

Figure 4A.1
Format for Evaluation Reports

These format guidelines give an overview of specific information that should appear in a faculty member's self-evaluation form, the department chair's evaluation report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's evaluation report, and the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Area weights assigned to specific areas must sum to 100%. The following are the headings which should appear at the beginning of each evaluation area being discussed with the area weight listed to the right of the heading.

1). **Introductory Heading** - The introductory heading should appear at the top of the first page of the evaluation form and include the following information as listed below.

Faculty Member's Name _____

Current Professorial Rank _____

Current Academic Year _____ *Department* _____

Type of Form *Self* _____ *Chair* _____ *Peer* _____

Type of Evaluation (check all applicable) *Annual* _____ *Tenure* _____ *Promotion* _____

2). TEACHING **Area Weight (50% to 70%)** _____

a) Classroom activities. 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), and future plans for development in the area of teaching.

b) Auxiliary teaching activities. Discuss evidence that grades have been submitted in a timely manner, how students are being advised, supplementary instructional time provided outside of class, the supervising of student research projects, working with colleagues to develop curricula, and plans for future development in this area.

c) How has the information from your most recent evaluation been used to improve instruction?

3). SCHOLARSHIP **Area Weight (10% to 40%)** _____

a) Research. Discuss scholarly research for the period of the evaluation. In particular, there should be emphasis on (a) how knowledge has been developed, (b) the application of existing knowledge used to solve practical problems, (c) the application of professional knowledge and skill to an artistic problem if applicable, or (d) the completion of a special program of intellectual development. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

b) Publication. Discuss scholarly works that have been disseminated within the faculty member's discipline. Examples across disciplines are exhibition of artistic work, editing grant applications, publication in scholarly journals, and publishing of works aimed toward student and general audiences. Also include comments on future plans for development in this area.

4). SERVICE *Area weight* (10% to 40%) _____

A faculty member may work in any of the following categories.

a) University Service. Comment about on-campus service provided during the period, including activities such as committee work, grant administration, consultations supporting the work of staff or faculty. Quality of service is very important (e.g., serving actively on a small number of committees is more valuable than serving minimally on many committees). Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

b) Professional service. Comment on the nature, scope, and effectiveness of service to the faculty member's profession. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

c) External Service. Comment on the strengths and weaknesses of off-campus service during the period, including such activities as participation on professional committees and governing boards, providing professional consultation to schools, civic organizations, and government agencies, and providing leadership on public matters. Include comments on future plans for development in this area.

5). Anticipated Area Weights for the Next Academic Year - This section should only appear on the self-evaluation form. The following anticipated area weights as indicated below should be listed in this section.

Teaching (50% to 70%) _____

Scholarship (10% to 40%) _____

Service (10% to 40%) _____

6). SYNTHESIS - This section will only appear in a department chair or Peer Evaluation Committee's evaluation form. In this section, the evaluator(s) determine the overall performance rating of the faculty member for the period covered. The quality of performance is weighed in relation to the faculty member's area weights. The final evaluation should (a) adhere to the guiding principles, (b) reflect equity within the department and among departments, and (c) allow a reasonable degree of flexibility in how a faculty member orients his or her effort.

a). Rationale of rating - This section clarifies the relationship between the various performance areas as listed in the University mission statement and the overall performance ranking given.

b). Overall rating of faculty member - Listed below are the ratings a faculty member will be assigned.

- _____ Distinguished performance
- _____ Very good performance
- _____ Adequate performance
- _____ Deficient performance

Date

Signature of Department or Committee Chair

Date

Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member

Figure 4A.2
Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form

Current Academic Year _____ **Department** _____
Faculty Member's Name _____

Department Representatives. Nominate up to three members from *within your department* to serve on your Peer Evaluation Committee. (To the extent possible, they should be tenured. In small departments, you may nominate one tenured faculty member from an allied field outside the department. You may not nominate your department chair, other faculty members who are being considered for tenure and/or promotion during this academic year, or members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.) Flexibility in appointments under these rules are allowable for first-year evaluations in small departments.

- a) _____
- b) _____
- c) _____

University Representative. Nominate one tenured faculty member from outside your department to serve on the Peer Evaluation Committee.

Assured nomination. From the *names appearing above*, enter the name of the one individual whom you wish to be nominated automatically to the Peer Evaluation Committee.

