

## 4A

## FACULTY EVALUATION MODEL

### 4A-1 SECTION 1. GENERAL INFORMATION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

This Faculty Evaluation Model has the following sections: principles and criteria upon which faculty evaluations are based (Section 4A-2); principles informing the roles of different parties in the faculty evaluation (Sections 4A-3 and 4A-4); evaluation procedures for each type of evaluation (Sections 4A-4 to 4A-11); and evaluation forms (Figures 4A.1 to 4A.10) and Calendars of Events for each type of evaluation (Tables 1-4).

This model covers evaluations of full-time faculty members and evaluations by faculty members of department chairs, but does not cover administrators or academic support personnel even though they may hold faculty rank. Full-time teaching faculty are those who teach at least nine semesters hours. Some faculty who would normally be considered full-time but who have been reassigned to other non-teaching duties are to adjust the weights in their self-evaluations to account for those other responsibilities. Performance in such non-teaching functions will be evaluated by whomever the faculty member reports to for those responsibilities.

Full-time faculty receive annual evaluations (Section 4A-6), as well as evaluations for promotion and/or tenure (Section 4A-7) and for first and/or second year contract renewal and advisory evaluations (Section 4A-8). Tenured faculty receive comprehensive, periodic, cumulative evaluation every five years, or five years from the last review related to tenure and/or promotion (Section 4A-11). Procedures for non-tenure-track faculty are also described (Section 4A-9). Faculty members are evaluated in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) to which flexible area weights are assigned (Section 4A-2). Overall evaluation is recorded on standard evaluation forms (Figures 4A.1, 4A.3, 4A.4), and measured in accordance with a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6). Overall performance ratings become the basis for annual recommendations for merit salary increases (Figure 4A.5), as well as for tenure, promotion, or contract renewal recommendations (Figure 4A.3). In this Model, the phrase "major evaluations" denotes evaluations for tenure, promotion, or contract renewal.

Librarians with faculty rank are evaluated under the provisions of the Faculty Handbook, Section 3-13, Policy Statement on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Professional Librarians. Evaluation of library services, including performance of library personnel, is delegated to the Academic Support Services Sub-Committee of the Faculty Senate. Evaluations (first-year, annual, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review) of professional librarians with faculty rank will follow the same general procedures that are applied to teaching faculty, with exceptions dependent on the special responsibilities of librarians. Those responsibilities are outlined in general terms as criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure in Section 3-13 of the Faculty Handbook.

Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion are advised to consult also Section 3-12 of the Faculty Handbook, which outlines University-wide criteria for tenure and promotion.

The underlying philosophy of this Model is that evaluation of faculty performance is a complex process which should promote a reasonable degree of equity and consistency for all individuals and academic departments. The Model should be implemented in a way that enhances faculty development and promotes faculty achievement and satisfaction, while also promoting the mission of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke.

As a means to help insure fairness, in all formal evaluations, a faculty member has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspects of reports submitted by Deans, department chairs or Peer Evaluation Committees. Each entity in the evaluation process, therefore, is to submit a copy of its report to the faculty member being evaluated.

All phases of evaluation are to be guided by the principles set forth in Sections 4A-1 to 4A-3. Individual faculty members have latitude in the roles they assume as they fulfill their responsibilities to the University and its mission. The Model encourages flexibility in applying the principles and criteria for each area of faculty evaluation (Section 4A-2), allowing for the varying needs and traditions of different academic disciplines. The model also specifies procedures (Sections 4A-4 to 4A-10) that promote consistency in evaluation. This evaluation model will be reviewed periodically by the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee and amended as the Faculty Senate deems appropriate.

While this Model attempts to be reasonably comprehensive with respect to policies and procedures, faculty members should also be familiar with other sections of the Faculty Handbook concerning tenure and promotion criteria (Section 3-12), grievance procedures (Section 4-1.3), and hearing procedures (due process: Section 3-4). Further, employment at the University and conduct as a faculty member are governed by sections of The Code of the University of North Carolina (copies of which are available from department chairs and the Office for Academic Affairs); faculty members should consult that document as well as the Faculty Handbook.

## 4A-2 SECTION 2. FACULTY EVALUATION: PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA

### 4A-2.1 Areas of Faculty Evaluation

For purposes of evaluation, all faculty responsibilities are divided among three general areas as specified in the opening sentence of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke Mission Statement in the University Catalog: "The University of North Carolina at Pembroke is a comprehensive University committed to academic excellence in a balanced program of teaching, research, and service." Some activities, such as grant-related work, may fall into several areas and should be evaluated accordingly.

Throughout Section 4A-2, the term "knowledge" is used as a broad summary term intended to include factual information, epistemological and empirical principles, artistic technique, empirical and interpretive methodologies, reasoning skills, and so forth.

## 4A-2.2 Evaluation of Teaching

### A. Principles and Definitions

At The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, teaching is the single most important responsibility of regular full-time faculty members. According to our Mission Statement, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke "provides an intellectual environment created by a faculty dedicated to effective teaching, interaction with students and scholarship." Teaching thus receives an area weight of 50%-70% in a faculty member's evaluation, unless an exception is granted in writing (see Section 4A-6.1 A.1).

The teaching area has two components. Classroom teaching includes all activities involved in preparing and conducting the courses which a faculty member is assigned to teach. Auxiliary teaching activities may include submitting grades, supervising student research projects or other learning not directly tied to a class, administration of teaching-related grants, cooperating with colleagues in planning curricula, cooperating with university-wide and departmental curricular objectives, and pursuing professional growth as a teacher.

### B. Criteria

1. Classroom teaching effectiveness is evaluated in terms of six broad dimensions:

a. Imparting general knowledge: Effective teachers impart a sound and up-to-date understanding of the concepts, categories, principles, summaries, and other generalizations that apply to the topics within a course, providing a foundation for other learning. Even courses in applied techniques present conceptual frameworks, which may be communicated through demonstrations, exercises, and discussions as well as lectures. Typically, success in imparting general content is evidenced by students' capacity to explain what they have learned; to understand new information in the area; to apply their knowledge to new problems and contexts; and to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information.

b. Imparting specific knowledge: Effective teachers impart a representative, unbiased, selection of facts, examples, and other details that enrich a course's general content. In a successful course, specific content authenticates and illustrates concepts, stimulates the imagination, and presents logical relationships between specific and general content clearly.

c. Developing skills: Effective teachers develop students' capacity to perform various types of skills. Some of these skills reinforce course content. Other skills involve broader intellectual operations that underlie most university courses, such as creativity, oral and written

communication skills, critical thinking, research methods, computer proficiency, and basic quantitative reasoning. Since many students need to develop basic skills, success in this area is an important component of effective teaching.

d. Motivating students: Effective teachers elicit from students a strong desire to learn. Motivated students prepare for class sessions, pay attention during class, participate in discussions, complete assigned work, rehearse skills, and study for examinations. Motivated students also show confidence, curiosity, and creativity; they strive for excellence in completing assignments; and they take an interest in non-required material and further course work in the area covered. Effective teaching practices to stimulate motivation are also addressed below.

e. Setting requirements and evaluating performance: Effective teachers fairly and accurately evaluate student learning while also providing students with specific feedback that promotes further learning. Performance standards are appropriate to course content and course level. Examinations, papers, and other assignments are sufficient, varied, and challenging; are appropriate to course content, course objectives, and students' background; and allow students to demonstrate their learning. Student work is graded carefully and returned in a timely manner with appropriate feedback. Student failure is handled constructively.

f. Success with effective teaching practices: Effective teachers provide syllabi with clear course objectives and requirements; use teaching techniques (e.g., lectures, demonstrations, exercises, and discussions) that are effective and appropriate to fulfill course objectives; meet their classes as scheduled; set high expectations and help students meet them; involve students in active and cooperative learning; and continually review and revise courses. Effective teachers are enthusiastic and intellectually involved, treat students with respect and courtesy, offer extra assistance to students, and encourage students to consult with them outside of class.

