth transition. Due to the complexity and responsibilities of the P&T Chair, the committee member felt that having a Co-chair will benefit the faculty the Committee serves.

3. Due to the pandemic, The files for P&T had to move to a virtual format. With the support of the Center of …. the P&T process moved to an electronic platform. Since the use of an electronic file review had been approved since 2017, the Committee initiated and conducted the P&T file review using Chalk & Wire ePortfolio digital platform.

   a. A survey was distributed to all of the participants who used Chalk & Wire for P&T. The results were very favorable to continue using this file delivery method and review. The candidate's responses were particularly encouraging. Although the peer review, Dean/directors, and P&T committee members expressed positive remarks and were in with most groups in favor of continuing using the file delivery method and review. (Results: See Attached)

   b. In collaboration with Dr. Kusch, the survey's suggestions will be incorporated into improving and providing training in the future. Improvement in plans for training, access to help, some of the functions have already been made for this year.

4. Unit Criteria reviewed (SOEHHP, FACS, and NSE)

   a. Two of the three Unit criteria were reviewed and approved for publication. NSE's unit criteria have been reviewed and awaiting NSE to resend for review.

   b. Recommendations have been made to the provost concerning updated unit criteria. I

encourage all units to review their current criteria. Especially since many did not include the evaluation term *ineffective* in their current versions, and the development of post-tenure measures should be considered at this time.

   c. Propose a Unit Criteria Standard: to provide guidelines in the development and processing of Unit Criteria. (Proposed in Appendix VIII).

5. Reviewed and submitted updates for FM Chapter 2 related to the P&T committee

6. Recommended Faculty Manual Revisions for P&T.

   a. Chapter 5

   b. Appendix V = File Preparation (Procedural guide for the preparation of the P&T file).

   c. Appendix VI = File Review – (Procedural guide for the review process for all P&T File reviews),

   d. Appendix VII = All other Reviews (Procedural guide for reviews (annual, Instructor, post-tenure)

   e. Appendix VIII – Calendar Template, Unit Criteria Procedures, and other documents (samples of letters)

7. Other recommendations:

   a. All committee members strongly support the ePortfolio as the only delivery method for Files for Review (See ePortfolio Survey Results).

   b. All committee members support that both the summary and support files will be forwarded to Columbia.

   c. All committee members agreed that combining the Cover Page and the Summary Voting form would eliminate redundancy.

        i. The candidate will complete the top portion of the form.

        ii. Peer Review/ All reviewers will complete the voting portion of the form.

   d. There was a discussion related to changing the teaching summary table for P&T. The decision is to wait and have further discussion and evaluate its use in the Annual Review.

8. P&T Workshops:

   a. The workshop for Spring 2020 was conducted virtually, with a recording of the session made available to the faculty via the P&T Webpage.

   b. The Spring 2021workshop is scheduled for April 15, 2021, 2 – 4 pm, and April 21, 2-4 pm on TEAMS. This will be recorded, and a recording and PowerPoint presentation will be made to the faculty.

9. Preparation of next year's activities:

   a. Master Calendar has been submitted for 2021-2022.

   b. Calendar changes:

   c. Peer review will receive additional time divided into two distinct activities.

   d. Aug 19 to September 10, 202 to provide support and guidance to the candidate for file submission

   e. September 11 – October 1: File review and deliberations. The candidate will not be permitted access to their file during the deliberation period.

   f. The final File will be forward NLT March 31st.

   g. Letters for Faculty meeting their penultimate year have been forward to the eligible faculty.

   h. Peer Review Workshop is proposed.

