UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

SCHOOL OF THE ARTS

Michael S. Rothkopf
School of Music

1533 South Main Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27127

(336) 631-1581
(336) 403-1097

rothkm@uncsa.edu
www.uncsa.edu

March 1, 20017

2016/17-03 Resolution

Resolution 2016/17-3 Peer Evaluation Guidelines at UNCSA.

In an examination of the literature of best practices at educational institutions (http://www.aaupnet.org/resources/for-members/handbooks-and-toolkits/peer-review-best-practices), we learn that the faculty Peer Evaluation process of review of the performance of faculty members is reserved as an instrument of shared governance to ensure that an individual's work as a faculty member is appraised by his/her peers as well as by administrators, students, and, in some cases, external evaluators for *formative* and *summative* reasons. *Formative* review is undertaken in the spirit of guiding a faculty member toward practices that strengthen and enrich his/her performance in the classroom in scholarly activities and in governance; *summative* review is undertaken to form a judgment about the performance of the faculty member with an eye toward applying promotional or other procedures.

And, whereas the University of North Carolina system, as a whole, employs Peer Evaluations as an essential part of complete examinations of a faculty members performance on all fronts (http://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php?pg=vs&id=389&added=1) and originally appeared in a UNC Administrative Memorandum #338 on September 28, 1993;

And whereas, UNC's Guidelines on Tenure and Teaching (UNC Policy Manual 400.3.1 [G]) includes this statement:

1c. Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.

And whereas, "Peer review is often identified with peer observations . . . it is more broadly a method of assessing a portfolio of information about the teaching of an instructor under review. This portfolio typically includes curricula vitae, student evaluations, self-evaluative statements, peer observations, and other evidence such as syllabi, assignments, student work, and letters solicited from former students . . . . . (https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/peer-review-of-teaching/#what) and in the case of UNCSA's Rank Promotion application form, supporting materials chosen by the faculty member under review are also included;

And whereas, in compliance with the UNC Policy Manual and Code #602 (https://old.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php?pg=dl&id=s392&inline=1&return_url=%2Fpolicy%2Findex.php%3Fpg%3Dtoc%26id%3Ds12), the University of North Carolina School of the Arts (UNCSA) has devised a method of Peer Evaluation of faculty members' performances for the completely separate purposes of Contract Reappointment, Mid-Ten-Year Review and the Optional Rank Promotion process as written in the UNCSA Faculty Manual, page 58 at http://www.uncsa.edu/mysa/faculty-staff/faculty-resources/faculty-affairs/faculty-affairs-forms/rank-promotion/process_and_deadlines_for_rank_promotion_2016-2017.docx, detailing:

Process and Deadlines for Contract Reappointment Evaluation

Process and Deadlines for Rank Promotion

Peer Review Committee for Rank Promotion

Peer Review Committee for Contract Reappointment Evaluation

And whereas, the procedures, as printed in the Faculty Manual, to be undertaken in forming the personnel makeup, assignation of chairs, and administrative charge to the Peer Evaluation Committees are not explicit;

And whereas, the UNCSA Provost's Office in collaboration with the Faculty Rank Committee (FRC) has now deployed the Engaged and Sustained

Professoriate (ESP) as the structure for evaluating Optional Rank Promotion for faculty who elect to undergo this process, and has now detailed the distinctions between the separate evaluative procedures of Contract Reappointment, Mid-Ten-Year Review, and Optional Rank Promotion (see appended definitions and example of Engaged and Sustained endeavors in the areas of Creative and/or Research Activities, Service and Teaching in Appendix A and Appendix B to this document);

And whereas, the FRC has now reviewed more than 50 Rank Promotion applications over the course of the past two years, and in that time has discovered that the constitution of Peer Review Committees have not been consistent (i.e., sometimes members were chosen and appointed selected by Arts Schools and Division Deans, and sometimes Chairs of the Peer Evaluation Committees have been selected by some Deans and, in some cases, the Peer Review Evaluation itself has come under the shaping influence of some Deans);