2. Auxiliary teaching activities are evaluated by criteria appropriate to these activities, such as submitting valid grades in a timely manner, effectively supervising student research projects or other learning not directly tied to a class, working constructively with peers to develop curricula, supporting University and departmental objectives, and participating in activities for professional development as a teacher.

### C. Documentation

1. Major evaluations (renewal, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review) shall include documentation of teaching effectiveness. This documentation typically includes copies of representative syllabi, tests, assignments, and handouts; samples of student work and the faculty member's response to the work; and Student Evaluation Reports (Section 4A-6.2 D). This documentation is typically not required for annual evaluations.

For major evaluations (renewal, tenure, promotion), reports on classroom observations by the department chair and members of a Peer Evaluation Committee are required (see Sections

4A-7 and 4A-8 for procedures).

2. Auxiliary teaching activities may be documented by copies of student research projects, outlines of new curricula to which a contribution was made, and records of participation in activities for professional development as a teacher (workshops, seminars, conferences, etc).

#### 4A-2.3 Evaluation of Scholarship

##### A. Principles and Definitions

Though teaching is their fundamental responsibility, all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a balanced pattern of scholarship and service over the previous three years of employment at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Scholarship receives an area weight of 10% to 40% in a faculty member's evaluation unless an exception is granted in writing (see Section 4A-6.1 A.1). Scholarly work in progress, if appropriately documented, is recognized as a component of scholarship, but completed works of scholarship receive greater weight in evaluation. In promotion and tenure decisions, a consistent pattern of completed scholarly projects is expected.

Scholarship (scholarly research and/or scholarly publication) is defined as a set of disciplined intellectual activities that create or refine knowledge and exert influence through public dissemination in an academically respectable format. This definition of scholarship includes creative activity appropriate to the arts.

1. Scholarly research is defined as (a) creating basic knowledge, (b) compiling or synthesizing knowledge, (c) applying existing basic knowledge to the solution of practical problems, (d) applying professional knowledge and skills to artistic problems, or (e) completing a special program of intellectual development.

Scholarly research may include research involved in the dissemination of scholarship or the preparation of scholarly publications, as an editor or reviewer.

Attendance at professional conferences and workshops can contribute to a faculty member's scholarly research and may count among scholarly activities in a given year. Over time, however, conference attendance without scholarly publication (see below) in itself is not considered scholarship.

Preparation and administration of grants qualifies as scholarly research only insofar as it entails the activities cited above.

2. Scholarly publication is defined as employing accepted techniques to publicly communicate research to (a) scholarly audiences, (b) student audiences, or (c) general audiences. Although most scholarly publication is intended primarily for other scholars, a publication that informs a

broader audience is acceptable as long as the format of the publication is appropriate to a discipline.

## B. Criteria

1. Specialized criteria: Scholarship is evaluated primarily against specialized criteria appropriate to the disciplines of each department and consistent with a department's evaluation plan. The quality of scholarly publication is typically ensured through a peer review process appropriate to its audience.

2. General criteria for evaluating scholarship include (a) significance, indicated by judged intellectual depth and scope, originality, and potential benefit to academia or society at large; and (b) peer review or recognition, indicated by publication in a refereed journal, publication in book form by a scholarly press or other recognized publisher, or presentation at a recognized forum for work in progress. National and international forums are typically accorded greater significance than regional ones. In tenure and promotion decisions, completed projects carry more weight than works in progress.

## C. Documentation

Typical documentation of scholarship includes copies of scholarly publications, books, conference papers, catalogs, or programs, and similar evidence of professional productivity in the faculty member's discipline. Less important is evidence of attendance at workshops, seminars, conferences, performances, or other activities even when they may directly contribute to a faculty member's scholarly or creative projects.

When such projects require longer periods of time to complete, a faculty member may provide evidence of significant progress toward completion, including paper presentations, contracts for book publication, or external peer comments on a paper or partial manuscript. In cases where the confidential nature of a research project prevents its wider dissemination, a faculty member should provide appropriate documentation.

## 4A-2.4 Evaluation of Service

### A. Principles and Definitions

Though teaching is a fundamental responsibility, all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to have a balanced pattern of scholarship and service over the previous three years of employment at The University of North Carolina at Pembroke. Service receives an area weight of 10% to 40% in a faculty member's evaluation unless an exception is granted in writing (see Section 4A-6.1 A.1).

Service is divided into three categories: University service, professional service, and external

and community service. Faculty members may apportion their service activities among these categories as they deem appropriate or as they are needed by the University (e.g. required service to area public schools).

1. University service includes any University-related activities other than teaching and scholarship that promote the welfare of the University. Activities within and outside one's academic department (academic advisement of students, mentoring, preparation of grant applications, administrative activities associated with external grants and student activities, committee work and involvement in faculty governance, revision of curricula, preparation of accreditation reports, and similar voluntary activities not assigned as position responsibilities) may be considered University service.

Collegiality (willingness and ability to cooperate with colleagues) may be considered relevant to evaluation of service. If so, assessment of collegiality should be based solely on the faculty member's capacity to relate constructively to peers, including his or her impact on others' work.

2. Professional service consists of activities that benefit a faculty member's field of professional expertise. Professional service may include serving on professional committees and governing boards, serving as an officer in a professional organization, organizing and chairing sessions at professional meetings, and performing routine editing and reviewing. A professional activity for which remuneration is granted is evaluated as service only in cases where any compensation is very limited (e.g., expenses or a small honorarium).

3. External and community service connotes activities that are (a) charitable, and (b) performed for the benefit of individuals or groups separate from the University and from the wider profession. External service might include participating on committees and governing boards; speaking to non-professional audiences about topics in one's discipline; providing professional consultation to schools, civic organizations, and government agencies; or providing leadership on public matters related to the faculty member's discipline. An external service activity for which remuneration is granted is evaluated as service only in cases where any compensation is very limited (e.g., expenses or a small honorarium).

## B. Criteria

1. University service is evaluated when possible by results: advisees graduated without major difficulties, grant applications completed, grants successfully administered, activities of student organizations, valuable contributions to a committee's projects, completion of reports, gaining accreditation, and similar accomplishments. Listing committee membership as a form of service implies that one has fulfilled at least the basic responsibilities of membership.

2. Professional service is evaluated when possible by results: by the importance of contributions made, by how demanding activities were, and by how well objectives were achieved.

3. External and community service is evaluated when possible by results: by the importance of contributions made, by how demanding activities were, and by how well objectives were achieved.

### C. Documentation

Service must be documented by appropriate materials only when it is granted a large area weight (15% or more) in an annual evaluation or is offered as support for contract renewal or for promotion or tenure. In general, letters of appreciation from organizers of service opportunities should be used as documentation only if they indicate an exceptional contribution.

1. University service may be documented by materials such as lists of advisees or advisement appointments, copies of reports or grants prepared, minutes of meetings, and supporting statements by department chairs, committee chairs, or the Office of Grants.

2. Professional service may be documented by printed or widely distributed materials such as conference programs, flyers, or minutes of meetings, or by statements from chairs or presidents.

3. External and community service may be documented by printed or widely distributed materials such as conference programs, flyers, or minutes of meetings, or by statements from chairs or presidents.

## 4A-3 SECTION 3. PARTICIPANTS IN FACULTY EVALUATION: PRINCIPLES AND ROLES

All evaluators should be guided by the traditions of academic freedom. Also, all evaluators are required to maintain confidentiality about all the information and decisions involved, except for disclosures required by their formal reporting responsibilities.

### 4A-3.1 The Faculty Member Being Evaluated

The main kinds of evaluations of faculty members, which are explained in more detail in Section 4A-4, are as follows. Each full-time faculty member, even a faculty member not tenured or in a tenure-track position, receives annual evaluations. In addition, faculty members in tenure-track positions receive evaluations for tenure and for each promotion. Untenured tenure-track faculty receive first and/or second year evaluations and may receive advisory evaluations.