Submitted Respectively,

Dr. Darlene Amendolair

Darlene Amendolair, Ph.D. RN
Associate Professor
Chair P&T

October 19, 2021

Promotion and Tenure Committee Survey: ePortfolio (Chalk and Wire)

Survey distributed January 26-February 15, 2021 (N=60)

Role of Survey Respondents
Note: survey respondents could select more than one option. Number of selections may exceed number of total respondents

	Percentage of Responses	Count
Candidate	29.69%	19
Dean/Director/Chair	23.44%	15
Peer Review Committee Member	26.56%	17
Peer Review Committee	14.06%	9
Promotion and Tenure Committee	6.25%	4
Total	100%	64

Please list the advantages of this modality for submission and review of Promotion and Tenure Files

Simplifies process by indicating exactly what to upload where. Makes it a low-touch experience since physical files don't exchange hands. Even beyond the pandemic, I see this as a benefit.
Multiple people can access files at the same time; easy to work with files if you are restricted to working from home; no need to physically print off and organize paper files.
Paperless, organized, timely updated
Not having to tote the physical files around.
It may cut down on the managing of documentation.
I liked it being virtual.
Access to the file
can review from anywhere
There was less repeating of information.
More efficient process Easy to search and review files
Chalk & Wire is a nightmare...We struggled with it during last Peer Review.
Easy to use, eliminates all the printing and paper use. Made it so that committees focused on what was done in the review period and less so on minutia.
None

Flexibility to view from home
Versus a paper portfolio, an electronic one is almost a no-brainer. The question is the format and platform for the electronic portfolio. A second question is the content of the portfolio, but I think that is outside of the scope of this survey.
This process was so much easier than the paper files! Please keep using this!
So many, I can't count them...Ease of submitting materials. Ease of reviewing materials. Saving paper, time, energy and hassles associated with physical materials.
easy to use once trained to do so
Easier process on both sides (candidate and reviewer); less paper
Quicker, I have files I need as electronic for future reviews, less paper. Wish academia wasn't such a stickler for not trying a new process. This should have been started 6-8 years ago. When I was hired, I was baffled that it wasn't electronic yet.
As a candidate, I thought that the submission process was fairly easy once I understood how the Chalk and Wire system worked. Serving as a member on another peer review committee, I liked how I was able to review the materials from home at a time that was convenient for me. I was not restricted by another person's schedule.
Hypothetically? It eliminates all the pain associated with dealing with multiple paper files.
Electronic is always better. Streamlines the process and access to files is easier.
Remote review
For me, this modality of submission was easier. It saved time in preparing, compiling and submitting the documents. For instance, time saving in printing the documents, creating the tabs etc. I appreciate Dr. Kusch for her help in this process, she was there whenever I had any questions. I would get prompt response from her.
Shareability ease of access equity to material effortless edits
There are clear benefits of an e-portfolio system, and I hope there is not consideration of returning to paper.
Much easier to access files than looking at printed books. It also seems much easier to submit all files for the people who are up for review.
It was very convenient to be review the files after typical business hours! Much appreciated!
I think the advantages largely outweigh the disadvantages. For the Committee, everyone can view the file without having to wait to pass around the binder. For the candidate, they can't the file up and get feedback built into the system about if there are any issues uploading, etc. It's better for the environment and many of the files we use are electronic anyway, so it was more work intensive to print them out anyway. I think it makes sense to keep using this in the future.
Able to review files anytime without competition for access. Easy to go back and forth between summary binder and supporting files.
It was easier to find and search for materials in an electronic format. It was much more convenient to be able to review in any location (as opposed to scheduling time in the library). More than one person could review the materials at the same time. It was easier to look at

