

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

Meeting Minutes

March 1, 2016

Sampson 103

Members present: Larry Arnold (At-Large), Mitu Ashraf (Secretary, At-Large), Youngsuk Chae (LTRS) Shenika Jones (EDUC), Dennis McCracken (NSM), June Power (ARTS), Libby Denny (Chair, SBS)

Members absent: None

Guest: None

Recording Secretary: Mitu Ashraf

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Libby Denny at 3:30 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes of the February 2, 2016, Meeting

The minutes of the February 2, 2016 meeting of the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee were approved.

III. Approval of Agenda

Agenda approved as written.

IV. Report from the Chair

Chair, Dr. Libby Denny, mentioned that time was running out to provide revisions of the Faculty Evaluation Policy in the Faculty Handbook.

VII. Old Business

The Subcommittee reviewed, line-by-line, the Faculty Evaluation Policy. A lengthy discussion and numerous revisions followed. In order to finish the revisions the Subcommittee members voted to extend the meeting by ten minutes.

The Subcommittee members voted on two items.

1. Format of Faculty Evaluation Policy related to University service. Discussion followed and revisions were made. (See the revised document for details.) The vote count was 6-0-0.

2. Faculty Evaluation Policy (Section II, Chapter 2). After a lengthy discussion and numerous revisions of the document, the members voted 6-0-0 in favor of the revised document. (See the revised document for details of revisions.)

VIII. New Business

None

IX. Announcements

The next meeting will be held in Sampson 103 at 3:30 p.m. on April 5, 2016.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Mitu Ashraf
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT 1

Format for Evaluation Reports

These format guidelines give an overview of specific information that should appear in a faculty member's self-evaluation form, the department chair's evaluation report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's evaluation report, and the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Area weights assigned to specific areas must sum to 100%. The following are the headings which should appear at the beginning of each evaluation area being discussed with the area weight listed to the right of the heading.

1). **Introductory Heading** - The introductory heading should appear at the top of the first page of the evaluation form and include the following information as listed below.

Faculty Member's Name

Current Professorial Rank

Current Academic Year _____ **Department**

Type of Form *Self* _____ *Chair* _____ *Peer*

Type of Evaluation (check all applicable) *Annual* _____ *Tenure* _____ *Promotion* _____

2). **TEACHING** **Area Weight (50% to 70%)**

a) Classroom activities. Discuss classroom work as it relates to how knowledge in a faculty member's discipline is covered (e.g., categories, principles, summaries), how the specific content of a discipline is imparted (e.g., facts, examples), the development of general student skills (e.g., communication, critical thinking, creativity, mathematics), how student learning is motivated (e.g., stimulating curiosity, confidence, and task-specific motivation), measures of student performance (e.g., examinations, papers, presentations, other projects), and future plans for development in the area of teaching.

b) Auxiliary teaching activities. Discuss evidence that grades have been submitted in a timely manner, supplementary instructional time provided outside of class, the supervising of student research projects, working with colleagues to develop curricula, and plans for future development in this area.

c) How has the information from your most recent evaluation been used to improve instruction?

3). SCHOLARSHIP **Area Weight (10% to 40%)** _____

a) Research. Discuss scholarly research for the period of the evaluation. In particular, there should be emphasis on (a) how knowledge has been developed, (b) the application of existing knowledge used to solve practical problems, (c) the application of professional knowledge and skill to an artistic problem if applicable, or (d) the completion of a special program of intellectual development. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

b) Publication. Discuss scholarly works that have been disseminated within the faculty member's discipline. Examples across disciplines are exhibition of artistic work, editing grant applications, publication in scholarly journals, and publishing of works aimed toward student and general audiences. Also include comments on future plans for development in this area.

4). SERVICE **Area weight (10% to 40%)** _____

A faculty member may work in any of the following categories in a given year.

a) University Service. Comment about on-campus service provided during the period, including activities such as academic advising (see [Academic Advisement, Section III, Chapter 1](#)), committee work (see [Faculty Governance, Section I, Chapter 3](#)), grant administration (see [Faculty Research Policy, Section II, Chapter 7](#)), or consultations supporting the work of staff or faculty. Quality of service is very important (e.g., serving actively on a small number of committees is more valuable than serving minimally on many committees). Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

b) Professional service. Comment on the nature, scope, and effectiveness of service to the faculty member's profession. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

c) Community Service. Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of off-campus service during the period, including such activities as participation on professional committees and governing boards, providing consultation to schools, civic organizations, and government agencies, and providing leadership on public matters. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

5). Anticipated Area Weights for the Next Academic Year - This section should only appear on the self-evaluation form. The following anticipated area weights as indicated below should be listed in this section.

Teaching (50% to 70%)

Scholarship (10% to 40%)

Service (10% to 40%)

6). SYNTHESIS - This section will only appear in a department chair or Peer Evaluation Committee's evaluation form. In this section, the evaluator(s) determine the overall performance rating of the faculty member for the period covered. The quality of performance is weighed in relation to the faculty member's area weights. The final evaluation should (a) adhere to the guiding principles, (b) reflect equity within the department and among departments, and (c) allow a reasonable degree of flexibility in how a faculty member orients his or her effort.

a). Rationale of rating - This section clarifies the relationship between the various performance areas as listed in the University mission statement and the overall performance ranking given.

b). Overall rating of faculty member - Listed below are the ratings a faculty member will be assigned.

_____ Distinguished performance

_____ Very good performance

_____ Adequate performance

_____ Deficient performance

Date

Date

Signature of Department or Committee Chair

Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member

ATTACHMENT 2

SECTION II CHAPTER 2 FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

General Information

This Faculty Evaluation Model has the following sections: principles and criteria upon which faculty evaluations are based; principles informing the roles of different parties in the faculty evaluation; evaluation procedures for each type of evaluation, evaluation forms, and Calendars of Events for each type of evaluation.

This Model covers evaluations of full-time faculty members and evaluations by faculty members of Department Chairs, but does not cover administrators or academic support personnel even though they may hold faculty rank. Full-time teaching faculty are those who teach at least nine semester hours. Some faculty who would normally be considered full-time but who have been reassigned to other non-teaching duties are to adjust the weights in their self-evaluations to account for those other responsibilities. Performance in such non-teaching functions will be evaluated by whomever the faculty member reports to for those responsibilities.

Full-time faculty receive annual evaluations, evaluations for promotion and/or tenure, and **evaluations for contract renewal**. **They and also may receive** advisory evaluations. Tenured faculty receive a comprehensive, periodic, cumulative evaluation every five years or five years from the last review related to tenure and/or promotion. Procedures for non-tenure-track faculty are also described. Faculty members are evaluated in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) to which flexible area weights are assigned. Overall evaluation is recorded on standard evaluation forms and measured in accordance with a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale **taking the faculty member's area weights into account**. Overall performance ratings become the basis for annual recommendations for merit salary increases as well as for tenure, promotion, or contract renewal recommendations. In this Model, the phrase "major evaluations" denotes evaluations for tenure, promotion, or contract renewal.

Librarians with faculty rank are evaluated under the provisions of the Faculty Handbook in the section below on "Policy Statement on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Professional Librarians." Evaluation of library services, including performance of library personnel, is delegated to the Academic Support Services Sub-Committee of the Faculty Senate. Evaluations (contract renewal, annual, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review) of professional librarians with faculty rank will follow the same general procedures that are applied to teaching faculty, with exceptions dependent on the special responsibilities of librarians. Those responsibilities are outlined in general terms as criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure in Section II, Chapter 1 on Faculty Personnel Policies and Section II, Chapter 3 on Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy.

Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion are advised to consult Section II, Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook that outlines University-wide criteria for tenure and promotion.

Optional Departmental Evaluation Plan

The general objectives of the Faculty Evaluation Model may be attained by other methods. Departments that prefer to modify criteria or procedures are strongly encouraged to develop a Departmental Evaluation Plan. That plan may provide specific criteria as supplements to the Guiding Principles and may substitute alternatives for the Format for Evaluation Reports, the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form, and the Department Chair Evaluation Form. In developing any alternative Student Evaluation of Instruction Form, a department should obtain input from its students. **Department plans may include descriptions of disciplinary expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service.**

An acceptable plan must (a) adhere to the guiding principles and procedural objectives in this document; (b) conform to all deadlines established herein; (c) produce a final output that can be expressed in terms of the Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form and the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form; (d) be approved by a two-thirds majority of the department's full-time faculty; and (e) be approved by the Faculty Senate. Departmental plans are required to be reasonably consistent across time so that no individual's evaluation is affected by temporary, arbitrary, or radical changes. The Office for Academic Affairs will maintain a file of all approved departmental plans for examination by all faculty members.

Guiding Principles

The underlying philosophy of this Model is that evaluation of faculty performance is a complex process that should promote a reasonable degree of equity and consistency for all individuals and academic departments. The Model should be implemented in a way that enhances faculty development and promotes faculty achievement and satisfaction while also promoting the mission of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke.

Delete the following repeated paragraph found in the original Handbook

~~All phases of evaluation are to be guided by the principles set forth below. Individual faculty members have latitude in the roles they assume as they fulfill their responsibilities to the University and its mission. The Model encourages flexibility in applying the principles and criteria for each area of faculty evaluation, allowing for the varying needs and traditions of different academic disciplines. The Model also specifies procedures that promote consistency in evaluation. This Evaluation Model will be reviewed periodically by the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee and amended as the Faculty Senate deems appropriate.~~

All phases of evaluation are to be guided by the principles set forth below. Individual faculty members have latitude in the roles they assume as they fulfill their responsibilities to the University and its mission. The Model encourages flexibility in applying the principles and criteria for each area of faculty evaluation, allowing for the varying needs and traditions of different academic disciplines. The Model also specifies procedures that promote consistency in evaluation. This Evaluation Model will be reviewed periodically by the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee and amended as the Faculty Senate deems appropriate.