Non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually (Section 4A-9).

Because of the complexity and specialized nature of academic work, a faculty member's self-evaluation should be a primary source of information about the goals, methods, and degree of success associated with his or her performance. Faculty members are responsible for representing their work accurately and providing appropriate documentation for their claims (see Section 4A-2). Faculty members should have considerable freedom to allocate their time

and effort in ways that use their competencies most productively, while still fulfilling their responsibilities to the University. To allow individual choices to play a meaningful role in self-evaluation, the faculty member indicates a set of annual area weights when completing a Self-Evaluation Report (see Figure 4A.1). These weights are taken into account by evaluators in developing overall performance evaluations. In all formal evaluations, the candidate has the right to submit a rebuttal pertaining to any aspects of reports submitted by the Dean, department chair, or the Peer Evaluation Committee.

#### 4A-3.2 Students

Students who take a faculty member's courses play a prominent role in evaluating the faculty member's teaching. They submit information on a Student Evaluation of Instruction Form (Figure 4A.4), from which summaries are compiled for each course, consisting of numerical data as well as all student comments. Student evaluations must be administered in a manner that conveys their importance and protects students' sense of freedom to give candid evaluations. Students should also have significant input in developing or selecting the instruments used to gather their evaluations of teaching (see Section 4A-6.2.A.).

Student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to validly judge a faculty member's performance as a teacher; hence, evaluation of teaching effectiveness involves a variety of types of documentation (see Section 4A-2.2. C.)

#### 4A-3.3 The Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for (a) coordinating the evaluation process at the departmental level, (b) providing the primary administrative evaluation of the faculty member's performance, and (c) promoting the professional growth of the department's faculty. In years prior to tenure and/or promotion decisions, the department chair is strongly encouraged to provide each faculty member with constructive, timely guidance about the means by which any deficiencies can be corrected.

A Department Chair's Evaluation Report includes assigning performance ratings, recommending merit salary increases in annual evaluations, and reporting on classroom observation for major evaluations. In preparing the Department Chair's Evaluation Report for a faculty member, a chair should use the Format for Evaluation Reports (Figure 4A.1) and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6). Serious consideration must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s).

#### 4A-3.4 The Peer Evaluation Committee

The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report in decisions involving tenure and/or promotion, as well as in first year and other contract renewal evaluations (see Section 4A-7.3 A. and 4A-7.4) and in post-tenure review evaluations

(see Section 4A-11.3.C). The report is based on documentation submitted by the faculty member being evaluated, classroom observations, and external review if called for. The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. To retain the special value of their perspective, Committee's evaluation should be independent of the department chair's evaluation.

In preparing the Peer Evaluation Report for a faculty member, a Peer Evaluation Committee should use the Format for Evaluation Reports (Figure 4A.1) and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6). Serious consideration must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s).

#### 4A-3.5 The Deans of Schools and Colleges

The Deans of Schools and Colleges are responsible for monitoring the evaluation process for compliance with the Faculty Evaluation Model as well as for overall fairness and equity. After reviewing the materials submitted by the Department Chair, Peer Evaluation Committee (if provided), and the faculty member under review, the Dean will complete the Dean's Recommendation or Report form (Figures 4A.9-4A.12), which will then be forwarded, with the materials the Dean has reviewed, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Academic units (for example, the library and the nursing program currently) that are not under the supervision of a Dean will submit evaluation reports directly to the Office for Academic Affairs.

#### 4A-3.6 The Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure Committee advises the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on matters of promotion and tenure. This University wide committee attempts to ensure a fair and consistent application of promotion and tenure standards. The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are to (a) gather the reports of the department chair and Peer Evaluation Committee, (b) request any additional information that it deems necessary, (c) examine all facets of the application, and (d) reach an equitable final decision. Responsibilities in the tenure and/or promotion process are discussed below (Section 4A-7.5).

##### A. Composition and restrictions on membership of the Committee:

1. The Committee will consist of five faculty members, one elected from each Faculty Senate division. The Committee on Committees and Elections will conduct faculty-wide elections for the divisional representatives under procedures outlined in the By-laws of the Faculty Constitution.

2. Membership is restricted to full-time faculty members; no department chair or other

administrator shall be eligible to serve. Department chairs and administrators may act as resource persons to the Committee.

3. Only those faculty members with tenure and the rank of associate or full professor are eligible for election to the Committee.
4. Membership is for three-year staggered terms. A member may not succeed him or herself.
5. A member of the Committee (Promotion and Tenure) shall not serve concurrently on the Faculty Hearing Committee or the Faculty Grievance Committee or a Tenure and Promotion Peer Evaluation Committee, but shall be eligible to serve on First Year Peer Evaluation Committees.
6. No member may receive a major evaluation while serving on the Committee. A member who is to receive a major evaluation must resign from the Committee by September 21 of the year of the evaluation so that a replacement may be elected. If a member fails to resign by that date, his or her major evaluation is aborted.
7. No member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall serve concurrently on the Faculty Hearing Committee or the Faculty Grievance Committee or a Tenure and Promotion Peer Evaluation Committee, but shall be eligible to serve on First Year Evaluation Committees.

#### B. Procedures

1. Committee leadership. At the final meeting in the spring semester, the Committee will select a chair and vice chair. The chairmanship rotates among divisions. The vice chair should represent the next division in the regular rotation. A member may serve as chair only once during his or her term. The chair is responsible for conducting meetings, insuring that all pertinent provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model are followed, using standard parliamentary procedures in reaching decisions, insuring confidentiality of proceedings, and preparing and distributing the Committee's final reports. Should the chair abstain from a case, the vice chair will preside; the vice chair will also assist in preparation of final reports.
2. Coordination with the Office for Academic Affairs. At the first meeting of the fall semester, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs briefs the Committee on the results of the previous committee's recommendations and on the forthcoming candidacies to be considered. Throughout the year, the Committee chair serves as the liaison between the Committee and the Office for Academic Affairs for matters pertaining to promotion and tenure decisions.
3. Quorum requirements and abstentions. A quorum of four members is required to conduct preliminary meetings, and a quorum of all five members is required for final decisions. In any decision that involves a conflict of interest on the part of a member, that member is to notify the other members and abstain from all deliberations and votes on that decision.

4. Report preparation. In preparing the Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Report for a faculty member, the committee is to follow the Format for Evaluation Reports (Figure 4A.1); complete the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form (Figure 4A.3); and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6). Serious consideration must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s). The Committee's final recommendation should be an independent judgment based on summaries of the overall record and the Committee's resolution of any disagreements between the candidate and other evaluators. The Committee should strive for consistency over time in applying criteria and making decisions.

#### 4A-3.7 The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee

The Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee is responsible for representing the norms and values of the general faculty in all matters related to the Faculty Evaluation Model.

When the current provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model do not provide adequate instruction on a specific procedural matter, the party involved may request an ad hoc ruling from the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee. This ruling will be forwarded for consideration to the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee's parent committee, the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee.

#### 4A-3.8 The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for making recommendations about a faculty member's salary increases, merit salary increases, tenure, promotion, and contract renewal to the Chancellor, based on recommendations and materials submitted by the department chair and other evaluators. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is also responsible for establishing and maintaining a general climate conducive to successful implementation of the Faculty Evaluation Model and for fostering conditions in which high levels of faculty achievement can occur. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs may modify deadlines in the evaluation process as circumstances warrant.

1. Recommendations about salary and about tenure, promotion, and contract renewal: In reviewing department chairs' salary recommendations, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should balance the need for institutional accountability with the need to provide equitable opportunities for annual merit salary increases. In cases of tenure, promotion, and contract renewal, the recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor to the Chancellor should provide the faculty member with a fair, reasonable decision that serves the interests of the University.

2. Implementation climate: The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for collaborating with department chairs to develop a uniform set of norms for

interpreting the meaning of the Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A-6). These norms will necessarily represent some discipline-related variations across departments, especially in the area of scholarship. Beyond such variations, no department chair should be permitted to use standards that deviate from the general norms and practices of the University.