files during deliberations if necessary. I imagine that, from a candidate perspective, it must have been nice not to print and hole punch materials.
Everything is in one location. Uploading files is easy. Easy to review.
Ease of access in the review process.
None that I experienced as a candidate.
I liked the convenience of having the files online, not having to deal with massive folders. Much more environmentally friendly!
I can work from home. Everything is easily accessible (when the system works--see below). Also, for the candidate, it's a huge time, money, and paper saver when done online.
We did not have to be on campus
It can be done with remote committee work.
Submission of materials was very easy. I think that with some improved directions/guidance it makes it even easier.
I liked the simplicity of uploading documents. I also thought it was clearer where things should go than in the physical binders.
Collect and save information. A clear structure for what to be submitted.
Very easy to navigate. Much better than paper-based notebooks. I would like to keep this format.
It is easier to share the candidate's file and review it without having to share the physical file or be on campus to review it.
I did not find Chalk and Wire an advantageous platform.
convenience during pandemic while not on campus
This method allowed us to share confidentially during COVID when we couldn't work face-to-face.
I did both a physical and electronic binder. I did the physical binder in May before we knew we were going online. It was extremely time-consuming in ways that do not improve the quality of the binder (printing hundreds of pages, punching holes, reprinting when you realize there is an error, etc.). The electronic submission was so much easier and faster. The only problem I had was with the URLs I had to include--definitely user error.
It is a godsend to have the file accessible online. It made the peer review process so much easier as committee members could review the file at their convenience instead of having to find time to go across campus to see a physical file. Chalk & Wire worked well for this purpose, although it is not intuitive.
The electronic files made it possible to review remotely.
It was much easier to submit my file this way than it was to do with 5 3-ring binders. I really appreciated the ease of this method and think the University should continue to collect files this way.
This is what was ridiculous about the prior system that has been removed: the massive amount of printing, the 3-hole-punching, meticulously creating tabs, keeping the one copy of the portfolio under lock and key while making it available only during regular business hours. The digital portfolio system does away with all of that.

Please list the concerns or disadvantages you had using ePortfolio

As a peer review committee member, the interface is not intuitive for finding and using the files. It is also not very user-friendly to know what steps make up the entire process, nor whether or not individual committee members have completed a necessary step in order to move on through the process.
Allowing to resubmit up to five times instead of 3
At times, I felt it was hard to navigate, but with more practice/training this could be rectified.
The ePortfolio does not address the main issue with P&T files. In that, the candidate may not be sure about where something goes. So, they put it where they think it should go. We need a clear and specific guide on where items go. Until this is done, it does not matter what format is used for P&T.
I do not like the system at all. I do not understand why we need to pay for this system when I think SharePoint can pretty much do the same thing. If we can't provide comments using the system, I don't see much of a point of paying a vendor for the system to have to deal with all the complexities. Why not upload the documents on SharePoint and have its setup to send alerts when you have something to review similar to when TAPS applications need to be review by Faculty Excellence Committee? It required too many steps and instructions to do what needed to be done. It had no function other than house the pdfs and ask us to confirm we reviewed it. It was too much stress for something that to me had no benefit other than being able to view it electronically.
Ease of use and navigating the system
Candidates seemed to have no sense of how the documents would look. Little instruction for candidates and peers. Concern that the Chair kept asking a candidate to add information and/or remove information to make the candidate look better (I thought we were to only consider what is submitted, not keep asking for more information.?)
Many times, items were difficult to find. I had to go to Dr. Kusch often to figure out how to help my committee members go in "the back way" to see items, even the outside letters that I had posted. There were still items that the Committee felt they had to print out in order to compare them to other components. Like descriptions vs vita and that was just too hard to do on the screen. For ones that didn't print it out there were things that were missed.
Can't think of any disadvantages
As I mentioned above the problem is with the unfriendly Chalk & Wire...
None
Not intuitive Cryptic Unreliable Wild goose chase
Concerned about security. Technology was bumpy on this first-time experience
I think there is no concern or disadvantage to using an electronic format. The question is the format and platform for the electronic portfolio. I find that Chalk & Wire is a relatively poor platform. It is unnecessarily complicated, the user interfaces are not intuitive and confusing,

