

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL OF THE ARTS  
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
March 1, 2017**

**Present:** Michael Rothkopf, Dennis Booth, Tanya Belov, Trish Casey, Martha Golden, Renata Jackson, Leslie Kamtman, Elizabeth Klaimon, Steve LaCosse, Laura Martin, David Pounds, Ellen Rosenberg, Betsy Towns, Mike Wakeford, Greg Walter

*Ex-officio* Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost David English, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs Karen Beres

**I. Approval of Minutes**

- Minutes of the February 15, 2017 Faculty Council Meeting were approved as written.

**II. Welcome David Pounds, Visiting Faculty At-large Faculty Council member**

**III. Rosemary Millar, Kenan Institute Liaison**

- Rosemary described several opportunities for the faculty.
  - UNCSA Enrichment Grants
  - UNCSA Faculty Leadership Grants
  - Creative Community Lab
- Encouraged Faculty to contact Rosemary for more information, questions, ideas.

**IV. Faculty Council Report – Michael Rothkopf**

- All-School Faculty Meeting March 15
  - Faculty Salary increases
  - Changes to Peer Evaluation process
  - Ombuds search update
  - Update on Faculty Assembly's defense of UNC's core educational mission
  - Standing Committee summary reports
  - Chancellor Bierman
- Faculty Manual: will work on revisions over Spring Break
- Sexual Assault Awareness month in April
  - Student Life looking for faculty participation in activities planned for April 3, 5, 12, 18
  - Contact Michael if interested in participating

**V. Peer Evaluation Guidelines**

- Thanks to the Faculty Rank Committee for preparing this.
- Document prepared by Faculty Rank Committee including Draft Resolution for Peer Evaluation Guidelines previously sent to Faculty Council; Resolution included with today's Agenda.
- MOTION to approve Resolution 2016-17-3 Peer Evaluation Guidelines at UNCSA.
  - Discussion followed.
  - Resolution 2016-17-3 Peer Evaluations Guidelines approved as amended:

**Peer Evaluation Procedures, revised and approved**

1. The Office of Faculty Affairs determines how many three-person Peer Evaluation Committees (PECs) and number of eligible faculty are needed in a given cycle based on how many faculty must be reviewed, and 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. A suggested example of best practice:  
<https://www.cte.cornell.edu/resources/documenting-teaching/peer-review-of-teaching/index.html>
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.
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.

## VI. Other

- Michael commented on the DLA proposal and the question he posed to the faculty, and the response that it generated. The issue he had with the DLA proposal had less to do with the actual proposal than it had to do with the procedure that is in place for approving curriculum.
- He proposed that, at the Council meeting April 5, we look at the procedures that go into approval of changes to the curriculum.
- There needs to be a clear procedure that matches the policy that is in place.
- Emphasized that the faculty are responsible for the curriculum.
- When there is a curriculum revision, he is not suggesting that deans are not a part of that process as it very much a collaborative effort, but at some point in the process, the faculty themselves need to take a look at that curriculum revision, take responsibility for the revision, and in some clear way approve it before it goes to the Educational Policies Committee.
- Will bring this issue to the April 5 meeting for Faculty Council to make some recommendations to EPC to help clarify the process. It is up to EPC to determine what their policies and procedures are.
- Emphasized the responsibility of the faculty to the curriculum and the responsibility of the administration to make sure the curriculum is implemented and has the funding it needs to go forward.
- Council discussion followed.
- Michael will put together some groundwork material to help prepare for discussion at the next Council meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Leslie E. Kamtman