*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.*

AGENDA

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

April 6, 2021 3:30PM

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

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

Members:

Anthony Johnson (Letters to 2022), Camille Goins (Education to 2021) Tracy Vargas (SBS to 2022), Jessica Dupuis (Secretary, ARTS to 2021), Rachel Smith (Chair, NSM to 2021), Larry Arnold (At large to 2022), Jonathan Ricks (CHS to 2021)

1. Call to Order
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes from March 2, 2021
4. Chair’s Report
5. All three motions (PTR language clarifications, recommendation of special committee to implement online SEI’s and revision of the PEC form) previously passed by FERS were approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/3.
6. All SEI’s will be conducted online from now on and CoursEval contract was renewed.
7. Annual evaluation due date delayed to 4/28 and Impact Statements will be allowed. (Format being developed by Melissa Schaub and Joe West.)
8. Chair will meet with Faculty Senate Executive Committee on 3/31 to determine charge and membership of special committee on implementation of online SEI’s.
9. Old Business
	1. Department Chair’s Annual Evaluation form (Appendix B)
	2. Change in Handbook language describing the procedure for conducting SEI’s (including consideration of changing to every semester) (Appendix A)
10. New Business
	1. Non-tenure track evaluations expectations (Appendix C)
	2. Evaluation procedures for Assistant/Associate Deans
11. Announcements
12. Adjournment

**Appendix A**

p. 83-85

### 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 and part-time faculty, teaching graduate or undergraduate courses, are evaluated during ~~one~~ each 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 evaluations of instruction are conducted using an online survey. Students and instructors receive an automated email to their UNCP account when the survey opens. In the email, students are provided a link and instructions for how to complete the survey and the amount of time they have left to complete it. Students have two weeks to complete the SEI evaluations. The invitation to complete SEI’s is sent out at 6:00 am the Monday two weeks before exam week and is closed at 5:59 am on the Monday of exam week.

Instructors of face-to-face classes are required to set aside 15 minutes of time in class for students to complete the survey on their digital devices during which the instructor is not to be present.

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 as well as a transcript of student comments is prepared as soon as possible~~, and transcripts of student comments are prepared when possible~~. The faculty member must not receive any report on his or her evaluations until grades for the current semester have been submitted~~. 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.

**Appendix B**

**Format for Department Chair’s Annual Evaluation Reports**

These format guidelines give an overview of specific information that should appear in ~~a faculty member's self-evaluation report,~~ the Department Chair’s evaluation report~~, the Peer Evaluation Committee's evaluation report, and the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC). Area weights assigned to specific areas must sum to 100%.~~ . All reports should be guided by the Disciplinary Statements adopted by the home department of the faculty member under evaluation.

Taking into account the faculty member’s selected weights and the department’s Disciplinary Statements, this report should discuss the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service. This report should include (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 candid assessment of whether or not the faculty member being evaluated is making sufficient progress towards promotion and tenure in each area: teaching, scholarship, and service (with suggestions for improvement where warranted) and (4) 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 evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service.

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 PTC \_\_\_\_\_***

***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?

*d)* Has sufficient progress been made towards promotion and tenure in the area of teaching?

\_\_\_\_\_Yes

\_\_\_\_\_No

Recommendations for improvement:

**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.

*c)* Has sufficient progress towards promotion and tenure been made in the area of scholarship?

\_\_\_\_Yes

\_\_\_\_No

Recommendations for improvement:

**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.

*d)* Has sufficient progress towards promotion and tenure been made in the area of service?

\_\_\_\_Yes

\_\_\_\_No

Recommendations for improvement:

**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, Peer Evaluation Committee, and Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluation. 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 Signature of Department or Committee Chair

Date Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member

**Appendix C**

p. 93 Faculty Handbook

**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