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

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

Minutes

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

October 6, 2020 3:30PM

<https://uncp.webex.com/meet/rachel.smith>

Join by phone

+1-415-655-0001 US Toll

Access code: 739 591 491

Members in attendance:

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

Members not in attendance: Chiuchu (Melody) Chuang (Education to 2021)

Guests: Dr. Liz Normandy, Professor and Associate Vice Chancellor of Planning and Accreditation and Polina Chemishanova, Associate Professor and Director of Composition

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 3:30pm.
2. Adoption of the Agenda
The agenda was adopted.
3. Approval of Minutes from Sept. 1, 2020
The minutes of the Sept. 1, 2020 meeting were circulated.
4. Chair Report
The Chair reported that the Resignation of the Faculty Senate Chair has put the meeting with the Provost on hold. The proposal about the 4/3 contract change is still being reviewed. Dr. Zoe Locklear will be attending the next meeting. The Chair will be sending out a link to the proposal prior to the meeting.

The Chair updated the committee on how new business needs to be passed. When passing new business, the subcommittee needs to do a voice vote, so votes are clearly recorded and if the motion doesn’t pass unanimously, there must be a roll call.

1. Old Business

The Chair proposed changes to clarify the language on p. 96, 97, and 93 in the Post-Tenure Review (Section II, Chapter 2) in the Faculty Handbook (see Appendix A). After discussing changes, the subcommittee agreed that it would be best to revisit and vote on changes to the language in the next meeting, once the sentences have been drafted by the Chair and Secretary. Dr. Liz Normandy shared information about the history and rules of the Post-Tenure Review. Dr. Normandy suggested that the subcommittee look at the Board of Governors Code before making changes. Dr. Normandy stated that the five-year plan cannot be eliminated because it contradicts the BOG.

Changes to the language that were proposed and discussed:

* p. 96 – The department or unit selects a Peer Evaluation Committee of three faculty members by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty within the department or unit.
* p. 96 – The faculty member being evaluated cannot make the final selection of Committee members. Dr Normandy indicated this is a requirement from the BOG and cannot be changed.
* p. 97 – remove letter (e) faculty member’s five-year plan & revise letters
* p. 93 – Prior to consultation with Department Chairs, in the December following the review, the Department Chair shall meet with the faculty members to review their annual evaluation

The subcommittee discussed the SEI calendar issue. The Chair reported that if the SEI calendar was going to be delayed by one month, the Dean thought more information should be collected from the Department Chairs. The Chair proposed that the subcommittee create a survey for the Chairs to complete. The subcommittee will revisit this item.

1. New Business
Several issues about the SEI’s were discussed, but due to running out of time the following items listed below were skipped and they will be addressed at the next meeting.
	1. SEI’s
		1. Online for all?
		2. Language change in Handbook (Appendix B)
		3. Equity as highlighted in CAS Innovation Council findings
2. Announcements

Next meeting: November 3, 2020 @ 3:30pm via Webex. The Provost will be attending the meeting.

1. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Appendix A: Post-tenure review language from Faculty Handbook

p. 96

**The Peer Evaluation Committee**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

p. 97

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

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

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

materials cited above.

p. 93

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

p. 97

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

of the Office for Academic Affairs).

Appendix B: Previous work on SEI’s

p. 83-84

**Student Evaluations of Instruction**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*FIAC action on this language*

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