

**The University of North Carolina at Pembroke  
Faculty Senate Agenda**

Wednesday, Feb. 3, at 3:30 p.m.  
213 Chavis University Center

Scott Hicks, Chair  
Roger Guy, Secretary

Members of the Senate:

<b>To 2016</b>	<b>To 2017</b>	<b>To 2018</b>
<b>ART</b> Aaron Vandermeer	<b>ART</b> Jonathan Maisonpierre	<b>ART</b> June Power
<b>EDN</b> Susan Edkins	<b>EDN</b> Joe Sciulli	<b>EDN</b> Carol Higy
<b>LET</b> Polina Chemishanova	<b>LET</b> Cynthia Miecznikowski	<b>LET</b> Jesse Peters
<b>NSM</b> Patricia Sellers	<b>NSM</b> Tom Dooling	<b>NSM</b> Marilu Santos
<b>SBS</b> Rick Crandall	<b>SBS</b> Brooke Kelly	<b>SBS</b> Xinyan Shi
<b>At-Large</b> Jeff Bolles	<b>At-Large</b> Scott Hicks	<b>At-Large</b> Beverly Justice
<b>At-Large</b> Jose D'Arruda	<b>At-Large</b> David Nikkel	<b>At-Large</b> Cliff Mensah
<b>At-Large</b> Roger Guy	<b>At-Large</b> Sara Simmons	<b>At-Large</b> David Young
<b>Chancellor</b> Robin G. Cummings <b>Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs</b> Zoe Locklear		

**Order of Business**

- A. Roll Call**
- B. Approval of Minutes** ([Appendix A](#))
- C. Adoption of Agenda**
- D. Reports from Administration**
  - 1. Chancellor—Robin G. Cummings
  - 2. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs—Zoe Locklear
- E. Reports of Committees**
  - 1. Operations Committees
    - a. Executive Committee—Scott Hicks
    - b. Committee on Committees & Elections—Aaron Vandermeer
      - 1. The Committee on Committees & Elections shall conduct the election of the 2016-2017 Senate Chair and Senate Secretary
    - c. Committee on Faculty Governance—Jesse Peters
  - 2. Standing Committees
    - a. Academic Affairs Committee—Jose D'Arruda
      - 1. Proposal from the Department of Music to revise improvisation requirements in minor in Jazz Studies (Academic Affairs Committee, 11-0-0) ([Appendix B](#))
      - 2. Proposal from the Department of Chemistry & Physics

to revise requirements for the track in Environmental Chemistry and the academic concentration in Physics (Academic Affairs Committee, 11-0-0) ([Appendix C](#))

3. Proposal from the Department of History to delete election options from the minor in American Studies (Academic Affairs, 11-0-0) ([Appendix D](#))

b. Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee—Sara Simmons

1. Proposal to revise policies on the selection, succession, terms, and evaluation of department chairs (Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee, 8-0-0) ([Appendix E](#))

2. Proposal to revise the processes of faculty evaluation of administrators (Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee, 9-0-0) ([Appendix F](#))

3. Proposal to amend the policies of post-tenure review (Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee, 8-0-0) ([Appendix G](#))

c. Student Affairs & Campus Life Committee—Brooke Kelly

**F. Faculty Assembly Report** ([Appendix H](#))

**G. Teacher Education Committee** ([Appendix I](#))

**H. Graduate Council** ([Appendix J](#))

**I. Other Committees**

**J. Unfinished Business**

**K. New Business**

**L. Announcements**

**M. Adjournment**

## Appendix A

### The University of North Carolina at Pembroke

#### Faculty Senate Minutes

Wednesday, Dec. 2, at 3:30 p.m.

213 Chavis University Center

Scott Hicks, Chair

Roger Guy, Secretary

Members of the Senate:

To 2016	To 2017	To 2018
<b>ART</b> Aaron Vandermeer	<b>ART</b> Jonathan Maisonpierre	<b>ART</b> June Power
<b>EDN</b> Susan Edkins	<b>EDN</b> Joe Sciulli	<b>EDN</b> Carol Higy
<b>LET</b> Polina Chemishanova	<b>LET</b> Cynthia Miecznikowski	<b>LET</b> Jesse Peters
<b>NSM</b> Patricia Sellers	<b>NSM</b> Tom Dooling	<b>NSM</b> Marilu Santos
<b>SBS</b> Rick Crandall	<b>SBS</b> Brooke Kelly	<b>SBS</b> Xinyan Shi
<b>At-Large</b> Jeff Bolles	<b>At-Large</b> Scott Hicks	<b>At-Large</b> Beverly Justice
<b>At-Large</b> Jose D'Arruda	<b>At-Large</b> David Nikkel	<b>At-Large</b> Cliff Mensah
<b>At-Large</b> Roger Guy	<b>At-Large</b> Sara Simmons	<b>At-Large</b> David Young
<b>Chancellor</b> Robin G. Cummings <b>Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs</b> Zoe Locklear		

**Members Present:** Polina Chemishanova Jose D'Arruda, Tom Dooling, Susan Edkins Roger Guy, Scott Hicks, Carol Higy, Beverly Justice, Brooke Kelly, Zoe Locklear, , Cliff Mensah, Cynthia Miecznikowski, David Nikkel, Jesse Peters, Patricia Sellers Xinyan Shi, Sara Simmons, Aaron Vandermeer, David Young

**Members Absent:** Marilu Santos, Joe Sciulli, Jonathan Maisonpierre

**Guests:** Irene Aiken, Scott Billingsley, Rebecca Bullard-Dillard, Nicolette Campos, Dick Christy, Jeff Frederick, Dan Kenney, Elizabeth Normandy, Melissa Schaub, Karen Stanley, Jack Spillan, Meredith Storms, W. Stewart Thomas, Susan Whitt

### Order of Business

- A. **Roll Call**
- B. **Approval of Minutes** - The Minutes were approved 17-0-0
- C. **Adoption of Agenda** - The Agenda was adopted 18-0-0
- D. **Reports from Administration**

1. Chancellor—Robin G. Cummings. Chancellor Cummings discussed a number of campus events surrounding the holiday and urged the faculty to attend. He also announced that Annette Straub had received the Governor’s Award and noted that an alumnus has accepted the provost’s position at Florida State University. The Chancellor also commended Dr. Jeff Frederick for his work on the State Employees Combined Campaign, noting that UNCP had the highest percentage of contributing employees in the UNC system. Dr. Cummings reminded the faculty to attend the graduate and undergraduate commencement ceremonies. He also announced a ribbon cutting ceremony for the Entrepreneurial Incubator would take place in downtown Pembroke at 2 p.m. Dec. 7. Dr. Cummings urged the Senate to vote for the March 15 bond issue, which would allocate \$23 million to UNCP. Following the Chancellor’s remarks, Interim Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration Carlton Spellman discussed the efforts and process underway to raise salaries. He noted that there were 69 faculty members whose salaries were below the lowest range of their rank according to the most recent College and University Professional Association (CUPA) data. He noted that the university was committed to raising salaries in a significant way within three to five years. He also discussed a number of other financial challenges facing UNCP. The Chancellor then discussed the searches underway for deans and urged the Senate to think creatively and proactively to attract ideal personnel for the positions, noting that he did not desire failed searches. He concluded by introducing Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources Angela Revels, who outlined her vision of human resources at UNCP.

2. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs—Zoe Locklear. Dr. Locklear began by thanking the Senate in helping compose the members of the search committees for the deans. She noted that new chairs were engaged in professional development workshops and that there would be a campus-wide department chair/dean workshop in early January. She also announced that the current School of Graduate Studies & Research would be bisected, to create two separate entities with two deans and become the School of Graduate Studies and the Office of Sponsored Research.

**E. Reports of Committees**

1. Operations Committees
  - a. Executive Committee—Scott Hicks. Dr. Hicks reported that he had met with the Provost regarding salary issues.
  - b. Committee on Committees & Elections—Aaron Vandermeer. No business was reported.
  - c. Committee on Faculty Governance—Jesse Peters. No business was reported.
2. Standing Committees
  - a. Academic Affairs Committee—Jose D’Arruda. The chair of the Enrollment Management Subcommittee, Emily Neff-Sharum, briefed the Senate on a survey regarding the roster verification

process that will be administered to the faculty in the spring semester.

- b. Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee—Sara Simmons. Dr. Simmons briefed the Senate on the current activity of the subcommittees of FIAC.
- c. Student Affairs & Campus Life Committee—Brooke Kelly. No business was reported.

**F. Faculty Assembly Report** The Assembly had not met and thus there was no report.

**G. Teacher Education Committee (See Agenda)**

**H. Graduate Council (See Agenda)**

**I. Other Committees (See Agenda)**

- 1. Integrated Marketing Committee
- 2. Tuition & Fee Review Committee
- 3. University Athletics Committee
- 4. University Oversight Committee

**J. Unfinished Business**—No unfinished business.

**K. New Business**

- 1. The Senate met in executive session for the purpose of considering a recommendation of the Honorary Degree Committee, per Pol. 01.25.01.

**L. Announcements**—Dr. Vandermeer announced that the the Music Department's Holiday Extravaganza is Dec. 5.

**M. Adjournment**

**Motion to Adjourn Passed 18-0-0**

**Meeting adjourned 4:50 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Roger Guy, Secretary

[Return to Agenda](#)

## Appendix B

The Department of Music proposes amending the Minors in Jazz Studies by deleting MUS 2360 and 2370 (Improvisation I & II) which have not been offered for several years. The number of required hours in improvisation will not change since students are still required to enroll in Private Improvisation (MUSP 1171).

**Rationale:** This proposed change aligns the jazz minor course listings in the catalog with the department's current course offerings. No substantive changes are being proposed.

Dept vote: 12 for; 0 against; 0 abstain

Affect others: No

Cross-Listing: No

Additional Resources: No

Affects Articulation Agreement: No

Affects Degree Pathway: No

Affects CAA Degree Plan: No

### PROGRAM INFORMATION:

#### **MINOR IN JAZZ STUDIES for Non-Music Majors**

A program designed to equip students to perform and teach music in the jazz idiom.