we spent too much time focused on the platform versus the portfolios, etc.
Like it is when starting any new system, it took time to get familiar and comfortable with the E-portfolios.
timing of this change is concerning. reviewers had no idea what they were doing or that's my perception from interactions
It was a learning curve, but after some work on the platform I had no problems.
I wish this process was implemented sooner. I had so many papers that were not electronic and the process of thinking I was going to submit them as paper for 6 years of books already fixed and then with only 30 days to stop and fix and get everything to electronic was a bit tricky. The unknown was stressful and everyone saying this was their first time as well as frustrating. I wish there was an in-person training to show exactly what to do rather than email descriptions or videos of people talking rather than showing would have been helpful.
As a candidate, using the ePortfolio did create extra work. While compiling my supporting materials folder, I was unsure of how many electronic pages would fit into the actual binder space. Therefore, I also created a physical binder to make sure I maximized my space. Also, it was unclear at the beginning how I would be notified as a candidate about the letters being placed into my file. For example, I did not know how I would receive the letter from my dean. If I needed to write a statement, I still do not know the process of how I would add that to my file at this point. Another concern that I have might pertain to just me. Not only was I a candidate, but I also served as an external member of another peer review committee. I learned that Chalk and Wire allowed the Chair of my external Committee to view my promotion file and process.
It was a disaster to work with. Things didn't work in the ways we were assured they would. Things would work for one person but not another, even when working together!
Chalk and Wire was extremely difficult to use. I spent hours and hours, at the beginning of an already challenging semester, trying to figure out how to find the material. I will not serve in a peer review committee if the system is not fundamentally improved. It felt like a test of endurance. The tutorials posted were very unhelpful. At the end I really wished I could have driven back and forth to campus to look at old-fashioned binders. While I had looked forward to ePortfolios, going from binders to Chalk and Wire was like jumping from the frying pan into the fire.
Complicated system. Written instructions with anticipated timelines could help or simplified system.
Difficult to use. Difficult to navigate. Not intuitive in language and prompts. Was not fully vetted before implementation. Could result in issues of permissions and unintended release of confidential documents. Awkward workflow.
At the beginning, I found that the instruction was little unclear in some places. But toward the end, Dr. Kusch added or modified these which was great.
constraints on uploaded material (Binders versus digital PDFS) ease of review for Committee committee response was difficult to understand (grading system was in numbers not in terms like "excellent, highly effective" etc.)
Chalk and Wire seemed overly complex and non-intuitive. I was unable to submit my review,

and the cause of the problem could not be identified.
Some faculty members who aren't as good with technology need more training on accessing the online files.
There was a definite learning curve to locating needed items in Chalk and Wire. Thankfully, Celena was very helpful!
My biggest frustration with the process was that my cohort was the first to use eportfolios and my entire file was already completed non-electronically by the time I was informed that the file needed to be moved to the ePortfolio. Given the unusual circumstances this year, there wasn't as much guidance or support as I would have liked. The instructions for Chalk and Wire weren't helpful and it took multiple trial and errors to accomplish even simple tasks. I also felt that communications about turning the file in weren't timed well - since I was already finished, the last-minute nature of the communications added a lot of stress, especially an email I received maybe 2 weeks before the deadline that discussed how candidates might approach online portfolios. This is something that should be communicated way further in advance and built into workshops, as well as with links online. The communication was the most frustrating aspect by far, unfortunately.
There were some technical issues were needed immediate support. If we continue, we need to make sure we have that available. It did take a lot of computer activity moving and clicking.
All of the letters were in the "collaboration" section and required download to our computers. For confidentiality purposes, I think it would be better to avoid downloading materials, if possible.
Some of the instructions are not quite clear. Some of the layout is a bit confusing. Anything paper (such as thank you notes or letters) has to be converted to a PDF and uploaded.
None
No training. No choice in using this versus the files I had prepared for the last 5 years. I don't own a scanner, so converting the paper copies to digital required going to campus during a pandemic. Having only a month's notice to complete this at the beginning of a semester. This might not have been such an issue, however, with the changes (at the end of my 4th year) of having to go from 5 binders to the 2-binder system without the opportunity to be grandfathered in just added stress to this already stressful process.
I found it incredibly confusing when trying to view the documents versus comment on the file. Despite having multiple files to review, I never seemed to understand which portal I was supposed to be in to do either of those tasks. It did not seem like this was designed for this type of work. Perhaps security and anonymity were the reason for the two portals, but I found it incredibly frustrating.
The launch of the online system was not easy, to say the least. The platform was so complex! I had so many files at different stages that It became almost a full-time job for a while just to learn the system and help the other committee members figure it out. That's the past, of course, but my point is that Chalk and Wire is too complicated for the job required.
Many files hard to read, everything felt sloppy. Way too limited evidence provided and often documents without explanation (three borderline type documents for scholarship?).

