

## Overview of the Senate's Report on Faculty Dossiers

As the Faculty Senate began to reconsider the current CNU dossier system, we were aware that what was sought in any revision would vary by the group of people who were asked. For junior faculty, the biggest need continues to be clarity in the process, while those faculty and administrators charged with reviewing candidates often expressed the need for more systematic and streamlined documentation. Many members of the faculty had also expressed concerns regarding the number of volumes in each dossier, and some wondered whether CNU's gradual move towards technological evaluation of other parts of the college could be adapted to suit the dossier as well.

Given these myriad issues, the Faculty Senate created a subcommittee which was tasked with reviewing the current state of the dossier and to suggest revisions based on suggestions made from the campus community. This subcommittee consisted of two Senators, Dr. Michael Lewis and Dr. Ron Mollick, as well as four faculty representing drawn from across a variety of academic disciplines (Dr. Ed Brash, Dr. Jean Filetti, Dr. Phil Hamilton and Dr. Bob Hasbrouck). After lengthy discussions among this group that yielded the beginnings of the proposed change in format, this subcommittee consulted with the Deans and provost to gain their input. The results are the proposed changes in the Faculty Dossier that are in the attached documents.

In making these suggested changes, we understand that not every member of CNU's community has been consulted, and given that central importance of the dossier to all faculty, we feel it is imperative to hear from as wide a range of voices as we can so that the resulting changes (if any) will be understood and supported by the widest possible number of people. As you think about your feedback, please ask as many questions as you deem necessary, if there are issues to be clarified, that is one of our main goals. Secondly, we would like to hear from you as to whether or not you would support this new potential dossier format, and if not, what do you see as the shortcomings that we might address in this plan.

## **Supplemental Binders-**

While there is no strict limit on the material that can be included in faculty supplemental binders, it is strongly encouraged that such material be closely coordinated with the faculty members' eval 6 statement.

To aide individual faculty in making decision about what to include in the supplemental binders, we offer the following three lists below.

1- Items that *should* be included in supplemental binders:

- Copies of published work/performances (could also be included on a CD in the jacket of the core binder).

2- Items that *may* be included in supplemental binders:

- Copies of relevant course materials demonstrating particular points of emphasis or alterations related to teaching.
- Alternate assessments of teaching effectiveness (e.g., summarized results of pre-test, post-tests done in courses).
- Copies of professional work in progress.

3- Items that *probably should not* be included in supplemental binders

- Copies of letters acknowledging service/participation in CNU activities
- Copies of notes from students thanking faculty for letters of recommendation, etc..