Committee on the Oversight of the Faculty Handbook
Meeting Agenda
Thursday, February 16, 2023 at 3:30pm
Location: Webex
https://uncp.webex.com/meet/rachel.smith

Committee Members: (Division) (End of term)

Cynthia Miecznikowski (LETT Secretary) (2023)
Vacant (ARTS) (2023)
Rachel Smith (NSM Chair) (2023)
Olivia Oxendine (EDUC) (2024)
Miranda Reiter (SBS) (2025)
Astrid Oviedo (CHS) (2022)
Mary Ann Jacobs (FERS) (Ex Officio)

I.   Call to Order
II.   Approval of Minutes from January 19 meeting (Appendix A)
III.   Approval of Agenda
IV.   Chair's Report
    a. In October we decided to change the language in the section of Chapter 1 on The History of the University of North Carolina from "All the schools and universities welcome students of both sexes and all races." to "All the schools and universities welcome students, regardless of how they identify their gender, race, and ethnicity"
Dr. Chemishanov thinks this came from UNC Code (below) so the Chair suggests that we make it consistent with the current statement:
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.

V.   Old Business
    a. Section II Chapter 2 pg. 85 Annual Deans Evaluation report (start here)
VI.   New Business
    a. Review of previously agreed upon changes to Handbook to determine if any require a vote of the Senate (Appendix B)
IX.   Announcements
X.   Adjournment

Upcoming Meetings: Thursday, March 16, 2023, 3:30 PM on Webex

Committee on the Oversight of the Faculty Handbook
Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 19, 2023, at 3:30pm
Location: Webex
https://uncp.webex.com/meet/rachel.smith

Committee Members (Division) (End of term)
Present:
      Cynthia Miecznikowski (LETT Secretary) (2023)
      Astrid Oviedo (CHS) (2022)
      Miranda Reiter (SBS) (2025)
      Rachel Smith (NSM Chair) (2023)
      Mary Ann Jacobs (FERS) (Ex Officio)
Absent:
      Olivia Oxendine (EDUC) (2024)
Vacancy: (ARTS) (2023)

VII.   Meeting was called to order at 3:31PM.
VIII.   No Minutes from November 17th meeting due to lack of quorum. Minutes of the October 20th meeting were approved.
IX.   Agenda was approved.
X.   Chair's Report
    a. No candidates from ARTS for vacant position means this post will likely remain vacant for 2023-2024.
    b. Motion revising charge was passed by senate and general faculty.
        i.   Chair noted that before all proposed changes are brought to Senate, the Committee will need to code the previously agreed upon changes from 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, also, to distinguish those that need formal Senate approval from those that will simply be reported to Senate "for information and review."
        ii. Committee will also need to clarify that all changes referred to FERS in 2021-2022 have been approved and those sections updated.
        iii. Chair proposed Committee compile master list of changes for Senate approval by March meeting.
XI.   Old Business
    a. Gender neutral language prior to p. 83: It was agreed that Chair and Secretary will review these and import to the master document.
    b. Section II Chapter 2: Student Evaluations of Instruction (p. 83 of pdf) is where the committee left off last year:
        i.   The question was raised whether this section had already been updated for the current (2022-2023) Handbook.
        ii. Chair and Secretary agreed to verify before next meeting and confirm other updates before continuing the Committee's work.
XII.   New Business
    a. Review of previously agreed upon changes to Handbook to determine if any require a vote of the Senate: This was postponed until verification of master document status.
IX.   Announcements (None)
X.   Meeting adjourned at 4:30PM.

Appendix B

p. 6
All the schools and universities welcome students ~~of both sexes and all races~~, regardless of how they identify their gender, race, and ethnicity.
p. 15
ARTICLE IV. DUTIES OF SENATORS
Section 1. Senators shall bring to the Senate proposals originating from (or endorsed by) Department Chairs, ~~from~~ academic supportive services, or~~and from other areas of academic~~ concerned ~~of the~~ faculty. ~~Proposals shall be in writing and furnished in sufficient copies to facilitate review and action of the Senate.~~

<div align="center">

SECTION II
CHAPTER 2
FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

</div>

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. ~~P~~performance in such non-teaching functions will be evaluated by ~~whomever~~ the individual ~~faculty member~~ to whom 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 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: 1)Teaching, 2)Scholarship, and 3) Service, ~~(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 Subcommittee 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. They should also be cognizant of respective department ~~their department's~~ Disciplinary Statements.