<b>Required Courses</b>	<b>Sem. Hrs.</b>
MUS 1040, 4220, 4230, 4240	6
3 hours <del>of from</del> MUSP 1171, <del>MUS 2360, 2370</del>	3
3 hours of MUSP (other than 1171)	3
6 hours of MUS 1561, 1621, 1741	6
<b>Total:</b>	<b>18</b>

#### **MINOR IN JAZZ STUDIES for Music Majors**

A program designed to equip music majors to perform and teach music in the jazz idiom.

<b>Required Courses</b>	<b>Sem. Hrs.</b>
MUS 1040, 3460, 4220, 4230, 4240	8
4 hours <del>of from</del> MUSP 1171, <del>MUS 2360, 2370</del>	4
6 hours of MUS 1561, 1621, 1741	6
<b>Total:</b>	<b>18</b>

[Return to Agenda](#)

## Appendix C

**Proposal: Revise requirements for Environmental Chemistry track (CENV) in B.S. in Chemistry Program. ENV 2100 is listed, but it should be ENV 1100.**

**Rationale:** The Biology Department changed ENV 2100 to ENV 1100 during the 2010-2011 Academic Year, but the CENV track had not been updated accordingly. Because the courses are equivalent in Braveweb, it has not affected students' progress through the program and therefore went unnoticed.

Dept vote: 14 for; 0 against; 0 abstain

Affect others: No

Cross-Listing: No

Additional Resources: No

Affects Articulation Agreement: No

Affects Degree Pathway: No

Affects CAA Degree Plan: No

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS:

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CHEMISTRY

Requirements for a Bachelor of Science Degree in Chemistry	Sem. Hrs.
Freshman Seminar	1
General Education Requirements*	44
Core Major Requirements	
BIO 1000	3
CHM 1100, 1110, 1300, 1310, 2260, 2270, 2500, 2510, 3980, 4100	30
PHY 1500, 1510, 1560, 1570 or PHY 2000, 2010, 2060, 2070	8
MAT 1070 and 1080 (or equivalent 1090), 2210, 2220	14(12)
**Track Option (see listings below)	34(36)
	<b>Total: 122</b>

\*Twelve hours of General Education courses are listed separately above as specific core requirements.

\*\*B.S. in Chemistry Track Option Course Requirements

Track (Major Code)	Sem. Hrs.
Environmental (CENV)	
CHM 2300, 3110, 3120, 4270	12
ENV <del>2100</del> 1100	3
GLY 1150, 2620	6
GLYL 1150	1
Electives	12 (14)

**Proposal: Delete PHY 4480 from requirements for an Academic Concentration in Physics.**

**Rationale:** Course was deleted years ago.

Dept vote: 14 for; 0 against; 0 abstain

Affect others: No

Cross-Listing: No

Additional Resources: No

Affects Articulation Agreement: No

Affects Degree Pathway: No

Affects CAA Degree Plan: No

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS:

ACADEMIC CONCENTRATION

For students seeking a baccalaureate degree in Elementary Education, Special Education, or Physical Education, the Department offers an Academic Concentration of 24 hours in Physics. This Academic Concentration is available to other students, regardless of major.

Required Courses for an Academic Concentration in Physics	Sem. Hrs.
PHY 1500, 1560, 1510, 1570, 2180, 2560, 3000, 3200, 3260, 4480	
	<b>Total: 24</b>

[Return to Agenda](#)



## Appendix D

**Proposal:** The Minor in American Studies lists HST 4100 and SOC 3820 as course options. These courses have been deleted in the last few years and should be removed from the list of course options in the catalog. In addition, department and course codes throughout the entire entry have been edited for ease of understanding and consistency.

**Rationale:** Because the courses do not exist as options, the inclusion of them in the catalog is misleading and by removing them, students will have a more accurate rendering of the path toward a Minor in American Studies. By revising the Catalog to remove the two non-existent courses, students will more fully understand the proper course offerings.

Dept vote: 11 for; 0 against; 0 abstain

Affect others: No

Cross-Listing: No

Additional Resources: No

Affects Articulation Agreement: No

Affects Degree Pathway: No

Affects CAA Degree Plan: No

### PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS:

Requirements for a Minor in American Studies	Sem. Hrs.
Core Requirements* HST 1010, HST 1020, HST 2010	9
Cultural Studies Elective Courses** One course (3 hours) from History: AIS 3600; HST 3040, 3050, 3060, 3100, 3140, 3150, 3160, 3170, 3260, 3410, 3610, 3620, 3800, 3820, 4040, 4050, 4060, 4070, <del>4100</del> , 4130, 4360 One course (3 hours) from Arts and Literature: AIS 3400; ART 3750; ENG 3100, 3130, 3140, 3440, 3470, 4230/4240; <del>MUSS 3xxx; Music: Special Topics; PHIS 4xxx; Philosophy and Religion: PHI-Special Topics only</del> , REL 4150; <del>THES 3xxx; Theatre: Special Topics</del> One course (3 hours) from Social Sciences***: AIS 4020, 4050, 4250, 4600; <del>Geology/Geography</del> GGY 3720, 3770; PLS 3010, 3020, 3040, 3050, 3060, 3100, 3110, 3120, 4020 ( <i>please see the current Academic Catalog for prerequisites</i> ); <del>SOC 3820</del> , 3870, 3880; <del>Mass Communication</del> : JRN 3170; <del>MCMS 4xxx</del> , <del>Special Topics</del>	9
	<b>Total: 18</b>

\*It is strongly suggested that students complete HST 1010/1020 prior to enrolling in ~~AST~~ HST 2010.

\*\*A student must draw on classes from at least two different departments to satisfy the Cultural Studies Elective requirement. ~~Permission to include~~ ~~Permission of American Studies Coordinator is required to use Special Topics Courses to fulfill~~

Cultural Studies Requirements. Please obtain permission prior to registration.  
~~special topics courses from any department requires permission of the American  
Studies Coordinator or Department of History Chair prior to registration.  
\*\*\*Please see "Courses Accepted for Credit toward the Completion of the Minor in  
American Studies" on the Department of History webpage  
[<http://uncp.edu/history/degrees/>] for accepted courses and consult with the  
American Studies Coordinator.~~

[Return to Agenda](#)

## Appendix E

### Proposal from the Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee to Revise Policies on the Appointment, Succession, and Evaluation of Department Chairs

Approved by FDW on January 14, 2016 (vote 9 – 0)

Proposal from the Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee to the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee

~~FDW vote tally: 9 – 0~~

Approved by FDW on January 14, 2016 (vote 9 – 0)

### Revise the Faculty Handbook's policies for the selection, succession, terms, and evaluation of department chairs. Changes impact pp. 118 - 119, 92 – 93

***Rationale:** The word “Provost” in some Handbook sentences may be a holdover from when there were no college deans, so the chain-of-command is updated by these revisions. An anti-nepotism clause has been added, in line with the UNC system’s policy 300.4.2 (see appendix to this proposal). The maximum number of a Chair’s terms is eliminated by this proposal because a department’s faculty may be overwhelmingly in favor of keeping the same Chair and/or unwilling to serve as Chair themselves; and/or in small departments there may be a lack of tenured or tenure-track faculty qualified or meeting other criteria to serve, because of their own grants, aspirations for directed leave, call-up for active military duty, family or medical leave, employee turnover, etc. Faculty confidentiality with the Dean, in making evaluative comments about the Chair on the Chair’s Evaluation Form, is made explicit in this proposal.*

## SECTION II CHAPTER 4

### FACULTY SELECTION AND EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

#### **Department Governance (Chair Responsibilities, Terms, Rotation, and Evaluation)**

The Department Chair is the designated leader and faculty administrative officer responsible for the effective and efficient operation of the department within the policies, directions, and plans of the campus as a whole. The Chair is expected to establish and maintain a collegial, productive work climate, which ensures the academic integrity and curricular coherence of his/her department.

Department faculty members nominate the Chair, **or self-nominate**, to the Dean of the School or College. **The Dean forwards the recommended candidate’s name to the Provost for approval.** The Chair serves at the pleasure of the Dean and Provost and is continued at their option. **No person may be appointed as chair if his or her appointment would violate the UNC system’s anti-nepotism policy 300.4.2 (<http://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php?pg=vs&id=s328>) ~~who is a spouse or domestic partner or in a romantic or sexual relationship with another~~**

~~Exempt Human Resource Act (EHRA) or State Human Resource Act (SHRA) employee of the department.~~

The leadership and general administrative responsibilities of the Department Chair include the following:

1. Engages in strategic planning for the department and the university.
2. Determines course scheduling and staffing and coordinates off-campus course offerings.
3. Plans, schedules, and supervises department meetings and events.
4. Supervises and evaluates office and clerical staff.
5. Supervises the use of, maintenance of, and accounting for equipment, facilities, and supplies and to request and oversees the department budgets.
6. Ensures that the department members meet all University requirements.
7. Administers contracts with and coordinates with agencies where practicum agreements exist.
8. Performs other duties as directed by the Dean, Provost, or Chancellor.
9. Assists the University in maintaining good community relations.

The Department Chair has responsibility for the following elements relating to faculty and instruction:

- 
1. Shows commitment to productive scholarship and research in relation to teaching load and service by facilitating faculty endeavors and through faculty evaluation.
  2. Is active in developing grants and funding for research and activities for students and faculty and in professional organizations locally, regionally and /or nationally.
  3. Serves as a liaison between the faculty and the Dean by monitoring the quality of programs by:
    - preparing accreditation and campus data and reports;
    - overseeing departmental brochures, websites, and newsletters and reports;
    - evaluating of and recommending tenure or promotion for faculty;
    - coordinating the hiring of new full-time and adjunct faculty;
    - processing grievances regarding faculty and staff; and
    - providing career counseling, monitoring the schedule, assigning instructors, and making recommendation for salary or salary changes.
  4. Facilitates requests for texts, supplies, and instructional materials, monitors student internships, senior projects, special exams, and independent studies; evaluates transfer credits; and oversees advising of students.
  5. Leads the department in the implementation of affirmative action goals; in acquiring faculty and staff development; and encouraging

social relations and activities between faculty, staff, and students that contributes to academic goals and diversity.

