THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE

FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number   2711S

Date of Senate Approval   04/07/11

- -
Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

FWDC 5:   **Clarification to Post-Tenure Review Procedures**
                                                        (Revision of SD0709F, Faculty Handbook 3.7)

Effective date: Fall 2011

Summary: This document makes two changes:

> a) It requires the submission of written student comments to the Post-Tenure Review Committee rather than leaving it to the discretion of the PTRC.

> b) It clarifies that the report that goes from the PTRC to the Evaluee, the Chair, and the Dean includes the specific recommendation of the PTRC. It also more clearly specifies that the PTRC makes a recommendation to the Dean, but that the Dean makes the final evaluation of the evaluee's performance during the PTR period.

Rationale:
> a) As currently written, the Post-Tenure Review Committee has the option of requesting written comments, but their practice in recent years has been to do so. This change brings the handbook into consistency with current practice. In addition, with our change to online administration of student evaluation of instruction, numerical scores and student comments are reported in the same document rather than produced separately. As a result, it is now easier to collect both rather than simply the numerical scores.

> b) Last year, the PTR process was revised so that the PTRC makes a recommendation to the Program Area Dean, who makes the final determination of the results of Post-Tenure Review, with the Provost serving as a point of appeal. This revision clarifies that the report should contain the specific recommendation of the PTRC to the Dean. In this way, the emphasis of the PTR process remains, as intended, on formative evaluation by peers.

Revised Faculty Handbook 3.7

Revised Section 3.7.2.7.A

> A. Completed Dossier

> The evaluee's dossier is assembled by the Chair (or, for evaluation of Chairs, by the most senior tenured member of the department) and submitted to the PTRC. The complete dossier will include, in order:

> 1) The Evaluee's Statement focusing on the five years of the PTR review period (submitted by Evaluee to Chair)
> 2) The Professional Curriculum Vitae (submitted by Evaluee to Chair)
> 3) Chair's Evaluation (prepared by the Chair, or for the review of Chairs, by the most senior tenured member of the department)

4) Results from Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching (prepared by the Chair)
5) Annual Faculty Records (past five years, collected by the Office of the Provost and submitted to the Chair)
6) Merit Evaluations (past five years, collected by Provost and submitted to the Chair)
7) Summary of numbers from course evaluations [and written student comments] over the past five years (provided by Office of Institutional Research to the Chair). ~~Written student comments may be requested by the PTRC and will be made available.~~

Failure of the evaluee to provide materials for his or her dossier in a timely fashion may result in sanctions imposed by the Provost.

Revised Section 3.7.3.1-2

1. The PTRC will write a report following the objectives of PTR given in section 3.7.1 that will go to the faculty member, the department chair, and the Program Area Dean to be submitted by March 1. [This report should provide a narrative evaluation of the faculty member's performance over the past five years and will include the specific recommendation of the PTRC to the Dean that the faculty member has either performed at a Successful level or has one or more areas that require concentrated development efforts.]

2. ~~The PTRC will make a recommendation of the final evaluation of the faculty member's performance directly to the Program Area Dean. Drawing on the contents of the report, the Program Area Dean conveys the recommendation of the PTRC to the candidate. The recommendation will be one of the following:~~ Drawing on this recommendation, the Dean will evaluate the faculty member's performance as either:

    A. The faculty member has performed at a Successful level. ~~The recommendation~~ [A letter communicating this evaluation] will be sent to the faculty member, with copies to the Chair and the Provost. The ~~recommendation~~ [letter] will express collegial appreciation for contributions to the mission of UNC Asheville, and will take note of any performances, accomplishments or contributions that appear excellent or exemplary. The Post-Tenure Review process will then be complete.

    B. The evaluee has one or more areas that require concentrated development efforts. ~~The recommendation~~ [A letter communicating this evaluation] will be sent to the evaluee and the Chair [with a copy to the Provost]. The ~~Report~~ [letter] will identify which of the three major areas of teaching, scholarship and/or service are of concern while noting any performances or accomplishments that appear commendable or excellent. The faculty member may challenge the ~~recommendation~~ [evaluation that a Development Plan is needed] by petitioning in writing to the Provost within 14 calendar days of receiving the recommendation.

If the Provost affirms the recommendation after considering a challenge, or the recommendation is unchallenged, the faculty member will construct a Development Plan in consultation with the Chair and the Program Area Dean. The Plan will ~~both address which of the three major areas of teaching, scholarship and service warrant improvement, and~~ include specific steps to lead to ~~that~~ improvement [in the area(s) of concern noted in the evaluation]. The Plan will include a time when the evaluee will again be reviewed by the PTRC - no less than one year later, up to three years later. The Chair and the Provost will review the plan to determine resource implications. The Plan must be approved by the Provost. The evaluee will meet at least semi-annually with the Department chair or academic unit head during the development period to assess progress.

Development Plans should include provision for mentoring peers who are requested by the ~~E~~[e]valuee and approved by the Provost. Mentoring peers should be senior members of the faculty who are skillful in collegial relationships and recognized for excellence in the area(s) requiring improvement. On request a mentoring peer may be appointed before the Development Plan is finalized.