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. While acknowledging differences between departments and disciplinary fields, 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. (See section entitled, "Disciplinary Statements.")

All phases of evaluation are to be guided by the principles set forth in the following pages ~~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 ensure 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, 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/apps/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.

Disciplinary Statements

To supplement general information provided in ~~UNCP's~~ faculty evaluation policies, each academic department develops Disciplinary Statements corresponding to each of the three areas of faculty evaluation—teaching, scholarship, and service. These statements are department and discipline-specific guidelines to the interpretation of general requirements described here in Chapter 2, Faculty Evaluation Policy and in Section II, Chapter 3, Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy. While remaining respectful of the academy's principle of academic freedom and UNCP's system of allowing faculty to choose area

weights, these statements serve as a guide for faculty as they negotiate the path towards tenure and promotion. Additionally, the statements ~~They~~ aid in the evaluation of candidate performance at all levels of ~~that~~ review ~~process~~. Finally, the statements ~~they~~ are also used in contract renewal and annual evaluations.

The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina (*"The Code"*) provides valuable guidance on the development and use of Disciplinary Statements in evaluation as it states,
> Within the University, important faculty personnel decisions are based on evaluations of performance rendered by a candidate's immediate colleagues and supervisors, who are in the best position to make such judgments. These assessments are not the product of mechanically applied checklists, criteria or formulas; there is no simple litmus test for outstanding teaching, research or service. Rather, these decisions must reflect careful exercises of discretion, in which the faculty colleagues draw on their own academic knowledge, experience and perceptions to evaluate the candidate's qualifications and performance. (UNC Policy Manual, Section 101.3.1)
> http://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php?pg=toc&id=s1

As can be seen, *The Code* prohibits the mechanical use of "checklists" in faculty evaluation. Thus, Disciplinary Statements should not take a checklist form nor ~~should they~~ state that a candidate must complete a specific number of activities in a particular area of evaluation in order "to be eligible" for tenure and/or promotion. Further, while evaluators are strongly advised to take the department's Disciplinary Statements into account before rendering an evaluation, the above section of *The Code* also states evaluators should draw on their own experience. As a result, faculty should not assume these statements are binding on evaluators.

Used properly, Disciplinary Statements offer useful insights into specific expectations within a discipline and/or department. The statements are not a vehicle for creating substantially new or more stringent requirements for faculty nor can they be used to create new faculty evaluation procedures that go beyond the general requirements laid out in the *Faculty Handbook* in Section II, Chapter 2, Faculty Evaluation Policy and Chapter 3, Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy. Rather, Disciplinary Statements are intended to ensure a common understanding of the ways university expectations for faculty apply across heterogeneous disciplines and departments. Departments that prefer to substantially modify criteria or procedures are strongly encouraged to develop a Departmental Evaluation Plan described in the subsection entitled, "Optional Departmental Evaluation Plan."

Combined academic departments may develop an overall set of Disciplinary Statements that incorporate expectations for each departmental discipline or may choose to develop a separate set of statements for each discipline. Departments offering more than one degree program may choose to develop subsets of program-specific statements if department members believe such subsets are warranted.

All Disciplinary Statements must be approved by the Dean and the Provost prior to implementation. Disciplinary Statements should be reviewed by academic departments not less than once every five years to ensure they remain an accurate representation of the department's expectations. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will notify Department Chairs in August of the academic year in which departmental review of the Disciplinary Statements should take place. The departmental review of the Disciplinary Statements may result in approval of the statements already in use, or in changes that departmental faculty may formulate. The Disciplinary Statements, including revisions, should be approved by a majority of the General Faculty members in the department and signed by the Department Chair. If a majority of departmental faculty does not approve the revisions the current Disciplinary Statements will remain in effect. The Department Chair records the department vote count in the

appropriate section of the Disciplinary Statements before submitting them to the Dean and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

While changes may be made more often than every five years if exigent circumstances warrant, statements should be reasonably consistent across time so that evaluations are not affected by temporary, arbitrary, or radical changes. Departments may initiate the review of Disciplinary Statements by notifying the Provost and Chancellor for Academic Affairs no later than the first day of the academic year during which revisions are to be considered. All revisions must be completed by March 1 so that faculty undergoing evaluation in the next academic year will have ample time to prepare.