6. Makes arrangements for lecturers, Visiting Professors and extra-curricular events with students, alumni, community and professionals.

The Department Chair has the following responsibilities related to students:

1. Hears and acts on student grievances, queries, and criticism of faculty, programs, and grades or complaints against students.
2. Assists the campus offices with placement, recruitment, publications, and academic advisement and assessment.
3. Facilitates department organizations and events.
4. Insures that letters for students concerning recommendation, referrals, recognition, admittance, credit evaluation, course substitution, transfer, dismissal, financial aid, scholarships, fellowships, and employment opportunities are processed in a timely manner.
5. Encourages undergraduate and graduate research and establishes procedures which prepare students for state or national exams.

#### **Chair Stipend and Course Release**

While serving as Chair, the individual will receive a stipend of ten percent of his/her base salary. Additionally, Chairs for departments with 10 or more faculty will receive two courses per semester release time. Chairs for departments with fewer than 10 full-time faculty will be granted one course release per semester and one additional course release during the academic year, i.e., a total of three course releases per academic year, **unless other reassigned time for other departmental considerations is approved by the Dean**. Chairs do not receive course releases for teaching graduate courses.

#### **Evaluation and Succession of Chairs**

The following policies and procedures govern the manner in which Chairs come into office and the procedure by which one Chair succeeds another:

1. Department Chairs at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke are appointed for four-year terms. A Department Chair can be reappointed ~~to a second consecutive four-year term~~ with the support of the Department and the recommendation/approval of the **Dean and Provost. The maximum number of terms for any Chair, consecutive or otherwise, is two four-year appointments. There is no maximum number of terms.**
2. The normal evaluation process for Chairs will take place during the ~~fall~~ **spring** semester of the second year of service, **using the evaluation form indicated on pp. 92 – 93. Results of the evaluation form and its comments will be reported anonymously to the Chair by the Dean.**
3. During the fall semester of the fourth year of service, the Chair will choose either to step down or to be considered for renewal. If the Chair wishes to be considered for renewal, the Chair will be evaluated again by the department members. As part of the evaluation process, **which again includes use of the evaluation form indicated on pp. 92 – 93**, all full-time faculty teaching in the department (hereinafter referred to as department members) will be polled as to whether or not they wish the Chair to be

reconsidered for reappointment. Numerical results of the poll of the department members will be reported to the department Chair by the ~~Provost~~ Dean, as will results of the evaluation form and its comments, anonymously. If a majority opposes reappointment, serious consideration should be given to the appointment of a new Chair.

4. When a Chair is to be considered for reappointment or a new Chair is to be appointed, the appointment process normally will take place during the spring semester of the fourth year of service. All department members teaching in the department will be consulted by the Dean's Office ~~for Academic Affairs Office~~ to identify those willing to serve as Chair. Department members will be polled confidentially regarding their preference for Chair. If an outside search for a new department Chair is to be conducted, normal search procedures will be followed.
5. At any time after the first year of a Chair's term, the ~~Dean~~ Provost, at the request or in consultation with department members, may poll the department as to whether or not they wish the Chair to continue to serve. The Dean and Provost will review the results and take the matter under consideration. If a department requests such poll, it may not request another such poll within one year of the date of the first poll.
- ~~6. The terms of one third of department Chairs will expire each year. The order in which Chair's terms will expire initially will be established by ranking Chairs by length of service as department Chairs.~~
7. In the event of the organization of a new department, the term of that Chair will start with his or her original appointment and will become a normal part of the rotation beginning with step one.
8. When the necessity for a leave of absence occurs with a department Chair, such as medical or family emergency, the Dean, in consultation with the Provost will, on a case by case basis, make a determination either to grant the leave of absence or to fill the position with a new Department Chair.
9. In the event a Chair permanently leaves his or her post as Chair before the end of the term for any reason, the newly appointed Chair will enter the rotation at step one.
- ~~10. This plan for renewable terms for department Chairs is to be implemented by the Provost in the fall of 2002.~~

## **Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 2, pp. 92 - 93**

### **Evaluation of Department Chairs**

Each Department Chair is evaluated annually by the Dean of his or her college or school ~~and by the Office of Academic Affairs~~. Procedures parallel those for annual evaluations of all faculty, except that the duties normally carried out by the Department Chair are handled by the Chair's Dean (see the section above on "Procedures for Annual Evaluation"). A Chair is evaluated in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service using area weights deemed appropriate for the department. There will, of course, be no merit salary increase recommendation from the

Department Chair. As part of the annual evaluation of the Chair's faculty responsibilities, the Dean will schedule a conference with each Chair to discuss the Dean's evaluation of the Chair's performance. The Dean will prepare a written annual evaluation report and present it to the Department Chair at least three days before the annual evaluation conference is to be held. At the evaluation conference, the Department Chair signs the evaluation report and receives a copy.

In evaluating a Chair's performance both as a faculty member and as an administrator, the Chair's Dean ~~and the Office for Academic Affairs~~ considers direct knowledge of the Department Chair's administrative performance, input from other administrators, and input from faculty, as well as documentation submitted by the Department Chair. The Dean takes into account Department Chair's administrative responsibilities as part of the Department Chair's annual evaluation, although formal faculty assessments are not collected each year. Departmental Chairs' administrative responsibilities are assessed as part of the procedure for renewable terms for Department Chairs (Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 4). Briefly, the ~~Office of Academic Affairs~~ Dean evaluates each Chair in the second year of service as Chair. At this time, the Dean will seek input from the faculty concerning performance of the Chair's administrative responsibilities and will distribute evaluation forms (available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/aa/forms/>) to each full-time faculty member in the department. The forms will be returned directly to the Dean.

Department Chairs who may be candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated under the tenure and promotion procedures in Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 3. The Chair's Dean will carry out the duties normally the responsibility of the Department Chair. Necessarily, however, there will be no recommendation from the Department Chair regarding the tenure and/or promotion decision.

Department Chairs will receive a contract renewal evaluation based on rank and initial contract length just as any other probationary faculty member does (see Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 1). Procedures normally the responsibility of the Department Chair will be handled by the Chair's Dean. Necessarily, however, there will be no recommendation from the Department Chair regarding reappointment.

Any Department Chair, just as any other faculty member, can call for an advisory evaluation. The Dean and Provost ~~and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs~~ may request advisory evaluations. Advisory evaluations have no formal consequences for decisions about contract renewal, tenure, or promotion.

Department Chairs are appointed for terms of four years. They may be continued in the Chair's position ~~for one additional term~~. Procedures for appointment and for evaluation of Chairs with respect to term continuation and renewal are specified in the Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 4.

-----  
Appendix to the Rationale

*Although it has been alleged by some (and put into practice at UNCP) that in the case of an intimate relationship between the Chair and a department faculty member, the partner-faculty member “reports to the Dean” instead of to the Chair, in fact the Dean does not make course assignments, schedules, or classroom requests for the department, yet those pose a risk of favoritism or other appearance of impropriety real or imagined; nor does the Dean apportion departmental travel money or other department resources that affect or intersect with the partner-faculty’s interest, which could include extra contracts but not only that. In the Faculty Handbook (p. 64), a conflict of interest is defined as a scenario in which “a faculty member or any member of that person’s immediate family (spouse and dependent children) has a personal interest in an activity that could have an impact on decision making at the university with respect to teaching, research, or administration.”*

*Although it could be argued that having the Dean complete annual evaluations of the partner-faculty follows the letter of the law, namely, the **UNC system’s anti-nepotism policy 300.4.2***

*(excerpt: neither related person shall be permitted, either individually or as a member of a faculty or as a member of a committee of a faculty, to participate in the evaluation of the other related person),*

*the partner-faculty ends up evaluated on teaching that was probably never observed by the Dean nor—more likely—in the Dean’s area of expertise, and, perhaps more importantly, ends up evaluated on scholarship not in the Dean’s area of expertise.*

*Additionally, one might argue that, in contrast, the letter of the law does not appear to be followed. From **UNC policy 300.4.2.1[G]**:*

Existence of the following types of relationships would appear, **invariably**, to violate the restriction against "direct supervision";

- a. Department chairman and a member of the instructional staff of the same department.
- b. Member of instructional or research faculty and his or her teaching or research assistant.
- c. Dean of a school and a chairman of a department included within the school.
- d. Chancellor and a vice chancellor.

*[emphasis added]*

Proposal from the Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee to the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee

Approved by FDW on January 14, 2016 (vote 9 – 0)



Revise the questionnaire that is used by department faculty to evaluate their chair. (This would be the form that is referred to on pp. 92 – 93 of the Faculty Handbook and currently stored with other forms under the Academic Affairs' portion of the university website.) **Also proposed is that the questionnaire be moved to online collection through an appropriate host or app, with an unlimited text box for the open-ended "Comments."**

***Rationale:** The current instrument seeks feedback about multiple different ideas that are lumped together in single-paragraph form, raising concerns about the validity of the measure, which ends up being a single numeric rating for different aspects of the chair's responsibilities and performance. The proposed revision breaks out differing ideas that can be evaluated separately. There are still a few double-barreled questions, in the interest of keeping the questionnaire from growing "too long." Eliminated is much of the language about the chairs' demeanor and leadership style that is not explicitly supported by the language pertaining to chairs' duties and responsibilities found in the Faculty Handbook. **Sources indicated in brackets in this proposal would not actually be included in the questionnaire.***

### Department Chair Evaluation Form

**Instructions:** This ~~form~~ questionnaire is for use by a faculty member in evaluating the department chair. The ~~forms~~ data are distributed, collected, and assessed by the ~~Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs~~ appropriate Dean. Use the scale given below to rate your opinion of the department chair's performance. ~~during the past year~~. Assign a numeric rating ranging from 5 (excellent) to 1 (unsatisfactory) to each area if applicable in your department and if you have a basis from which to judge. Since a rating by itself provides only limited information, you may ~~should~~ also write comments in the space provided ~~or on a separate sheet~~. ~~These comments will be crucial in identifying specific strengths and weaknesses~~. The confidential comments will be shared anonymously with the Chair by the Dean as part of the Chair's performance review.