3. Promoting faculty achievement: The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should facilitate faculty development in teaching, scholarly activities, and service. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should encourage department chairs to schedule teaching assignments judiciously and appropriately, and to award reassigned time to faculty members as necessary. Working with the Faculty Research and Development Committee and the University's Office of Grants, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should promote a healthy program of both internal and external funding for scholarly and creative work.

#### 4A-3.9 The Chancellor

As Chief Executive Officer of the University, the Chancellor is responsible for facilitating the work of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and others in implementing the Faculty Evaluation Model and promoting faculty achievement. The Chancellor receives, reviews, and acts upon all evaluative materials provided by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After reviewing the materials produced by the final evaluation process, the Chancellor takes actions regarding salary and employment.

#### 4A-4 SECTION 4. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY: GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The evaluation procedures described in this section are designed to attain the following objectives:

- (a) provide every faculty member with adequate information on how evaluations will be conducted;
- (b) promote a reasonable degree of equity and consistency both within and among departments;
- (c) provide procedures that allow a reasonable degree of flexibility for faculty; and
- (d) define the relationship between the various components of an evaluation and the final decision of the evaluator.

New faculty members should be informed of the evaluation procedures during their orientation to the University and should be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the Faculty Evaluation Model.

#### 4A-4.1 Annual Evaluation

The annual evaluation provides the basis for merit salary increases and ongoing administrative

supervision of faculty. It consists of a Self-Evaluation Report, Student Evaluation Report, Chair's Evaluation Report, an Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and a recommendation by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Every full-time faculty member is evaluated annually. Faculty members on leave of absence are not evaluated, and part-time faculty are evaluated by department chairs using procedures developed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Procedures are explained in Section 4A-6 and the Calendar of Events is shown in Table 1. Annual evaluation reports from previous years are used in evaluations for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion.

#### 4A-4.2 Evaluation for Tenure and/or Promotion

Evaluations for decisions concerning tenure and/or promotion of tenure-track faculty include:

- Self-Evaluation Report
- Student Evaluation Report
- Current-year Chair's Evaluation Report (with Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form)
- A minimum of the previous three year's Chair's Evaluation Reports
- Peer Evaluation Report (with Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form)
- Promotion and Tenure Committee Evaluation Report (with Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form)
- Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion
- Recommendation by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

All tenure track faculty are evaluated for tenure and/or promotion no later than their sixth year of employment at the University. All faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion also receive a major evaluation. Procedures are explained in Section 4A-7 and the Calendar of Events is shown in Table 2. See Section 3.3 of the Faculty Handbook for Tenure Regulations.

A faculty member being considered for promotion who is a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must resign that membership by September 21, if he or she is to be considered for a promotion in that academic year.

#### 4A-4.3 First and/or Second Year Evaluation for Contract Renewal and Advisory Evaluations

All faculty, including non-tenure-track faculty, receive a major evaluation in their first year of employment at the University. In subsequent years, a major evaluation for untenured faculty is optional at the discretion of the faculty member or department chair. Peer evaluations of visiting faculty are at the option of the department chair and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Evaluations after the second year (but prior to tenure and/or promotion evaluation) may be

initiated by a tenure-track faculty member or by his/her chair anytime during the tenure-track process and will be advisory in nature.

For additional information and procedures see Section 4A-8 and the Calendar of Events in Table 3.

#### 4A-4.4 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

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

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.

For additional information and procedures, see Section 4A-11.

#### 4A-5 SECTION 5. OPTIONAL DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN

The general objectives of the Faculty Evaluation Model (Sections 4A-1 to 4A-4) may be attained by other methods. Departments that prefer to modify criteria or procedures are strongly encouraged to develop a Departmental Evaluation Plan. That plan may provide specific criteria as supplements to the Principles and Criteria (Section 4A-2), and may substitute alternatives for the Format for Evaluation Reports (Figure 4A.1), the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form (Figure 4A.4), and the Department Chair Evaluation Form (Figure 4A.7). In developing any alternative Student Evaluation of Instruction Form, a department should obtain input from its students.

An acceptable plan must (a) adhere to the guiding principles and procedural objectives in this document; (b) conform to all deadlines established herein; (c) produce a final output that can be expressed in terms of the Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form (Figure 4A.5) and the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form (Figure 4A.3); (d) be approved by a two-thirds majority of the department's full-time faculty; and (e) be approved by the Faculty Senate. Departmental plans are required to be reasonably consistent across time so that no individual's evaluation is affected by temporary, arbitrary, or radical changes. The Office for Academic Affairs will maintain a file of all approved departmental plans for examination by all faculty members.

## 4A-6 SECTION 6. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

Every faculty member is evaluated every academic year. The annual evaluation includes a(n): (1) Self-Evaluation Report, (2) Student Evaluation Report, (3) Chair's Evaluation Report, (4) Chair's Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation, (5) the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase, and (6) recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Procedures for compiling these reports are listed below. The Calendar of Events for Annual Evaluations appears in Table 1.

### 4A-6.1 Faculty Self-Evaluation Report

In the Self-Evaluation Report, the faculty member must discuss his or her teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, each component is assigned an area weight reflective of the time, effort, and accomplishments in each area. The following sections present guidelines to assist the faculty member in compiling the Self-Evaluation report. These guidelines are intended as a general overview of the specific information that should appear in a faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report both in terms of area weights and subheadings (see Figure 4.1.).

#### A. Area Weights

1. Allocation of area weights: A faculty member must specify an area weight for each of the three areas of evaluation. For faculty with a regular 12-hour teaching load, these percentages must conform to the following ranges: teaching, 50% - 70%; scholarship, 10% - 40%; and service, 10% - 40%. For any given academic year, the sum of these weights must equal 100%. Faculty members with unusual teaching loads are to adjust the ranges appropriately. A request for an exemption from these standards must be submitted in writing and approved by the chair of the faculty member's department. Exceptions to these standards will be granted in reference to department needs. Grounds for an exemption may include, for example, additional teaching duties, administrative or grant activity, or retraining and retooling in the methodology appropriate to a faculty member's discipline. Faculty members may discuss their area weights with the department chair at any time prior to completing their self-evaluation.

2. Adjustment of area weights. When circumstances create special demands on a department, a chair may require a faculty member to adapt his or her pattern of responsibilities to meet such demands. The department chair must inform the faculty member in writing of the circumstances and the adjustments required. The faculty member may then adjust his or her area weights on the Self-Evaluation Report as he or she deems appropriate.

If the department chair is concerned that a prior pattern of area weights is not generating a record adequate for tenure in the department, the chair should recommend that a faculty member adjust his or her weights in future years.

Adjustments in area weights may also be needed if a faculty member's teaching load is reduced

to allow for other types of activities, such as research or administrative responsibilities.

## B. Format of Faculty Self-Evaluation Report

The faculty Self-Evaluation Report should be structured so that subheadings indicate the items reported and indicate appropriate area weights for each subheading. See Figure 4A.1 for an example of how the report should be structured and the subheadings listed.

## 4A-6.2 Student Evaluations of Instruction

Students evaluate the teaching of all teaching faculty. Results are summarized in a Student Evaluation Report. In the following sections, the procedures, format, and reporting of these student evaluations are discussed.

### A. Policies for Student Evaluations

All course instructors (full- or part-time faculty, department chairs, or administrators who teach) are evaluated by students in all their classes during one semester of each academic year. The Student Evaluation of Instruction Form must be approved by the Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate (see Figure 4A.4). A department may add up to five supplementary items or scales to this form without approval from the Senate. Alternatively, a department may develop a substitute Student Evaluation of Instruction Form in lieu of the general form. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve any alternate forms.