Date

Signature of Candidate

**Figure 4A.3
Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form**

Current Academic Year _____ *Department* _____

Candidate's Name _____

Current Professorial Rank _____

Number of Years at UNCP (including present year) _____

Number of Years in Rank (including present year) _____

Type of Decision (check each that applies) *Promotion* ____ *Tenure* ____ *Renewal* ____

Recommendations

Promotion: Approved _____ Disapproved _____ Not applicable _____

Vote of Committee (when applicable): Number For _____ Number Against _____

Remarks (optional) _____

Tenure: Approved _____ Disapproved _____ Not applicable _____

Vote of Committee (when applicable): Number For _____ Number Against _____

Remarks (optional) _____

Renewal after probationary year: Approved _____ Disapproved _____
Not applicable _____

Vote of Committee (when applicable): Number For _____ Number Against _____

Remarks (optional) _____

Participating Members of
Committee: _____

Abstaining Members: _____

Date

Signature of Chair

Date

Signature of Evaluating Committee Member

Date

Signature of Evaluating Committee Member

Date

Signature of Evaluating Committee Member

Date

Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member
(except for Promotion and Tenure Committee use)

We nominate this faculty member for (check one or more):

1. UNC Board of Governors' Award for Excellence in Teaching
2. UNCP Teaching Award
3. Adolph L. Dial Award for Scholarship/Creative Work
4. Adolph L. Dial Award for Community Service

DRAFT
Figure 4A.4
Student Evaluation of Instruction Form

Date_____ Professor_____ Course #_____

Course Title_____ Expected Grade_____

Your Year in School (circle one): Fresh. Soph. Junior Senior

Number of times you have been absent in this course (approx.)_____

Your input plays a very important role in the evaluation of teaching at UNCP. Therefore, please give the most accurate statements and ratings that you can. To maintain the independence of your judgment, do not talk with other students as you complete this form. When you are finished, please pass the forms to a student selected by the class. He or she will collect all the forms, place them in an envelope, seal the envelope, and then deliver it to the department secretary. Your instructor will not be present as you complete the form, and he or she will never see any of the original forms. Instead, the instructor will receive a summary of their contents next semester. *Do not include your name.*

I. Written Evaluation. Describe your perceptions of this course. Focus especially on aspects of the course that you found valuable, and offer suggestions for improvements. These comments are considered quite valuable, so please weigh them carefully. Be accurate and give details. Feel free to use as much space as you need.

(continued on the back)

II. Ratings. Begin by finding the space marked NAME at the top of the answer sheet: enter the *name of this course* (NOT your name). Then rate the instructor on the following statements, using the scale given below. Complete the first rating by filling in the appropriate bubble after the space for item 1 on the answer sheet. Continue in this manner until all of the statements have been rated. *Use a dark pencil.*

Scale:

- (a) Strongly Agree
- (b) Agree
- (c) Disagree
- (d) Strongly Disagree
- (e) Don't Know

Statements:

1. Clearly communicated the course plan (objectives, grading and attendance policies, and schedule)
2. Made good use of the materials that students were required to purchase
3. Started and ended class at a dependable, appropriate time
4. Clearly explained specific topics through lectures, discussions, and demonstrations
5. Gave a coherent course (with different parts relating clearly to one another)
6. Related the course to general knowledge and to ideas from other courses
7. Was effective in getting students involved in class sessions
8. Stimulated a desire to learn outside of class and general intellectual curiosity
9. Challenged students and required a sufficient amount of work to achieve the course objectives
10. Was prompt in grading and returning work
11. Accurately measured students' performance through appropriate tests, papers, and other procedures
12. Followed reasonable standards in assigning letter grades to different levels of performance
13. Acted in a courteous and professional manner
14. Was available to students during office hours and for appointments
15. Had a positive, constructive attitude toward the subject
16. In general, taught the course effectively

Supplementary departmental questions are to follow here, if requested.

**Figure 4A.5
Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form**

Current Academic Year _____ *Department* _____

Faculty Member's Name _____

Current Professorial Rank _____

Number of Years at UNCP (including present year) _____

Number of Years in Rank (including present year) _____

Overall Recommendation for Merit Salary Increase - Annual merit salary increase recommendation should reflect the faculty members current year performance rating, the UNC Board of Governors' regulations on the dispersal of salary increase monies, and University-wide constraints set by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and by the Chancellor.