Scale: 5 Excellent; 4 Good; 3 Adequate; 2 Needs improvement; 1 Unsatisfactory

**I. LEADERSHIP OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES:** ~~shows general optimism and enthusiasm toward the department's teaching responsibilities, encourages creativity, diversity, and dedication in teaching; facilitates the development of rigorous yet reasonable teaching standards, fosters the timely development and revision of curricula, discreet and balanced in handling student input; reduces interpersonal tensions and promotes genuine consensus in the area of teaching, innovative and flexible in solving practical problems related to teaching (e.g., printing, scheduling, and utilization of classroom and laboratory resources); inspirational as a model of good teaching, available to confer with faculty on these~~

~~matters, and democratic in leadership style and the delegation of responsibilities in this area.~~

~~Rating \_\_\_\_\_ Comments:~~

Ensures the academic integrity and curricular coherence of the department  
[Handbook p. 118]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Facilitates requests for texts, instructional materials [Handbook, 118] classrooms  
and facilities

5                    4                    3                    2                    1                    N/A

Monitors student internships, senior projects, special exams, and independent  
studies [118]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1                    N/A

Supervises the use of, maintenance, and accounting for equipment, facilities, and  
supplies [118]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1                    N/A

Comments:

**II. LEADERSHIP OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES:** ~~provides avenues for recognizing scholarly achievement within the department, promotes tolerance and understanding of different approaches to research within the department, fair in allocating departmental resources to support research, resourceful and cooperative in helping faculty members solve practical problems related to research (including the development of grant proposals), inspirational as a model of scholarly achievement, available to confer with faculty on these matters, and democratic in leadership style and the delegation of responsibilities in this area.~~

~~Rating \_\_\_\_\_ Comments:~~

Shows commitment to productive scholarship in relation to teaching load and  
service by facilitating faculty endeavors and through faculty evaluation [p. 118] in  
accordance ~~consonance~~ with university guidelines

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

~~Active in developing grants and funding for research and activities for students and  
faculty~~

~~[p. 118] or~~ Resourceful and cooperative in helping faculty members solve practical  
problems related to research (including the development of grant proposals) [from  
original above]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Fair and transparent in the delegation of responsibilities in the areas mentioned above

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Fair and transparent in allocating departmental resources to support ~~research~~ scholarship

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Comments:

**III. FACULTY EVALUATIONS:** ~~fair in setting aside personal feelings, loyalties, and philosophical considerations in conducting evaluations, reasonable in setting evaluation standards, accurate and thorough in reviewing the details of a faculty member's work, flexible in encouraging individualized patterns of overall achievement, conscientious in using evaluative criteria that are consonant with the guidelines of the Faculty Evaluation Model and the broad parameters of the disciplines represented in the department, diligent in handling the procedural details associated with evaluation, available to confer with faculty on these matters, and democratic in leadership style and the delegation of responsibilities in this area.~~  
**Rating \_\_\_\_\_ Comments:**

(See chair's duties in this regard, beginning on p. 75 of Handbook)

Fair in setting aside personal feelings, loyalties, and philosophical considerations in conducting evaluations [from original above]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Accurate in reviewing the details of a faculty member's work [original]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Flexible in encouraging individualized patterns of overall achievement [original]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Conscientious in using evaluative criteria that are ~~in accordance consonant~~ with the guidelines of the Faculty Evaluation Model [original] ~~and the department's disciplinary statements~~

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Diligent in handling the procedural details associated with evaluation

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Comments:

**IV. REPRESENTATION OF THE DEPARTMENT EXTERNAL/INTERNAL**

**COMMUNICATION:** ~~effective in communicating the department's concerns to the administration and the administration's concerns to the department, effective in representing the department to accrediting organizations and to potential students and faculty, diligent and resolute in seeking University resources for the department, stalwart in protecting the department's standards and integrity, and democratic in leadership style and the delegation of responsibilities in this area.~~

**Rating \_\_\_\_\_ Comments:**

Accurate and transparent in communicating the department's concerns to the administration [from original]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1                    No basis to judge

Accurate and transparent in communicating the administration's concerns to the department

5                    4                    3                    2                    1                    No basis to judge

Assists the university in maintaining good community [p. 118] and alumni relations

5                    4                    3                    2                    1                    No basis to judge

Oversees department brochures, websites, newsletters, and reports [p. 118]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Promotes the department's achievements and activities to the campus community

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Comments:

**V. RECRUITMENT OF FACULTY AND STAFF:** ~~accurate in assessing the department's short- and long-term needs, diligent in announcing vacancies, processing applications, and meeting legal requirements, flexible in filling positions with the best available candidate, democratic in establishing recruitment procedures and making final decisions, and democratic in leadership style and the delegation of responsibilities in this area.~~

**Rating \_\_\_\_\_ Comments:**

Accurate in assessing the department's short- and long-term needs for faculty and staff

5                    4                    3                    2                    1                    No basis to  
judge

Coordinates the hiring of new full-time and adjunct faculty [118]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Determines course scheduling and staffing and coordinates off-campus course offerings [118]

5                    4                    3                    2                    1

Comments:

[Return to Agenda](#)

## Appendix F

### Proposal from the Faculty & Institutional Affairs Committee to Revise the Processes of Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

#### Draft - FIAC Proposal Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

Proposed changes are indicated by red font or strikethroughs.  
See rationale for changes at the end of the document.

## SECTION II CHAPTER 4 FACULTY SELECTION AND EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

(excerpt from 2015-16 Faculty Handbook, pages 120-121)

### **Faculty Evaluation of Administrators**

#### **Guiding Principles for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators**

The faculty and administrators share responsibility for the effective operation of the University in fulfilling its mission. Faculty members regularly interact and cooperate with administrators and are affected by their policies and decisions. Though the primary responsibility for preparing evaluations of administrators rests with their superiors, some of whom may seek input from selected faculty members, the faculty also needs a direct role in evaluation. Evaluations conducted by the faculty itself can provide valuable information to the administrator being evaluated, the administrator's immediate supervisor, and the Chair of the Faculty **Senate** and the **Faculty Senate** Executive Committee.

The principles underlying evaluation of administrators are similar to those for faculty evaluation. Evaluations should be fair, consistent, and aimed both at improving the performance of individual administrators and the offices under their supervision and at serving the mission of the University.

The Faculty Senate conducts faculty evaluations of administrators. The criteria and procedures described below, along with the attached evaluation forms, are designed to elicit faculty input and to address issues with which the faculty is familiar and concerned. All full time faculty members are invited to complete an evaluation form, with the understanding that each faculty member will undertake evaluation in a responsible and professional manner, responding only to questions about which he or she has personal knowledge.

The Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate shall have the responsibility of reviewing the process by which evaluations of administrators are conducted. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee may modify or simplify the ~~attached~~ evaluation ~~forms~~ surveys and may recommend changes in procedures or ~~forms~~ surveys to the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee.

### **Criteria for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators**

The criteria by which faculty evaluate administrators reflect the mission of the office, **and** each administrator's responsibilities ~~and his or her impact on the faculty, students, and the institution.~~

### **Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators**

Faculty evaluation of administrators and offices is conducted on a two-year cycle. All such evaluations are the responsibility of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. (Evaluations of Department Chairs and of Academic Support Services are conducted separately.)

~~Procedures for conducting evaluations and reporting information are as follows: by way of an email message, all full-time faculty members are directed to the Faculty Evaluation of Administrators web site where they are asked to complete the form and submit it directly to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.~~ **Early in the spring semester of each academic year, the Chair of the Faculty Senate will email notification of the upcoming faculty evaluation of administrators to all full-time faculty members. In March, the Chair of the Faculty Senate will email a link to the electronic survey for evaluation of administrators to all full-time faculty.** The Chair of the Faculty Senate will be responsible for compiling the results of the evaluations and submitting a summary report to the Chancellor at the end of the academic year.

### **Schedule of Faculty Evaluations of Administrators by the Faculty Senate**

Spring of odd-numbered calendar years:

- Division of Academic Affairs (including all Deans)
- Division of Business Affairs
- Division of Enrollment Management

Spring of even-numbered calendar years:

- The Chancellor
- The Office of the Chancellor
- Division of Student Affairs
- Division of Advancement

### **Forms **Survey Format** for Evaluations of Administrators**

~~The forms for the evaluation of administrators contain the elements on which the specified administrators and administrative units will be evaluated. The Faculty Senate adopted the forms in March 2003. In practice, the forms will be formatted appropriately for completion by faculty and the names of the administrators in each functional category will be inserted to identify them. The forms may be found on the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>.~~ **The titles of administrative positions may change over time. Therefore, prior to each even-numbered-year and odd-numbered-year evaluation period, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will review the list of administrative positions within the divisions that are scheduled for evaluation to determine the specific positions that**

will be evaluated. The format for the items in the electronic survey will be as follows:

**[Insert title of administrative position and name of person currently in the position]**

Survey question:

Do you have sufficient knowledge of this administrator's performance to have a basis for evaluation?

Response options:

Yes/No

If response is "Yes," the following item is available:

Use the text box below to provide comments regarding strengths and/or weaknesses:

### **Rationale for suggested changes to Faculty Evaluation of Administrators**

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee charged FIAC with reviewing the evaluation process and to propose a system and instruments by Jan 31, 2016. The instruments for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators that are posted on the Academic Affairs website are outdated and no longer being used.

The Committee reached a consensus on the following suggestions:

1. send out the survey in March rather than in May;
2. list the individuals' names for each office so faculty are clear about whom they are evaluating;
3. since it is difficult to separate the office from the administrator who is in charge of the office, evaluate the whole office with an open-ended comment box so that perceptions related to a particular office can be entered into the text box;
4. for each office being evaluated, ask first whether respondents have knowledge about that office; if the answer is 'No,' the site will automatically take the faculty to the next office being evaluated, but if the answer is 'Yes,' evaluation questions for this office will pop up for faculty to answer.

The titles of administrative positions may change over time. Therefore, prior to each evaluation period, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will review the list of



administrative positions within the divisions that are scheduled for evaluation to determine the specific positions that will be evaluated.