### B. Collection Procedures for Student Evaluations

Instructors being evaluated by students must employ the following evaluation procedures. First, the class is to select a student who will distribute the forms, collect the completed forms, place them in an envelope, and return the sealed envelope to the department secretary. Second, the faculty member must be absent from class while the evaluations are completed. Third, the faculty member being evaluated must not tabulate the student evaluations. Fourth, the faculty member must not receive any report on his or her evaluations until grades for the current semester have been submitted; verbatim evaluation statements will be transcribed when possible. Faculty members are encouraged to conduct student evaluations at the beginning of a class session, to allow adequate time to complete them.

Student evaluation of graduate instruction follows the same procedures as in undergraduate instruction. Graduate courses are evaluated following procedures approved by the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate. These procedures can be found in the Graduate Faculty Handbook.

### C. Schedule of Student Evaluations

All first-year faculty are to be evaluated by students in both fall and spring semesters. Other faculty members are to be evaluated once a year on the following schedule:

Academic years that begin in an odd-numbered year (e.g., fall, 1995-spring, 1996)

Faculty whose last names begin A - M are evaluated in the fall semester

Faculty whose last names begin N - Z are evaluated in the spring semester

Academic years that begin in an even-numbered year (e.g., fall, 1996-spring, 1997)

Faculty whose last names begin N - Z are evaluated in the fall semester

Faculty whose last names begin A - M are evaluated in the spring semester

### D. Preparation of Student Evaluation Reports

A quantitative summary of the ratings in each course is prepared as soon as possible and transcripts of student comments are prepared when possible. The faculty member being evaluated must not prepare the quantitative summary or the transcript of comments. The department chair must retain the raw Student Evaluation of Instruction Forms for as long as these may be required for future evaluation reviews.

After grades have been submitted, the faculty member receives copies of the quantitative summaries and copies of the transcribed student comments if available. The faculty member may examine the original comments in the department chair's office.

The department chair prepares the Student Evaluation Report, based on both undergraduate and graduate student evaluations, to be included in the annual Chair's Evaluation Report, by summarizing in a narrative the quantitative summaries and individual comments given by students.

## 4A-6.3 Annual Chair's Evaluation Report

As specified in Section 4A-4, each department chair must compile an annual Chair's Evaluation Report for each faculty member in the department. This report consists of the (a) faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report, (b) Student Evaluation Report, (c) chair's narrative evaluation, and (d) Chair's Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form. In the following sections, the Chair's Evaluation Report and the Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form are discussed.

### A. Policies for Annual Chair's Evaluation Report

Each chair must compile and submit to the Office for Academic Affairs an annual Chair's Evaluation Report for each faculty member he or she supervises. This report should discuss the

faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service. This report should conform to the general guidelines of the Format for Evaluation Reports (Sections 4A-6.1; Figure 4A.1), with the addition of: (1) a narrative synthesis of the faculty member's performance, (2) an overall rating of the faculty member using the Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6) , and (3) a signature section for the department chair and faculty member being evaluated. The information appearing in the annual Chair's Evaluation Report for a faculty member will be drawn from (a) the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report, (b) student evaluations, and (c) the department chair's observations on teaching, scholarship, and service. Even when a major (e.g., first-year) evaluation has been conducted earlier in the academic year, a separate annual evaluation is required for purposes of a merit salary increase recommendation, since most of the year's work will have been completed after the earlier major evaluation.

The department chair is required to obtain the faculty member's signature on the Chair's Evaluation Report and the Annual Merit Salary Increase Form. In both instances, the signature merely acknowledges having reviewed the report and form, but does not indicate agreement with their content.

#### B. Chair's Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form

The department chair's recommendation on the Annual Merit Salary Increase Recommendation Form (Figure 4A.5) is based on information developed in the annual Chair's Evaluation Report for each faculty member, and must reflect the UNC Board of Governors' regulations for the dispersal of salary increase monies and the constraints set for The University of North Carolina at Pembroke by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and by the Chancellor. The recommendation is to correspond to the overall performance rating contained in the Chair's Evaluation Report, as indicated by the relationships below.

Overall Performance Rating	Recommended Merit Salary Increase
Distinguished	High Plus
Very Good	High
Adequate	Medium
Deficient	Low or No Increase

#### 4A-6.4 Annual Dean's Evaluation Report

After reviewing the materials the Department Chairs submit, the Dean of the relevant college or school will complete the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase form for each faculty member. Within three days, each faculty member will sign the Dean's Recommendation, acknowledging having seen it but not necessarily agreement with it. One copy of the signed Dean's Recommendation will be retained by the faculty member. The Dean will then forward the recommendation, with the materials submitted by the Department Chair, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

In the event that the Dean's recommendation does not agree with that of the Department Chair, the Dean shall justify that decision with appropriate comments on the Dean's Recommendation for Annual Salary Increase form. The faculty member shall have the right to rebut comments made on the Dean's Recommendation form; such rebuttal shall be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 10 days of the faculty member's signing of the Dean's recommendation.

#### 4A-6.5 Annual Provost's Evaluation Report

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs reviews all the evaluative materials submitted by the Deans and recommends to the Chancellor whether or not to increase each faculty member's salary and how much to increase the salary, if an increase is recommended.

#### 4A-6.6 Chancellor's Evaluation

After reviewing all the materials accumulated by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and considering the recommendation of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor makes the final decision on all faculty salary increases.

### 4A-7 SECTION 7. PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

All Assistant and Associate Professors receive a tenure and/or promotion evaluation no later than their sixth year of employment at the University. In the following sections, the tenure and/or promotion evaluation procedures and documents are discussed. See Section 4A-4 B and Tables 2 and 3 for descriptions and Calendars of Events for these evaluations.

Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion also should consult Section 3-12, of the Faculty Handbook, which outlines University-wide criteria for tenure and/or promotion.

#### 4A-7.1 Notification and Scheduling of Tenure and Promotion Evaluations

The department chair is responsible for ascertaining when mandatory tenure and/or promotion evaluations are due. The department chair is responsible for announcing these occasions by September 7, in letters to the candidate, the Dean of the faculty member's school or college, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The letter to the candidate must indicate that the Self-Evaluation Report, Student Evaluation Reports, Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form, and supporting materials are due by September 21. Although there are established eligibility dates for faculty members applying for tenure and promotion (Faculty Handbook, Section 3-3), a faculty member may request consideration for tenure and/or promotion earlier than these dates. To exercise this option, a faculty member must petition in writing to the department chair, the Dean of the relevant school or college, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs by August 21 of the

current academic year. Otherwise, evaluation for promotion and tenure will occur in accordance with established dates.

#### 4A-7.2 Responsibilities of the Faculty Member in Relation to Tenure and Promotion

A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or tenure must submit the documentation listed below to the department chair by September 21. Other possible actions are also listed.

##### A. Forms and Documents Submitted by a Faculty Member

For renewal of contract, promotion, and tenure, the candidate must complete and submit the following items:

1. An expanded Self-Evaluation Report that covers the entire period under consideration (e.g. one to six years for tenure, or the period since the last major evaluation) with an emphasis on the past three years of employment.
2. A summary of teaching effectiveness indicated by Student Evaluation Reports for the period under consideration, and by current course syllabi and course materials (assignments, handouts, tests, etc.) for one general education course, one upper division course, and one graduate course when appropriate. Current year student evaluations for faculty members considered for tenure and/or promotion will not be included due to the difficulty of obtaining valid reports early in the semester. Instead, prior-year Student Evaluation Reports (from department chair or Office for Academic Affairs files) will be used.
3. Evidence of scholarship (e.g., conference papers, publications, books) or other evidence of professional activity related to a faculty's particular discipline (e.g., works in progress, creative works, participation in recitals or exhibitions).
4. A completed Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form (Figure 4A.2). A faculty member being evaluated may not nominate another faculty member who is also being considered for tenure and/or promotion during the same academic year, the department chair, or a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

##### B. Optional External Review

A faculty member may request an external review of his or her scholarship to support an application for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty members wishing to do so must submit a written request to the department chair by October 7. The Peer Evaluation Committee may also request an external review of a faculty member's scholarship by following the same procedure. In either case, the candidate is solely responsible for providing (a) an outline of specialty areas and materials that pertain to specialty areas and (b) a list of potential reviewers

for each specialty area. The candidate, department chair, and Peer Evaluation Committee must agree concerning the qualifications of any external reviewer. If external review is contemplated, the candidate is advised to make preparations before the fall semester.

