# Digital Submission of First Year Renewal Materials Survey Results

April 4, 2019

I. What is your role in the Renewal Process?

		Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
			No responses were entered for this question.		
Faculty being renewed		6	38%	n/a	n/a
DEC Chair or Member		5	31%	n/a	n/a
Department Chair		2	12%	n/a	n/a
Dean		2	12%	n/a	n/a
Dean's Administrative Assistant		1	6%	n/a	n/a
Other, please specify		0	0%	n/a	n/a
	Total Respondents (For this Question)	16	100%		

II. For each of the following techincal aspects of the renewal process indicate your satisfaction on a scale from very unsatisfied to very satisfied.

		Very Unsatisfied (1 Points)	Unsatisfied (2 Points)	Neutral (3 Points)	Satisfied (4 Points)	Very Satisfied (5 Points)	N/A (0 Points)	Response Total	Points	Avg
view	Setting up the folder(s)	0% (0)(0pts)	6.25% (1) (2pts)	0% (0)(0pts)	25% (4) (16pts)	43.75% (7) (35pts)	25% (4)(0pts)	16	53	3.31
view	Sharing the folder(s)	0% (0)(0pts)	12.5% (2) (4pts)	0% (0)(0pts)	18.75% (3) (12pts)	56.25% (9) (45pts)	12.5% (2) (0pts)	16	61	3.81
view	Instructions for setting up and sharing	0% (0)(0pts)	12.5% (2) (4pts)	6.25% (1) (3pts)	18.75% (3) (12pts)	50% (8) (40pts)	12.5% (2) (0pts)	16	59	3.69
view	Creation of PDF files	0% (0)(0pts)	12.5% (2) (4pts)	0% (0)(0pts)	18.75% (3) (12pts)	43.75% (7) (35pts)	25% (4)(0pts)	16	51	3.19
view	Information available about process	0% (0)(0pts)	6.25% (1) (2pts)	12.5% (2) (6pts)	37.5% (6) (24pts)	43.75% (7) (35pts)	0% (0)(0pts)	16	67	4.19
						Total Respondents (For this Question)		16		
						Total Responses		80		
						Total Points Earned		291		
				Point Average (total points all rows/responses for all rows)				3.64		
				Point Weighted Average (total points all rows/responses for all rows)				3.64		

III. What suggestions do you have that would make the process smoother?

1. When a new faculty member is hired from day one their PCN # should be used to create a data base file for them that will have all their professional information readily available. This will cut down on the excessive paper that is used for P&T and renewals. Not to mention the amount of binders that need to be delivered and stored.

2. During the process there were some questions that eventually were answered. Based on that experience from each department I am sure it will be useful to incorporate the answers into the instruction documents, and it might also be useful to create a list of frequently asked questions. If the point is to save paper, why make the DEC print out the recommendation, sign it, and then upload it? There should be a way to have electronic signatures for the DEC, candidate, Dean,and Provost.

3. I have little idea how these are being used at the end of the day. Am I signing a new contract? Do I get merit pay? It's unclear. I would wish for more transparency about this. Otherwise, it's a clear process and so much easier and cheaper than compiling a print folder. It also respects DEC time and labor more when the files can be accessed at any point.However, I'm not keen on everyone being able to access my file whenever they want and would like to know when I can un-share so I can build for next year. In general, the security and privacy aspect of this is lacking, but I've noticed this with multiple aspects of file collection across the department and institution.

4. The most difficult part of the process was the requirement that the documents be numbered - it made it very hard to add new documents because then every document afterward needed to be renumbered, then the list of documents needed to be renumbered, and the hyperlinks IN the list of documents needed to be updated because by changing the name of the file, the hyperlink no longer worked! If there is a main list, I do not see any need for the documents to be numbered, particularly if that main list has hyperlinks to the documents.

5. Sample of a first year renewal.

6. The example of how to organize the files was for teaching faculty, and for librarians the organization needed to be different. Examples and instructions that are tailored to faculty from different departments would be helpful.

7. There needs to be a better process for putting the letters into the candidate's folder OR having the DEC folder shared with the candidate. To be honest, I still don't have a digital copy of my department DEC's letter. Both the Dean and Provost e-mailed me their letters, but although I met with my department DEC, I never got a copy of their letter. The only one I have is the hard copy that came back with the Provost's letter in the big manila envelope. I mentioned above that the DEC never shared their Evaluations folder with me due to them thinking my letter might not be the only one in there (i.e., if someone else were up for evaluation, they would only have one folder with multiple people's letters in it). So the process for making sure those letters get back to the candidate needs to be improved. I also felt like this process came up VERY suddenly. It was only by coincidence that I heard during a New Faculty Meeting (with the Provost) in December that this could be a possibility. If I hadn't heard, I would have started to put together my dossier over break in hard copy. So information about this process needs to be disseminated much sooner. That issue will only be magnified if this is ever made retroactive or mandated for people who previously submitted in hard copy.

