

**Minutes of the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee (FERS)
Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee (FIAC)
UNCP Faculty Senate
November 2, 2010**

Members Present: Elizabeth Denny (chair), Aaron Vandermeer, David Dran, Frankie Denise Powell, Wendy Miller, M.J. Braun, and Margaret Truman

I. Call to Order

Dr. Elizabeth Denny, Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. Approval of Agenda for November 2, 2010

Agenda was approved unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes from October 5, 2010

Minutes were approved unanimously with slight corrections.

V. Old Business

- A. There were no questions on FIAC's actions on revised material related to early tenure.
- B. Vote on revision of Section 5-3.C.3 addressing FIAC's concerns passed 6-0. The following revision will be brought before the next FIAC meeting:

5-3.C.3 Early promotion and tenure

According to Section 5.3.B, Academic Tenure in Relation to Faculty Rank, faculty appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor receive a series of multi-year contracts until, at the end of the sixth year of employment, they are re-appointed with permanent tenure at the same or higher rank, or not reappointed.

Faculty requesting tenure/promotion prior to the sixth year of employment will meet the following criteria:

- 1) Currently in a tenure-track position;
- 2) Documented evidence of exceptional teaching as determined by the department;
- 3) An exceptional record of scholarship. The circumstances and record of performance that make the case exceptional must be fully documented by the candidate and validated by the department. The fact that an applicant meets the performance criteria for tenure/promotion does not constitute an exceptional case for early tenure/promotion;
- 4) Documented evidence of exceptional service (university, professional, and external) as determined by the department;
- 5) At least four years of full-time experience in teaching or librarianship at an accredited four-year college or university, including two years completed at UNC Pembroke; and
- ~~6) A letter of support from the Chair of the Department and the Dean of the College to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs that justifies early tenure/promotion.~~

6) A letter from the Chair of the Department to the faculty member, the Dean, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs acknowledging the candidate meets the requirements in Criteria 1) and 5). This letter must be submitted by August 15.

A candidate for early tenure/promotion can make application only once. If the candidate is not successful in receiving early tenure/promotion, he/she will not be penalized in any way and can pursue the normal tenure/promotion process.

C. Student Evaluation Issue

We returned to the discussion of problems that have arisen with student evaluation of on-line courses. We think a form that is different from the form used in face-to-face classes is being used for student evaluation of on-line classes, but we have also heard that some on-line instructors don't think that their students are receiving student evaluation forms. We are also unsure where these evaluations of on-line classes, if distributed and collected, are being sent and who examines them. The problems are: the form for on-line evaluation has not been authorized by the Faculty Senate; there should be a single student evaluation form for all classes; it is unclear who is receiving and using the data from the student evaluations; and, these discrepancies in the procedure followed for student evaluation may cause problems for faculty when they apply for promotion and tenure.

Our basis for bringing this matter forward is that the above practices appear to not correspond to the Faculty Handbook. Therefore, we have decided to propose one form for all classes and begin working on that form by considering the revision of the student evaluation form prepared by FERS that was rejected in March 2009 and the document that matched each criterion for evaluating faculty to evaluators and evaluation instruments and materials.

VI. New Business

A. We began our discussion of the question: During a tenure/promotion review, should the PEC have access to evaluations written by the chair in previous years?

We agreed that since it appears different chairs handle this issue differently, a firm policy one way or the other must be developed posthaste. We discussed the pros and cons and decided to take up the issue in our next meeting.

VII. Announcements

None.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MJ Braun
Secretary for November 2, 2010