Performance Rating. *Check one:*

Recommended Merit Salary Increase. *Check one:*

Distinguished _____
 Very Good _____
 Adequate _____
 Deficient (explain) _____

High _____
 Medium _____
 Low _____
 None _____

Remarks (optional): _____

 Date

 Signature of Department Chair

 Date

 Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member

I nominate this faculty member for (check one or more):

1. UNC Board of Governors' Award for Excellence in Teaching
2. UNCP Teaching Award
3. Adolph L. Dial Award for Scholarship/Creative Work
4. Adolph L. Dial Award for Community Service

Figure 4A.6
Standard Performance Rating Scale
Faculty Evaluation, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke

This scale is to be used in evaluating each major area of responsibility: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Distinguished performance consists of an exceptionally high degree of success in performing the various duties in the area. To earn a rating in this category, the faculty member should demonstrate exceptional creativity and involvement in performing all the responsibilities related to the area, and these efforts should result in a very high level of effectiveness relative to the opportunities available at the University.

Very good performance consists of an overall pattern of very substantial success in meeting the highest standards of faculty performance. The faculty member may be consistently very good in all domains or may be outstanding in several domains and only good in others.

Adequate performance consists of performance that generally meets minimum standards of faculty performance. This category is also earned when the faculty member is good in some functions and mildly deficient in others so long as the overall contribution to the University is adequate. Any deficiencies lie in secondary domains rather than in those directly impacting on the University's major functions.

Deficient performance consists of an overall pattern of success that is below an acceptable minimum.

Figure 4A.7
Department Chair Evaluation Form

Instructions: This form is for use by a faculty member in evaluating the department chair. The forms are distributed, collected, and assessed by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. 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. Since a rating by itself provides only limited information, you should also write comments in the space provided or on a separate sheet. These comments will be crucial in identifying specific strengths and weaknesses.

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:**

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:**

III. FACULTY EVALUATION: 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:**

IV. REPRESENTATION OF THE DEPARTMENT: 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:**

V. RECRUITMENT OF FACULTY: 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:**

Figure 4A.8

**The University of North Carolina at Pembroke
Post-Tenure 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

Figure 4A.9
Format for Dean's Report of First-Year Comprehensive Review

To: Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Subject: Reports for First-Year Comprehensive Review of _____

I have read the Chair's Report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's Report (and any rebuttals, if provided) and have reviewed any other materials attached to those reports, and I

- _____ Recommend renewal after the probationary year
- _____ Do NOT recommend renewal after the probationary year

Additional Comments (if necessary):

Signature, Dean of the College/School of _____ Date _____

Signature, Faculty Member (if needed) _____ Date _____

Attachments: Chair's Report
Peer Evaluation Committee Report
Rebuttals (if any)

Figure 4A.10
Format for Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase

To: Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Subject: Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase for _____

I have read the Chair's Report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's Report (and any rebuttals, if provided) and have reviewed any other materials attached to those reports.

_____ I agree with the Chair's recommendation.

_____ I do NOT agree with the Chair's recommendation and recommend the following:

- _____ High Merit Salary Increase
- _____ Medium Merit Salary Increase
- _____ Low Merit Salary Increase
- _____ No Merit Salary Increase

Additional Comments (if necessary):

Signature, Dean of the College/School of _____ Date

Signature, Faculty Member (if needed) Date

Attachments: Chair's Report
Rebuttals (if any)

Figure 4A.11
Format for Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion

To: Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Subject: Reports for Tenure/Promotion of _____

I have read the Chair's Report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's Report (and any rebuttals, if provided) and have reviewed any other materials attached to those reports, and I

_____ Recommend Tenure

_____ Recommend Promotion

_____ Do NOT recommend Tenure

_____ Do NOT recommend Promotion

Additional Comments (if necessary):

Signature, Dean of the College/School of _____ Date _____

Signature, Faculty Member (if needed) _____ Date _____

Attachments: Chair's Report
Peer Evaluation Committee Report
Rebuttals (if any)

Figure 4A.12
Format for Dean's Report for Post-Tenure Review

To: Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Subject: Reports for Post-Tenure Review of _____

I have read the Chair's Report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's Report (and any rebuttals, if provided) and have reviewed any other materials attached to those reports.

I evaluate the faculty member's performance as:

_____ Satisfactory
_____ Unsatisfactory

Additional Comments (if necessary):

Signature, Dean of the College/School of _____ Date

Signature, Faculty Member (if needed) Date

Attachments: Chair's Report
Peer Evaluation Committee Report
Rebuttals (if any)