Difficulty navigating due to limited use by everyone. Too easy to miss a required step to allow process to move forward. Need to for the Chair to go ask the candidate to submit more information. Real concern that Chair would say they would add additional documents from the candidate, but we could never see what was added while still being asked to make our vote.

It is confusing as hell to work with as a reviewer. Very difficult to navigate.

The reviewer side of things is confusing. It is difficult to figure out exactly what needs to be done and where to find items. It is NOT user friendly on the reviewer side of things by any measure.

Adjusting and converting with very little time before submission was stressful.

The instruction is confusing. Some sections should be defined in a better description. Also, the reviewer should have an idea about what a candidate was requested to submit.

None

Chalk and Wire wasn't the most user friendly. It was often difficult to figure out how to access certain information (especially if it was edited by the candidate) and to know what steps we were supposed to take next. It seems like there should be an easier platform to use.

- Difficult to navigate files.
- Too easy for candidate files to be placed in multiple places. This is of concern, as often candidate files contain confidential information that should have limited access. In addition, it can make it seem that candidates did not turn in a complete file. I am concerned that Chalk & Wire is not a suitable platform for P&T needs.
- Too easy for errors with setting up tasks for committee members; this seems to stem from each committees' tasks being assigned individually, as some instructions worked others did not and it depended on whether or not materials/tasks were set up correctly in the system.

it is too complicated; time-consuming

The system was not user-friendly. It was difficult to figure out where to click, and the options were not intuitive. It took a lot of trial and error and emails and watching and reading tutorials over and over again and was highly frustrating. And I'm sure it was also difficult for Celena as she was the one answering our thousand emails and phone calls!

My only concern is that with a physical binder, you are limited as to the amount of content you can include (4" worth). Without a physical limitation, I worry that the size of files will vary--or simply that candidates will not have a clear idea how much they can include.

I think the main problem with Chalk & Wire was a lack of advance training in the system. It is not intuitive and, in some respects, cumbersome. Still, if it is what we have it can work well for this purpose, but we needed more thorough training. I think we actually did quite well in the short time we had, so this is far from a criticism of what we did last summer, but I would like to see some formal trainings for peer review and P&T committee members in the future.

I found the Chalk & Wire application difficult to understand, navigate, and know what the next step in the process was. Others on my review committee complained of the same thing. C&W was designed for a different purpose. I had to constantly ask for help on how to execute the next action in C&W. There were 7-9 page of instructions just to get started! All we are doing is reading through a file and noting things, so C&W is too cumbersome for this. I like

the idea of submitting files in electronic format, but the candidates could just submit a single Word document or at the very least, submit a number of Word documents encapsulated in a single folder.

In the past, when reviewing the physical notebooks reviewers left very useful editorial comments as sticky notes in the notebooks. There is no way to do this using C&W. We could do this using the "track changes" feature in Microsoft Word though.

The submissions from all three candidates my Committee reviewed submitted through C&W were missing pieces, had information in the wrong place, etc. All three looked different and none were complete.

It was confusing at times to upload materials; however, Celina was always available to help out. She was really an important piece to this process.

Very time consuming
Documents were very lengthy, and the quantity was greater (you could have a link or a file within one section containing 50 plus pages-- whereas in a binder, the size of the documents are kept to a certain volume of information.)

Current system is confusing for some of us. After I logged in, I could not easily determine what I was supposed to do next.