As a means to help insure fairness in all formal evaluations, a faculty member has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspects of reports submitted by Deans, Department Chairs, ~~or~~ Peer Evaluation Committees, **and the Promotion and Tenure Committee**. Each entity in the evaluation process, therefore, is to submit a copy of its report to the faculty member being evaluated.

While this Model attempts to be reasonably comprehensive with respect to policies and procedures, faculty members should also be familiar with other sections of the Faculty Handbook concerning tenure and promotion criteria (Section II, Chapter 3), grievance procedures (Section II, Chapter 1), and hearing

procedures (due process: Section II, Chapter I). Further, employment at the University and conduct as a faculty member are governed by sections of *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina* (available at the website for the UNC General Administration at <http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>). Faculty members should consult this document as well as the Faculty Handbook.

For purposes of evaluation, all faculty responsibilities are divided among three general areas of teaching, research, and service as reflected in The University of North Carolina at Pembroke Mission Statement. Some activities, such as grant-related work, may fall into several areas and should be evaluated accordingly. Throughout the following sections, the term “knowledge” is used as a broad summary term intended to include factual information; epistemological and empirical principles; artistic technique; empirical and interpretive methodologies; reasoning skills; and so forth.

Evaluation of Teaching

At The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, teaching is the single most important responsibility of regular full-time faculty members. According to our Mission Statement, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke “exists to promote excellence in teaching and learning, at the graduate and undergraduate levels, in an environment of free inquiry, interdisciplinary collaboration, and rigorous intellectual standards.” Teaching thus receives an area weight of 50%-70% in a faculty member’s evaluation, unless an exception is granted in writing.

The teaching area has two components. Classroom teaching includes all activities involved in preparing and conducting the courses that a faculty member is assigned to teach. Auxiliary teaching activities may include submitting grades, supervising student research projects or other learning not directly tied to an assigned course, class, administration of administering teaching-related grants, cooperating with colleagues in planning curricula, cooperating with university-wide and departmental curricular objectives, and pursuing professional growth as a teacher.

Classroom teaching effectiveness is evaluated in terms of six broad dimensions:

1. Imparting general knowledge: Effective teachers impart a sound and up-to-date understanding of the concepts, categories, principles, summaries, and other generalizations that apply to the topics within a course, providing a foundation for other learning. Even courses in applied techniques present conceptual frameworks that may be communicated through demonstrations, exercises, and discussions as well as lectures. Typically, success in imparting general content is evidenced by students’ capacity to explain what they have learned; to understand new information in the area; to apply their knowledge to new problems and contexts; and to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information.
2. Imparting specific knowledge: Effective teachers impart a representative, unbiased, selection of facts, examples, and other details that enrich a course’s general content. In a successful course, specific content authenticates and illustrates concepts, stimulates the imagination, and presents logical relationships between specific and general content clearly.
3. Developing skills: Effective teachers develop students’ capacity to perform various types of skills. Some of these skills reinforce course content. Other skills involve broader intellectual operations that underlie most university courses, such as creativity, oral and written communication skills, critical thinking, research methods, computer proficiency, and basic quantitative reasoning. Since many students need to develop basic skills, success in this area is an important component of effective teaching.
4. Motivating students: Effective teachers elicit from students a strong desire to learn. Motivated students prepare for class sessions, pay attention during class, participate in discussions, complete assigned work, rehearse skills, and study for examinations. Motivated students also

- show confidence, curiosity, and creativity; they strive for excellence in completing assignments; and they take an interest in non-required material and further course work in the area covered. Effective teaching practices to stimulate motivation are also addressed below.
5. Setting requirements and evaluating performance: Effective teachers fairly and accurately evaluate student learning while also providing students with specific feedback that promotes further learning. Performance standards are appropriate to course content and course level. Examinations, papers, and other assignments are sufficient, varied, and challenging; are appropriate to course content, course objectives, and students' background; and allow students to demonstrate their learning. Student work is graded carefully and returned in a timely manner with appropriate feedback. Student failure is handled constructively.
 6. Success with effective teaching practices: Effective teachers provide syllabi with clear course objectives and requirements; use teaching techniques (e.g., lectures, demonstrations, exercises, and discussions) that are effective and appropriate to fulfill course objectives; meet their classes as scheduled; set high expectations and help students meet them; involve students in active and cooperative learning; and continually review and revise courses. Effective teachers are enthusiastic and intellectually involved, treat students with respect and courtesy, offer extra assistance to students, and encourage students to consult with them outside of class.

Auxiliary teaching activities are evaluated by criteria appropriate to these activities, such as submitting valid grades in a timely manner, effectively supervising student research projects or other learning not directly tied to an ~~assigned class-course~~, working constructively with peers to develop curricula, supporting University and departmental objectives, and participating in activities for professional development as a teacher.

Major evaluations for renewal, tenure, ~~and promotion, and post-tenure review~~ will include documentation of teaching effectiveness. This documentation typically includes copies of representative syllabi, tests, assignments, and handouts; samples of student work and the faculty member's response to the work; and Student Evaluation Reports. This extensive documentation is typically not required for annual evaluations. Major evaluations for renewal, tenure, and promotion require reports on classroom observations by the Department Chair and members of a Peer Evaluation Committee. Auxiliary teaching activities may be documented by copies of student research projects, outlines of new curricula to which a contribution was made, and records of participation in activities for professional development as a teacher (workshops, seminars, conferences, etc).

Evaluation of Scholarship

Though teaching is their fundamental responsibility, all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a balanced pattern of scholarship and service ~~over the previous three years of employment at~~ the University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Scholarship receives an area weight of 10% to 40% in a faculty member's evaluation unless an exception is granted in writing. Scholarly work in progress, if appropriately documented, is recognized as a component of scholarship, but completed works of scholarship receive greater weight in evaluation. In promotion and tenure decisions, a consistent pattern of completed scholarly projects is expected.

Scholarship (scholarly research and/or scholarly publication) is defined as a set of disciplined intellectual activities that create or refine knowledge and exert influence through public dissemination in an academically respectable format. This definition of scholarship includes creative activity appropriate to the arts. Scholarly research is defined as (a) creating basic knowledge, (b) compiling or synthesizing knowledge, (c) applying existing basic knowledge to the solution of practical problems, (d) applying professional knowledge and skills to artistic problems, or (e) completing a special program of intellectual

development. Scholarly research may include research involved in the dissemination of scholarship or the preparation of scholarly publications as an editor or reviewer.

Attendance at professional conferences and workshops can contribute to a faculty member's scholarly research and may count among scholarly activities in a given year. Over time, however, conference attendance without scholarly publication (see below) in itself is not considered scholarship. Preparation and administration of grants qualifies as scholarly research only insofar as it entails the activities cited above.

Scholarly publication is defined as employing accepted techniques to publicly communicate research to (a) scholarly audiences, (b) student audiences, or (c) general audiences. Although most scholarly publication is intended primarily for other scholars, a publication that informs a broader audience is acceptable as long as the format of the publication is appropriate to a discipline.

Scholarship is evaluated primarily against specialized criteria appropriate to the disciplines of each department, ~~and consistent with a department's evaluation plan~~. The quality of scholarly publication is typically ensured through a peer review process appropriate to its audience. General criteria for evaluating scholarship include (a) significance as indicated by judged intellectual depth and scope, originality, and potential benefit to academia or society at large; and (b) peer review or recognition as indicated by publication in a refereed journal, publication in book form by a scholarly press or other recognized publisher, or presentation at a recognized forum. ~~for work in progress~~. National and international forums are typically accorded greater significance than regional ones. In tenure and promotion decisions, completed projects carry more weight than works in progress.

Typical documentation of scholarship includes copies of scholarly publications, books, conference papers, catalogs, or programs, and similar evidence of professional productivity in the faculty member's discipline. Less important is evidence of attendance at workshops, seminars, conferences, performances, or other activities even when they may directly contribute to a faculty member's scholarly or creative projects. When such projects require longer periods of time to complete, a faculty member may provide evidence of significant progress toward completion, including paper presentations, contracts for book publication, or external peer comments on a paper or partial manuscript. In cases where the confidential nature of a research project prevents its wider dissemination, a faculty member should provide appropriate documentation.

Evaluation of Service Paragraphs will be rearranged here. Numbers in red refer to the order and will not appear in the final text.

1. Though teaching is a fundamental responsibility, all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a balanced pattern of scholarship and service at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Service receives an area weight of 10% to 40% in a faculty member's evaluation unless an exception is granted in writing.

2. Service is divided into three categories: University service, professional service, and community service. In a given year, faculty members may apportion their service activities among these categories as they deem appropriate or in accordance with the needs of the University (e.g. required service to area public schools). Although a faculty member may choose to emphasize one or more areas of service, candidates for tenure and/or promotion should show some level of service in each of the three categories.

3. University service includes any University-related activities other than teaching and scholarship that promote the welfare of the University. Activities within and outside one's academic department (academic advisement of students, mentoring, preparation of grant applications, administrative activities associated with external grants and student activities, committee work and involvement in faculty governance, ~~revision of curricula~~, preparation of accreditation reports, and similar voluntary activities not assigned as position responsibilities) are considered University service.

