

*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

March 14, 2023

<https://uncp.webex.com/meet/mary.jacobs>

Join by phone

+1-415-655-0001 US Toll

Access code: 734 841 630

### **Members:**

Scott Cohen (Secretary, SBS 2024); Kennard DuBose (CHS 2023); Dennis Edgell (NSM 2023); Irina Falls (EDUC, 2023); Mary Ann Jacobs (Chair, LETT 2024); Aaron Vandermeer (ARTS, 2023); Jennifer Wells (At Large, 2024); and Polina Chemishanova, Digital Portfolio Administrator

- I. Call to Order
- II. Adoption of the Agenda
- III. Approval of Minutes from February 7, 2023 (Appendix H)
- IV. Chair's Report
  - a. Our next meeting date is April 4<sup>th</sup>.
  - b. My updates are in new business on SEIs and from the Committee on the Faculty Handbook.
- V. Old Business
  - a. The committee will refer the paragraph beginning "University service is evaluated when possible by results" to FERS during the 2022-2023 Academic Year. - the committee will review the draft language (Appendix A)
  - b. Rename and reorganize (OAA website) Evaluation forms. – (See Appendix B).
  - c. Signatures Expectations - Language that refers to the signature of the candidate should be defined for the Faculty Evaluation model especially in the Faculty Handbook. (See Appendix C)
  - d. Typical Calendar of events – Faculty Evaluation model – The Faculty evaluation model needs adjustment. We will take this up to clarify what if any action the FERS committee might take on the evaluation timeline (Appendix D)
  - e. Single form PEC Requests (PTR different)
  - f. Evaluate the PEC composition needs to be evaluated.
  - g. New request from the Faculty Governance Committee to FERS (See Appendix E)
- VI. New Business
  - a. SEIs that contain 3 student evaluations Updates from Crystal Walline (See Appendix F)
  - b. Questions from the Committee on the Faculty Handbook (Appendix G)
- VII. For the Good of the Order
- VIII. Announcements
- IX. Adjournment

## Appendix A

### **Suggested Rewording from Scott Cohen**

From page 79 of the Microsoft Word Version

#### **Original**

University service is evaluated when possible by results: advisees 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.

#### **Suggested**

University service is evaluated when possible by the outcomes of the service as well as the effort and time invested to support the faculty governance and mission of the institution. Example would be **activities** such as advisees 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. However, those responsibilities are not fulfilled by simply attending the service activity. Committee service requires participation and effort to attain the goals and charge of the organization. Professional service and community service are evaluated when possible by the outcomes of the service as well as the effort and time invested. Examples would outline the importance of contributions made, by the nature of activity and by how well objectives of the activity were achieved.

Sent 11/19/2022

These (below) were personal notes sent from Dr. Charlton, these were not voted on by FICA, nor are they notes from FICA. These are suggestions from Dr. Charlton.

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.

University service is evaluated when possible by the outcomes of the service as well as the effort and time invested to support faculty governance and the mission of the university. Examples would be activities such as: advisees, 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. However, those responsibilities are not fulfilled by simply attending the service activity. Committee service requires participation and effort to attain the goals and charge of the organization. Committee service is evaluated when possible by the outcomes of the service as well as the effort and time invested. Examples would outline the

importance of contributions made, the nature of the activities, the effort expended during the activity, and the level of achieving the objectives of the activity.

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). Professional service is documented by.....add? I don't know.

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. Community service is documented by...add? I don't know.