[Return to Agenda](#)

## Appendix G

### Draft – Proposal: FERS Post-Tenure Review Changes

Proposed changes in red type  
See rationale for changes at the end of the document

*Faculty Handbook, 2015-2016, pp. 87-92*

#### **Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)**

Tenured faculty must undergo a cumulative review process every five years, commencing from date of the tenure review (or from date of review for promotion, if such review occurs within the five-year period after tenure review).

The purpose of this review is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose performance has been found satisfactory, (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three years for improvement of performance of faculty whose performance has been found unsatisfactory, and (c) for those whose performance remains unsatisfactory, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may include a recommendation for discharge in the most serious cases of incompetence.

In response to the Board of Governors' and General Administration of The University of North Carolina's request to develop institutional policies and procedures with regard to post-tenure review, the Post-Tenure Advisory Committee of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke has prepared this document outlining UNC Pembroke's post-tenure review process. It is felt that this document adheres not only to the 1) broad principles outlined in the Executive Summary as found in the Report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review that was approved by the UNC Board of Governors on 16 May 1997, 2) the Guidelines as found in the Administrative Memorandum Number 371 issued by President C. D. Spangler, Jr. on 24 June 1997, and 3) Chapter VI of The Code of the University (August, 1988), but also parallels and reflects the basic tenets of the Faculty Evaluation Model as found in the UNCP Faculty Handbook. It must furthermore be noted that nothing in this Post-Tenure document prohibits the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor from making personnel decisions and taking personnel actions relative to reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal of faculty in warranted cases as indicated by the dismissal, non-reappointment, and termination policies of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke (UNCP Faculty Handbook, Section II, Chapter 1) and *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*.

In the words of the Executive Summary cited above, "Post-tenure review is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality (p. I)." This document further states that "institutional policies shall

explicitly involve peers in the review process." In addition, it was noted in that report that the recommendations contained therein were intended "to strengthen the system of tenure and academic freedom while assuring on-going quality in the teaching, research, and service mission of The University of North Carolina."

Thus presented below are the necessary 1) principles and criteria upon which the UNCP post-tenure review process is based, 2) principles governing the roles of individuals and groups, 3) evaluation procedures to be followed, 4) forms needed for the cumulative evaluation of tenured faculty, 5) a calendar of events for cumulative evaluation of tenured faculty, and 6) a specified time line of not more than three academic years for the implementation of the review process.

### **Principles and Criteria**

Faculty at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke who are tenured must undergo the cumulative review process outlined below every five years. The purpose of this review is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose work is found satisfactory, (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three academic years for improvement of performance of faculty found unsatisfactory, and (c) for those whose performance remains unsatisfactory, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which may include in the most serious cases of incompetence a recommendation for discharge. ("A faculty member, who is the beneficiary of institutional guarantees of tenure, shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. During the period of such guarantees the faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty or misconduct of such nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty." (*The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*, Section 603(1), <http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>.)

All UNCP faculty are evaluated annually in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) according to a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale. This annual review includes a(n) (a) Self-Evaluation Report, (b) Student Evaluation Report, (c) Chair's Evaluation Report, (d) Chair's Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, (e) Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and (f) recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In addition to these reports, Evaluations for Contract Renewal and Evaluations for Tenure and/or Promotion include a Peer Evaluation Report. The latter of these evaluation processes also includes a Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Report. The comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review process outlined herein for tenured faculty in no way detracts from, replaces, or diminishes the importance and significance of this annual performance review. Furthermore, a comprehensive review undertaken for promotion decision purposes may preclude the need for the cumulative review process outlined in this document until the fifth year following such review. As is true for all phases of the UNCP faculty evaluation model, a faculty member has the right to receive written feedback and to submit a rebuttal to any

aspect of reports submitted by Deans, Department Chairs or Peer Evaluation Committees.

Written feedback from the Department Chair and Dean should include recognition for exemplary performance. A negative review must include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific **detailed** descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties. Any faculty response to a negative review will be forwarded with the packet to all subsequent levels of review.

In situations where a faculty member has received a rating of "unsatisfactory," an individual development or career plan will be created that includes (a) specific steps designed to lead to improvement, (b) a specified time line in which improvement is expected to occur, and (c) a clear statement of consequences should adequate improvement not occur within the designated time line. These consequences may include dismissal as allowed by The UNC Code, 603 (1). During the period allowed for improvement, the Department Chair or Dean (in the case of a Department Chair) will meet with the faculty member on at least a semi-annual basis to review progress toward meeting the development plan's specifications. If the faculty member's duties are modified as a result of an unsatisfactory rating, the revised duties are specified in the development plan.

All phases of this evaluation process are to be guided by the principles set forth in the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model (UNCP Faculty Handbook). Thus all "Principles and Criteria" relevant to faculty evaluation detailed in that document are also relevant to the post-tenure evaluation process and consequently are not repeated in this present document. These include principles and definitions, criteria, and documentation for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service.

### **Principles Governing the Roles of Individuals and Groups** **The Faculty Member Being Evaluated**

All tenured faculty will undergo a cumulative review process every five years commencing from date of the tenure review. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is promoted, this cumulative review will not be necessary until the fifth year following the promotion review. When tenured faculty apply for promotion and undergo post-tenure review at the same time, separate decisions will be made on each **using the appropriate forms to record those decisions**. As indicated in the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model, the faculty member's self-evaluations should be "a primary source of information about the goals, methods, and degrees of success associated with his or her performance." As is also stated therein, the annual weights assigned to each area by the individual being evaluated are to be taken into account by subsequent evaluators. Furthermore, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspect of the reports submitted by the Department Chair, ~~or~~ the Peer Evaluation Committee or Dean.

## **Students**

As is the case with all evaluation procedures at UNCP, student evaluations, while thought to play a prominent role in evaluating the faculty member's teaching. However, they do not by themselves provide sufficient information to judge fully a faculty member's performance as a teacher. Hence, evaluation of teaching effectiveness at UNCP involves a variety of types of documentation. (For more information on the role that students play in the evaluation process at UNCP, see the section above on "Student Evaluation of Instruction.")

## **The Peer Evaluation Committee**

The department or unit selects the Peer Evaluation Committee 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 the 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. This group is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Following completion delivery of the Peer Evaluation Committee's work 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.

## **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) is responsible for writing his/her own recommendations report (see Format for Chair's Post-Tenure Report Faculty Evaluation Reports), obtaining the evaluated faculty member's signature on the report and submitting this document to the Office of Academic Affairs. 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/her report.

## **The Dean of the Faculty Member's School or College**

The Dean will review the reports from the Chair and from the Peer Evaluation Committee as well as any supporting materials and any rebuttals. The Dean will assess the performance of the faculty member based on the materials presented and

will complete the Dean's ~~Recommendation Report~~ **Report using the Format for Dean's Report** for Post-Tenure Review. The Dean will give the faculty member a copy of the Dean's ~~recommendation report~~ and submit that ~~recommendation report~~, with all attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

### **The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**

Based on the materials submitted by the Dean, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for taking appropriate actions concerning the status of each tenured faculty member who has undergone the cumulative review process. (For further information regarding the responsibilities of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, see the section below on "Evaluation Procedures"). The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the faculty member, the faculty member's Department Chair (or Dean for Department Chairs), and the Dean of the relevant college or school, will also be responsible for constructing, monitoring, and evaluating satisfactory completion of any plan for improvement of performance for any faculty member whose performance has been judged unsatisfactory.

After reviewing the materials produced by this evaluation process, the Chancellor takes actions as deemed appropriate. In situations where a tenured faculty member has received a rating of "unsatisfactory," and the identified deficiencies are not removed in the specified period of time, the Chancellor may impose sanctions, which may include discharge as allowed by The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, Section 603 (1).

### **Evaluation Procedures**

The cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty provides a basis for the support and encouragement of excellence among tenured faculty by (a) continuing tenure for faculty whose work is found satisfactory, (b) providing a clear plan and a specified time line of not more than three academic years for improvement of performance of faculty found unsatisfactory, and (c) for those whose performance remains unsatisfactory, providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions, which can include a recommendation for discharge. All tenured faculty will undergo this cumulative review process every five years. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is evaluated for promotion, this cumulative review may not be necessary until the fifth year following the conclusion of that process. The cumulative review process includes the faculty member, the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or school in the case of **the evaluation of** Department Chairs), the Dean of the faculty member's college or school, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor.

At the point in time when the cumulative evaluation for tenured faculty process is to begin, the faculty member involved will be so notified in writing by his/her Department Chair or by the Dean of the relevant college or school if the review involves the Department Chair (see Calendar of Events below). The faculty member will subsequently submit to his or her Department Chair (Dean of relevant college

or school for **evaluation of** Department Chairs) a copy of (a) Self Evaluations for the previous five years, (b) Student Evaluation summaries for the previous five years, (c) Chair Evaluations for the previous five years, (d) Dean's annual evaluation reports for the previous five years, (e) any additional information since the last annual evaluation that is deemed pertinent, and (f) a completed copy of the Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form. In the initial stages of this process, these various materials might be collected from a variety of sources (the faculty member's own copies, copies in the possession of the Department Chair, and/or copies in the possession of the Office for Academic Affairs).

The Department Chair (or Dean for **the evaluation of** Department Chairs) then (a) appoints three faculty members to the Peer Evaluation Committee in the manner described above, (b) calls this group together for its initial meeting in order to orient the members to the process, and (c) makes available to the members the materials cited above.

The responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee will be consistent with those described in the sections above on other evaluation processes. The Peer Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or school for **the evaluation of** Department Chairs), working independently of each other, are responsible for preparing and submitting a Post-Tenure Evaluation **Recommendation Report using the appropriate format** (available from the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>) to the Dean of the faculty member's college or school and, through the Dean, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. These reports, based on the various documents that have been submitted, will include a rating of the overall performance of the faculty member as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory and a narrative justification. ~~If the ranking indicates unsatisfactory performance, the Committee's report has the option of including specific suggestions that might lead to improvement.~~ The faculty member undergoing this cumulative post-tenure review process will be given two completed, signed, and dated copies of each of these reports (the Peer Evaluation Committee's report and the Department Chair's report). Within three days, the faculty member being evaluated returns one copy that has been signed and dated. This signature indicates merely that the faculty member acknowledges being apprised of its contents, not that he/she agrees with it. In all cases, the faculty member being reviewed may submit a rebuttal to the Dean within ten **business** days of having received these reports. The respective Chair (Peer Evaluation Committee or Department) submits these two reports to the Dean of the faculty member's school or college.