7. Collegiality (willingness and ability to cooperate with colleagues) may be considered relevant to evaluation of service. If so, assessment of collegiality should be based solely on the faculty member's capacity to relate constructively to peers, including his or her impact on others' work, **rather than on perceived personality characteristics.**

5. Professional service consists of activities that benefit a faculty member's field of professional expertise. Professional service may include serving on professional committees and governing boards, serving as an officer in a professional organization, organizing and chairing sessions at professional meetings, and performing routine editing and reviewing. A professional activity for which remuneration is granted is evaluated as service only in cases where any compensation is very limited (e.g., expenses or a small honorarium).

6. Community service connotes activities that (a) are charitable; (b) are performed for the benefit of individuals or groups separate from the University and from the wider profession whether in a secular or non-secular context; and c) involve a commitment in time and use of professional expertise. Examples of community service include participating on committees and governing boards; speaking to non-professional audiences about topics in one's discipline; providing consultation to schools, civic organizations, and government agencies; or providing leadership on public matters related to the faculty member's professional expertise. A community service activity for which remuneration is granted is evaluated as service only in cases where any compensation is very limited (e.g., expenses or a small honorarium). **UNCP Serve, under the auspices of the Office of Civic and Community Engagement, may be helpful in identifying local service venues for faculty; however, faculty are free to seek out any service opportunity that interests them and makes use of their professional expertise.**

4. University service is evaluated when possible by results: ~~advisees~~ **advisement activities**, grant applications completed, grants successfully administered, activities of student organizations, valuable contributions to a committee's projects, completion of reports, gaining accreditation, and similar accomplishments. Listing committee membership as a form of service implies that one has fulfilled at least the basic responsibilities of membership. Professional service and community service are evaluated when possible by results: by the importance of contributions made, by how demanding activities were, and by how well objectives were achieved.

8. Appropriate materials that demonstrate service contributions commensurate with the area weight assigned must be used to document service. In general, letters of appreciation from organizers of service opportunities should be used as documentation only if they indicate an exceptional contribution. University service may be documented by materials such as lists of advisees; copies of reports or grants prepared; and supporting statements by Department Chairs, committee chairs, or the Office for Sponsored Research and Programs. Professional service and community service may be documented by printed or widely distributed materials such as conference programs, flyers, or by statements from chairs or presidents.

Participants in Faculty Evaluation

All evaluators should be guided by the traditions of academic freedom. **They are required to adhere to the tenets of the Faculty Evaluation Model when making judgments about a faculty member's performance.**

Also, all evaluators are required to maintain confidentiality about all the information and decisions involved except for disclosures required by their formal reporting responsibilities.

The Faculty Member Being Evaluated

The main kinds of evaluations of faculty members are as follows. Each full-time faculty member, even a faculty member not tenured or in a tenure-track position, receives annual evaluations. In addition, faculty members in tenure-track positions receive evaluations for tenure and for each promotion. Untenured tenure-track faculty receive contract renewal evaluations and may receive advisory evaluations. Non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually.

Because of the complexity and specialized nature of academic work, a faculty member's self-evaluation should be a primary source of information about the goals, methods, and degree of success associated with his or her performance. Faculty members are responsible for representing their work accurately and providing appropriate documentation for their claims. Faculty members should have considerable freedom to allocate their time and effort in ways that use their competencies most productively while still fulfilling their tripartite responsibilities to the University. To allow individual choices to play a meaningful role in self-evaluation, the faculty member indicates a set of annual area weights when completing a Self-Evaluation Report. These weights are taken into account by evaluators in developing overall performance evaluations. In all formal evaluations, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspects of reports submitted by the Dean, the Department Chair, or the Peer Evaluation Committee, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Students

Students who take a faculty member's courses play an important role in evaluating the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. They submit information on a Student Evaluation of Instruction Form consisting of numerical data and student comments from which summaries are compiled for each course. Student evaluations must be administered in a manner that conveys their importance and protects students' sense of freedom to give candid evaluations. Students should also have significant input in developing or selecting the instruments used to gather their evaluations of teaching.

Student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member's performance as a teacher; hence, evaluation of teaching effectiveness involves a variety of types of documentation. In addition, all parties involved in faculty evaluation are cautioned to avoid placing undue emphasis on individual student comments, as these comments may not be reflective of the opinions of the majority of students in a given course. The Student Evaluation of Instruction completion rate in each course should also be taken into account by all evaluators when weighting the numerical data summary. The data should be viewed with extreme caution when completion rates for the listed course were low.

The Department Chair

The Department Chair is responsible for (a) coordinating the evaluation process at the departmental level, (b) providing the primary administrative evaluation of the faculty member's performance, and (c) promoting the professional growth of the department's faculty. In years prior to tenure and/or promotion decisions, the Department Chair is strongly encouraged to provide each faculty member with constructive, timely guidance about the means by which any deficiencies can be corrected.

A Department Chair's Evaluation Report includes assigning performance ratings, recommending merit salary increases in annual evaluations, and reporting on classroom observation for major evaluations. In preparing the Department Chair's Evaluation Report for a faculty member, a Chair should use the Format for Evaluation Reports and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>). Serious consideration

must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s). **In the case of a positive tenure and/or promotion review, the Department Chair should provide specific information about the faculty member's success in meeting expectations. If a review for tenure and/or promotion reaches a negative conclusion, the Department Chair must provide specific instances in his/her report to illustrate the faculty member's failure to meet expectations.**

The Peer Evaluation Committee

A Peer Evaluation Committee's first task is to elect a chair who then notifies the Department Chair of his or her election. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report in decisions involving tenure and/or promotion, as well as **for** contract renewal evaluations. ~~and in post-tenure review evaluations.~~

The report is based on documentation submitted by the faculty member being evaluated, classroom observations, and external review if called for. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The Peer Evaluation Committee is given access to the faculty member's entire portfolio including previous annual chair Evaluations. However, no discussion should take place between the Peer Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair (or between the Peer Evaluation Committee and the Dean in the case of a Department chair) during the course of the review.

In preparing the Peer Evaluation Report for a faculty member, a Peer Evaluation Committee should use the Format for Evaluation Reports and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale. Serious consideration must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s). **In cases of tenure and/or promotion review, the Peer Evaluation Committee Report must include sufficient information to justify the committee's decision.**

The Deans of Schools and Colleges

The Deans of Schools and Colleges are responsible for monitoring the evaluation process for **procedural** compliance with the Faculty Evaluation Model as well as for overall fairness and equity. After reviewing the materials submitted by the Department Chair, Peer Evaluation Committee (if provided), and the faculty member under review, the Dean will complete the Dean's Recommendation or Report form (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>) which will then be forwarded, with the materials the Dean has reviewed, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee advises the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on matters of promotion and tenure. This University-wide committee attempts to ensure a fair and consistent application of **published** promotion and tenure standards. The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are to (a) **gather read and carefully consider** the reports of the appropriate Dean, Department Chair, and Peer Evaluation Committee; (b) request any additional information that it deems necessary; (c) examine all facets of the application **including the faculty member's portfolio**; (d) reach an equitable final decision **taking into account the weights chosen by the faculty member**; and (e) **write a report that supports in detail the decision of the Committee**. Responsibilities in the tenure and/or promotion process are described in Section II, Chapter 3.

The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee is responsible for representing the norms and values of the general faculty in all matters related to the Faculty Evaluation Model. When the current provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model do not provide adequate instruction on a specific procedural matter, the party involved may request an ad hoc ruling from the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee. This ruling will be forwarded for consideration to the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee's parent committee, the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for making recommendations about a faculty member's salary increases, merit salary increases, tenure, promotion, and contract renewal to the Chancellor based on recommendations and materials submitted by the Department Chair and other evaluators. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is also responsible for establishing and maintaining a general climate conducive to successful implementation of the Faculty Evaluation Model and for fostering conditions in which high levels of faculty achievement can occur. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs may modify deadlines in the evaluation process as circumstances warrant.

In reviewing Department Chairs' and Dean's salary recommendations, the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should balance the need for institutional accountability with the need to provide equitable opportunities for annual merit salary increases. In cases of tenure, promotion, and contract renewal, the recommendations of the Dean and Provost to the Chancellor should provide the faculty member with a fair, reasonable decision that **adheres to the tenets of the Faculty Evaluation Model and** serves the interests of the University.

The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for collaborating with Department Chairs and Deans to develop a uniform set of norms for interpreting the meaning of the Standard Performance Rating Scale. These norms will necessarily represent some discipline-related variations across departments, especially in the area of scholarship. Beyond such variations, no ~~Department Chair~~ **evaluator (e.g., Department Chair, Dean, Peer Evaluation Committee, Promotion and Tenure Committee)** should be permitted to use standards that deviate from the general norms and practices of the University.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should, through the Academic Deans, facilitate faculty development in teaching, scholarly activities, and service. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should encourage Department Chairs to schedule teaching assignments judiciously and appropriately and to award reassigned time to faculty members as necessary. Working with the Faculty Research and Development Committee and the Center for Sponsored Research and Programs, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should promote a healthy program of both internal and external funding for scholarly and creative work. **Working with Office of Civic and Community Engagement the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should promote opportunities for faculty service.**

The Chancellor

As Chief Executive Officer of the University, the Chancellor is responsible for facilitating the work of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and others in implementing the Faculty Evaluation Model and promoting faculty achievement. The Chancellor receives, reviews, and acts upon all evaluative materials provided by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After reviewing the materials produced by the final evaluation process, the Chancellor takes actions regarding salary and employment.

Procedures for Annual Evaluation

Procedures for Evaluating Faculty: General Considerations

The evaluation procedures described in this section are designed to attain the following objectives: (a) provide every faculty member with adequate information on how evaluations will be conducted; (b) promote a reasonable degree of equity and consistency both within and among departments; (c) provide procedures that allow a reasonable degree of flexibility for faculty; and (d) define the relationship between the various components of an evaluation and the final decision of the evaluator. New faculty members should be informed of the evaluation procedures during their orientation to the University and should be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the Faculty Evaluation Model.

