

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE

FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number 1413F

Date of Senate Approval 12/5/13

-----  
Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

**FWDC 7: Clarification to Procedures for Faculty Personnel Review (Faculty Handbook sections [3.3](#), [3.5](#), [3.7](#))**

**Effective date:** Immediately

**Summary:** This document (1) clarifies that the separate document summarizing peer review of teaching, required for Post Tenure Review, should summarize the results of annual peer review, and (2) makes the Office of the Provost responsible for providing results of student evaluation of teaching.

**Rationale:** (1) Post Tenure Review procedures require a separate document regarding peer review of teaching. It is unclear how this document relates to the results of annual peer review of teaching, which is now required for all members of the faculty. Because annual peer review of teaching will result in multiple observations, perhaps authored by various faculty members, the PTR document should be separately prepared by the chair, who should summarize the results of annual peer review undertaken during the PTR evaluation period and attach that summary to the reports submitted to the chair by faculty reviewers.

(2) The current faculty handbook stipulates that the Office of Institutional Research is responsible for providing the quantitative results from student evaluation of teaching. Since we moved to online administration of student evaluation in Fall 2010, Institutional Research no longer has a role to play in the gathering and processing of student evaluation of teaching, nor does that office have access to the results. The Office of the Provost has access to all evaluations gathered since Fall 2010, and will request copies of student evaluations from earlier years from Department Chairs as needed.

**I. Revise the first paragraph of 3.3.3.1.2 as follows:**

**3.3.3.1.2 Peer Review of Teaching**

Peer review of teaching is an essential component of faculty evaluation. It contributes to evidence of teaching effectiveness through the observations of peers with an understanding of effective pedagogy and complements student ratings of instruction. All full-time faculty members should be peer reviewed by at least one tenured faculty member in their academic department or program area at least once per academic year. Peer reviews should be submitted to both the faculty member and the Department Chair or Program Director who will incorporate the peer review into their annual evaluation and into any documents required for personnel review; peer reviews of Department Chairs should be submitted to both the Department Chair and to the appropriate Program Area Dean (see section 3.4). Peer reviews should be conducted according to the following guidelines.

## **II. Revise 3.5.4.2 as follows:**

### **3.5.4.2 Documents for Evaluation by the Office of Academic Affairs**

An evaluation folder must be established in the Office of Academic Affairs for each candidate under review for reappointment, tenure or promotion. Documents in this folder are reviewed by the Committee of Tenured Faculty and the Provost and VCAA. The Academic Affairs folder contains only the following documents:

1. The Candidate's Statement (submitted by the candidate)
2. The Professional Curriculum Vitae (submitted by the candidate)
3. The Fall semester Faculty Record (submitted by the candidate)
4. The Candidate's Statement of Clarification, Explanation or Rebuttal, if written (submitted by the candidate)
5. The Chair/Director's Evaluation and Recommendation (submitted by the Chair/Director)
6. Comments from Student Evaluation Forms administered since the last review (provided by the Office of the Provost)
7. Student Evaluation Rating Form Summaries administered since the last review (provided by the Office of the Provost)
8. All appropriate annual Faculty Records (collected by Provost and VCAA)
9. All appropriate annual Merit Evaluations (including Dean's or Provost's written explanation of final evaluation and Provost's response to any appeal) (collected by Provost and VCAA)

The tenure committee or the Provost and VCAA may request samples of teaching and scholarly/creative materials.

## **III. Revise 3.7.2.7A as follows:**

### **A. Completed Dossier**

The evaluatee'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 Evaluatee's Statement focusing on the five years of the PTR review period (submitted by Evaluatee to Chair)
- 2) The Professional Curriculum Vitae (submitted by Evaluatee 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) Summary of Results of Peer Review of Teaching (prepared by the Chair, attached to results of annual Peer Review of Teaching (see 3.3.3.1.2))
- 5) Annual Faculty Records (past five years, collected by the Office of the Provost and submitted to the Chair)
- 6) Merit Evaluations (including Dean's or Provost's written explanation of final evaluation and Provost's response to any appeal) (past five years, collected by Provost and submitted to the Chair)
- 7) Quantitative scores and student comments from course evaluations over the PTR review period (provided by Office of the Provost to the Chair).

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

#### **IV. Revise 3.7.2.7F as follows:**

F. Summary of Results of Peer Review of Teaching (prepared by the Chair as a separate document and assembled in the dossier submitted to the PTRC)

1) Purpose: To provide evidence of teaching effectiveness in addition to the results of student evaluation of instruction.

2) Format: The Chair should provide a one-to-two page document which summarizes the results of annual peer review of teaching (see 3.3.3.1.2) and attach it to those results, submitting all together.