## **Appendix B**

### **Academic Affairs Forms**

#### **Forms**

- Academic Honor Code Violation Form
- Administrative Staff Form
- Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form
- Class Irregularity Report
- Faculty Serious Illness Leave Form

#### **Curriculum Proposals**

- Course Proposal
- General Education Course Proposal
- Program Proposal
- Curriculog – Curriculum Management System

#### **Exam Change**

- Exam Change Request Form

#### **Evaluation of Administrators Forms**

- Chancellor Evaluation for Faculty
- Office of the Chancellor: Collective Evaluation Form for Faculty
- Provost and Academic Vice Chancellor Evaluation Form for Faculty
- Vice Chancellor & Officers for Business Affairs: Evaluation Form for Faculty
- Officers for Academic Affairs: Evaluation Form for Faculty
- Dean of Graduate Studies: Evaluation Form for Faculty
- Vice Chancellor & Officers for Development and University Relations: Evaluation Form for Faculty
- Vice Chancellor & Officers for Student Affairs: Evaluation Form for Faculty

#### **Faculty Evaluation Forms**

- Department Chair Evaluation Form
- Five Year Plan for Post Tenure Review
- Format for Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase
- Format for Dean's Report for Post-Tenure Review
- Format for Dean's Report for Probationary Contract Review
- Format for Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion
- Format for Department Chair's Annual Evaluation Reports
- Format for Department Chair's Report to Post-Tenure Review
- Post-Tenure Review Five-Year Plan Template
- Tenure Promotion Renewal Form
- Standard Performance Rating Scale
- Student Evaluation of Instruction Form
- Peer Evaluation nomination and Appointment Form

#### **Faculty Contract Information**

- New Faculty Recruitment Guideline
- New Faculty Checklist
- Faculty Information Form
- New Faculty Recommendation letter

- Statement of Proficiency in Oral and Written Communication
- Adjunct Contract
- Full-Time Faculty Contract
- Non-Faculty Teaching Contract
- Overload Contract

#### **Forms**

- Grade Appeal Checklist
- Notice of Intent to Engage in External Professional Activities for Pay
- Notification of Intent to Offer Off-Campus or Online Course and Programs
- Professor's Class Absence Request
- Report of Non-University Activities
- Request for Approval of Independent Study
- Request for Audit
- Request for Authorization to Offer Off Campus or Online Courses or Programs
- Settlement of a Violation of the Academic Honor Code
- Statement in Proficiency in Oral and Written Communication
- Student Complaint Form
- Student Complaint Log
- Student Travel Form
- Syllabus Checklist
- Travel Reimbursement (2019)
- Travel Request (2019)
- Domestic Travel Guidance
- International Travel Recommendations for Fully vaccinated People
- Assumption of Risk and Acknowledgement

#### **Phased Retirement**

- Phased Retirement Policy-Appendix A-Application and Reemployment Agreement
- Phased Retirement Policy-Appendix B-General Release (2019)

## Appendix C

### Page 86

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 ten business days of signing the report.

### Page 96

#### **The Peer Evaluation Committee**

The department or unit selects 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.

### Page 97

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

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

Reply from Angie Sent 2.23.2023

Good morning Mary Ann,

Signature for the HR operations 'depends' on the official authority or requestor of such document or item, for example certain personnel documents require an official 'wet' signature, some forms permit a copy or e-signature, and internally we accept signature copies for campus forms. Another example if a document requires notary, of course you appear before the notary to witness the signature.

I will defer to the counsel for legal opinion on a definition but from HR perspective there isn't a one fits all 'wet or physical' signature requirement.

Regards,

Angela

Angela Revels, M.A., PHR  
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources  
The University of North Carolina at Pembroke  
Office of Human Resources

Reply from Kelvin Jacobs Sent 2.23.2023

To my knowledge, the university hasn't defined signature. Since its common knowledge as to what a signature is, when dealing with legal documents we often indicate that electronic and/or digital signatures are acceptable.

Since this is an internal form, then you can dictate what's acceptable. I do suggest making it convenient as opposed to a rigid requirement.

## **Appendix D**

The timeline for evaluation covers several pages beginning on page 87

### **Notification and Scheduling of Tenure and Promotion Evaluations**

The Department Chair is responsible for ascertaining when a mandatory tenure evaluation is due. The Department Chair is responsible for announcing this occasion 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**. Faculty members choosing to apply for promotion must notify their Department Chairs by **August 1** so that the procedure described above can be applied.

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.