The annual evaluation provides the basis for merit salary increases and ongoing administrative supervision of faculty. It consists of a Self-Evaluation Report, Student Evaluation Report, Chair's Evaluation Report, an Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and a recommendation by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Every full-time faculty member is evaluated annually. Faculty members on leave of absence are not evaluated, and Department Chairs evaluate part-time faculty using procedures developed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Every faculty member is evaluated every academic year. The annual evaluation includes a(n): (1) Self-Evaluation Report, (2) Student Evaluation Report, (3) Chair's Evaluation Report, (4) Chair's Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, (5) the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and (6) recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Procedures for compiling these reports are listed below. The Calendar of Events for Annual Evaluations appears below.

In the Self-Evaluation Report, the faculty member must discuss his or her teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, each component is assigned an area weight reflective of the time, effort, and accomplishments in each area. The following sections present guidelines to assist the faculty member in compiling the Self-Evaluation report. These guidelines are intended as a general overview of the specific information that should appear in a faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report both in terms of area weights and subheadings.

A faculty member must specify an area weight for each of the three areas of evaluation. For faculty with a regular ~~12-hour~~ teaching load these percentages must conform to the following ranges: teaching, 50% - 70%; scholarship, 10% - 40%; and service, 10% - 40%. For any given academic year, the sum of these weights must equal 100%. Faculty members with unusual teaching loads are to adjust the ranges appropriately. A request for an exemption from these standards must be submitted in writing and approved by the chair of the faculty member's department. Exceptions to these standards will be granted in reference to department needs. Grounds for an exemption may include, for example, additional teaching duties, administrative or grant activity, **additional service activity**, or retraining and retooling in the methodology appropriate to a faculty member's discipline. Faculty members may discuss their area weights with the Department Chair at any time prior to completing their self-evaluation.

When circumstances create special demands on a department, a chair may require a faculty member to adapt his or her pattern of responsibilities to meet such demands. The Department Chair must inform the faculty member in writing of the circumstances and the adjustments required. The faculty member may then adjust his or her area weights on the Self-Evaluation Report as he or she deems appropriate. If the Department Chair is concerned that a prior pattern of area weights is not generating a record adequate for tenure in the department, the chair should recommend that a faculty member adjust his or her weights in future years. Adjustments in area weights may also be needed if a faculty member's teaching load is reduced to allow for other types of activities, such as research, **service**, or administrative responsibilities.

The faculty Self-Evaluation Report should be structured so that subheadings indicate the items reported and indicate appropriate area weights for each subheading. See the Format for Evaluation Reports (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>) for an example of how the report should be structured and the subheadings listed.

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.

Instructors 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, the faculty member must be absent from class while the evaluations are completed. Third, the faculty member being evaluated must not tabulate the student evaluations. Fourth, the faculty member must not receive any report on his or her 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 adequate time to complete them.

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 as soon as possible, and transcripts of 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 ~~summarizes the~~ **provides** quantitative summaries and individual comments given by students ~~in a narrative~~ and is included in the annual Chair's Evaluation Report

Annual Chair's Evaluation Report

As specified previously, each Department Chair must compile an annual Chair's Evaluation Report for each faculty member in the department. This report consists of the (a) faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report, (b) Student Evaluation Report, (c) chair's narrative evaluation, and (d) Chair's Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form.

Each Chair must compile and submit to the appropriate Dean an annual Chair's Evaluation Report for each faculty member he or she supervises. This report should discuss the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service **taking into account the faculty member's selected weights**. This report should conform to the general guidelines of the Format for Evaluation Reports, with the addition of: (1) a narrative synthesis of the faculty member's **overall** performance, (2) an overall rating of the faculty member using the Standard Performance Rating Scale, and (3) a signature section for the Department Chair and faculty member being evaluated. The information appearing in the annual chair's narrative evaluation for a faculty member will be drawn from (a) the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report, (b) student evaluations, and (c) the Department Chair's ~~observations on~~ **evaluation of** teaching, scholarship, and service. Even when a major evaluation has been conducted earlier in the academic year, a separate annual evaluation is required for purposes of a merit salary increase recommendation, since most of the year's work will have been completed after the **Department Chair's portion of the** earlier major evaluation **was completed**.

The Department Chair is required to obtain the faculty member's signature on the Chair's Evaluation Report and the Annual Merit Salary Increase Form. In both instances, the signature merely acknowledges having reviewed the report and form but does not indicate agreement with their content. **The faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the Chair's report to the Dean within 10 business days of signing the report.**

The Department Chair completes the Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>). The recommendation is based on information developed in the annual Chair's Evaluation Report for each faculty member and must reflect the UNC Board of Governors' regulations for the dispersal of salary increase monies and the

constraints set for The University of North Carolina at Pembroke by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and by the Chancellor. The recommendation is to correspond to the overall performance rating contained in the Chair's Evaluation Report as indicated by the relationships below.

Overall Performance Rating	Recommended Merit Salary Increase
Distinguished	High Plus
Very Good	High
Adequate	Medium
Deficient	Low or No Increase

Annual Dean's Evaluation Report

After reviewing the materials the Department Chairs submit **and any rebuttal submitted by the faculty member**, the Dean of the relevant college or school will complete the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase form for each faculty member. Within three days, each faculty member will sign the Dean's Recommendation, acknowledging having seen it but not necessarily agreement with it. The faculty member will retain one copy of the signed Dean's Recommendation. The Dean will then forward the recommendation and the materials submitted by the Department Chair to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

In the event that the Dean's recommendation does not agree with that of the Department Chair, the Dean **will must** justify that decision with appropriate comments on the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase form. The faculty member will have the right to rebut comments made on the Dean's Recommendation form; such rebuttal **will must** be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 10 days of the faculty member's signing of the Dean's recommendation.

Annual Provost's Evaluation Report

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs reviews all the evaluative materials submitted by the Deans and recommends to the Chancellor whether ~~or not~~ to increase each faculty member's salary and how much to increase the salary if an increase is recommended.

Chancellor's Evaluation

After reviewing all the materials accumulated by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and considering the recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor makes the final decision on all faculty salary increases.

Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Evaluation

Evaluations for decisions concerning tenure and/or promotion of tenure-track faculty include the following materials and reports:

- Candidate's materials compiled in accordance with the Portfolio Requirements listed below.
- Chair's Evaluation Report for Tenure/Promotion (with Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form)
- Peer Evaluation Report for Tenure/Promotion (with Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form)
- Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion
- Promotion and Tenure Committee Evaluation Report (with Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form)
- Recommendation by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

All tenure track faculty are evaluated for tenure and/or promotion, **a major evaluation**, no later than their sixth year of employment at the University. ~~All faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion also receive a major evaluation.~~ The Calendar of Events is shown below. Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion also should consult Section II, Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook that outlines University-wide criteria for tenure and/or promotion.

A faculty member being considered for promotion who is a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must resign that membership by September 24 ~~7~~ if he or she is to be considered for a promotion in that academic year.

Notification and Scheduling of Tenure and Promotion Evaluations

The Department Chair is responsible for ascertaining when mandatory tenure ~~and/or promotion~~ evaluations are due. The Department Chair is responsible for announcing these occasions by August 15 in letters to the candidate, the Dean of the faculty member's school or college, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The letter to the candidate must indicate that the Self-Evaluation Report, Student Evaluation Reports, Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form, and supporting materials are due by August 29.

Although there are established eligibility dates for faculty members applying for tenure and promotion, a faculty member may request consideration for tenure and/or promotion earlier than these dates. To exercise this option, a faculty member must petition in writing to the Department Chair, the Dean of the relevant school or college, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by August 1 of the current academic year. Otherwise, evaluation for promotion and tenure will occur in accordance with established dates.

Responsibilities of the Faculty Member Being Evaluated

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure must submit a portfolio and a completed Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>) to the Department Chair by August 29. It is strongly advised that all members of the Peer Evaluation Committee be tenured or in phased retirement in the evaluated faculty member's home department. However, when circumstances dictate, other choices may be made **to ensure disciplinary representation**. An evaluated faculty member may not nominate faculty members who are being considered for contract renewal or tenure and/or promotion during the same academic year, the Department Chair, or a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The following material must be submitted by the faculty member in a three-ring binder divided into eight sections labeled with headings.

1. A copy of the completed Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form
2. A current Curriculum Vitae
3. An Expanded Self Evaluation Report covering the full period under consideration.
4. Copies of signed Department Chair's Annual Evaluations received since the last successful major evaluation.
5. Student Evaluation Reports for the full period under consideration (Include the quantitative summary of ratings and transcripts of student comments.)
6. Documentation of effectiveness in teaching: Include course syllabi for a selection of courses taught at UNCP and course materials (selected assignments, handouts, PowerPoint slides, tests,

student work, etc.) for one General Education course (if applicable), one upper division course (if applicable), and one graduate course (if applicable).

7. Documentation of scholarship and other professional activity in the faculty member's discipline: Include conference papers/posters, publications, reviews, books, creative work, recordings, programs, conferences attended, etc. with specific dates.
8. Documentation of service: Include relevant materials that illustrate **significant contributions in the areas of university, professional, and community service.**

A faculty member may request an external review of his or her scholarship to support an application for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty members wishing to do so must submit a written request to the Department Chair by September 17. The Peer Evaluation Committee may also request an external review of a faculty member's scholarship by following the same procedure. In either case, the candidate is solely responsible for providing (a) an outline of specialty areas and materials that pertain to specialty areas and (b) a list of potential reviewers for each specialty area. The candidate, Department Chair, and Peer Evaluation Committee must agree concerning the qualifications of any external reviewer. If external review is contemplated, the candidate is advised to make preparations before the fall semester.