#### C. Signing Evaluation Reports and Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Forms; Optional Rebuttals

Upon receipt of the Chair's Evaluation Report and completed Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form (Figure 4A.3), the faculty member must sign and return one copy of each to the chair within three working days. The faculty member also is required to sign the Peer Evaluation Report and its Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. In both instances, the signature merely acknowledges having reviewed the reports and forms, but does not indicate agreement with their content.

If the faculty member has received an unfavorable report from either the department chair or Peer Evaluation Committee, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal to the Office for Academic Affairs within 10 days of receiving either report.

### 4A-7.3 Responsibilities of Department Chairs in Relation to Tenure and Promotion Evaluations

As discussed in Section 4A-7.1, department chairs are responsible for notifying a faculty member by September 7 of the evaluation year, in writing, that a mandatory major evaluation is due. Additionally, department chairs are responsible for establishing Peer Evaluation Committees, conducting classroom observations, compiling and submitting Student Evaluation Reports, preparing and submitting all Chair's Evaluation Reports that are required for tenure and/or promotion decisions, and completing the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Forms (Figure 4A.3).

#### A. Establishment of the Peer Evaluation Committee

The department chair obtains a Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form (Figure 4A.2) from the candidate and appoints three faculty members to the Peer Evaluation Committee.

In small departments, the faculty member may nominate one tenured faculty member from an allied field outside the department. Department chairs from departments other than that of the faculty member being reviewed may also participate on Peer Evaluation Committees. (Flexibility in appointments under these rules are allowable for first-year evaluations in small departments.) The department chair is obligated to appoint the candidate's assured nominee (see Figure 4A.2) so long as the nominee is qualified, but the department chair may substitute other qualified faculty members for the two remaining positions. Whenever possible, the department representatives must be tenured members of the department (except that faculty members participating in phased retirement are eligible to serve) whose rank is equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate.

In a three-person department, the third department member is automatically appointed to the

committee unless he or she is also being considered for tenure and/or promotion; at least one of the other members must be from an allied discipline (usually in the same division of the Faculty Senate).

Prohibited from serving on a Peer Evaluation Committee are the department chair of the faculty member's department, members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and any faculty member being considered for tenure and/or promotion during the same academic year.

By September 30, the department chair must send a letter notifying Peer Evaluation Committee members of their appointment, and the time and date of an initial meeting, with copies to the candidate and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The department chair will submit the candidate's materials to the Peer Evaluation Committee.

#### B. Chair's Evaluation Report for Tenure and Promotion Decisions

1. Classroom Observations: The department Chair's Evaluation Report should include information from classroom observations each lasting at least 30 minutes in two separate courses.

2. Summary Report of Student Evaluations: The department chair prepares the Student Evaluation Report by summarizing in a narrative the quantitative summaries and individual comments given by students. The chair prepares this report in a similar fashion to the annual evaluation by combining the results of the previous three annual Student Evaluation Reports. See Section 4A-6.2 for a discussion of student evaluations.

3. Chair's Evaluation Report and Recommendation: The department chair must prepare a report and make a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. In completing this report, the department chair considers the faculty member's self-evaluation, supporting documentation, student evaluations, and classroom observations. Other input from students, colleagues, external sources, and University administrators may also be used. The Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6) is to be followed in making the final recommendation. See Figure 4A.1 for the areas to be addressed in the Chair's Evaluation Report for tenure and/or promotion.

#### C. Discussion and Submission of Chair's Evaluation Report for Tenure and Promotion

The department chair provides the faculty member with two completed, signed, and dated copies of the Chair's Evaluation Report, including a completed Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form, for the faculty member's review and signature. The department chair at that time conducts a conference with the faculty member to explain the report, receive feedback, and discuss future directions. Finally, within three days of the conference the department chair obtains the signature of the faculty member on one set of copies, which becomes part of the department chair's full report. When a faculty member signs and returns any evaluation report, such action shall indicate merely that the faculty member acknowledges being apprised of its

contents, not that he or she agrees with it. The Chair's Evaluation Report is forwarded to the Dean of the relevant school or college by November 15.

#### 4A-7.4 Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee

The requirements for membership on a Peer Evaluation Committee are described in Section 4A-7.2 A and Section 4A-7.3 A; see also the Peer Evaluation Committee Form (Figure 4A.2).

Under the guidance of its chair, the Peer Evaluation Committee is charged with preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report based on the following items: documentation submitted by the faculty member undergoing evaluation for tenure and/or promotion, classroom observations, and external review if necessary.

##### A. The Committee Chair

A Peer Evaluation Committee's first task is to elect a chair, who then notifies the department chair of his or her election. The committee chair is responsible for conducting meetings, insuring that all pertinent provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Model are followed, using standard parliamentary procedure in reaching all major decisions, insuring confidentiality of the proceedings, and preparing and distributing the Committee's report. The department chair assists the peer evaluation process. By October 7, the department chair provides to the chair of the Peer Evaluation Committee a copy of the candidate's Self-Evaluation Report, the cumulative Student Evaluation Report, and any supporting materials.

##### B. Classroom Observations

At least two members the Committee must conduct classroom observations of the candidate's teaching. To promote reliability, a set of classroom observations should consist of at least one observation lasting at least 30 minutes in two separate courses by each observer. Observers submit an oral or written report of their observations to the Committee. The Committee's final report weighs and integrates these reports but does not incorporate them verbatim.

##### C. Optional External Review

External review of scholarly work is not typically required for the Peer Evaluation Committee report. However, the Peer Evaluation Committee is obligated to initiate an external review under two circumstances: (a) if the candidate requests such review or (b) if, during the course of its deliberations, the Peer Evaluation Committee discovers that some scholarly works require external review. The candidate is responsible for providing an outline of the specialty areas involved and the materials that pertain to each specialty area and a list of potential reviewers for each specialty area (see Section 4A-7.2 B). The Committee is responsible for selecting from the candidate's list three or more external reviewers for each set of materials, soliciting and receiving the external reviews, and providing a copy of the reviews to the department chair. If

adjustments must be made to the slate of external reviewers, these adjustments must be agreed to by the candidate, the department chair, and the Peer Evaluation Committee.

#### D. The Decision Process of the Peer Evaluation Committee

The Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6) is used as a general guide. The Committee should strive for consensus in developing its conclusions, and its report (including the completed Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form) must reflect a majority opinion. Nevertheless, a member of a Peer Evaluation Committee is obligated to object to any procedure believed to violate the provisions of the Model or to any conclusion believed to be inaccurate. The Committee should then deliberate these objections, consulting the Model as appropriate. When an issue cannot be resolved to each member's satisfaction, the Committee is obligated to investigate the matter more fully. Inquiries can be made to the candidate, the department chair, the Faculty Evaluation Review Committee, or the Office for Academic Affairs at any time. When a minority member disagrees with the majority's final action on any matter, and believes that the overall evaluation has been affected, he or she is obligated to submit a narrative minority report detailing his or her position.

#### E. The Peer Evaluation Committee's Report

The Committee's report consists of a narrative Peer Evaluation Report or approved substitute (see Figure 4A.1; including area weights from the candidate's Self-Evaluation Report, as completed for tenure and/or promotion); a Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form (Figure 4A.3) when appropriate; any supporting materials submitted by the candidate; and any minority report. The Committee chair prepares the report, obtains the signatures of other members, provides the candidate with signed and dated copies of the Peer Evaluation Report and of the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. Within three days, the Committee chair obtains the candidate's signature on one copy of the Peer Evaluation Report and the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form. The signed copies the Committee's final report are submitted to the Dean of the relevant school or college, along with all the candidate's materials, by November 15.