The Dean of the relevant college or school will review the reports from the Department Chair (~~if available~~) and the Peer Evaluation Committee, including ~~any supporting materials provided by the Chair or Peer Evaluation Committee~~ and any rebuttals submitted by the **evaluated** faculty member ~~being evaluated~~. The Dean will then complete the Dean's Report for Post-Tenure Review, including his or her



evaluation of the faculty member's performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The Dean's ~~Report~~ **report** will serve as a cover letter to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and will include as attachments the reports from the Department Chair and from the Peer Evaluation Committee along with all supporting documents. Within three days, the faculty member will sign the Dean's ~~Report~~ **report**, acknowledging having seen it but not necessarily agreement with it. The faculty member will retain one copy of the signed Dean's Recommendation. The Dean will then forward his or her report, with the attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

If the Dean does not agree with the evaluation of the Chair and/or the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Dean must justify that judgment with appropriate comments. The faculty member has the right to submit a rebuttal to the Dean's evaluation within ~~10~~ **ten business** days of signing the report.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will review **all documents, reports, and supporting materials**. ~~the Dean's report, with the reports of the Department Chair and the Peer Evaluation Committee and all supporting documents attached.~~ In the event that the ratings in the reports submitted unanimously indicate unsatisfactory performance, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will communicate this finding in writing to the faculty member, the Department Chair (unless the faculty member is the Department Chair), and the Dean of the faculty member's college or school. It will be responsibility of the Department Chair (or Dean if the faculty member concerned is the Department Chair), in collaboration with the faculty member evaluated, to draw up an individual development or career (remediation) plan. The plan will include steps designed to lead to improvement in the faculty member's performance to a satisfactory level, a specified time frame of not more than three academic years in which this improvement is to occur, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement to a satisfactory level of performance not occur within the specified time frame. After review and concurrence by the Dean of the faculty member's college or school, the plan will be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who must approve the plan, taking into account the need for institutional resources to support the faculty member's efforts to remediate identified deficiencies in his or her performance.

At the end of the time period specified in the remediation plan, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the faculty member's Department Chair (Dean, if the faculty member is a Department Chair), and Dean of the faculty member's college or school, will determine if the provisions of the plan have been met. If so, the faculty member will be judged satisfactory in performance for the current post-tenure review cycle. Note that the existence of a remediation plan does not defer or postpone any succeeding post-tenure review. If the provisions of the remediation plan have not been met and the required improvement not occurred, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall recommend sanctions to the Chancellor, under the provisions of University



policy on Discharge and the Imposition of Serious Sanctions and *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*. Such sanctions may include reduction in rank, discharge, or other disciplinary action.

If performance ratings unanimously indicate satisfactory performance or if there is disagreement among the reports on the satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance of the faculty member being evaluated, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will accept the performance review report with no further action. In the case where a faculty member's performance is found to be unsatisfactory, the Provost will take appropriate action (s). If any elements of unsatisfactory performance have not been improved to a satisfactory level in the specified period, the Provost's action may include discharge as specified by *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina* Section 603 (1).

**Forms for Use in the Faculty Evaluation Process**

The following forms related to faculty evaluation are available at the website for the Office of Academic Affairs at <http://www.uncp.edu/about-uncp/administration/departments/academic-affairs/forms>

- Format for Evaluation Reports
- Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form
- Peer Evaluation Committee Request Form for Post-Tenure Review
- Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form
- Student Evaluation of Instruction
- Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form
- Standard Performance Rating Scale
- Department Chair Evaluation Form
- ~~Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form~~
  - **Format for Peer Evaluation Committee's Report for Post-Tenure Review**
  - **Format for Department Chair's Report for Post-Tenure Review**
  
- Format for Dean's Report for Probationary Contract Review
- Format for Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase
- Format for Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion
- Format for Dean's Report for Post-Tenure Review

**pp. 105-106**

**Typical Calendar of Events for Post-Tenure Review**

The events listed below are intended as guidelines; dates may be altered as conditions warrant. Specific policies and procedures are found elsewhere in this document and in the full UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model. If a date listed in this table falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is automatically moved to the next business day.

<b>DATE</b>	<b>EVENT OR DOCUMENT</b>
April 15	Notification: Department Chair notifies faculty member that the post-tenure review process will occur during the following academic year.
August 1	Optional Promotion Review: If a faculty member wishes to undergo review for promotion in addition to a required post-tenure review, the faculty member must notify the Department Chair by this date.
August 15	Evaluation Announcement: If the faculty member wishes to undergo review for promotion in addition to the required post-tenure review, the Department Chair notifies the Dean, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the impending promotion evaluation by this date. The faculty member should receive a copy of this notification.
August 29	Submission of Materials: The faculty member presents the Department Chair with the required documents. [In the initial stages of this process, these various materials might be collected from a variety of sources (the faculty member's own copies, copies in the possession of the Department Chair, and/or copies in the possession of the Office of Academic Affairs).]
September 7	PEC Formation: The Department Chair announces the composition of the Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC).
September 17	Transmittal of Materials: By this date, the Department Chair meets with the PEC, reviews its charge, and gives the PEC the candidate's materials. The PEC elects its chair after meeting with the dept chair.
September 17 – November 1	Optional observation of teaching (when deemed appropriate) is carried out by Department Chair and members of the Peer Evaluation Committee. The PEC independently deliberates on all

	materials, observations, etc., to reach a recommendation. <del>The PEC Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Report Form</del> is completed by the PEC. <b>The Peer Evaluation Committee's Report for Post-Tenure Review is completed</b> (Section II, Chapter 2)
November 5	Two copies of the PEC's <del>Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Report Form</del> are transmitted to the faculty member.
Report transmittal + 3 business days	Faculty member being evaluated signs/dates form from PEC. The faculty member retains one signed copy.
November 5	Department Chair completes, after consultation with the PEC, the <del>Chair's Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form</del> . <b>Department Chair's Report for Post-Tenure Review.</b> (Section II, Chapter 2)
November 5 6	Two copies of the Chair's <del>Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Report Form</del> are transmitted to the faculty member.
Report transmittal + 3 business days	Faculty member being evaluated signs/dates form from Department Chair. The faculty member retains one signed copy.
November 8 9	PEC and chair reports are submitted, along with the candidate's materials to the Dean
Report transmittals + 10 business days	[Optional] Faculty member being evaluated submits rebuttal to report(s) to the Dean.
December 1	For candidates undergoing concomitant review for promotion, Dean reviews Chair and PEC post-tenure report forms, supporting materials, including rebuttals, and completes the Dean's <del>Recommendation Report</del> for Post-Tenure Review ( <del>Form 4-12.M</del> ). By deadline, Dean gives the faculty member and Department Chair, a copy of the Dean's <del>recommendation Report</del> and submits that <del>recommendation report</del> , with all attached post-tenure materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
January 15	For candidates not undergoing concomitant review for promotion, Dean reviews Chair and PEC reports, supporting materials, including rebuttals, and completes the Dean's <del>Recommendation Report</del> for Post-Tenure Review (Form 4-12.M). By deadline, Dean gives the faculty member and Department Chair, a copy of the Dean's <del>recommendation report</del> and submits that <del>recommendation report</del> , with all attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

February 15                    Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs confers with the Dean concerning outcome of evaluation process.

March 15                     ~~Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs gives recommendations to Chancellor.~~

**The University of North Carolina at Pembroke**

**Format for Peer Evaluation Committee Report for Post-Tenure Review  
Evaluation Recommendation Form**

*Current Academic Year* \_\_\_\_\_ *Department* \_\_\_\_\_

*Faculty Member's Name* \_\_\_\_\_

*Current Professorial Rank* \_\_\_\_\_

*Number of Years at UNCP* \_\_\_\_\_ *Number of Years in Rank* \_\_\_\_\_

**Ranking (check one):**

Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_  
Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

**Narrative Justification for Ranking:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Peer Evaluation Committee/Department Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Peer Evaluation Committee Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Peer Evaluation Committee Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member

The University of North Carolina at Pembroke

**Format for Department Chair's Report for Post-Tenure Review Evaluation  
Recommendation Form**

*Current Academic Year* \_\_\_\_\_ *Department* \_\_\_\_\_

*Faculty Member's Name* \_\_\_\_\_

*Current Professorial Rank* \_\_\_\_\_

*Number of Years at UNCP* \_\_\_\_\_ *Number of Years in Rank* \_\_\_\_\_

**Ranking (check one):**

Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_  
Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

**Narrative Justification for Ranking:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of ~~Peer Evaluation Committee~~/Department Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member

## Rationale for suggested Post-Tenure Review changes

Last year when working on changes to our post-tenure procedure mandated by GA, FERS became aware of inconsistent evaluation practices across UNCP departments. Unfortunately, we did not have time last year to delve into those issues.

A primary concern related to post-tenure review is that depts have been using two different evaluation forms. Some depts use the familiar "Format for Evaluation Reports" form for dept chair and PEC reports while others use the "Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form." Instructions in the text regarding the proper form to use were ambiguous. Hence, this proposal.

Our recommendation is that ONLY the Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form (which DOES require a narrative justification so its use DOES yield a "report") be used for post-tenure review. We further recommend 1) the title of this form be changed to properly reflect its purpose and 2) that separate forms be developed for chair and PEC use. We have made other suggestions as well for clarity and consistency across the text.