Upon receipt of the Chair's Evaluation Report and completed Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>) the faculty member must sign and return one copy of each to the chair within three working days. The faculty member also is required to sign the Peer Evaluation Report and its Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. In both instances, the signature merely acknowledges having reviewed the reports and forms, but does not indicate agreement with their content. If the faculty member has received an unfavorable report from either the Department Chair or Peer Evaluation Committee, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal to the Dean within 10 days of receiving either report.

Responsibilities of the Department Chair

Department Chairs are responsible for notifying a faculty member in writing by August 15 of the evaluation year that a mandatory contract renewal or tenure evaluation is due. Additionally, Department Chairs are responsible for establishing Peer Evaluation Committees, conducting classroom observations of teaching, preparing and submitting all Chair's Evaluation Reports that are required for contract renewal and tenure and/or promotion decisions, and completing the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Forms.

The Department Chair obtains the completed Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form from the candidate (forms available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>). The chair appoints three faculty members to the Peer Evaluation Committee. Department Chairs from departments other than that of the evaluated faculty member may also serve on Peer Evaluation Committees. **The** Department Chair is obligated to appoint the candidate's assured nominee so long as the nominee is qualified, but the Department Chair **may is free to** substitute other qualified faculty members for the two remaining positions. It is strongly advised that all members of the Peer Evaluation Committee be tenured members of the evaluated faculty member's home department; however, when circumstances dictate, other choices may be made. **Ideally, the members of the Committee should be faculty whose rank is equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate but other choices may be made by the Department Chair to ensure disciplinary representation.** Faculty members in phased retirement are eligible to serve.

In a three-person department, the third department member is automatically appointed to the Committee unless he or she is also being considered for tenure and/or promotion or contract renewal. Prohibited from serving on a Peer Evaluation Committee are the Department Chair of the faculty member's department, members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and any faculty member undergoing contract renewal or tenure and/or promotion evaluation during the same academic year.

By September 7, the Department Chair must send a letter notifying Peer Evaluation Committee members of their appointment, and the time and date of an initial meeting, with copies to the candidate, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Department Chair will submit the candidate's materials to the Peer Evaluation Committee.

The Department Chair's Evaluation Report for tenure and promotion decisions should include information from classroom observations each lasting at least 30 minutes in two separate courses. If the faculty member is teaching online, provisions must be made for observation of online teaching. (See Online Course Management Policy and Procedures, Part 1.d available from the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/policies-and-procedures>). ~~The Department Chair prepares the Student Evaluation Report by summarizing in a narrative the quantitative summaries and individual comments given by students. The Chair prepares this report in a similar fashion to the annual evaluation by combining the results of the previous three annual Student Evaluation Reports. See above for a discussion of student evaluations.~~

The Department Chair must prepare a report and make a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. In completing this report, the Department Chair considers the faculty member's self-evaluation including his/her selected area weights, supporting documentation, optional external reviews if provided by the Peer Evaluation Committee, student evaluations for the full period under consideration, and classroom observations. Other input from students, colleagues, external sources, and University administrators may also be used judiciously, if deemed reliable. The Standard Performance Rating Scale is to be followed in making the final recommendation. See the Format for Evaluation Reports for the areas to be addressed in the Chair's Evaluation Report for tenure and/or promotion. The Chair's report should contain sufficient details to justify the Chair's recommendation concerning tenure and/or promotion.

The Department Chair provides the faculty member with two completed, signed, and dated copies of the Chair's Evaluation Report, including a completed Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form, for the faculty member's review and signature. The Department Chair at that time conducts a conference with the faculty member to explain the report, receive feedback, and discuss future directions. Finally, within three days of the conference the Department Chair obtains the signature of the faculty member on one set of copies that becomes part of the Department Chair's full report. When a faculty member signs and returns any evaluation report, such action shall indicate merely that the faculty member acknowledges being apprised of its contents, not that he or she agrees with it. The Chair's Evaluation Report is forwarded to the Dean of the relevant school or college by November 8.

Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee

Under the guidance of its chair, the Peer Evaluation Committee is charged with preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report based on the following items: the portfolio submitted by the faculty member undergoing evaluation for tenure and/or promotion, classroom observations, and external review if necessary.

A Peer Evaluation Committee's first task is to elect a chair, who then notifies the Department Chair of his or her election. The Committee chair is responsible for conducting meetings, insuring that all pertinent provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model are followed, using standard parliamentary procedure in

reaching all major decisions, insuring confidentiality of the proceedings, and preparing and distributing the Committee's report. The Department Chair assists the peer evaluation process **but the Chair's evaluation and Peer Evaluation Committee's work proceed independently**. By September 17, the Department Chair provides to the chair of the Peer Evaluation Committee the candidate's portfolio.

At least two members of the Committee must conduct classroom observations of the candidate's teaching. To promote reliability, a set of classroom observations should consist of at least one observation lasting at least 30 minutes in two separate courses by each observer. If the faculty member is teaching online, provisions must be made for observation of online teaching. (See Online Course Management Policy and Procedures which can be accessed at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/policies-and-procedures>). Observers submit an oral or written report of their observations to the Committee. The Committee's final report weighs and integrates these reports but does not incorporate them verbatim.

External review of scholarly work is not typically required for the Peer Evaluation Committee report. However, the Peer Evaluation Committee is obligated to initiate an external review under two circumstances: (a) if the candidate requests such review or (b) if, during the course of its deliberations, the Peer Evaluation Committee discovers that some scholarly works require external review. The candidate is responsible for providing an outline of the specialty areas involved and the materials that pertain to each specialty area and a list of potential reviewers for each specialty area (see discussion above in the section on "Responsibilities of the Faculty Member Being Evaluated"). The Committee is responsible for selecting from the candidate's list three or more external reviewers for each set of materials, soliciting and receiving the external reviews, **attaching these reviews to the candidate's portfolio**, and providing a copy of the reviews to the Department Chair. If adjustments must be made to the slate of external reviewers, the candidate, the Department Chair, and the Peer Evaluation Committee must agree to these adjustments.

In the decision process of the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Standard Performance Rating Scale is used as a general guide. The Committee should strive for consensus in developing its conclusions, and its report (including the completed Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form) must reflect a majority opinion. Nevertheless, a member of a Peer Evaluation Committee is obligated to object to any procedure believed to violate the provisions of the Model or to any conclusion believed to be inaccurate. The Committee should then deliberate these objections, consulting the Model as appropriate. When an issue cannot be resolved to each member's satisfaction, the Committee is obligated to investigate the matter more fully. Inquiries can be made to the candidate, the Department Chair, the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee, or the Office for Academic Affairs at any time, **keeping in mind the need for the Committee's deliberations to occur independently of other evaluators**. When a minority member disagrees with the majority's final action on any matter and believes that the overall evaluation has been affected, he or she is obligated to submit a narrative minority report detailing his or her position.

The Committee's report consists of a narrative Peer Evaluation Report or approved substitute, including area weights from the candidate's Self-Evaluation Report as completed for tenure and/or promotion; a Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form and any minority report. The Committee chair prepares the report, obtains the signatures of other members on the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form, and provides the candidate with signed and dated copies of the Peer Evaluation Report and of the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. Within three days, the Committee chair obtains the candidate's signature on one copy of the Peer Evaluation Report and the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. The signed copies the Committee's final report are submitted to the Dean of the relevant school or college, along with all the candidate's materials, by November 8.

When a faculty member signs and returns any evaluation report or form, such action shall indicate merely that the faculty member acknowledges being apprised of its contents, not that he or she agrees with it.

Responsibilities of the Dean

The Dean will read the Department Chair's Report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's Report, all attached materials **and any rebuttal submitted directly to the Dean. The Dean** ~~and~~ then completes the Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion. That form will serve as a cover letter to the report package and will include as attachments the Chair's Report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's Report, any rebuttals, and the candidate's materials. Within three days, the faculty member being evaluated will sign the Dean's Report, acknowledging having seen it, but not necessarily agreement with it. The faculty member will retain one copy of the signed Dean's Report.

The Dean will then forward his or her report, by December 15, with attached materials (Chair's report, Peer Evaluation Committee's report, **rebuttals**, and the candidate's materials), to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, via the Office for Academic Affairs. In the event that the Dean's recommendation does not agree either with that of the Department Chair or of the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Dean ~~shall~~ **must** justify that decision with appropriate comments on the Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion form. The faculty member shall have the right to rebut comments made on the Dean's Report form; such rebuttal shall be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee via the Office of Academic Affairs.

Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee receives the Chair's Evaluation Report, the Peer Evaluation Report, the Dean's Report, (plus any rebuttals of these), and the candidate's portfolio from the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Committee may request any additional information that it deems necessary. It examines all facets of the application, reaches an equitable final decision **in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model**, prepares a report on the candidate, and completes a Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form.

A candidate's record should be evaluated in terms of documents submitted to the Committee and using the area weights given on the Self-Evaluation Report (as completed for tenure and/or promotion). The Committee may consult with the candidate, the Department Chair, the chair of the Peer Evaluation Committee, and administrators to obtain additional information about a candidate, as it deems appropriate. When a candidate has submitted a rebuttal to a Chair's Evaluation Report or Peer Evaluation Report, the Promotion and Tenure Committee is obligated to consider it. If the Committee finds probable cause for concern, it should instruct the parties involved to submit, in a timely manner, either a counter-rebuttal or a corrected report. In the event of a counter-rebuttal, the matter should be pursued to a satisfactory resolution.

