*The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee shall review the Faculty Evaluation Model regularly and strive to clarify the existing document. The subcommittee shall make recommendations to the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee regarding any changes in the written document and shall respond to all requests for alteration of the document or its underlying philosophy.*

*The subcommittee shall consist of seven members. Each division will be represented on the subcommittee, and there will be one at-large member. At least two of the faculty appointed each year must be tenured. The At-Large member must come from a department not already represented. The subcommittee meets on the First Monday of the Month.*

Minutes

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

November 3, 2020 3:30PM

[**https://uncp.webex.com/meet/rachel.smith**](https://uncp.webex.com/meet/rachel.smith)

**Join by phone**
+1-415-655-0001 US Toll
Access code: 739 591 491

Members in attendance:

Anthony Johnson (Letters to 2022), Jessica Dupuis (ARTS to 2021), Rachel Smith (Chair, NSM to 2021), Aaron Vandermeer (At large to 2022), Jonathan Ricks (CHS to 2021)

Members not in attendance: Chiuchu (Melody) Chuang (Education to 2021), Tracy Vargas (SBS to 2022),

Guests: Dr. Liz Normandy, Professor and Associate Vice Chancellor of Planning and Accreditation

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 3:32pm.
2. Adoption of the Agenda
The agenda was adopted.
3. Approval of Minutes from October 6, 2020
The minutes of the October 6, 2020 meeting were approved as circulated.
4. A Conversation with the Provost
The Chair reviewed Evaluation Proposals 1 and 2 with Dr. Locklear. Dr. Locklear wanted to take more time to consider the proposals and hopefully will meet with us at the next meeting in February to discuss this item.
5. Chair’s Report

The Chair reported that the Administration was unaware that language had been passed and confirmed about if faculty are successfully on their way to tenure in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service in the faculty handbook.

The Chair shared comments that she received from faculty about language to consider regarding Post-Tenure Review.

The Chair discussed the issue about SEI’s not moving fully online yet and how that would impact our discussion under New Business. Dr. Vandermeer shared the history of Interfolio and commented that a reminder to everyone about the SEI’s issue would be beneficial. Dr. Vandermeer will be drafting a memo about the SEI’s issue and make a recommendation to create an implementation committee to oversee this matter. This memo will be reviewed at our next meeting in February 2021.

1. Old Business

The subcommittee went over the changes that were proposed and discussed on p. 96, 97, and 93 in the Post-Tenure Review (Section II, Chapter 2) in the Faculty Handbook (see Appendix A) at our previous meeting. Dr. Normandy stated that the last sentence under The Department Chair (or Dean for the Evaluation of Department Chairs) on p. 96 is a required statement by the BOG and it cannot be changed.

After further discussion, the Chair asked, if the subcommittee was ready to approve the language. Dr. Vandermeer made a motion to approve and Dr. Johnson seconded it. There was a unanimous voice vote, so there was no need to do a roll call. This item will be presented to FIAC in January 2021.

* 1. Post-tenure review fixes (Appendix A) that were approved by the subcommittee:
	p. 96 – The department or unit selects a Peer Evaluation Committee of three members by
	process agreed upon by the tenured faculty within the department or unit.
	p. 97 – remove letter (e) faculty member’s five-year plan & revise letters
	p. 93 – Department chairs shall meet with each faculty member in the Fall semester
	following successful Post-tenure review to develop a plan for the next five years that should include milestones that are aligned with annual performance evaluation and are consistent with the department’s Disciplinary Statements.

The subcommittee discussed the survey for Departments Chairs (Appendix B) regarding the Student Evaluations of Instruction. It was decided that The Chair would revise the survey and it would be recirculated to the committee members via email by the end of the week for review. The deadline to submit any edits to the Chair was set for Wednesday, November 11, 2020. Once the survey is revised, The Chair will run the survey by Dean Gay before distributing it out to Department Chairs during the week of November 16, 2020.

1. New Business

The committee members discussed revising the language for the Student Evaluations of Instruction (Appendix C). It was agreed upon that the subcommittee will wait until the next meeting to revise SEI’s language at which time we should know more about the status of the SEI’s moving fully online and the results from the survey of Chairs.

1. Announcements

Next meeting: February 2, 2021 at 3:30pm via Webex. The Provost may attend the meeting.

1. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49pm.