## **Appendix E**

Request from Faculty Governance Committee to the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

The Faculty Governance Committee requests the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee to review and articulate the criteria for faculty wishing to be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer from Lecturer. The current policy is as follows.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer is based on continued improvement in and demonstration of excellence in teaching with at least satisfactory performance in service activities. After serving as a Lecturer at UNCP for five years, a Lecturer may notify the Chair of his or her department in writing that he or she wishes to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer; the notification must be made by August 1<sup>st</sup> of the year in which the evaluation will take place. The evaluation will follow the procedures used for promotion to professorial ranks, with the exception that the applicant's professional academic activities may be evaluated in the place of scholarly achievement. (Faculty *Handbook*, Section II, Chapter 1, p.44)

Rationale for Review Request:

As it stands now, the *Handbook* does not state, clearly, the various criteria that lecturers should meet to be promoted to the position of Senior Lecturer. We also request that you consider a separate section in the handbook for promotion of lecturer to senior lecturer.

## Appendix F

### **From Crystal Walline Chair of the Committee on SEI**

#### **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 (SEI) ~~Form~~ form. Although student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member's performance as a teacher, and are documented to be susceptible to bias, 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 each semester of each academic year. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve the ~~Student Evaluation of Instruction Form~~ SEI 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~~ SEI form in lieu of the general form. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve any alternate forms.

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 encouraged to set aside 15 minutes of time in class for students to complete the survey online 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 (GCA) 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~~ GCA form are not used in faculty evaluation but instead are used for program improvement and accreditation purposes.

A quantitative summary of the ratings in each course as well as a transcript of student comments are prepared as soon as possible. The faculty member being evaluated must not receive any report on his or her evaluations until grades for the current semester have been submitted. **Note that student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information validly to judge a faculty member's performance as a teacher, and all parties involved in faculty evaluation are cautioned to avoid placing undue emphasis on individual student comments, which may not reflect majority opinions. The SEI completion rate in each course should also be taken into account by all evaluators when weighing the numerical data summary. When sample sizes are relatively low, the data in general should be viewed with extreme caution; evaluators should look more for trends over time than for particular target scores. Additionally, Chairs, Deans, and Peer Evaluation and other committees are reminded that SEI instruments nationally have strong, documented evidence of racial, gender, and other biases, and must be used extremely carefully; our instruments have not been normalized for validity and reliability.**

After grades have been submitted, the faculty member and Chair receive the quantitative summaries and the student comments. 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.

Approved 23 February 2023 by the Student Evaluations of Instruction Committee

The SEI recommends a Non-Guaranteed Anonymity Statement should accompany release of Student Evaluations of Instruction for any surveyed course with 3 or fewer registered students.

"Note that for courses with low total enrollment, the anonymity of your responses may not be as complete as it would be in a larger course, even though student names are never attached to the results."

Approved 23 February 2023 by the Student Evaluations of Instruction Committee

The SEI recommends a Small Sample Size Statement should accompany release of Student Evaluations of Instruction in either of the following circumstances:

A course with 3 or fewer registered students -or-

A course that received 3 or fewer SEI responses

“Student Evaluations of Instruction are instrumental in allowing students an opportunity to provide feedback on the effectiveness of course instruction. However, Faculty, Department Chairs, and other administrators should interpret evaluations with small sample sizes with caution, as small sample sizes reduce the power of the feedback and increase the likelihood of skewed or non-representative feedback. In other words, evaluations with low response rates should not be used as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness in the faculty review process, including but not limited to, Annual Evaluations, Promotion and Tenure decisions, and conferment of Teaching Awards. A comprehensive evaluation of teaching effectiveness should include student feedback, peer observations, evaluation of instructional materials and learning management systems (e.g. Canvas), and instructor self-reflections.”