Our reasons are as follows:

1. The heading of the "Format for Evaluation Reports" indicates it is to be used for tenure, promotion, and annual review. Post-tenure review is not listed as an option suggesting this form was not intended for this purpose.
2. The performance rankings that may be assigned listed in the "Format for Evaluation Reports" do not correspond to performance rankings that may be assigned during post-tenure review.
3. According to the Handbook, the following materials are to be submitted by the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review: "(a) Self Evaluations for the previous five years, (b) Student Evaluation summaries for the previous five years, (c) Chair Evaluations for the previous five years, (d) Dean's annual evaluation reports for the previous five years, (e) any additional information since the last annual evaluation that is deemed pertinent, and (f) a completed copy of the Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form." (p. 90, 2015-2016 *Faculty Handbook*)

As can be seen, unlike the requirements for tenure and/or promotion portfolios, for post-tenure review no artifacts such as syllabi, teaching materials, assignments/tests and so on are to be submitted to support one's teaching performance. Further, direct observation of teaching is not required. Thus, it would appear the Format for Evaluation Reports is not appropriate for this type of review. More specifically, the Format for Evaluation Reports form states: Discuss classroom work as it relates to how knowledge in a faculty member's discipline is covered (e.g., categories, principles, summaries), how the specific content of a discipline is imparted (e.g., facts, examples), the development of general student skills (e.g., communication, critical thinking, creativity, mathematics), how student learning is motivated (e.g., stimulating curiosity, confidence, and task-specific motivation), measures of student performance (e.g., examinations, papers, presentations, other



projects),....” Without artifacts and direct observation, it is difficult to see how those instructions could be followed.

4. We note that if a person is to be considered for promotion at the time of the post-tenure review, the Format for Evaluation Reports will still be used for the promotion portion of the evaluation as separate decisions are made for each type of review.
5. We deleted the March 15 calendar entry related to the Chancellor. The text there appears to be lifted from sections related to tenure and promotion evaluation. In the case of post-tenure review, according to the body of the text, the Chancellor does not become involved in the process UNLESS there is agreement the faculty member has failed the review AND the faculty member also fails to improve under the mandatory remediation plan within the specified timeframe.
6. We have shortened the information related to the subheading “Students.” The original section appears to have been lifted directly from the procedures in the *Handbook* related to evaluation for tenure and/or promotion. In those cases, evaluators are required to examine teaching materials such as syllabi and other course materials that must be submitted in the portfolio. Evaluators are also required to observe teaching. As is noted in #3 above, the portfolio submitted for post-tenure review does not contain teaching materials and as is noted in the *Handbook* text, teaching observations are not mandatory for post-tenure review.
7. We further note it is important to follow the *Handbook* procedures as they are written *for every kind of evaluation*. For example, FERS has become aware that some dept chairs insist their faculty (who are undergoing post-tenure review *only*) submit materials other than those required in #3 above, p. 90 *Faculty Handbook*. Similarly, there appears to be continuing confusion about the purpose of the narrative *Graduate Course Evaluation*. As the *Handbook* indicates, that form is to be completed by graduate students **in addition to** the standard Student Evaluation of Teaching form **not instead of** the standard form. Further, results from graduate course evaluation are not to be used to evaluate faculty so they would not be included in a portfolio for any sort of evaluation including post-tenure evaluation.

[Return to Agenda](#)

## Appendix H

### **Highlights of UNC Faculty Assembly Meeting—December 4, 2015**

Theme: “The Present and Future of UNC Academics”

Chair Stephen Leonard called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Michael Delafield (NCSSM and UNCGA), Janice Haynie (FSU), Travis Lewis (ECU), and Monica Osborne (NCSU, formerly at UNCP), and Facilitator Karrie Dixon (UNCGA) participated in a panel discussion on academics, student affairs, and the challenges of student success. A primary focus was on student mental health. Record number of suicides this year. Student suicides more public than in the past, sometimes in front of friends or between classes. Osborne reported that 1/3 of students seen by counseling center reported suicidal thoughts. Poor handling of an attempted suicide increases the chances of another attempt. *FERPA grants exceptions for health and safety*: if a professor receives a communication from a student stating something like “My life is over” or “There’s no point to live anymore,” forward the information to the counseling center. Todd Lewis, Student Affairs Director, reported a dramatic increase in recent years of contacts by helicopter parents, including e-mailing professors and doing assignments for their child. Mr. Lewis also reported more disruptive behavior in the classroom, such as arguing with the professor or other students or “blowing up.” Formerly, he encountered 1 or 2 such incidents per semester, now it’s 1 or 2 each week. An Assembly Delegate attributed this increase to the isolation of students with their electronic devices, the ubiquity of outbursts on electronic media, and lack of experience and knowledge of interacting with flesh and blood human beings. Another delegate indicated that students are less likely to come to talk with their professor than in the past. Osborne indicated that, legally, a university cannot force students to get treatment nor expel them due to mental illness. However, a university can have a student involuntarily committed with evidence of a psychotic episode.

Community Engagement update. Leslie Boney, Vice President for International, Community, and Economic Engagement, reported that they are targeting internships with small- and medium-sized businesses.

Academic Affairs update. Junius Gonzales, UNC Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, reported a proliferation of institutions offering programs in North Carolina, including Johns Hopkins, Cornell, and the University of Southern California. His office is trying to track graduation rates of transfers within the UNC System. The standards for whether a program in the UNC System is considered one of “low productivity” are rather arbitrary. Our standards are about twice as high as for some other state systems. Also, other states tend to have longer periods of assessment than every two years.

A Student Success Summit has been scheduled for April 5-6, 2016.

Government relations update. Drew Moretz, UNC Vice President for Government Relations, reviewed good and bad aspects of the state budget for the UNC System.

Stephen Leonard has shared with the Board of Governors and with incoming President Margaret Spellings the current issues concerning faculty and how they can avoid losing faculty support:

- 1) Rescind the Post-Tenure Review Policy the Board adopted
- 2) Support the recommendations of the General Education Council on System-wide assessment of writing and critical thinking
- 3) Increase faculty salaries (for the past 3 years this issue has been off the table; not anymore after the increase in some Chancellor salaries—the vote was 16-13 on that increase)
- 4) A huge trust deficit for Spellings, given the way the hiring process was handled by the BOG. Spellings cannot afford to be perceived as doing the Board's or the Legislature's bidding against her better judgment.

Leonard indicated he had a good conversation with Spellings on those issues. Spellings plans to attend the February Faculty Assembly Meeting on faculty work and to be "in listening mode." Spellings plans to meet with faculty on each of the System campuses. If only a select group is invited, they should be picked by the Faculty Senate.

There was a consensus that the Academic Affairs Fellows selection process should in the future involve faculty input, perhaps requiring approval by the Faculty Senate.

It was noted that standards for retired faculty to receive Emeritus status vary widely among the campuses. Faculty Senate Chairs will be asked to submit their campus policy in order to assess this situation.

System provosts are to take the lead in working against the "NC Gap" legislation. Faculty Senates should be prepared to support the provosts as things unfold on this matter.

Unanimous approval of the April 2015, September 2015, October 2015 Assembly Meeting Minutes.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Nikkel, UNC Faculty Assembly Delegate

[Return to Agenda](#)

## Appendix I

### Teacher Education Committee Meeting Minutes

January 12, 2016

3:00 p.m., room 1106, Jones Athletic  
Building



*“Preparing professional educators  
who are committed, collaborative, and*

*competent.”*

TEC Members Present: M. Ash, A. Bryant, S. Cinnamon, R Dillard, I. Falls, D. Feikema, K. Ficklin, K. Granger, R. Hagevik, T. Hunt, E. Jeon, M. Klinikowski, R. Ladd, C. Lara, L. Mabe, A. McDonald, L. Mitchell, G. Robinson, J. Rivera, M. Scott, D. Scruton, H. Sellers, K. Stanley, M. Storms, J. Warren, B. Winters

Staff: A. Opata

Guests: V Ford, S. Simmons

1. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.
2. Approval of the Minutes: The November 11, 2015 minutes were approved as presented.
3. Sharing Good News
  - a. Dr. Mabe: The School of Administration program had 14 graduates with the East Carolina University Ed.D. cohort program.
  - b. Dr. Lara: OLÉ is the new Spanish Language Student Organization. The purpose of OLÉ at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke is to assist with the academic development of UNCP students and the surrounding communities. The objective of OLÉ is to bring students together who have an interest in Spanish, which includes aspects such as culture, language, and literature of Latin America and Spain.
  - c. Dr. Dillard: Congratulations to our Elementary graduate program on ranking 75 in the U.S. News and World Report Best Online Graduate programs.
  - d. The School of Education congratulates Dr. Leah Fiorentino, who was acknowledged as Fellow #7 recently at the Annual Conference of the National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE). In the announcement it was stated that “Dr. Fiorentino has had a tremendous impact on the field of kinesiology and has created a legacy that will guide our association into the future.”
  - e. Dr. Angela McDonald was elected President-elect of the American Association of State Counseling Boards at their 29th Annual Conference in Tampa recently. Her new term of office will officially begin July 1, 2016.

The organization is comprised of members from all of the state licensing boards for counseling.

- f. Dr. Mabel Rivera was elected Vice-President of the North Carolina Council for Exceptional Children.

#### 4. Curriculum proposals

- a. Proposals from M.A., Health/PE Specialization - Dr. Bryan Winters – motion to approve proposal. (proposal sent for review to the Professional Studies Subcommittee; Karen Granger will come back to committee with an update).

-Delete EDN 5660; Add EXER 5980 (existing course)

-Delete EXER 5080; Add new course EXER 5120

- b. Proposals from MAT-HPE – proposal approved

- Delete EDN 5440; Add EXER 5980 (existing course)

- Delete EXER 5080; Add new course EXER 5120

- Add pre-requisite to EXER 5950 (completion of EXER 5980)

- c. Proposals from School Counseling - Dr. Jeff Warren – proposal approved

CNS 5600, CNS 6130, CNS 6100

Revise Prerequisite for each course

#### 5. Action Items

- a. Admission into the Teacher Education Program – Ms. Aku Opata – All of the students presented for admission into the Teacher education Program was approved. 21(Undergrad), 7(Licensure), & 11(AIG).

#### 6. Discussion Item – Dr. Roger Ladd

The Institutional Report (IR) for NCATE was submitted on time by the work group on November 24, with additional assistance from Dr. Mary Ash. Mary Klinikowski was instrumental in getting the report submitted on time. The Board of Examiners (BOE) has already met for the offsite visit; we expect the final version of their offsite report next week or soon thereafter. Our onsite visit, as you are aware, is April 17-19. We very much appreciate the information provided by Program Coordinators and Directors in the fall, but we continue to find areas where we need more information and data. In some cases, the information we have is structured differently enough that we may need to ask follow up questions. Once we receive the offsite report, we will ask those program directors to provide additional information to address concerns and we may ask for more information about particular assignments. It is possible that there will be meetings with individual Program Coordinators and Program Directors. We are confident that our candidates are doing worthwhile work and meeting the standards, but we are still working out the best way to demonstrate through clear data that they do. So Program Coordinators and Directors can expect more questions, surveys, and other requests for information very soon after we receive the Offsite Report. We appreciate everyone's cooperation and patience so far.