When a faculty member signs and returns any evaluation report or form, such action shall indicate merely that the faculty member acknowledges being apprised of its contents, not that he or she agrees with it.

#### 4A-7.5 Responsibilities of the Dean

The Dean will read the Department Chair's Report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's Report, and all attached materials, and then complete the Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion. That form will serve as a cover letter to the report package and will include as attachments the Chair's Report, the Peer Evaluation Committee's Report, any rebuttals, and the candidate's materials. Within three days, the faculty member being evaluated will sign the Dean's Report, acknowledging having seen it, but not necessarily agreement with it. One copy of the signed

Dean's Report will be retained by the faculty member.

The Dean will then forward his or her report, with attached materials (Chair's report, Peer Evaluation Committee's report, and the candidate's materials), to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, via the Office for Academic Affairs. In the event that the Dean's recommendation does not agree either with that of the Department Chair or of the Peer Evaluation Committee, the Dean shall justify that decision with appropriate comments on the Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion form. The faculty member shall have the right to rebut comments made on the Dean's Report form; such rebuttal shall be submitted along with the other materials. The Dean's report should be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee by January 15.

#### 4A-7.6 Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are to receive from the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs the Chair's Evaluation Report and the Peer Evaluation Report (plus any rebuttals of these), request any additional information that it deems necessary, examine all facets of the application, reach an equitable final decision, prepare a report on the candidate, and complete a Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form (Figure 4A.3).

##### A. The Decision Process of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

A candidate's record should be evaluated in terms of documents submitted to the Committee and using the area weights given on the Self-Evaluation Report (as completed for tenure and/or promotion). The Committee may consult with the candidate, the department chair, the chair of the Peer Evaluation Committee, and administrators to obtain additional information about a candidate, as it deems appropriate. When a candidate has submitted a rebuttal to a Chair's Evaluation Report or Peer Evaluation Report, the Promotion and Tenure Committee is obligated to consider it. If the Committee finds probable cause for concern, it should instruct the parties involved to submit, in a timely manner, either a counter-rebuttal or a corrected report. In the event of a counter-rebuttal, the matter should be pursued to a satisfactory resolution.

##### B. Recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Committee's final recommendation (indicated on the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form; Figure 4A.3) should be an independent judgment based on a synthesis of the overall record. The Committee is to use the Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6) as a general guide, and it should strive for consistency over time. In the interest of fairness to candidates for tenure, the Committee should give very strong consideration to a set of consistently favorable annual evaluations from the department chair during the years prior to the tenure decision. In such cases, the Committee should have very compelling countervailing evidence to justify a recommendation against tenure and/or promotion.

### C. The Promotion and Tenure Committee's Report

After reaching a final decision on tenure and/or promotion, the Committee, as directed by the chair, prepares a draft report. This consists of a narrative Tenure and Promotion Report following the Guidelines for Evaluation Forms (Figure 4A.1); any rebuttals, counter-rebuttals, or corrected reports from the department chair or Peer Evaluation Committee; and a completed Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form (Figure 4A.3). If either the chair or vice chair has abstained from a case, the non-abstaining party prepares the preliminary draft of the final report. The Committee deliberates on this draft until a majority approves it. The approved Tenure and Promotion Report, along with all other reports and the candidate's materials, should be submitted within 14 days, no later than April 1, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and, at the same time, a copy of this advisory report sent to the candidate under consideration for tenure and/or promotion. Members may submit minority reports, which are appended to the approved report. If the faculty member has received an unfavorable report from the Promotion and Tenure committee, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal to the Office for Academic Affairs within ten days of receiving the report.

#### 4A-7.7 Responsibilities of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in Relation to Promotion and Tenure

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall receive and distribute all materials from the department chair, Peer Evaluation Committee, Dean of the faculty member's school or college, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the faculty member being evaluated. Upon receipt of the Tenure and Promotion Report, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs considers all recommendations and supporting materials. Further consultations with the candidate or any of the participants in the evaluation process may be conducted.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor submits a final recommendation to the Chancellor no later than May 1, accompanied by all of the evaluation materials received, and at the same time sends the candidate under consideration for promotion or tenure an unelaborated statement of this recommendation. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for informing the candidate of the final action taken by the Chancellor, the vote of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and any additional details that are deemed beneficial to a consistent and equitable evaluation process. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will return the candidate's materials to him or her at the conclusion of the evaluation process.

#### 4A-7.8 Responsibilities of the Chancellor in Relation to Promotion and Tenure

The Chancellor shall receive, review, and act upon all evaluative materials provided by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After reviewing the materials produced by the final evaluation process, the Chancellor shall take actions regarding salary and employment.

#### 4A-8 SECTION 8. PROCEDURES FOR FIRST- OR SECOND-YEAR CONTRACT RENEWAL AND FOR ADVISORY EVALUATIONS OF UNTENURED TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

All untenured tenure-track faculty should receive a comprehensive evaluation during their first year of employment at the University. In subsequent years, such an evaluation for untenured tenure-track faculty is optional at the discretion of the faculty member or department chair. These evaluations, if initiated by the department chair, may be for cause or, at the discretion of either the faculty member or chair, may be advisory in nature.

##### 4A-8.1 First-year Contract Renewal Evaluations

Except that they occur at times relatively earlier in the faculty member's employment at the University (see Table 3 for the Calendar of Events), the procedures for these evaluations generally follow the procedures specified for tenure and/or promotion. Notification of the faculty member and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs occurs by September 7 (no notification of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is needed, since they will not review the faculty member's materials). The faculty member presents required documents to the department chair by September 21. The department chair appoints a Peer Evaluation Committee by October 7; procedures to be followed by the Peer Evaluation Committee are shown in Section 4A-7.4.

Although the awkwardness of doing so early is completely apparent, first-year faculty members nevertheless are to collect student evaluations of their courses, generally following the procedures shown in Section 4A-6.2. Classroom observations by the department chair and by members of the Peer Evaluation Committee, therefore, are even more important to the evaluation process.

The department chair completes a Chair's Evaluation Report as described in Section 4A-7.3 B, and submits the report as described in Section 4A-7.3 C. The Peer Evaluation Committee (if convened) submits a Peer Evaluation Report (see Section 4A-7.4) as well. The Dean of the relevant school or college reviews the reports from the Chair and the PEC, as well as any rebuttals by the faculty member. The Dean then completes the Dean's Report of First-Year Comprehensive Review and submits it with all supporting materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Note, however, that this report is due to the Office for Academic Affairs by January 15, somewhat later than the reporting date for tenure and/or promotion purposes. The later date allows the faculty member to review all of the reports, including the Student Evaluation Report, after the fall semester grades have been submitted, while still allowing time for review of the report(s) by the University administration.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs reviews all the evaluative materials and recommends to the Chancellor whether or not to reappoint the candidate. The Chancellor makes the final decision on reappointment. Conditions governing nonreappointment are listed in

the Faculty Handbook, Section 3-5; note that the faculty member's competence is not the only factor considered in reappointment decision. The Code of the University of North Carolina (see the excerpt in the Faculty Handbook, Appendix N) specifies that, should the faculty member not be reappointed, he or she is to be notified not less than 90 days before the current contract expires (typically mid-May).

#### 4A-8.2 Advisory Evaluations

Advisory evaluations may be initiated by a tenure-track faculty member or by his/her department chair anytime during the tenure-track process. Such evaluations are proactive steps to help faculty members improve performance and become more tenurable. The department chair may appoint a Peer Evaluation Committee as part of advisory evaluations. If advisory evaluations are conducted, the committee should identify aspects of the faculty member's performance that may present problems when a tenure decision is due. Advisory evaluations have no formal consequences for decisions about contract renewal, tenure, or promotion.

