

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE

FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number 6615S

Date of Senate Approval 03/19/15

Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

FWDC 13: Revisions to Dossier submitted for Post-Tenure Review

Effective date: Fall 2015

Summary:

1) For Post-Tenure Review, chairs have been expected to prepare a separate document summarizing the results of peer review of teaching, unlike reappointment, tenure, or promotion, and attach it to the original results themselves for inclusion in the evaluatee's dossier. This document removes this document from the evaluatee's PTR dossier. Instead, it encourages chairs to incorporate the results of peer review in their evaluations of candidates for PTR, consistent with Section 3.3.3.1.2 of the Faculty Handbook.

2) This document adds an opportunity for evaluatees to respond to the Chair's evaluation by providing a supplementary statement.

Rationale:

1) Peer review was explicitly included as a separate document for Post-Tenure Review as a way to emphasize the intention that PTR is formative in addition to summative, unlike reappointment, tenure, or promotion. However, in practice, the fact that the dossiers for these decisions, submitted to the Committee of Tenured Faculty, do not contain a document of this kind has led to confusion, particularly for chairs who happen to be writing statements for a faculty member going through reappointment, tenure, or promotion at the same time as another undergoes Post-Tenure Review. For consistency, this document encourages chairs to incorporate peer review in their evaluation of candidates, consistent with Section 3.3.3.1.2 of the Faculty Handbook.

2) It has been observed that evaluatees do not have recourse if they disagree with any element of the Chair's Evaluation, other than any revision arising out of their discussion of the evaluation prior to submission to the PTRC. FWDC believes that it is important for evaluatees to have this opportunity, parallel to that afforded to candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

I. Revise 3.7.2.7 as follows

7. The PTRC will review a dossier containing documents from several sources. The evaluatee will submit the items noted (see A 1-2, below) to the Chair of his or her department. The Chair will provide items 3-4 ~~and 7~~. The Office of the Provost provides item 5-6. For evaluation of Chairs, the most senior tenured member of the department/program will normally assume the duties of the Chair, as described below.

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), as well as any supplementary statement submitted by the evaluatee in response.
- 4) Quantitative scores and student comments from course evaluations over the PTR review period (provided by the Chair).

~~Summary of Results of Peer Review of Teaching (prepared by the Chair, attached to collected annual Peer Reviews of Teaching (see 3.3.3.1.2) from the PTR review period)~~

- 5) Annual Faculty Records (past five years, collected by the Office of the Provost)
- 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 the Office of the Provost)
- 7) ~~Quantitative scores and student comments from course evaluations over the PTR review period (provided by 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.

.....

E. Chair's Evaluation (provided by the Chair of the department and assembled in the dossier submitted to the PTRC)

- 1) Purpose: The Chair's Evaluation has always been central to decisions concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion. It is a summary evaluation that, when viewed together with the evaluations appended to the Faculty record, provides an historical account of the evaluatee's overall performance as viewed by the Chair.
- 2) Format: The Chair's Evaluation should be written in simple narrative form, to the Chair of the PTRC, addressing the evaluatee's past, present and future contributions to the department and the university. This statement may also be used to address factors and extenuating circumstances affecting the evaluatee's performance, which are not usually covered in the listing of activities by

category. Discussion of teaching performance should refer to the results of peer review of teaching as well as student rating of instruction. The Chair must consult with faculty colleagues and report on that consultation. It is not expected that a department vote is taken or reported. For purposes of faculty development, the Chair should discuss the evaluation with the faculty member prior to submission of the evaluation to the PTRC. The evaluatee may write a supplementary statement including explanatory or clarifying information after reviewing the Chair's Evaluation. This supplementary statement should be sent to the Chair and included in the candidate's evaluation file.

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.~~