Appendix A: Post-tenure review language from Faculty Handbook

p. 96

p. 96

**The Peer Evaluation Committee**

The department or unit selects ~~the~~ a Peer Evaluation Committee of three members by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty within the department or unit. The faculty member being evaluated cannot make the final selection

of Committee members. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for evaluating submitted

materials, assessing their implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member’s

performance. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer

Evaluation Report using the Format for Peer Evaluation Committee’s Post-Tenure Report. This report

will include a narrative and an overall performance rating. In the case of a negative review, specific

detailed descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member’s assigned duties must be

provided in the narrative. The Chair of the Peer Evaluation Committee obtains the evaluated faculty

member’s signature on the report and submits the report to the Dean of the faculty member’s college or

school. Following delivery of the Peer Evaluation Committee’s report to the evaluated faculty member,

the Department Chair (or Dean for the evaluation of the Department Chair) must consult with the

Committee before sending the materials to the next level of review.

p. 97

The Department Chair (or Dean for Department Chairs) then (a) appoints three faculty members to the

Peer Evaluation Committee in the manner described above, (b) calls this group together for its initial

meeting in order to orient the members to the process, and (c) makes available to the members the

materials cited above.

p. 93

Department chairs shall meet with each faculty member in the Fall semester following successful Post-tenure review to develop a plan for the next five years ~~In consultation with department chairs, faculty shall develop five year goal(s) or plans~~ that should include milestones that are aligned with annual performance evaluation and are consistent with the department’s Disciplinary Statements. These plans can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair.

p. 97

At the point in time when the cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty process is to begin, the faculty

member involved will be so notified in writing by his or her Department Chair or by the Dean of the

relevant college or school if the review involves the Department Chair (see Calendar of Events below).

The faculty member will subsequently submit to his or her Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or

school for the evaluation of the evaluation of Department Chairs) a copy of (a) Self Evaluations for the

previous five years, (b) Student Evaluation summaries for the previous five years, (c) Chair Evaluations

for the previous five years, (d) Dean’s annual evaluation reports for the previous five years, ~~(e) faculty~~

~~member’s five year plan~~ (~~f~~e) any additional information since the last annual evaluation that is deemed

pertinent, and (~~g~~f) a completed copy of the Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form. In the initial

stages of this process, these various materials might be collected from a variety of sources (the faculty

member’s own copies, copies in the possession of the Department Chair, and/or copies in the possession

of the Office for Academic Affairs).

p. 96

**The Department Chair (or Dean for the Evaluation of Department Chairs)**

The Department Chair (Dean of the Chair’s school or college for evaluation of Department Chairs), subsequent to the completion of the Peer Evaluation Committee Evaluation and consultation with the Peer Evaluation Committee, is responsible for writing his or her own report (see Format for Chair’s Post-Tenure Report), obtaining the evaluated faculty member’s signature on the report and submitting this document to the Dean of the faculty member’s college or school. This report will include a narrative and an overall performance rating. In the case of a negative review, specific detailed descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member’s assigned duties must be provided in the narrative. The Chair (or Dean for the evaluation of Department Chairs) must consult with the Peer Evaluation Committee before submitting his or her report.

Appendix B: Survey of Chairs

**FERS Survey of Department Chairs**

**Start of Block: Default Question Block**

Q3 The Faculty Evaluation Review subcommittee is trying to identify solutions to the problem that arises when faculty are evaluated in the Spring semester and their chair has access to their Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEI's) but they cannot see the results until grades have been submitted.  Since one of the proposed solutions (moving back the annual evaluation calendar by either 15 days or 1 month) would impact Chairs significantly, we wanted to get your feedback.

Q2 It is important that faculty members in my department are able to view the results of their SEI's within 10 days after the Chair submits his/her annual evaluation report in order to be offered the opportunity to submit a rebuttal.

* Strongly agree (1)
* Somewhat agree (2)
* Neither agree nor disagree (3)
* Somewhat disagree (4)
* Strongly disagree (5)

Q1 It is important that faculty in my department can view the results of their student evaluations of instruction (SEI's) prior to submitting their annual evaluation.

* Strongly agree (1)
* Somewhat agree (2)
* Neither agree nor disagree (3)
* Somewhat disagree (4)
* Strongly disagree (5)

Q4 Delaying the deadline for Chair's annual evaluation reports until after the end of the Spring semester would allow me to give them the time and attention necessary.

* Strongly agree (1)
* Somewhat agree (2)
* Neither agree nor disagree (3)
* Somewhat disagree (4)
* Strongly disagree (5)

Q5 Delaying the deadline for Chair's annual evaluation reports to June 1 would require me to work during a time I am not compensated or under contract.

