

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT ASHEVILLE
FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number 2818S
Date of Senate Approval 02/08/18

Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

FWDC 6: **Personnel Decisions for Joint Appointments**
Faculty Handbook [Section 3.5.4.1](#) and [Section 3.7.2](#)

Effective date: Fall 2018

Summary: For joint appointments, this document describes the roles of the two departments in making personnel recommendations.

Rationale: While this process is briefly discussed in section [2.6.2](#) of the Faculty Handbook on this subject, there is no mention of joint appointments in 3.5, which describes policies and procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, or in 3.7, which covers Post-Tenure Review. As we have an increasing number of joint appointments, it is important to have clarity in all relevant sections of the handbook on these processes. This document stipulates that, for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the chair of the primary department is responsible for managing department review and for writing the Chair/Director's Evaluation and Recommendation, which must incorporate input from the chair of the second department; this input is also made available to the candidate and to tenured members of the primary department in the evaluation process. For Post-Tenure Review, this document stipulates that the chair of the primary department must consult with the chair/director of the second department in formulating their evaluation.

Add to 3.5.4.1.5:

[F. When the faculty member has a joint appointment \(Faculty Handbook 2.6.2\)](#)

The Chair of the faculty member's primary department will be responsible for coordinating the departmental review and for composing the Chair/Director's Evaluation and Recommendation. The Chair of the second department will prepare an evaluation statement and recommendation which is made available to the candidate and added to the materials listed in (4) above. The Chair of the primary department must refer to this statement and recommendation in the Chair/Director's Evaluation and Recommendation.

Revise 3.7.2.7.E.2 as follows:

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 and providing a clear recommendation as to whether the evaluatee exceeded, met, or did not meet expectations, where faculty expectations are defined in section 3.3.3. 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 all tenured faculty colleagues in the department and report on that consultation. It is not expected that a department vote is taken or reported. The Chair may consult with untenured faculty (who have completed GA-provided PTR training modules) or with tenured faculty members outside of the department at their discretion; **for the PTR of a joint appointment, the Chair must consult with the department chair/program director of the second department in making the evaluation.** 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.