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
October 04, 2022
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 September 06, 2022 (Appendix A)
IV. Chair's Report
   a. Referral of the SEI language around courses with 3 or fewer students will go to the SEI Committee (from Holden's email of 9-15-2022): "..SEI Committee is being tasked with crafting a recommendation surrounding the "courses with three or fewer enrolled students" and sending it to FERS, who will weigh in and send it on to FIAC. At some point in the process (probably [before] FIAC weighs in) I will seek input from the SGA and report that to FIAC. FIAC will make the final recommendation to the Senate. The above bold-listed courses should be a part of this recommendation, and my opinion is that the final approved proposal ought to be added to an appropriate place in the Faculty Handbook. See the referenced courses here: **Individual study, internship, writing lab, thesis/dissertation research, independent study, study abroad, exchange, practicum, clinical, and military courses."**

 V. Old Business

   a. The committee will refer the paragraph about the attendance at professional conferences and workshops to FERS during the 2022-2023 Academic Year. – the committee will review this paragraph at the next meeting in October. (See Appendix B)
   b. 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 this paragraph at the next meeting in October. (See Appendix C)
   c. Rename and reorganize (OAA website) Evaluation forms. – the committee will delay this reorganization to a later date.
   d. Single form PEC Requests (PTR different) – the committee will delay this form

development to a later date.

VI. New Business
- a. The FERS Committee voted and approved a motion to continue to meet via WebEx for the balance of the year.
- b. 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 D)
- c. Typical Calendar of events – Faculty Evaluation model – The Faculty evaluation model needs adjustment. We will take this up in the October meeting to clarify what if any action the FERS committee might take on the evaluation timeline (See Appendix E)

VII. For the Good of the Order

VIII. Announcements

IX. Adjournment

Appendix A

<div align="center">

Unapproved Minutes
Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee
September 06, 2022

https://uncp.webex.com/meet/mary.jacobs
Or Join by Phone:+1-415-655-0001 US Toll
Access code: 734 841 630
Host PIN: 7114

</div>

Members in attendance : Jennifer Wells, Nursing, (at Large, 2024)
Scott Cohen, Accounting (SBS, 2024); Mary Ann Jacobs, AIS, Chair (LETT 2024); Aaron Vandermeer, Music (ARTS, until 2023); Irina Falls, Education (EDUC, until 2023) Polina P. Chemishanova (Digital portfolio administrator); Holden Hanson, FS Chair 2022-2023.

Members absent: Kennard DuBose (CHS, until 2023)
Dennis Edgell, Geology & Geography (NSM, until 2023)

I. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order at 3:35 pm.

II. Adoption of the Agenda - The agenda was approved with the addition of a vote for Secretary in New Business and with the addition of Dr. Chemishanova to the membership of the committee.

III. Approval of Minutes from April 5, 2022 – The minutes from April 5th were approved by acclamation.

IV. Chair's Report - The Chair had no news to report except that Dr. Hanson would attend the first meeting and discuss a new issue around Student Evaluation of Instruction Reports (SEIs).

V. Old Business
    a. The committee will refer the paragraph about the attendance at professional conferences and workshops to FERS during the 2022-2023 Academic Year. – the committee will review this paragraph at the next meeting in October.
    b. 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 this paragraph at the next meeting in October.

    List of potential topics for review in FERS AY 2022-2023
        1. Rename and reorganize (OAA website) Evaluation forms. – the committee will delay this reorganization to a later date.
        2. Single form PEC Requests (PTR different) – the committee will delay this form development to a later date.
        3. SEIs: Consider whether SEIs should be distributed to courses with low enrollment (Provost decision 08/29/2022). Consider limit (or unlimited) on the comments section. – the Chair of FERS will ask the Chair of the SEI ad hoc Committee if they are already working on this issue and Dr. Chemishanova and the Provost will continue to meet with IR on this issue.

VI. New Business
    Signatures Expectations - Language that refers to the signature of the candidate should be removed for the Faculty Evaluation model especially in the Faculty Handbook.

Typical Calendar of events – Faculty Evaluation model – The Faculty evaluation model needs adjustment. We will take this up in the October meeting to clarify what if any action the FERS committee might take on the evaluation model timeline.

VII. For the Good of the Order – none.

VIII.

Announcement –

IX. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 pm.

Appendix B

Note that we are tasked with the first paragraph.

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

Appendix C

<u>From page 79</u> of the Microsoft Word Version

University service is may be evaluated ~~when possible by results~~ by the quality of engagement. Possible outcomes may include: 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 impactfully fulfilled at least the basic responsibilities of membership. Professional service and community service are evaluated ~~when possible by results~~ by the quality of engagement. Possible outcomes may include: by the importance of contributions made, by how demanding activities were, and by how well objectives were achieved.

Appendix D

Page 86
The Department Chair is required to share and enable the rebuttal option for 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. Evaluating administrators (Chairs and PEC) are encouraged to meet with the faculty member to review the evaluation report and/or the salary increase form.

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.

Appendix E

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.