* Strongly agree (1)
* Somewhat agree (2)
* Neither agree nor disagree (3)
* Somewhat disagree (4)
* Strongly disagree (5)

Q6 It is important the my faculty's annual evaluations include at least one semester of SEI's each year.

* Strongly agree (1)
* Somewhat agree (2)
* Neither agree nor disagree (3)
* Somewhat disagree (4)
* Strongly disagree (5)

Q7 It isn't important that the annual evaluation reports which are included and discussed are evaluating instruction during the current academic year (and not the preceding academic year).

* Strongly agree (1)
* Somewhat agree (2)
* Neither agree nor disagree (3)
* Somewhat disagree (4)
* Strongly disagree (5)

**End of Block: Default Question Block**

Appendix C: Previous work on SEI’s

p. 83-84

**Student Evaluations of Instruction**

All teaching faculty (full- and part-time faculty, Department Chairs, and administrators who teach) are evaluated by students using the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form. Although student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member’s performance as a teacher, they do contribute to the overall faculty evaluation process. The data are summarized in a Student Evaluation Report.

Full-time faculty, teaching graduate or undergraduate courses, are evaluated during one semester of each academic year and part-time faculty are evaluated each semester. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form. A department may add up to five supplementary items or scales to this form without approval from the Senate. Alternatively, a department may develop a substitute Student Evaluation of Instruction Form in lieu of the general form. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve any alternate forms.

Complete schedules and instructions for conducting student evaluations of instruction are available at the Academic Affairs website; however, i~~I~~nstructors being evaluated by students must employ the following evaluation procedures.

~~First, the class is to select a student who will distribute the forms, collect the completed forms, place them in an envelope, and return the sealed envelope to the department secretary.~~ ~~Second,~~ ~~t~~The faculty member must ~~be absent from class~~ not be present while the evaluations are completed,~~. Third, the faculty member being evaluated~~ must not have access to ~~tabulate~~ the student evaluations and~~. Fourth, the faculty member~~ must not receive any report on ~~his or her~~ their evaluations until grades for the current semester have been submitted~~; verbatim evaluation statements will be transcribed when possible~~. Faculty members are encouraged to ~~conduct student evaluations at the beginning of a class session, to~~ allow students adequate time to complete the~~m~~ evaluation.

Student evaluation of graduate instruction follows the same procedures as in undergraduate instruction using the Student Evaluation of Instruction instrument. In addition, graduate courses are evaluated using the Graduate Course Analysis form following procedures approved by the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate. These procedures can be found in the Graduate Faculty Handbook. Data from the analysis of graduate courses are not used in faculty evaluation but instead are used for program improvement and accreditation purposes.

All first-year faculty are to be evaluated by students in both fall and spring semesters. Other faculty members are to be evaluated once a year on the following schedule:

Academic years that begin in odd-numbered years (e.g., fall, 2011-spring, 2012)

Faculty whose last names begin A - M are evaluated in the fall semester

Faculty whose last names begin N - Z are evaluated in the spring semester

Academic years that begin in even-numbered years (e.g., fall, 2012-spring, 2013)

Faculty whose last names begin N - Z are evaluated in the fall semester

Faculty whose last names begin A - M are evaluated in the spring semester

A quantitative summary of the ratings in each course is ~~prepared~~made available as soon as possible, and transcripts of handwritten student comments are prepared when possible. ~~The faculty member being evaluated must not prepare the quantitative summary or the transcript of comments.~~ The Department Chair must retain the raw Student Evaluation of Instruction Forms for as long as these may be required for future evaluation reviews. After grades have been submitted, the faculty member receives copies of the quantitative summaries and copies of the transcribed student comments if available. ~~The faculty member may examine the original comments in the Department Chair’s office.~~ The Department Chair prepares the Student Evaluation Report, based on both undergraduate and graduate student evaluations of instruction. It provides quantitative summaries and individual comments given by students and is included in the annual Chair’s Evaluation Report.

*FIAC action on this language*

* Committee members discussed the best approach for dealing with this issue given that the campus may move to all online evaluations as early as next year. They indicated they would prefer for the motion to address where the responsibility for administering and distributing the results of SEI’s lies and a means for ensuring that faculty members are getting access to the results of their SEI’s following the semester in which they were administered. Since it is very likely that all SEI’s will have to be conducted online this semester, it was suggested that we use this semester as a pilot for online evaluation implementation and delay addressing this change until next year. As a result, the Chair of FERS withdrew the motion.