The Committee's final recommendation, as indicated on the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form, should be an independent judgment based on a synthesis of the overall record. The Committee is to use the Standard Performance Rating Scale as a general guide, and it should strive for consistency over time. In the interest of fairness to candidates for tenure, the Committee should give very strong consideration to a set of consistently favorable annual evaluations from the Department Chair during the years prior to the tenure decision. In such cases, the Committee should have very compelling countervailing evidence to justify a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion. **The Committee should also give strong consideration to norms in the candidate's discipline as represented in the Peer Evaluation Report, the Department Chair's Report, and any optional external reviews.**

After reaching a final decision on tenure and/or promotion, the Committee, as directed by the chair, prepares a draft report. This consists of a narrative Tenure and Promotion Report following the Guidelines

for Evaluation Forms Reports; any rebuttals, counter-rebuttals, or corrected reports from the Department Chair or Peer Evaluation Committee; and a completed Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. If either the Chair or Vice Chair has abstained from a case, the non-abstaining party prepares the preliminary draft of the final report. The Committee deliberates on this draft until a majority approves it. **The report must provide detailed support for the majority's decision.** The approved Tenure and Promotion Report, along with all other reports and the candidate's materials, should be submitted within 14 days, no later than April 1, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and, at the same time, a copy of this advisory report sent to the candidate under consideration for tenure and/or promotion. Members may submit minority reports that are appended to the approved reports **submitted to the faculty member and to the Provost.** If the faculty member has received an unfavorable report from the Promotion and Tenure committee, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal to the Office for Academic Affairs within ten business days of receiving the report.

Responsibilities of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall receive and distribute all materials from the Department Chair, Peer Evaluation Committee, Dean of the faculty member's school or college, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the faculty member being evaluated. Upon receipt of the Tenure and Promotion Report, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs considers all recommendations and supporting materials. Further consultations with the candidate or any of the participants in the evaluation process may be conducted.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor submits a final recommendation to the Chancellor no later than May 1, accompanied by all of the evaluation materials received, and at the same time, sends the candidate under consideration for promotion or tenure an unelaborated statement of this recommendation. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for informing the candidate of the final action taken by the Chancellor, the vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and any additional details that are deemed beneficial to a consistent and equitable evaluation process. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will return the candidate's materials to him or her at the conclusion of the evaluation process.

Responsibilities of the Chancellor

The Chancellor receives, reviews, and acts upon all evaluative materials provided by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After reviewing the materials produced by the final evaluation process, the Chancellor takes action regarding salary and employment.

Procedures for Contract Renewal Evaluations and Advisory Evaluations of Untenured Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members receive a comprehensive contract renewal evaluation in their first year of employment at the University according to the Calendar found below. In subsequent years, a major evaluation for untenured faculty is optional at the discretion of the faculty member or Department Chair. These evaluations, if initiated by the Department Chair, may be for cause or, at the discretion of either the faculty member or Chair, may be advisory in nature. Peer evaluations of visiting faculty are at the option of the Department Chair, the appropriate Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The procedures for these evaluations generally follow the procedures specified for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty members undergoing contract renewal evaluations are to collect student evaluations of their courses. Observation of teaching by the Department Chair and by members of the Peer Evaluation Committee is even more important to the evaluation process.

The faculty member being evaluated for an initial contract renewal must submit the materials listed below in a three-ring binder divided into seven sections labeled with headings. Portfolios submitted for contract renewal evaluations subsequent to the initial probationary evaluation should also include a section for copies of signed Department Chair annual evaluations.

1. A copy of the completed Peer Evaluation Nomination Form
2. A current Curriculum Vitae
3. A Self Evaluation Report
4. Student Evaluation Reports for all courses evaluated during the evaluation period. In case of a one-year contract renewal, the Department Chair will provide these reports to the Peer Evaluation Committee by the Department Chair as the evaluation period begins before the end of the first semester. (See Calendar below).
5. Documentation of effectiveness in teaching: Include course syllabi for a selection of courses taught at UNCP and course materials (selected assignments, handouts, PowerPoint slides, tests, student work, etc.) for one General Education course (if applicable), one upper division course (if applicable), and one graduate course (if applicable).
6. Documentation of scholarship and other professional activity in the faculty member's discipline: Include conference papers/posters, publications, reviews, books, creative work, recordings, programs, conferences attended, copies of works in progress.
7. Documentation of service: Include relevant materials that illustrate significant contributions.

The Department Chair completes a Chair's Evaluation Report and submits the report as described in the section on "Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Evaluation." The Peer Evaluation Committee (if convened) submits a Peer Evaluation Report as described in the section on "Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Evaluation." The Dean of the relevant school or college reviews the reports from the Chair and the Peer Evaluation Committee as well as any rebuttals by the faculty member. The Dean then completes the Dean's Report of Contract Renewal Evaluation and submits it with all supporting materials to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs reviews all the evaluative materials and recommends to the Chancellor whether or not to reappoint the candidate. The Chancellor makes the final decision on reappointment. Conditions governing non-reappointment are listed in the Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 1; note that the faculty member's competence is not the only factor considered in reappointment decision. *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina* also specifies deadlines for notification of non-reappointment.

A tenure-track faculty member or his/her Department Chair may initiate an advisory evaluation any time during the tenure-track process. Such evaluations are proactive steps to help faculty members improve performance and become more able to achieve tenure. The Department Chair may appoint a Peer Evaluation Committee as part of advisory evaluations. If advisory evaluations are conducted, the Committee should identify aspects of the faculty member's performance that may present problems when a tenure decision is due. [Advisory evaluations have no formal consequences for decisions about contract renewal, tenure, or promotion.](#)

Procedures for Evaluation of Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Full-time non-tenure **track** faculty receive a major evaluation in their first year of employment at the University following the Calendar of Events for One-Year Contract Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Non-tenure track faculty may perform service but their main responsibility is teaching. As such, the portfolio materials and self-evaluation submitted for the one-year contract review evaluation will focus on those two areas. (See section entitled "Full-Time Appointments, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Adjunct,

and Visiting Faculty.”) In subsequent years, a major evaluation for non-tenure track faculty is optional at the discretion of the faculty member or Department Chair.

Non-tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated annually just as all other faculty members are. After the first year of employment at the University, non-tenure-track faculty receive major advisory evaluations at the discretion of the faculty member or Department Chair. Peer evaluations for non-tenure-track faculty (including visiting faculty) may be included in this process at the option of the Department Chair and the appropriate Dean.

Non-tenure track faculty members are not covered by Section 604 of *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*; however, during the term of their employment, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Adjunct and Visiting faculty have the right to seek recourse through UNC Pembroke grievance processes, for redress of grievances concerning discharge, academic freedom, salary adjustment, or other conditions of work.

MATERIAL DELETED HERE THAT RELATES TO POST-TENURE EVALUATION AND EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS AS NO CHANGES ARE PROPOSED

Forms for Use in the Faculty Evaluation Process

The following forms related to faculty evaluation are available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>

- Format for Evaluation Reports
- Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form
- Peer Evaluation Committee Request Form for Post-Tenure Review
- Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form
- Student Evaluation of Instruction
- Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form
- Standard Performance Rating Scale
- Department Chair Evaluation Form
- Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form
- Format for Dean’s Report for Probationary Contract Review
- Format for Dean’s Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase
- Format for Dean’s Report for Tenure/Promotion
- Format for Dean’s Report for Post-Tenure Review

Calendars of Events for Evaluation

Typical Calendar of Events for Annual Evaluations

The events listed below are intended as guidelines only; dates are approximate and may be altered as conditions warrant. Specific policies and procedures are found in the full Faculty Evaluation Plan.

DATE	EVENT OR DOCUMENT
-------------	--------------------------

August 14 - April 14	Area Weight Discussion: A faculty member can discuss at any time before submitting the Self-Evaluation Report the area weights to be assigned to specific areas of evaluation.
December	Fall Student Evaluation: All faculty scheduled for student evaluations in the fall semester should conduct these evaluation the last week of class. Department chairs compile Student Evaluation Reports.
April 1-14	Spring Student Evaluation: Faculty scheduled for student evaluations in the spring semester should conduct these evaluations during April 1 to April 14. See section above on "Student Evaluation of Instruction" for discussion of the schedule of student evaluations. The Department Chair is responsible for compiling a summary of student evaluations.
April 14	Submission of Self-Evaluation Report: A faculty member should submit his or her Self-Evaluation Report to the Department Chair by April 14.
April 14 - May 1	Annual Chair's Evaluation Report and Faculty Conference: The Department Chair will prepare an annual Chair's Evaluation Report for each member of the department, and discuss this report and the Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation with the faculty member being evaluated.
Report transmittal + 3 days	Signing and Returning Chair's Evaluation Report: The faculty member has three (3) working days after receipt of chair's evaluation to review the evaluation materials, and to sign and return one copy to the Department Chair.
Report signing + 10 days	Optional Rebuttal of Chair's Evaluation: The faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the Chair's annual evaluation to the Dean of his or her school or college (Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs if the Dean is also the Department Chair) within 10 days after signing the report when there are areas of disagreement.
May 1	Submission of Chair's Annual Reports: The Department Chair should submit to the Dean of the respective school or college the annual Chair's Evaluation Report, attaching the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report, any supporting documentation, Student Evaluation Report, and Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation.
May 1-15	Annual Dean's Evaluation Report: The Dean will prepare an annual Dean's Evaluation Report for each member in his or her school or college, and complete the Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation for the faculty member being evaluated.
Report transmittal + 3 days	Signing and Returning Dean's Evaluation Report: The faculty member has three (3) working days after receipt of Dean's evaluation to review the evaluation materials, and to sign and return one copy to the Dean.
Report signing + 10 days	Optional Rebuttal of Dean's Evaluation: If the Dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the Department Chair, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the Dean's annual evaluation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 10 days after signing the report.