Yet ANOTHER software program to learn that we will only use once a year and therefore will have to re-learn it every year!!

What suggestions do you have related to the ePortfolio?

Use SharePoint. I am not in favor of using C&W for reviews. We need a system where we are allowed to put editorial comments directly on a document. If someone needs to change formatting due to inconsistencies, check spelling on a word, etc. it would be much easier to document it on a pdf with a "comment." Instead, we have to give the candidate high-level comments such as requesting they check their grammar or commenting the exact page number and paragraph of mistakes. I do not understand the issue with minor comments being electronic. If you are worried about more serious comments being added, you could have the chair review the committee comments on the document before releasing them to the candidate. It took more time than needed to have to document it elsewhere instead of directly on the document.

Provide an extensive training for evaluators as well as the recorded videos/PDFs.

Hard copy instructions with screen shots.

What is uploaded needs to be exactly and only what should be evaluated based on the faculty manual. The manual may need some updates.
Sections should be able to be uploaded all together. Not so many separate parts. All scholarship, descriptions and artifacts in one document would make having to read it easier and be able to compare more efficiently.
More training for all involved.

-Well organized. Everyone should use the same template (sections, contents, etc.)
so, the evaluator does not have to switch templates from candidate to candidate's file.

Use different but simple platform to spend time reviewing and evaluating candidates instead of wasting time navigating Chalk & Wire....
None
one that isn't meant for something different and doesn't' have useless options and rabbit holes, or the option to irrevocably derail all my work
Stick with it. Let's work out the bumps & join the digital age. This is MUCH better than going to a tiny room on campus & often waiting in line to view files.
Find a better electronic platform than Chalk & Wire.
Regular training for all parties to the process.
none
Actual training showing the exact way screens/uploads etc. are supposed to look rather than just talking about it. Actual Screenshots.
I know that the decision to use the ePortfolio was quickly made this summer. I appreciated the videos that Celena Kusch made about the process. If you were to continue with this process, I would suggest that you let the candidates know ahead of time when you go through the P&T meeting at the end of the year. Learning about the switch in the summer was added stress in an already stressful situation. Second, I would suggest a follow up video about what happens after you hit submit. What happens if I do need to submit a follow-up statement to my file? Where would that go?
EXTENSIVE training must be given! Honestly, I'd prefer that candidates submit PDF's "old skool". Chalk & Wire is user-unfriendly junk.
Streamline the system and post clear and concise written instructions about how to find the material and submit evaluations.
Instructions for each user type
I would like to have had the opportunity to vet the platform for P&T before implementing it. This rapid roll out was abrupt, increased the time required, and I find the platform non-intuitive... as if it was selected for something else but is being used for this instead.
Detail instructions are very important in each tab as it provides clear information to candidate what to include and in what format.
New procedures - checklists etc.
I would prefer a tool more specifically designed for faculty review that would be more straightforward to use.
Keep it. There is no reason to ever go back to printed books.
Communications about the ePortfolio, along with instructions, should be sent well in advance (I'm thinking months in advance). For me, I built up my file and added to it over the course of my probationary period, so the last-minute nature of the communications was frustrating. This should also be built into P&T workshops with exemplar portfolios and a portal with instructions for candidates to easily access information.
I like it and we need to continue using it. Just need to have more technical support. and a comprehensive written and video tutorial focusing on each group using it.