And whereas, in discussion with the FRC, the Office of the Provost has expressed a desire to standardize the personnel make-up and procedure for forming Peer Evaultin committees for all three separate purposes (Contract Reappointment, Mid-Ten-Year Review and Optional Rank Promotion);

And, whereas the FRC, on Faculty Enrichment Day, 2016, initiated a campus wide and faculty wide effort and dialogue, led by keynote speaker David Teachout in his main address and in two breakout sessions on that day, and supported by documentation authored by Dee Fink that was later disseminated by email to the entire Faculty about the foundational principles that guide contractual normal, usual, expected and routine performance in teaching in distinction to Engaged and Sustained performance required for Optional Rank Promotion;

And whereas the Faculty would like to ensure that each faculty member to be reviewed has a Peer review that is strictly a product of faculty peers;

The Faculty Rank Committee, therefore, proposes to the Faculty Council of UNCSA that in order to create consistency across all Peer Review procedures and across all the Arts Schools, Divisions and Programs, the following procedures should be placed into the UNCSA Faculty Manual and replace the directives that now exist in that document:

1. The Office of Faculty Affairs identifies which faculty will be evaluated in a given cycle. The Office of Faculty Affairs then determines for given cycle 1) how many three-person Peer Evaluation Committees (PECs) are needed, 2) the number of eligible faculty needed based on how many faculty must be reviewed, and 3) which faculty are eligible to serve on a PEC.

2. The Office of Faculty Affairs informs the Dean of a School, Program or Division which faculty are being evaluated, how many PECs and eligible faculty are needed in a given cycle and which faculty are eligible to serve on a PEC.

3. The Dean or designee convenes the full faculty, announces which faculty are eligible to serve on a PEC in a given cycle or year, explains procedure and leaves the room, along with the faculty member(s) under review.

4. The faculty elect a leader to run the selection process. The faculty discuss, nominate and select by written vote, one committee at a time, a three-member PEC for each member under review. Before constituting the next committee, the outcome of each vote is tabulated and announced. A faculty member may serve on more than one PEC.

5. In cases where an Art School or Division or Program does not have enough faculty to constitute PECs for everyone under review in a given year, the Office of Faculty Affairs will provide a list of all eligible faculty evaluators campus-wide to make up the three-person core PEC. The faculty will then use this list to elect and finalize the PEC, as outlined above.

6. In cases where a faculty member under review would like to have a fourth peer reviewer from outside the faculty member's School or Division or Program join the three-person PEC, the faculty member should submit that name to the Dean or designee, who will contact the fourth reviewer to determine if she/he is willing to serve.

7. The Dean will convene the PECs to charge them to meet, elect a chair and undertake the evaluation process of named faculty.

8. The Chair of the PEC will charge the other members to undertake teaching observations, including pre- and post-observation interviews and reflections by evaluators that are shared transparently with the faculty being reviewed, in accordance with best practices.
   Suggested examples of best practice:

   a. https://www.cte.cornell.edu/resources/documenting-teaching/peer-review-of-teaching/index.html
   b. https://www.cte.cornell.edu

9. Further, the Chair will charge the PEC members to review the documents in the entire dossier for the faculty member under review and then will write a summative evaluation based on the committee's notes. In the cases where any member disagrees with the evaluation or has a different recommendation, the Chair will include the dissenting member's letter with the summative evaluation.

10. In the case of Contract Reappointment and Mid-Ten-Year Review, the Chair will complete the 'Peer Review Committee Evaluation & Recommendation for Contract Reappointment Evaluation.' The Chair will insert the PEC letter(s) into the appropriate form.

11. In the case of Optional Rank Promotion, the Chair will sum up the points given by PEC members and complete and sign the Rank Promotion Application Form. The Chair will insert the PEC letter(s) into the Rank Promotion Application Form.

Members of Faculty Council
Michael S. Rothkopf, Chair
Wade Wilson, Vice Chair
Leslie Kamtman, Secretary
Tanya Belov
Dennis Booth
Trish Casey
Norman Coates
John Ferri
Martha Golden
Renata Jackson
Elizabeth Klaimon
Geordie MacMinn
Laura Martin
Paul Sharpe
Betsy Towns
Mike Wakeford
Greg Walter