All revisions must be approved by the Dean and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs prior to implementation. Under normal circumstances, revisions approved during an academic year will become effective at the start of the following academic year. The Office for Academic Affairs maintains an online listing of all approved Disciplinary Statements and their effective dates for examination by all faculty and evaluators. Older sets will be archived online.

Under normal circumstances, when faculty members undergo review (e.g., tenure, promotion, and annual) the evaluation is guided by the Disciplinary Statements in effect in their department at the time of the evaluation. However, if a department revises its Disciplinary Statements a faculty member may elect to be evaluated under the previous set of Disciplinary Statements without penalty for a period of up to two academic years after the effective date of the new Disciplinary Statements. In such cases, the faculty member should notify his or her Department Chair in writing within 30 calendar days of the effective date of the new Disciplinary Statements. This letter must indicate whether a one or two-year grace period has been elected. If a tenure and/or promotion review occurs during the grace period, a copy of the faculty member's letter to the Department Chair should be included in the portfolio. In no case will a faculty member be permitted to be evaluated for any purpose under a portion of an older set of Disciplinary Statements and a portion of a newer set of Disciplinary Statements.

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 section entitled "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.

An acceptable plan must (a) adhere to the guiding principles and procedural objectives in this document; (b) include Disciplinary Statements approved by the Dean and the Provost; (c) conform to all deadlines established herein; (d) 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; (e) be approved by a two-thirds majority of the department's full-time faculty; and (f) 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 and will post them online for examination by all faculty members.

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, 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, current 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 information 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' capacitiesy 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 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 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 PEC ~~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). Self-evaluations submitted for any type of evaluation should reflect the ~~tie the faculty member's teaching work to the teaching~~ Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member's home department.

<u>Evaluation of Scholarship</u>
Though teaching is their fundamental responsibility, all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a balanced record ~~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 significant 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 reflect ~~should tie the faculty member's scholarly work to the scholarship~~ Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member's home department.

Evaluation of Service
Though teaching is a fundamental responsibility, all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a balanced record ~~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.

Service is divided into three categories: u~~U~~niversity 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.

University service includes any u~~U~~niversity-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 u~~U~~niversity service.

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.

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).

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.

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.

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 materials such as conference programs, flyers, or by statements from chairs or presidents. Self-evaluations submitted for any type of evaluation reflect ~~should tie the faculty member's service work to the service~~ Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member's home department.

Participants in Faculty Evaluation
~~All~~ Eevaluators should be guided by the traditions of academic freedom. They must ~~are required to~~ adhere to the tripartite 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. The Self-Evaluation Report should reflect ~~tie the faculty member's work to~~ the Disciplinary Statements adopted by the faculty member's home department. 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 responsibilities to their department and 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 must be 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, the Peer Evaluation Committee, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Student~~s~~ Evaluation of Instruction

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 teaching performance. ~~as a teacher; hence,~~ Eevaluation 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

At the department level, ~~T~~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 a manner consistent with the department's Disciplinary Statements. 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 https://www.uncp.edu/resources/academic-affairs/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 or her report to illustrate the faculty member's failure to meet expectations. In either case, the Department Chair's conclusion should be informed by the department's Disciplinary Statements.

The Peer Evaluation Committee

A Peer Evaluation Committee's (PEC's) first task is to elect a chair who then notifies the Department Chair of ~~his or her~~ their election. The ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC is responsible for preparing and submitting a ~~Peer Evaluation~~ PEC Report in decisions involving tenure and/or promotion, as well as for contract renewal and requested 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~~ PEC is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the

faculty member's performance. The ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC 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~~ PEC and the Department Chair (or between the ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC and the Dean in the case of a Department chair) during the course of the review.