I'd like to think about how to streamline the process to better utilize the technology. For example, are there changes we could make so that we don't have to have a separate "collaborate" section?
Perhaps sit down with a couple of candidates and review the screens to see if they can be improved.
None
Train people who have to use this. It doesn't matter what my feedback is, as I feel that things will go forward without consideration for the people who are directly impacted by this.
If there's a way to view and comment on the materials without having to be in two separate portals, that would greatly improve this process. (For this reason, I am checking "no" in the question below, but I would like for the files to continue to be online.)
My suggestion is to not use Chalk and Wire again, at least not in the configuration that we did in Fall 2020. The process could have been so easy, but Chalk and Wire had too many options, was way too complicated, and just a completely frustrating experience. It could have been much easier with a simpler platform. Also, I never understood why we did some things on the One Drive and others on Chalk and Wire.
I usually want to use technology, but feel this process misses the mark: Everything seemed disjointed. Did not feel adequate evidence provided for review.   Need education about how to prepare documents with overall appearance kept in mind. Remind the candidate that additional documents could equal a 4-inch notebook so only a couple/3 documents are probably not enough unless extremely strong evidence.   Need to provide step-by-step visual guide for the reviewer to assure clicking all the right boxes.
I don't blame the creators of the videos explaining it, but they ended up not really matching what we needed to do on occasion.
Chalk and Wire might not be the "best" system for this function, but it seems serviceable.   I think that the lessons learned form this year will help improve the experience next year for the reviewers and hopefully streamline the process for all involved.   Additional training workshops/video/resources will help for both the candidate and review side.   May need to consider structural changes to the file and the P&T process so that the e-portfolio model can be fully embraced.
Require it of candidates from day one. It would have made the whole process clearer and more efficient.
I think it is a good tool for future review. However, I believe the reviewers should be advised to be more tolerant to the information since it is a new system, and no existing works can be used as a reference.
None
I would like a more simplistic platform than Chalk & Wire. It shouldn't take so many user guides just to figure out how to use it. Everyone I talked to felt similarly.
prefer not to use at all
The idea of an ePortfolio, rather than traditional paper binders, is great. Chalk & Wire to administer this was very difficult to maneuver and I do not suggest continuing this method.
Please adopt ePortfolios moving forward!!

The process on Chalk & Wire needs to be carefully reviewed and revised. There were a couple of instances where we were waiting on a notification that didn't come or had trouble sharing information with the candidate during the mentoring phase. But I don't see why things can't be improved. I think, too, that as we transition from the older concept of the P&T file as containing everything to a more streamlined file, we need to better define what the essential elements of the file are in our unit criteria. It is possible to include much more in an electronic format and the concept of a 1" binder doesn't have much meaning.

Just give the candidates a Word document already containing all the necessary section headings (and even a few directions where needed) and let them populate it with information until they get everything in. Then, the review committees can use review this file (and leave editorial notes within) over any type of shared network drive. We could even use a managed document store (insuring only one person has the file "checked out" at a time).

If candidates find using C&W easier to assemble their files, then let them do that and then export the files as a PDF and let reviewers work with the PDF file outside of C&W. So, if they like it, let the candidates prepare the files using C&W but don't make reviewers review it within C&W.

1. Please keep doing it this way.
2. Make sure Celina is a part of the process. Her videos and availability were the key for making this process so easy to navigate.

Allow the Committee to attach the recommendation-- v. pasting a response in a column. Allow for the Chair to see what is missing from others-- there were delays moving to the next phase because members had yet to go in the system and click the box that s/he reviewed the materials

I don't know enough about the system to be able to make specific suggestions. However, I would ask that you take seriously the concerns of those who find the system confusing.

Put it on a password protected P drive folder

Please indicate if you would like to continue using P&T ePortfolio

All Respondents

	Percentage of respondents	Count
Yes	60.34%	35
No	24.14%	14
Undecided	15.52%	9
Total	100%	58

Candidates

	Percentage of respondents	Count
Yes	94.74%	18

	Percentage of respondents	Count
No	5.26%	1
Undecided	0%	0
Total	100%	19

Dean/Director/Chair

	Percentage of respondents	Count
Yes	46.67%	7
No	33.33%	5
Undecided	20%	3
Total	100%	15

Peer Review Committee/Committee Member

	Percentage of respondents	Count
Yes	41.67%	10
No	33.33%	8
Undecided	25%	6
Total	100%	24

Promotion and Tenure Committee

	Percentage of respondents	Count
Yes	75%	3
No	25%	1
Undecided	0%	0
Total	100%	4