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.

AMENDED AGENDA
Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee
April 04, 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 March 14, 2023
IV. Chair's Report
    a. New Business Suggestions to improve response rates for SEIs (see Appendix F)
V. Old Business
    a. Rename and reorganize (OAA website) Evaluation forms. – (See Appendix A).
    b. 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 B)
    c. Single form PEC Requests (Tabled Indefinitely on March 14, 2023)
    d. Evaluate the PEC composition needs to be evaluated.
    e. New request from the Faculty Governance Committee to FERS (See Appendix C)

VI. New Business

    a. SEIs that contain 3 student evaluations Updates from Crystal Walline (See Appendix D)
    b. Questions from the Committee on the Faculty Handbook (Appendix E)

VII. For the Good of the Order
VIII. Announcements
IX. Adjournment

Appendix A

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 B

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 C

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 1st 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.

Related information from the handbook
Senior Lecturers (p. 44 – 45) Faculty Handbook
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 1st 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.~~

As tenure-track faculty members do, Senior Lecturers have organizational responsibility for the courses they teach. They also adhere to departmental guidelines for course content if any exist. Senior Lecturers may participate in course and curriculum development and advise students. Senior Lecturers may also contribute to the school or department beyond teaching-related activities through campus service (including the faculty senate and its subcommittees) and academic discipline professional activities. Initial appointment as a Senior Lecturer is for a fixed term of one year. Subsequent appointments may be made for fixed terms of from one to five years.

Initial appointments for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Adjunct, and Visiting faculty are for one academic year. Reappointments will depend on performance reviews and the educational needs of the department. After the initial appointment, multiyear contracts may be awarded to Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Adjunct faculty whose professional characteristics indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles. No obligation exists on the part of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke to give any notice, other than statement of the length of appointment in the appointment contract, before a current terms expires as to whether appointment will be offered for a succeeding term. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, upon the faculty member's written request made no earlier than 180 calendar days nor later than 90 calendar days before his current term expires, shall, as a matter of professional courtesy, within 20 calendar days after he receives the request gives the faculty

member a written statement as to whether the University would like to negotiate a new appointment with the faculty member and, if so, the proposed terms. Failure to communicate a decision shall not affect or replace the notice of non-reappointment deemed to have been made with the original appointment contract and shall not constitute a new determination of non-reappointment or an offer.

Taken from pp.115 - 116
Senior Lecturer Promotion Criteria
Candidates for Senior Lecturer tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated using the criteria of scholarship and professional growth, University, professional, and community service, and, most importantly, excellence and effectiveness in teaching.

Teaching
Though teaching is, in many ways, a highly individualized profession and though there are continuing debates over the most effective techniques, there is little disagreement over the importance of exceptional teaching as the major criterion for tenure and/or promotion to Senior Lecturer. Clearly, exceptional teachers will show command of their subject, be creative and imaginative, be enthusiastic, promote critical thinking, stimulate their students to improved performance, engage in and use research, and be outstanding communicators. Disciplinary differences in teaching can be understood by referring to the Disciplinary Statements.

Scholarship and Professional Growth
All faculty are expected to engage in forms of scholarship appropriate to their discipline, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the University. Scholarship is a valuable component in the makeup of a good teacher. Evaluation of scholarship and creative activity considers the contributions to the field or discipline, the quality of the work, and its significance or impact, with particular emphasis on accomplishments since the last appointment or promotion. It also includes consideration of the continuity, range, focus, and aggregation of productive work in the field.
Reflection on scholarship in the evaluation process ideally moves it beyond a simple listing of accomplishments or compilation of documents. Evidence of scholarship includes activities, artifacts documenting those activities, and a narrative containing reflective discussion from the candidate.
The reflective narrative should demonstrate a pattern of scholarly activity consistent with the departmental Disciplinary Statements and the "Indicators/Categories of Scholarship Accomplishments" as presented below.

Faculty members are encouraged to continue to pursue opportunities for growth and development throughout their professional lives. Faculty members should engage in appropriate activities that will enhance their teaching effectiveness, keep them abreast of developments in their academic fields, and/or add new areas of expertise to the existing programs of the University.

Service
All faculty are expected to engage in forms of service appropriate to their discipline, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the University. As a criterion for tenure and promotion, the concept of service will go beyond routine duties. Successful candidates must show evidence of participation and leadership in projects on and off the campus that contribute to advancing the mission of the University. Reflection on service in the evaluation process ideally moves beyond a simple listing of accomplishments or compilation of documents.

Plans for Professional Activities and Future Development
Each faculty member will engage in activities that contribute to professional growth and development, and refinement of his or her expertise.

Promotion Standards

Senior Lecturer Assistant Professor

It is generally recognized that promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer Assistant Professor is based on the lecturer'potential. The following are required for promotion to Senior Lecturer Assistant Professor:

1. Unless there are extenuating circumstances, a terminal degree in the appropriate field;
2. Evidence of effectiveness in teaching;
3. Evidence of scholarship and professional growth;
4. Evidence of university, professional, and community service;
5. Essentially positive evaluations;
6. A minimum of three years' experience in higher education, unless cumulative achievement deemed equivalent.

Indicators/Categories of Scholarship Accomplishment

While this listing is not meant to include all possible examples of scholarship accomplishment, it does likely cover the great majority of works that could validly be claimed as scholarship. It is recommended that all faculty members use this list and the Disciplinary Statements from their department, along with guidance from their Chairs and peers, to direct them into appropriate projects that will result in acceptable scholarship accomplishments. One should keep in mind that a few minor accomplishments typically will not be sufficient for promotion, especially the promotion to full professor.

1. Dissemination of Scholarship (Identify the project as peer-reviewed or not peer-reviewed. More weight will be given to peer-reviewed works published by major professional organizations or presses of acknowledged quality.)

