April 2, 2009

Memo to: Rebecca Wheeler, President
           Faculty Senate

From: Michelle A. Vachris, Chair
           Faculty Review Committee

Subject: Senate charge to FRC.

Earlier this semester the Faculty Senate requested "that the FRC consider and recommend a) what material, and b) what amount of that material should be included in a candidate's dossier"…and "what the FRC would like to see to effectively and yet economically evaluate a candidate."

The FRC has carefully considered what information is useful in evaluating candidates. We recognize that more detailed information would probably be needed by the Departmental Review Committees and our recommendations below include both perspectives.

Firstly, the FRC recommends that the University Eval-6 be reviewed and revised to align with the newly adopted Eval-4. The current Eval-6 also has redundant categories and so it should also be streamlined.

In terms of the content of the dossier, the FRC first explored whether much of the current required documentation could be placed online for review to cut down on the amount of paper involved. However, given that we need easy access to the information during our meetings, we concluded that the paper-based system would be more efficient for the time being.

We propose the following system which should result in much less paper that is now being submitted. Faculty dossiers should have maximum sizes. We are hopeful that we can limit faculty to one binder. The size and number of the binders would be determined in a pilot study. In general, documentation would be limited to the previous 5 years. This time frame would cover the 2nd year, 4th year and tenure reviews, as well as post-tenure reviews. Exceptions could be made for promotions to full and distinguished professor.

1. The dossier must have a label on its spine identifying the candidate and must be arranged in the order given below with appropriately labeled tabs or dividers between sections.
2. Pocket of the inside front cover: Current form EVAL7 (including DRC summary statement) and current completed form EVAL6 (in that order).
3. Form EVAL10 (checklist) as the fist page of the dossier.
4. Current Departmental Eval 4.

5. Current curriculum vitae for the candidate. The CV must separate peer-reviewed versus non-peer reviewed publications and presentations and should align with the departmental Eval-4.
6. Copies of all previous EVAL6's from the candidate arranged in descending order by year (most recent year first) **not to exceed 5 years.**
7. Copies of all summary statements, recommendations, and decisions generated by previous evaluations (forms EVAL7 and EVAL8), **not to exceed 5 years.** These materials are to be grouped together *by year*, with EVAL8 preceding EVAL7 for each year, and then arranged in descending order by year.
8. Documentation of teaching:
   a. Course syllabi – one from each course taught for evaluation period. Do not include multiple syllabi if you taught more than one section over the evaluation period unless significant course revisions were made.
   b. A sampling of tests, assignments and other evaluation tools. Do not include each tests/assignment given.
   c. IDEA reports for all sections evaluated arranged in descending order by year (most recent year first) **not to exceed 5 years.**
   d. Other relevant teaching documentation.
9. Documentation of Professional Development: arranged in descending order by year (most recent year first) **not to exceed 5 years.** Limited to published or forthcoming works and only the most recent version of the work is included. Note that for this area, the FRC would not necessarily need copies of the works. We could review the CV and information on the Eval-6 and rely on the Department Review Committee's assessment of the quality of the professional contributions. However, the DRC would want to see the actual work.
   a. Articles: If already published, include copy of published article. If forthcoming, include copy of article & acceptance letter.
   b. Books: If already published, include copy of cover and copyright page. If forthcoming, include copy of contract.
   c. Creative works: concise descriptions of the product(s), as well as any documentation that speaks to the veracity and quality of the product or project (i.e.: playbills, programs, advertizing pieces, etc). Additionally, any peer review must appear in the dossier. In the case of visual arts or theater performances -- rather than supporting pictures, photos, graphs, drawings, schematics, etc. -- we should recommend but not require an online portfolio of the project.
   d. Presentations: Only include copy of program or similar documentation. Do not include copy of the paper.
10. Documentation of Service: Service is listed in the CV, so minimal additional documentation is needed. No need to document University committee assignments as these are recorded in the Provost's office.