7. Teacher Recruitment and Retention (R&R) Activities Report – Ms. Karen Granger
  - a. Praxis II workshop to be held on February 20, 2016. Additional information will be provided.
  - b. NC Foundations Support Sessions to assist in preparation for the licensure exam will be held January 12, January 26, February 9, February 16, March 15, April 5, April 12, & April 19 in the Education building. Additional information will be provided.
  - c. New Teach NOW Website
  
8. Report from the Office of University-School Partnerships – Dr. Bryan Winters
  - a. Student Internship Orientation to be held January 11-14, 2016 at the Regional Center.
  
9. Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators Tests – Dr. Valjeaner Ford
  - a. The Praxis Core workshops schedule for the spring 2016 semester will be sent via email, as soon as complete.
  - b. Student accountability for test preparation: we are exploring ways to make test preparation sessions mandatory prior to students taking the tests.
  
10. Praxis Plus Report – Ms. Melissa Edwards
  - a. Tutors will begin tutoring sessions early next week. There are five experienced tutors this semester (3 math, 2 reading/writing).
  - b. The updated schedule for office hours (until filled with students as tutoring sessions) is posted on the [www.uncp.edu/praxisplus](http://www.uncp.edu/praxisplus) webpage!
  - c. Office will be operational until February 29. Funds are available to reimburse students that attend tutoring sessions until that date (and test fairly soon after completion of sessions.)
  - d. Derek Oxendine will help SOE develop a plan for tutoring services once Praxis Plus ends.
  
11. Report from Hearing Appeals Board – Ms. Kelly Ficklin – The Hearing Appeals Board had one appeal submitted this month from a MAT student seeking to take 12 hours during internship. The committee will meet to consider this request soon.
  
12. Report - NCATE/Accreditation – Dr. Roger Ladd
  - a. The IR report was submitted. The Board of Examiners will release their offsite report to us and we will be in touch with Directors and Coordinators regarding additional information needed.

13. Report - Director of Assessment – Ms. Mary Klinikowski  
Teacher Candidate Work Sample: As a unit, we need to work on rubrics.
14. Technology Report – Dr. Lisa Mitchell
- a. Technology in SOE classrooms is currently working. Please submit work orders for technology through Loria Huggins.
  - b. We have not purchased any new technology this year. If you have previous Teacher Education funded technology you are no longer using, please turn it in to Loria Huggins so it can be used by others. If you have a particular technology needed for teaching and learning, please let your department chair know.
  - c. Social Media & Communication: Teacher Education updates completed for spring 2016 to TV, Blog and Calendar.
  - d. Send Blog, TV and Calendar updates to [uncpaddington@gmail.com](mailto:uncpaddington@gmail.com) or [Lisa.Mitchell@uncp.edu](mailto:Lisa.Mitchell@uncp.edu) with the event, date(s), time(s) and location.
  - e. Calendar link: <http://www.uncp.edu/academics/colleges-schools-departments/colleges-schools/school-education/education-calendar>
  - f. Blog link: <http://www.uncptep.wordpress.com>
  - g. Opportunities: Continuing this semester for interested students, faculty and staff Educational Tech Topics workshops 3:30-4:30pm in room 203 in the School of Education – topics to be announced: January 21, February 18, March 17, & April 21, 2016.
15. Report – Office of Teacher Education/Dean’s Office – Dr. Karen Stanley
- a. TEC subcommittees – those that have not selected a chair and met, please do so. Please report any changes to Courtney Brayboy or Dr. Stanley.
  - b. Program Advisory Council – some programs have advisory boards; others need to establish them to assist in decisions regarding program effectiveness, improvement.
  - c. The Hattie M. Strong Scholars Program has been established at UNCP and has awarded the first two \$5000 scholarships at the December Pinning/Awards Ceremony. Two \$5000 scholarships, for students with demonstrated financial need, will be awarded in May 2016, to students completing internships in fall or spring of 2016. Ms. Karen Granger is chairing a the committee, assisted by Ms. Janice Goolsby, Financial Aid; and from Teacher Education, Dr. Carol Higy, and Dr. Nicole Stargell.
  - d. Please let us know of teaching materials or technology needed for your classrooms by emailing Dr. Karen Stanley, [karen.stanley@uncp.edu](mailto:karen.stanley@uncp.edu).
16. Announcements
- a. Volunteers needed at the Fort Bragg military base. Professors at the base are in need of mentors. Please email Dr. Jose Rivera with questions.
17. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

*Next meeting: Wednesday, February 10, 2016, 3:00 p.m., Jones Building, room 1106*

*Minutes submitted by: Courtney S. Brayboy*

[Return to Agenda](#)



## Appendix J

### Graduate Council Report to Faculty Senate

February 3, 2016, meeting

The UNCP Graduate Council met on Monday, January 25, 2016. Below is information particularly relevant to the Faculty Senate.

**Graduate Faculty Nomination:** The following nominees were approved as indicated.

First	Last	Qualifying Degree	Dept	Program	Status
Constance	Mullinix	PhD	Nursing	MSN	Full
Deborah	Hummer	DNP	Nursing	MSN	Prof Affil

**Graduate Course/Curriculum Proposals**—The following proposals were considered and passed.

#### **School of Education, Ed Leadership and Counseling Dept, Professional School Counseling**

- Program Proposal (includes all the following)
  - Change program outcomes (listed on the program proposal form)
  - Move CNS 5900 Addictions Counseling from *Specialty Area and Elective Courses* to *Elective courses*
  - Course proposal: Create and add CNS 5XXX Career and College Readiness course to *Specialty Area*
  - CNS 5900 Addictions Counseling (from Specialty Area and Elective Courses)
  - Add five elective courses (four new courses)
- Course proposal: CNS xxxx School Counselor as Leader, Advocate, and Consultant
- Course proposal: CNS xxxx Addressing the Achievement Gap and Issues of Social Justice
- Course proposal: CNS xxxx Evidence-Based School Counseling
- Course proposal: CNS xxxx Legal Aspects of Educational Leadership (Cross-listed with EDNL 5860)
- Course Revisions to prerequisites in the following:
  - CNS 5350 The Professional School Counselor
  - CNS 5600 Assessment Practices in Counseling
  - CNS 6100 Counseling Practicum
  - CNS 6130 School Counseling Internship

#### **School of Education, Ed Leadership and Counseling Dept, Clinical Mental Health Counseling**

- Program Proposal: In catalog description,
  - remove statement on cost of comprehensive exam

- remove limit of comprehensive exam attempts
- remove statement, “Students complete the Counseling Practicum during their second year of study after completing the core counseling courses.”
- remove student learning objectives
- revised statement on when students need to take and pass a comprehensive examination (before beginning CNS 6120 Clinical Mental Health Counseling Internship)
- Course Proposals:
  - CNS 5450 Change prerequisite to “Admission to the CMHC program.”
  - CNS 6120 Change prerequisite to “Completion of CNS 6100 Counseling Practicum, **passed the comprehensive exam**, permission of the instructor, and a minimum of a GPA of 3.0.”

### **School of Education, HPER, MA and MAT**

- Program Proposal MA (PE concentration): Replace EXER 5080 with EXER 5120 **new** content methods course
- Program Proposal MAT: Replace EXER 5080 with EXER 5120 **new** content methods course
- Course Proposal (new course): EXER 5120 – Advanced Methodologies in Health/PE II, will be required in both MA and MAT programs.

### **Regulation Proposal from the School of Graduate Studies**

Addresses UNC University Policy 700.7.1, Military Student Success

#### **Deferral of Enrollment**

A student called to active military duty before enrolling in courses may request a deferral of admission using the process below:

- The student must submit a request (i.e., letter or email) to the Graduate School for a deferment stating the reason for the request (call to active duty), indicating the term he/she wishes to re-enroll (the term can be changed if needed).
- The Graduate Dean approves the deferment and informs the Program Director and student of the approval.
- The student is to notify the Graduate School and their Program Director at least 30 days prior to the first class day of her/his plan to return to graduate school.
- If the student's discharge from the service is delayed, the student contacts the Graduate School and requests an extension of his/her deferment. The Graduate Dean will approve the delay and inform the Graduate Program Director.

#### **Graduate Extension of Time to Degree for Military Leave of Absence**

When a student on military leave of absence plans to resume graduate study, he/she must inform the Graduate School at least 30 days prior to the first class day of the return semester. The Graduate School will readmit students

who were in good academic standing at the time of their call to duty who seek readmission no later than three years after the completion of the period of service. Readmission fees will be waived. All registration holds must be cleared before the student will be eligible to register.

In the case of a military leave of absence, the time clock related to the time limit for the completion of the degree will be stopped at the semester in which the leave begins. The time clock will resume upon the student's return to the program. Students will reenter the program under the catalog of record when they are readmitted. While all academic credit, including transfer credits taken before enrollment in the graduate program, will remain on the graduate transcript, courses originally approved to be counted toward the degree program which now fall outside of the original time limit must be reviewed for content relevancy and approved through the credit reinstatement (appeals) process. In some cases, additional course work may be warranted due to outdated information.

#### **Graduate Studies Report and discussions**

- English Ed MA and MAT admissions change-now accepting passing PRAXIS II scores (in addition to GRE and MAT scores)
- Graduate Faculty Renewals occurs in April, materials due in March. List of needed renewals were on the Graduate Faculty list sent to Program Directors in January.

#### **Announcements/Reminders**

- The Graduate Research Symposium will be held April 5, 2016 beginning at 5:30 in UC Annex. Please encourage your students to participate
- Graduation Application Deadline: March 1 for fall 16 graduation

**Next Meeting: Monday, February 15, 3:00, UC Annex Room 203**

[Return to Agenda](#)