- May 15 Submission of Dean's Annual Reports: The Dean should submit the annual Dean's Evaluation Report, attaching the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report, any supporting documentation, Student Evaluation Report, and Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- May-August Faculty Contracts: The Office of the Chancellor should send the next year's contract, and salary increase information, to faculty members by the start of the new academic year.

Typical Calendar of Events for Tenure and/or Promotion

The events listed below are intended as guidelines only; dates are approximate and may be altered as conditions warrant. Specific policies and procedures are found in the full Faculty Evaluation Plan. If a date listed in this table falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is automatically moved to the next business day.

DATE	EVENT OR DOCUMENT
April 1-14	Spring Student Evaluation: Faculty members collect student evaluations (the schedule varies by surname and year).
August 1	Early Review Petition: The faculty member petitions for early review for tenure or promotion, if desired. Optional Promotion Review: If a faculty member wishes to undergo review for promotion in addition to a required post-tenure review, or if a Lecturer wishes to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer, the faculty member must notify the Department Chair by this date.
August 15	Evaluation Announcement: The Department Chair notifies the faculty member, the Dean, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the impending major evaluation by this date.
August 29	Submission of Materials: The faculty member submits materials to the Department Chair including the PEC nomination form.
September 7	PEC Formation: The Department Chair announces the composition of the Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC).
September 17	Transmittal of Materials: By this date, the Department Chair meets with the PEC, reviews its charge, and gives the PEC the full set of the candidate's materials, including previous Chair evaluations (or Dean evaluations for the Chairs.) The PEC elects its chair after meeting with the Department Chair.
September 17- November 1	External Review Initiation: If desired, external review of the faculty member's scholarly or creative work is initiated by either the faculty member or the PEC (through the Department Chair). Observations of Teaching: Observation of the candidate's teaching is carried out by the Department Chair and members of the PEC. If the faculty member is teaching online, provisions must be made for observation of online teaching. PEC Evaluation: The PEC deliberates on all materials, observations, etc., to reach a recommendation. A report is drafted and the PEC Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form is completed and signed by the PEC members. Chair's Evaluation: The Department Chair prepares and signs an independent report and completes and signs the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal form.

November 5	Two copies of the PEC report, including any minority report, and two copies of the Department Chair's report are due to the faculty member by this date. The Department Chair and PEC chair confer separately with the faculty member.
Report transmittal + 3 business days	Faculty Signatures: The faculty member signs the reports and the Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Forms from PEC and Department Chair, acknowledging content but not necessarily agreement. The faculty member retains one signed copy of each report.
Report signing +10 business days	Optional Rebuttal: The faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the PEC and/or Department Chair's report, if desired, to the Dean of the faculty member's school or college within 10 business days of signing the report..
November 8	Report Submission: Department Chair and PEC submit their reports signed by the faculty member to the Dean of the relevant school or college. The chair submits the candidate's materials to the relevant Dean. Any minority PEC report is also submitted.
December 1	Dean's Evaluation Report for Promotion and Tenure: The Dean will prepare and sign two copies of the Dean's Evaluation Report for each faculty member in his or her school or college being considered for promotion or tenure. These reports must be delivered to faculty members under review by this date.
Report transmittal+ 3 business days	Returning Dean's Evaluation Report: The faculty member has three (3) business days after receipt of Dean's evaluation to review the evaluation materials, and to sign and return one copy to the Dean.
Report signing +10 business days	Optional Rebuttal of Dean's Evaluation: If the Dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the Department Chair or PEC, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the Dean's evaluation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) via the office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 10 business days after signing the report.
December 15	Dean submits the Dean's report, Chair's report, PEC report (including any minority reports and rebuttals), and the candidate's materials to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) via the Office of Academic Affairs. The PTC may request, if they desire, a counter rebuttal or corrected report responding to candidate's rebuttal to PEC or Department Chair report.
April 1	Submission of Promotion and Tenure Committee Report: The Chair of the PTC should submit the Committee's report, the completed PTC Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form, and all reports and materials received to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Any PTC minority report is also submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The faculty member must be given a copy of the PTC report, including any minority report, and the PTC Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form by this date. The faculty member is not required to sign these materials.
Report transmittal + 10 business days	Optional rebuttal to the PTC Report: If the PTC report is unfavorable, the faculty member may, within 10 business days of receiving the report, submit a rebuttal to

the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

- May 1 The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs sends his or her recommendation for promotion and/or tenure to the Chancellor.
- May Administrative Report: The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs sends a report of Chancellor's decision, vote of PTC, and other information to candidate.

The faculty member under consideration for tenure and/or promotion is to receive a copy of the various reports as they are submitted. Note that the UNCP Board of Trustees approves tenure and promotion decisions.

CALENDARS FOR CONTRACT RENEWAL EVALUATION AND POST-TENURE REVIEW OMITTED IN THIS DRAFT AS NO CHANGES ARE PROPOSED.

SECTION II
CHAPTER 3
FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

Academic Freedom and Responsibility in the University Community

The University of North Carolina at Pembroke is dedicated to the transmission and advancement of knowledge and understanding. Academic freedom is essential to the achievement of these purposes. This institution therefore supports and encourages freedom of inquiry for faculty members and students, to the end that they may responsibly pursue these goals through teaching, learning, research, discussion and publication, free from internal or external restraints that would unreasonably restrict their academic endeavors. The University of North Carolina at Pembroke protects faculty and students in their responsible exercise of the freedom to teach, to learn, and otherwise to seek and speak the truth. Faculty and students of this institution share in the responsibility for maintaining an environment in which academic freedom flourishes and in which the rights of each member of the academic community are respected.

It is the policy of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke to support and encourage full freedom, within the law, of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication for all members of this institution's academic staff. Members of the faculty are expected to recognize that accuracy, forthrightness, and dignity befit their association with this institution and their position as men and women of learning. They should not represent themselves, without authorization, as spokespersons for The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. The University of North Carolina at Pembroke will not penalize nor discipline members of the faculty because of the exercise of academic freedom in the lawful pursuit of their respective areas of scholarly and professional interest and responsibility.

Academic Tenure

Academic tenure refers to the conditions and guarantees that apply to a faculty member's employment. More specifically, it refers to the protection of a faculty member against involuntary suspension, discharge from employment, or reduction in rank by The University of North Carolina at Pembroke except upon specified grounds and in accordance with the established procedures.

Academic tenure refers to the conditions and guarantees that apply to a faculty member's employment. More specifically, it refers to the protection of a faculty member against involuntary suspension, discharge from employment, or reduction in rank by The University of North Carolina at Pembroke except upon specified grounds and in accordance with procedures provided in Section II, Chapter 1 on the Faculty Hearing Committee and against termination of employment except as provided in Section II, Chapter 1 on Non-Reappointment of Tenure Track Faculty members on Probationary Term Appointments and Termination of Faculty Employment.

Academic tenure for faculty members is intended to secure their academic freedom and to help the institution attract and retain faculty members of high quality. While academic tenure may be withheld

on any grounds other than those specifically stated to be impermissible, a conferral of tenure requires an assessment of the faculty member's demonstrated professional competence, potential for future contribution, and institutional needs and resources.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria

~~On November 2, 1988, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the following criteria to be used in tenure and promotion considerations.~~

~~Recognizing that the quality of an institution rests largely on the quality of its faculty, it is imperative that there be at least minimal criteria to assist in tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty members need to be informed and to understand from the beginning of their employment that neither tenure nor promotion is a right or an automatic consequence of years of service, that each is earned through demonstrated excellence. In tenure decisions, consideration must be given additionally to the faculty member's potential for future contribution and institutional needs and resources. The terminal degree is required for all professorial ranks beginning with the Assistant Professor level. While the criteria for tenure and promotion are largely the same and while tenure and promotion decisions might be made at the same time, it should be understood that they are separate decisions.~~

~~Candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated using the criteria of scholarship and professional growth, University and community service, and, most importantly, excellence and effectiveness in teaching. As a minimum standard, candidates should be evaluated as satisfactory or above in all categories. So far as possible, evidence of performance in these areas is to be objective and documented, with evaluations conducted by the candidates' peers and appropriate administrators. Each department's ranking of each of the following categories of evaluation will be used.~~

The following sections are to be reordered. Numbers in red will not appear in the final document

2. Scholarship and Professional Growth

All faculty are expected to engage in forms of scholarship appropriate to their discipline, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the University. Scholarship is a valuable component in the makeup of a good teacher. Evaluation of scholarship and creative activity considers the contributions to the field or discipline, the quality of the work, and its significance or impact, with particular emphasis on accomplishments since the last appointment or promotion. It also includes consideration of the continuity, range, focus, and aggregation of productive work in the field.

Reflection on scholarship in the evaluation process ideally moves it beyond a simple listing of accomplishments or compilation of documents. Evidence of scholarship includes activities, artifacts documenting those activities, and a narrative containing reflective discussion from the candidate. The reflective narrative should demonstrate a pattern of scholarly activity consistent with the “Indicators/Categories of Scholarship Accomplishments” as presented below.”

Faculty members are encouraged to continue to pursue opportunities for growth and development throughout their professional lives. Faculty members should engage in appropriate activities that will enhance their teaching effectiveness, keep them abreast of developments in their academic fields, and/or add new areas of expertise to the existing programs of the University.

3. Service

All faculty are expected to engage in forms of service appropriate to their discipline, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the University. As a criterion for tenure and promotion, the concept of service will go beyond routine duties. Successful candidates ~~should~~ must show evidence of participation and leadership in projects on and off the campus that contribute to advancing the mission of the University. Reflection on service in the evaluation process ideally moves it beyond a simple listing of accomplishments or compilation of documents.