8. None

IV. (Faculty) What challenges did you encounter in the creation of PDF files?

1. I made the files in Word, when I saved them as PDFs, the hyperlinks were no longer functional. When I googled the problem, it turns out it might be a Mac thing. There's a workaround (sending the file to myself in my gmail account, opening it using the google document editor, then downloading it as a PDF) but it's annoying and complicated and had to be redone every time I updated a document. I don't have a solution, so this is mainly just whining.In general, though, this was a much more simple process than the binder creation would have been. I heartily endorse it.

2. None. It was easy to print to PDF from e-mail or save as PDF, from Word.

3. None

V. (DEC, chairs, deans) What changes would you make to the evaluation form? How did you handle the signatures?

1. Printed letter, signed, and uploaded.

2. We printed the form and signed it. We then took it to the dean's office.

3. We printed, signed and scanned the form.The whole process wasn't so bad, but that's only because we were dealing with a first year renewal. I can't imagine doing this for a tenure/promotion portfolio. The prospect of dealing with such a portfolio online rather than in print would actually make me think twice about serving on the DEC in the future should it become mandatory.

4. This is a very easy process. I hope we can institute it across the university. I had someone in our department create PDF fillable forms for our checklist and signatures form. Thank you.

5. We used the normal form and then scanned it in. The scans don't always look the best, but it works.

6. There should be a way to have electronic signatures for the DEC, candidate, Dean,and Provost.

7. We printed the form, signed it, scanned it, and uploaded it to the folder. Would electronic signatures be possible?

8. As Department Chair, I was expecting to receive some notification when the faculty member's materials were submitted to the DEC, but I didn't. I also expected there to be an electronic evaluation form but instead we were signing and uploading the paper form. Also, I was surprised that this form was uploaded to a different shared folder (separate from the one containing the faculty member's portfolio). If that is the way it is supposed to work that's fine, but it would be helpful to have some instructions on how all the different pieces are to be handled.

VI. What additions, deletions or changes would you make to the instructions?

1. The graphic with the blue arrows and boxes is more complicated than it needs to be.

2. In the main instructions for renewal, there is a request for a manila folder with select documents in it to be sent to the Dean. It was not clear if I needed to do that, so I did it just to be sure. Turns out it wasn't needed...not a big deal but maybe make sure to explicitly mention that the manila folder is not needed.

3. The instructions to the DEC/Department Chair should indicate that the folder recipient must have permission to forward the folder onward. If this was the case, at least one person missed that.

4. Area in the candidate file for their CV - perhaps a folder that would include all the materials of the Manilla folder (CV, student most recent evaluations etc)

5. There should be a fool proof master check-off sheet for P&T and Renewals. The DEC should be held accountable for dumping the file/binders on to the administrative professional who sometimes has no idea what to do. It is not right to make the Dean or his Admin. Asst. go through binders and make the correct number of copies of missing information for the folder that is turned into the Provost Office. Many feel that they do not need to follow directions even though they know what needs to be done because someone will fix it for them.

6. I would include specific instructions for where to include the CV and other documents that may be outside of the 4 areas covered in the main folders.

7. Initially, there was some confusion as to how to create the one drive folder for DEC submissions, but once we received the Creating Promotion & Tenure Evaluations Folder using OneDrive DEC Instructions it was pretty straight forward.

8. The instructions for sharing were clear, and I followed them. The issue was sharing with the correct people. For instance, for Provost Dauwalder's review, I gave him permission to view, but then I later got an e-mail from Dean Wolff asking permission to share with Michelle Lynes in the Provost's Office. So while I thought I knew the process, it got unnecessarily complicated. The instructions are also unclear in terms of the DEC's Evaluations folder. My department never shared this with me because their interpretation was that if multiple candidates were being reviewed, they obviously wouldn't share my letter with others and vice versa. So the process of sharing the Evaluations folder needs to be figured out, and the flow chart needs to be updated in terms of sharing both the Evaluations folder as well as who to share the Portfolio with (as discussed above).

9. The DEC instructions were vague. I had to ask the faculty member how she set it up.

10. None

VII. (Deans) Comment on the process of dealing with online candidate portfolios. Did you encounter any difficulties or would you recommend any changes?

1. See above. No real issues.

2. Communication among all parties regarding the process and expectations . . . for one I had to create the evaluation folder, the faculty had it online and received the evaluation from the DEC in hard copy. Another committee did part of the process online, but turned in the evaluation forms in hard copy.