In preparing the ~~Peer Evaluation~~ PEC Report ~~for a faculty member~~, a ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC 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) as well as the department's Disciplinary Statements. In cases of tenure and/or promotion review, the ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~ PEC Report must include sufficient information to justify the Committee's decision.

Peer Evaluation Committee Eligibility

Peer Evaluation Committee members should be at or above the rank sought by the faculty candidate. No more than one member should come from outside the candidate's department. When circumstances dictate, however, the Department Chair may appoint additional members from outside the candidate's department or below the rank sought with the approval of the Dean and Provost. Department chairs outside the candidate's department and faculty members in phased retirement are eligible to serve. Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) are ineligible to serve on PECs in Tenure/Promotion evaluations; however, they may serve on PECs of evaluations that are not seen by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (Contract Renewal, Post-Tenure Review-only). Prohibited from serving on a Peer Evaluation Committee are the Department Chair of the faculty member's department, faculty members above the rank of department chair (including Assistant Deans), and any faculty member undergoing the same type of evaluation during the same academic year (Contract Renewal, Tenure/Promotion, or Post-Tenure Review). A faculty member simultaneously undergoing Tenure/Promotion and Post-Tenure-Review evaluations may not serve as a PEC member for either type of evaluation. Faculty members undergoing review during the same academic year may not serve on each other's PECs, regardless of the types of evaluation.

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~~ PEC (provided for major reviews, advisory reviews, and post-tenure reviews only), 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 https://www.uncp.edu/resources/academic-affairs/academic-affairs-forms) which will then be forwarded, with the materials the Dean has reviewed, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

When a Department Chair (or equivalent position) is the faculty member being evaluated, the Dean will act as the Department Chair would in other evaluations. In this case, the Dean will use the Format for Evaluation Reports form instead of the Dean's Recommendation or Report form. When Deans act as Department Chair, they will likewise remain independent of the Peer Evaluation Committee.

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) 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; ~~and~~ (d) reach an equitable final decision taking into account the weights chosen by the faculty member and the Disciplinary Statements of the faculty member's department; and (e) write a report that supports ~~in~~ 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~~ the faculty candidate or reviewing body involved may request an ad hoc ruling from the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee. 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. The Provost, in consultation with the chairs of the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee, the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee, and the Faculty Senate, shall also have the authority to make non-substantial changes in the execution of the Faculty Evaluation Model as related to evolving technologies and features in our digital Faculty Evaluation portfolio system. The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee will adjudicate whether a proposed change is substantial in the event of uncertainty.

In reviewing Department Chairs' and Dean's salary recommendations, the Provost and 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 and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for collaborating with Deans to approve Disciplinary Statements submitted by each academic department and for ensuring that the Disciplinary Statements are consistent with provisions of Section 101.3.1 of *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina*. These statements are used to guide the application of the Standard Performance Rating Scale. Beyond disciplinary variations expressed in the departmental Disciplinary Statements, no evaluator (e.g., Department Chair, Dean, Peer Evaluation Committee, Promotion and Tenure Committee) is permitted to use standards that deviate from the general norms and practices of the University. Current definitions for each level of performance on the Standard Performance Rating Scale may be found here: https://www.uncp.edu/resources/academic-affairs/academic-affairs-forms in the section entitled "Faculty Evaluation Forms."

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should, through 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~~ Office of 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 the 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 and their department's Disciplinary Statements.

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 of Instruction Report (SEI), 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.

All faculty are evaluated each academic year. ~~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.

Self-Evaluation Report
In the Self-Evaluation Report (SEI), the faculty member must discuss his or her teaching, scholarship, and service in the context of his or her department's Disciplinary Statements. 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 SEI ~~Self-Evaluation~~ Report. These guidelines are intended as a general overview of the specific information (including subheadings and area weights) that should appear in ~~a faculty member's~~ ~~Self-Evaluation~~ SEI 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 adjust~~apt~~ ~~his or her~~ their 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~~ their area weights on the Self-Evaluation Report as ~~he or she~~ they deem~~s~~ 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 ~~c~~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~~ SEI 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 https://www.uncp.edu/resources/academic-affairs/academic-affairs-forms for an example of how the report should be structured and the subheadings listed.