## Appendix G

**From:** Holden Hansen <[holden.hansen@uncp.edu](mailto:holden.hansen@uncp.edu)>  
**Date:** Saturday, February 18, 2023 at 11:22 AM  
**To:** "Rachel B. Smith" <[rachel.smith@uncp.edu](mailto:rachel.smith@uncp.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: Action item for Faculty Senate agenda from Handbook Oversight

Rachel,

I am inclined to agree that all of these changes are significant and require a Senate vote.

If I understand correctly, the latter two changes related to Faculty Evaluation should be sent to FERS (then FIAC) for approval before coming to the Senate.

The first change related to the currency of the UNC code is directly from Oversight of the FH and can come to the Senate for a vote on March 1. I don't see that this should necessarily go to any other committee or subcommittee.

As for all minor changes not requiring a vote, it would make more sense to me if you wait until April or May, since you state that there is more work to do before the end of the year.

I am copying the Executive Committee in case they are in disagreement with me on all of this. If you don't hear any objections, I say let's go with the plan I have outlined above.

Thanks. It feels good that we are finally making progress, and that next year Oversight will be able to start from clean slate.

Holden

**From:** Holden Hansen <[holden.hansen@uncp.edu](mailto:holden.hansen@uncp.edu)>  
**Date:** Saturday, February 18, 2023 at 11:22 AM  
**To:** "Rachel B. Smith" <[rachel.smith@uncp.edu](mailto:rachel.smith@uncp.edu)>  
**Cc:** Maria Pereira <[maria.pereira@uncp.edu](mailto:maria.pereira@uncp.edu)>, Kelly Charlton <[kelly.charlton@uncp.edu](mailto:kelly.charlton@uncp.edu)>, Melissa A Schaub <[melissa.schaub@uncp.edu](mailto:melissa.schaub@uncp.edu)>, Jennifer Wells <[jennifer.wells@uncp.edu](mailto:jennifer.wells@uncp.edu)>, Camille Goins <[Camille.Goins@uncp.edu](mailto:Camille.Goins@uncp.edu)>, Peter Grimes <[Peter.Grimes@uncp.edu](mailto:Peter.Grimes@uncp.edu)>, "Renee D. Lamphere" <[renee.lamphere@uncp.edu](mailto:renee.lamphere@uncp.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: Action item for Faculty Senate agenda from Handbook Oversight

Rachel,

I am inclined to agree that all of these changes are significant and require a Senate vote.

If I understand correctly, the latter two changes related to Faculty Evaluation should be sent to FERS (then FIAC) for approval before coming to the Senate.

The first change related to the currency of the UNC code is directly from Oversight of the FH and can come to the Senate for a vote on March 1. I don't see that this should necessarily go to any other committee or subcommittee.

As for all minor changes not requiring a vote, it would make more sense to me if you wait until April or May, since you state that there is more work to do before the end of the year.

I am copying the Executive Committee in case they are in disagreement with me on all of this. If you don't hear any objections, I say let's go with the plan I have outlined above.

Thanks. It feels good that we are finally making progress, and that next year Oversight will be able to start from clean slate.

Holden

**From:** Rachel B. Smith <[rachel.smith@uncp.edu](mailto:rachel.smith@uncp.edu)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 18, 2023 4:43 AM  
**To:** Holden Hansen <[holden.hansen@uncp.edu](mailto:holden.hansen@uncp.edu)>  
**Cc:** Maria Pereira <[maria.pereira@uncp.edu](mailto:maria.pereira@uncp.edu)>  
**Subject:** Action item for Faculty Senate agenda from Handbook Oversight

Holden,

We have reviewed the changes from last year and so far this year and found that three are substantial enough to perhaps require the vote of the senate so I wanted to get your impressions about each.

p. 6

All the schools and universities welcome students of both sexes and all races, regardless of their race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, or veteran status.

This is part of a description of the history of the UNC system in Chapter 1 of the Handbook. We thought that the “inclusive” language needed an update. I asked Polina if she knew the source of this statement and she pointed me to UNC Code Section 103. So, at our last meeting we revised the language to be consistent with this code. Although a case could be made that this is an update for currency based on what I suspect was an update in the UNC Code language, it is a significant change so we wanted to see if you thought it would require the vote of Senate.