1. Teaching

Though teaching is, in many ways, a highly individualized profession and though there are continuing debates over the most effective techniques, there is little disagreement over the importance of exceptional teaching as the major criterion for tenure and/or promotion. Clearly, exceptional teachers will show command of their subject, be creative and imaginative, be enthusiastic, promote critical thinking, stimulate their students to improved performance, engage in and use research, and be outstanding communicators.

Plans for Professional Activities and Future Development

Each faculty member will engage in activities that contribute to professional growth and development, and refinement of his/her expertise.

Promotion Standards

Assistant Professor

It is generally recognized that promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor is based on potential. The following are required for promotion to Assistant Professor:

1. Unless there are extenuating circumstances, a terminal degree in the appropriate field;
2. Evidence of effectiveness in teaching;

3. Evidence of scholarship and professional growth;
4. Evidence of university, professional, and community service;
5. Essentially positive evaluations;
6. A minimum of three years experience in higher education, unless cumulative achievement deemed equivalent.

Associate Professor

It is generally recognized that promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon both demonstrated performance and potential. The following are required for promotion to Associate Professor:

1. Unless there are extenuating circumstances, a terminal degree in the appropriate field;
2. Evidence of superior teaching;
3. Evidence of scholarship and professional growth;

Each faculty member should pursue an appropriate balance among the different types of scholarship essential to the implementation of the mission of the institution. Faculty are advised that the Faculty Evaluation Model requires that at least 10% of a faculty member's effort be devoted to scholarship during the time period since appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor. The candidate should provide evidence of quality scholarship from the indicators/categories of scholarship accomplishment identified below. Evidence from peer-reviewed categories is expected for promotion to Associate Professor.

4. Evidence of university, professional, and community service;

Each faculty member should pursue an appropriate balance among the different types of service essential to the mission of the institution and the support of the faculty member's discipline. Faculty are advised that the Faculty Evaluation Model requires that at least 10% of a faculty member's effort be devoted to service during the time period since appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor. The candidate should provide evidence of university, professional, and community service apportioned as he/she sees fit.

5. Essentially positive evaluations;
6. A minimum of seven years experience in higher education, unless cumulative achievement deemed equivalent;
7. A minimum of four years in rank of Assistant Professor at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, unless cumulative achievement deemed equivalent.

Professor

It is generally recognized that promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon one's having achieved professional and scholarly distinction. The following are required for promotion to Professor:

1. Unless there are extenuating circumstances, a terminal degree in the appropriate field;
2. Evidence of outstanding teaching;
3. Evidence of significant scholarship and professional growth

Each faculty member should pursue an appropriate balance among the different types of scholarship essential to the implementation of the mission of the institution. Evidence of consistent scholarly contributions to the profession should be demonstrated over the course of the candidate's career. The candidate should provide evidence of quality scholarship from the indicators/categories of scholarship

accomplishment identified below. Evidence of peer-reviewed scholarship is required for promotion to full Professor.

4. Evidence of university, professional, and community service;

Each faculty member should pursue an appropriate balance among the different types of service essential to the mission of the institution and the support of the faculty member's discipline. Faculty are advised that the Faculty Evaluation Model requires that at least 10% of a faculty member's effort be devoted to service during the time period since appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor. The candidate should provide evidence of university, professional, and community service apportioned as he/she sees fit.

5. Positive evaluations;
6. A minimum of ten years experience in higher education, unless cumulative achievement deemed equivalent
7. Five years in rank of Associate Professor at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, unless cumulative achievement deemed equivalent.
8. Evidence of leadership in fulfilling collegiate responsibilities.

It is strongly recommended that a candidate not receiving promotion ~~should~~ not be considered the following academic year.

Indicators/Categories of Scholarship Accomplishment

While this listing is not meant to include all possible examples of scholarship accomplishment, it does likely cover the great majority of works that could validly be claimed as scholarship. It is recommended that all faculty members use this list, along with guidance from their Chairs and peers, to direct them into appropriate projects that will result in acceptable scholarship accomplishments. One should keep in mind that a few minor accomplishments typically will not be sufficient for promotion, especially the promotion to full professor.

1. Dissemination of Scholarship (Identify the project as peer-reviewed or not peer-reviewed. More weight will be given to peer-reviewed works published by major professional organizations or presses of acknowledged quality.)

- Publication of a book
- Published monograph
- Book chapters
- Articles in scholarly journals
- Conference proceedings
- Presentations in scholarly forums
- Textbooks
- Translations of scholarly/literary works
- Reviews of scholarly works; abstracts
- Workbooks/Study guides
- Articles published in educational magazines
- Other papers and reports (trade, in-house publications, and encyclopedias)

- Instructor's Manuals

2. Creative Activities

- Composition (with more weight given to departmentally sponsored, outside peer-reviewed performances of compositions or to peer-reviewed compositions published by organizations of acknowledged quality)
- Public Performances exhibits (with more weight given to departmentally sponsored peer reviewed performances in venues of acknowledged quality)
- Exhibits (with more weight given to juried art exhibits in venues of acknowledged quality)
- Demonstrating professional competence through employment by reputable professional companies
- Commissions (with more weight given to commissions from prestigious public or professional institutions)
- Invited presentations, lectures, master classes, workshops, and performances (with more weight given to reputable professional organizations or venues of acknowledged quality or to peer reviewed activities where appropriate)

3. Editing

- Editor, book of readings (published by a professional organization or nationally recognized publishing house)
- Editorial Board, international, national, regional or state journal

4. Grants and Contracts

Funded research/program grants

- Grants proposals (not funded)
- Grants for professional development
- Grant reviewer

5. Classroom based research projects--Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

(When defined as scholarship, teaching both educates and entices future scholars. Faculty as scholars are also learners, transforming and extending knowledge as well as transmitting it.)

- Development of software and other course materials (professionally disseminated)
- Articles on pedagogy or curriculum design
- Reports based on program and service grants devoted to innovative pedagogy
- Contracts devoted to developing and disseminating innovative pedagogy

6. Scholarship related to service or the use of professional expertise—Scholarship of Engagement or Application (To be considered scholarship, service activities must be directly tied to one's special field of knowledge and relate to and flow directly out of professional activity related to one's special field of knowledge.)

- Commissioned research reports
- Articles in the popular or regional press
- Editorial, curatorial, or community education projects
- Accreditation reports (In exceptional cases, the individual responsible for compiling the accreditation report can make a case for the scholarship component of the document being submitted for consideration.)
- Course materials designed for professional development seminars

7. Other

- Honors/awards for research and artistic efforts

- Significant citations of work in professional literature
- Membership in professional societies
- Attendance at professional meetings
- Supervision of graduate or undergraduate theses or extensive projects that involve research or artistic efforts
- Special research or artistic efforts
- Special initiatives in on-campus scholarly or professional development
- Continuing education, workshops, symposia, or other specialized training programs attended or completed
- Professional consultancies resulting in professional development

Early Tenure

According to Section II, Chapter 1 on Faculty Personnel Policies on Faculty Status, faculty appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor receive a series of multi-year contracts until, at the end of the sixth year of employment, they are reappointed with permanent tenure at the same or higher rank, or not reappointed. Faculty requesting tenure/promotion prior to the sixth year of employment will meet the following criteria:

1. Currently in a tenure-track position;
2. Documented evidence of exceptional teaching as determined by the department;
3. An exceptional record of scholarship. The circumstances and record of performance that make the case exceptional must be fully documented by the candidate and validated by the department. The fact that an applicant meets the performance criteria for tenure/promotion does not constitute an exceptional case for early tenure/promotion;
4. Documented evidence of exceptional service (university, professional, and community) as determined by the department;
5. At least four years of full-time experience in teaching or librarianship at an accredited four-year college or university, including two years completed at UNC Pembroke; and
6. A letter from the Chair of the Department to the faculty member, the Dean, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs acknowledging that the candidate meets the requirements in Criteria 1) and 5). This letter must be submitted by August 1.

A candidate for early tenure/promotion can make application only once. If the candidate is not successful in receiving early tenure/promotion, he/she will not be penalized in any way and can pursue the normal tenure/promotion process.

ATTACHMENT 3

Rationale for proposed changes from FERS

(Please note, due to the many changes we propose, this list is phrased in generalities. Any questions, please feel free to email the FERS chair, Libby Denny, at elizabeth.denny@uncp.edu)

1. We believe that in many instances when there are problems with the evaluation processes including P&T, it may not be because the policies are flawed but rather because various evaluators are not following the written policies. We have added wording to try to correct those problems.
2. We have attempted to strengthen the area of advisement at the request of the Advisement and Retention Council. GA is also interested in how each university handles advisement. UNCP advisement is generally strong in our opinion. However, like anything it can be improved. We also believe that not enough service credit is given to faculty who advise so we tried to strengthen mentions of advisement in the Faculty Evaluation Model for that reason.
3. We have tried to clarify procedures related to Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). In particular, we have included additional wording to make clear faculty teaching graduate courses DO administer the same SEI to their students as faculty teaching undergraduate courses. We also corrected the name of the graduate course evaluation form. See attached memo from Dr. Irene Aiken.
4. We tried to work on the overall area of Service at the request of the administration sent to us via the Senate Executive Committee. As all of you know, service is assigned the same set of variable weights as scholarship (10-40%) in all evaluations. However, I think most faculty would agree that, in actual practice, regardless of the assigned weights, scholarship always receives stronger consideration during P&T than does service. We have attempted to correct this problem by adding to the Service descriptions in the Model and in the P&T policy area and making some other wording changes.
5. We tried to clear up inconsistencies.