#### 4A-9 SECTION 9. PROCEDURES FOR SPECIAL EVALUATIONS OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Non-tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated annually just as all other faculty members are. Non-tenure-track faculty receive a major advisory evaluation at the discretion of the faculty member or department chair. Peer evaluations for non-tenure-track faculty (including visiting faculty) may be included in this process at the option of the department chair and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

#### 4A-10 SECTION 10. EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

##### 4A-10.1 Annual Evaluations of Faculty Responsibilities

Each department chair is evaluated annually by the Dean of his or her college or school and by the Office for 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 Section 4A-6). 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.

The Office for Academic Affairs collects from each chair an annual self-evaluation and supporting documentation, and may conduct classroom observations of the department chair's teaching. 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 consider 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.

#### 4A-10.2 Evaluation of Chair's Departmental Administrative Responsibilities

Department chairs' administrative responsibilities are taken into account by the Office for Academic Affairs as part of the department chairs' 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 4-1.2). Briefly, chairs are evaluated by the Office for Academic Affairs 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 (e.g., Figure 4A-7) to each full-time faculty member in the department. The forms will be returned directly to the Dean.

#### 4A-10.3 Evaluations for Tenure and/or Promotion

Department chairs who may be candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated under the tenure and promotion procedures in Section 4A-7. As listed in the introductory paragraph of Section 4A-7.3, 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.

#### 4A-10.4 Probationary Evaluations; Advisory Evaluations

Department chairs in their first year of employment at the University will receive a first-year comprehensive evaluation just as any other probationary faculty member does (see Section 4A-8). 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. Advisory evaluations may be requested by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Advisory evaluations have no formal consequences for decisions about contract renewal, tenure, or promotion.

#### 4A-10.5 Evaluation for Renewable Terms for Department Chairs

Department chairs are appointed for terms of three 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 4-1.2.

#### 4A-11 EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY (POST-TENURE REVIEW)

##### 4A-11.1 General Background

A. 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 Tenure Policies and Regulations of The University of North Carolina at Pembroke [UNCP Faculty Handbook, Section 3.1 through Section 3-9] and The UNC Code [The UNC Code, pp. 19-25].

B. 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."

C. 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.

#### 4A-11.2 Principles and Criteria

A. 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 UNC Code, p. 21 Section 603(1).]

B. All UNCP faculty are evaluated annually in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) according to a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale (Figure 4A.6.) 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 (Section 4A-6.) In addition to these reports, First Year (and Second Year when recommended) 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 (Section 4A-4.2; and also Section 4A-7 through 4A-8.2). 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 (see Section 4A-11.3A). 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.

C. 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, (p. 21 Section 603 (1)).

D. All phases of this evaluation process are to be guided by the principles set forth in Sections 4A-1 to 4A-3 of the UNCP Faculty Evaluation Model (UNCP Faculty Handbook). Thus all "Principles and Criteria" relevant to faculty evaluation detailed in Section 4A-2 of 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 (Section 4A-2.2), scholarship (Section 4A-2.3), and service (Section 4A-2.4).

#### 4A-11.3 Principles Governing the Roles of Individuals and Groups

##### A. The Faculty Member Being Evaluated

All tenured faculty will undergo a cumulative review process every five years commencing from date of tenure. If during that period, the tenured faculty member is promoted, this cumulative review will not be necessary until the fifth year following the date the promotion becomes effective. When tenured faculty apply for promotion and undergo post-tenure review at the same time, separate decisions will be made on each. As indicated in Section 4A-3.1 of 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.

##### B. 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, 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 Section 4A-3.2.]

##### C. The Peer Evaluation Committee

The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report to the Office for Academic Affairs. This group is responsible for gathering appropriate information, assessing its implications, and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member's performance. The Peer Evaluation process must be independent of the department chair's evaluation.

##### D. The Department Chair (or Dean for department chairs)

The department chair (Dean of the Chair's school or college for department chairs) is responsible for writing his/her own recommendations (see Figure 4A.8 below), and submitting this document to the Office for Academic Affairs.

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

The Dean will review the reports from the Chair and from the PEC, as well as any supporting materials and rebuttals. The Dean will assess the performance of the faculty member based on the materials presented and will complete the Dean's Recommendation for Post-Tenure Review. The Dean will give the faculty member a copy of the Dean's recommendation and submit that recommendation, with all attached materials, to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

#### F. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for making recommendations based on the materials submitted by the Dean to the Chancellor 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 Section 4A-11.4 below). 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.

#### G. The Chancellor

As Chief Executive Officer of the University, the Chancellor receives, reviews, and acts upon the recommendations of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. 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 UNC Code (Section 603 (1)).

### 4A-11.4 Evaluation Procedures

A. 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 (see Section 4A-11.3A). In the initial stages of the post-tenure review process, those faculty members with more than five years of service beyond tenure will be reviewed in order of seniority (for more information concerning this matter, see below in the section labeled "Timetable for the Implementation of the Review 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 department chairs), the Dean of the faculty member's college or school, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor.

B. 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 (Dean of relevant college or school for department chairs) (see Calendar of Events below). The faculty member will subsequently submit to his or her department chair (Dean of relevant college or school for 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 Nomination Form (Figure 4A.2). 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 department chairs) then (a) appoints three faculty members to the Peer Evaluation Committee in the manner described in Section 4A-7.3.A, (b) calls this group together for their initial meeting in order to orient them to the process, and (c) makes available to them the materials cited above with the exception of the Chair Evaluations. The Chair Evaluations are not made available to the Peer Evaluation Committee in order to protect the integrity and independence of the peer evaluation process.

C. The make-up of the Peer Evaluation Committee will be identical to that described in Figure 4A.2 of the UNCP Faculty Handbook. The responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee will be consistent with those described in Section 4A-7.4 of the Faculty Handbook.

D. The Peer Evaluation Committee and the department chair (Dean of relevant college or school for department chairs), working independently of each other, are responsible for preparing and submitting a Post-Tenure Evaluation Report Form (See Figure 4A.8) 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 Office for Academic Affairs within ten days of having received these reports. These two reports are subsequently submitted by the respective chair (Peer Evaluation Committee or department) to the Dean of the faculty member's school or college.

E. 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, as well as any rebuttals submitted by the 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 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, acknowledging having seen it but not necessarily agreement with it. One copy of the signed Dean's Recommendation will be retained by the faculty member. 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 PEC, 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 days of signing the report.

F. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will review 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 shall 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 the UNCP Tenure Regulations (Section 3 of the Faculty Handbook) and of The Code 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 Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall recommend to the Chancellor that no action be taken.

G. As Chief Executive Officer of the University, the Chancellor receives, reviews, and acts upon all evaluative materials provided by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After reviewing the materials produced by this evaluation process, the Chancellor will take appropriate action(s). In the case where a faculty member's performance is found to be unsatisfactory and those elements of unsatisfactory performance have not been improved to a satisfactory level in the specified period, the Chancellor's action may include discharge as specified by The UNC Code (Section 603 (1)).

#### 4A-11.5 Forms Required for Cumulative Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Figure 4A.2 - Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form.

Figure 4A.8 - Post-Tenure Evaluation Recommendation Form.

#### 4A-11.6 Timetable for the Implementation of the Review Process

In order to ensure 1) that all tenured faculty are evaluated within the initial five-year period and 2) that an approximately equal number are evaluated each year, the following timetable has been devised.

Year of Post-Tenure Review	Faculty Needing to be Reviewed	No. in Category
Year 1 (1998-1999)	All faculty tenured during 1966-1975 All faculty tenured in 1993	12 3
Year 2 (1999-2000)	All faculty tenured during 1976-1981 All faculty tenured in 1994	6 10
Year 3 (2000-2001)	All faculty tenured during 1982-1984 All faculty tenured in 1995	13 4
Year 4 (2001-2002)	All faculty tenured during 1985-1987 All faculty tenured in 1996	6 9
Year 5 (2002-2003)	All faculty tenured during 1988-1992 All faculty tenured in 1997	14 1
Year 6 (2003-2004)	All faculty in Year 1 category All faculty tenured in 1998	15 ?
Year 7 (2004-2005)	All faculty in Year 2 category All faculty tenured in 1999	16 ?