- Publication of a book
- Published monograph
- Book chapters
- Articles in scholarly journals
- Conference proceedings
- Presentations in scholarly forums
- Textbooks
- Translations of scholarly/literary works
- Reviews of scholarly works; abstracts
- Workbooks/Study guides
- Articles published in educational magazines
- Other papers and reports (trade, in-house publications, and encyclopedias)
- Instructor's Manuals

2. Creative Activities

- Composition (with more weight given to departmentally sponsored, outside peer-reviewed performances of compositions or to peer-reviewed compositions published by organizations of acknowledged quality)
- Public Performances exhibits (with more weight given to departmentally sponsored peer reviewed performances in venues of acknowledged quality)
- Exhibits (with more weight given to juried art exhibits in venues of acknowledged quality)
- Demonstrating professional competence through employment by reputable professional companies
- Commissions (with more weight given to commissions from prestigious public or professional institutions)
- Invited presentations, lectures, master classes, workshops, and performances (with more weight given to reputable professional organizations or venues of acknowledged quality

or to peer reviewed activities where appropriate.

3. Editing
- Editor, book of readings (published by a professional organization or nationally recognized publishing house)
- Editorial Board, international, national, regional or state journal

4. Grants and Contracts
Funded research/program grants
- Grants proposals (not funded)
- Grants for professional development
- Grant reviewer

5. Classroom based research projects--Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
(When defined as scholarship, teaching both educates and entices future scholars. Faculty as scholars are also learners, transforming and extending knowledge as well as transmitting it.)
- Development of software and other course materials (professionally disseminated)
- Articles on pedagogy or curriculum design
- Reports based on program and service grants devoted to innovative pedagogy
- Contracts devoted to developing and disseminating innovative pedagogy

6. Scholarship related to service or the use of professional expertise—Scholarship of Engagement or Application
(To be considered scholarship, service activities must be directly tied to one's special field of knowledge and relate to and flow directly out of professional activity related to one's special field of knowledge.)
- Commissioned research reports
- Articles in the popular or regional press
- Editorial, curatorial, or community education projects
- Accreditation reports (In exceptional cases, the individual responsible for compiling the accreditation report can make a case for the scholarship component of the document being submitted for consideration.)
- Course materials designed for professional development seminars

7. Other
- Honors/awards for research and artistic efforts
- Significant citations of work in professional literature
- Membership in professional societies
- Attendance at professional meetings
- Supervision of graduate or undergraduate theses or extensive projects that involve research or artistic efforts
- Special research or artistic efforts
- Special initiatives in on-campus scholarly or professional development
- Continuing education, workshops, symposia, or other specialized training programs attended or completed
- Professional consultancies resulting in professional development

Appendix D

From Crystal Walline Chair of the Committee on SEI

<u>**Student Evaluations of Instruction**</u>
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."

From: Holden Hansen <holden.hansen@uncp.edu>
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2023 at 11:22 AM
To: "Rachel B. Smith" <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>
Date: Saturday, February 18, 2023 at 11:22 AM
To: "Rachel B. Smith" <rachel.smith@uncp.edu>
Cc: Maria Pereira <maria.pereira@uncp.edu>, Kelly Charlton <kelly.charlton@uncp.edu>, Melissa A Schaub <melissa.schaub@uncp.edu>, Jennifer Wells <jennifer.wells@uncp.edu>, Camille Goins <Camille.Goins@uncp.edu>, Peter Grimes <Peter.Grimes@uncp.edu>, "Renee D. Lamphere" <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>
Sent: Saturday, February 18, 2023 4:43 AM
To: Holden Hansen <holden.hansen@uncp.edu>
Cc: Maria Pereira <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 ~~should tie 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 F

Dear Mary Ann,

I had hoped I could get this to you before your agenda came out, but it just wasn't possible. SEI discussed strategies to improve response rates for SEIs and we came up with the following recommendations.

Recommendations

1. SEIs should **not** be mandatory. Students should have the right to give feedback on their instruction; they should also have the right to not do so. Making SEIs mandatory is unethical (in the opinion of the committee) and may be illegal. If, at any point, the administration is interested in making SEIs mandatory, the legality of doing so needs to be carefully investigated in advance.
2. View UNCP's response rate, and subsequent comparison to other System schools, through the lens of survey culture at UNCP. According to Chunmei in IR, students at UNCP routinely have lower response rates to system-wide surveys compared to other system schools.
3. **Incentivize** students to participate by offering drawings to win VISA gift cards. Suggested: One $100 gift card and five $25 gift cards. Alternative suggestion: Offer students a voucher for a free meal in the cafeteria.
4. Work with DoIT to automate a Canvas announcement or push a notification to the students' To Do list (i.e. the assignment list on the right). Mei has already initiated this discussion with DoIT; I will forward you that email chain.
5. When the students receive their email invitation to submit SEIs, send the faculty an automated email reminding them to communicate with students about the importance of SEIs and to read the instructions out loud to them in class. The instructions I am referring to are the ones that were put in the SEI packet when they were administered F2F. Asynchronous faculty could be encouraged to post a video of themselves reading the instructions or put an announcement on Canvas.
6. Add the SEIs time period to the Academic Calendar (to increase visibility and communication).
7. Require faculty list the dates SEIs will be available on the syllabus; add this requirement to the Syllabus Checklist.
8. Minor revisions to the faculty handbook [attached].

In summary, it is the opinion of this committee that increased **communication**, **encouragement**, and offering **incentives** are the best strategies to employ to increase SEI response rates.

I hope these ideas are helpful to FERS! Let me know if you have any questions.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Walline, PhD
Associate Professor of Biology