#### SECTION 103. EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN THE UNIVERSITY.

Admission to, employment by, and promotion in the University of North Carolina and all of its constituent institutions shall be on the basis of merit, and there shall be no unlawful discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, or veteran status.

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. Self-evaluations submitted for any type of evaluation should reflect ~~the faculty member’s scholarly work to the scholarship~~ Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member’s home department.

Although we thought this was outdated and could be removed, I would like this change to be reviewed by faculty from all disciplines because it might still be applicable to Art faculty, etc.

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 significant scholarship**. Preparation and administration of grants qualifies as scholarly research only insofar as it entails the activities cited above.

While we thought this was a good change, it seems to change the weight given to conference attendance in evaluations. Mary Ann Jacobs (FERS Chair) thought it should be referred back to them and I'm inclined to agree.

Otherwise, I've attached the whole list which are ready to go to Senate and those which we thought might need to be voted on are highlighted. We are working on other changes but wanted to ensure that they were correct before forwarding them to you but we also wanted to get this on a Senate agenda before the end of the year. If you'd prefer that we wait and present all the changes from the whole two years at the May meeting, we can do that instead.

Best,  
Rachel

## Appendix H

*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.*

### UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

February 07, 2023

<https://uncp.webex.com/meet/mary.jacobs>

Join by phone

+1-415-655-0001 US Toll

Access code: 734 841 630

#### Members:

Scott Cohen (Secretary, SBS 2024); Kennard DuBose (CHS 2023); Dennis Edgell (NSM 2023); Irina Falls (EDUC, 2023); Mary Ann Jacobs (Chair, LETT 2024); Aaron Vandermeer (ARTS, 2023); Jennifer Wells (At Large, 2024); and Polina Chemishanova, Digital Portfolio Administrator

I. Call to Order: 3:32 pm

II. Adoption of the Agenda

III. Approval of Minutes from November 1, 2023: as amended.

IV. Chair's Report

- a. Notes from Kelly Charlton Appendix A and E (on service and SR lecturers) and Crystal Walline Appendix F were added to this agenda.
- b. Our next meeting date is March 14 and we meet April 4th

V. Old Business

- a. The committee will refer the paragraph beginning "University service is evaluated when possible by results" to FERS during the 2022-2023 Academic Year. - the committee will review the draft language. The notes from Kelly Charlton speak to this issue see Appendix A: Scott to address.
- b. Rename and reorganize (OAA website) Evaluation forms. – (See Appendix B on the Agenda). Discussed how to organize. Aaron to address.
- c. Signatures Expectations - Language that refers to the signature of the candidate should be removed for the Faculty Evaluation model especially in the Faculty Handbook. (See Appendix C on the Agenda) to contact general consul signatures still have valuable what defines a signature. Mary to address.
- d. Typical Calendar of events – Faculty Evaluation model – The Faculty evaluation model needs adjustment. We will take this up to clarify what if any action the FERS committee might take on the evaluation timeline Starts page 102 pdf. Polina and Aaron to address.
- e. Single form PEC Requests (PTR different) wait for further information from BOG

VI. New Business

- a. Evaluate the PEC composition needs to be evaluated. (See Appendix C on the Agenda) discussed that guaranteed member being in the area or related area, even chair. See page 81 Jennifer to address
- b. New request from the Faculty Governance Committee to FERS (See Appendix E on the Agenda) discussed the new for further developing criteria for Senior Lecturer. Process

- developed. Mirror new Assistant Professor model. Will be moved to next meeting.
- c. SEIs that contain 3 student evaluations See Notes from Crystal Walline (See Appendix F on the Agenda) Chair to send and be discussed at next meeting. Requested a redline version be sent for review.

VII. For the Good of the Order

VIII. Announcements

IX. Adjournment

- a. Motion to adjourn: Aaron Vandermeer, second Dennis Edgell
  - i. No objections
  - ii. Meeting adjourned at 5 pm