

POL 02.05.05
Teaching Effectiveness Policy

Authority: Chancellor

History:

- First Issued: November 7, 2024

Related Policies:

- [UNC Policy 400.3.1 Teaching Effectiveness in the University of North Carolina](#)
- [UNC Policy 400.3.1.1 \[R\] Regulation on Teaching Effectiveness in the University of North Carolina](#)
- [UNC Pembroke Faculty Handbook 2024-25, Section 2, Chapter 2 - Faculty Evaluation Policy](#)
- [POL 05.25.01 Post-Tenure Review](#)
- [POL 02.05.04 - Faculty Workload Policy](#)

Additional References:

- [North Carolina General Statute 116-1\(b\) Higher Education](#)
- [UNC Policy 400.3.4 Policy on Faculty Workload](#)
- [UNC Policy 400.3.3 Performance Review of Tenured Faculty](#)

Contact Information: Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, 910-521-6224

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 North Carolina G.S. 116-1(b), declares that the mission of the UNC System "...is to discover, create, transmit, and apply knowledge to address the needs of individuals and society" and further specifies that, "Teaching and learning constitute the primary service that the university renders to society. Teaching, or instruction, is the primary responsibility of each of the constituent institutions." Consistent with the directive set forth in state law, the UNC Board of Governors has established the expectation that teaching "...should be the first consideration of all UNC institutions." The University of North Carolina, therefore, has a primary obligation to provide undergraduate and graduate education of the highest quality. This policy provides the basis for the institution to formulate policies and processes that ensure, recognize, and reward teaching effectiveness.

2. SCOPE

2.1 This policy applies to tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty as defined in [Chapter VI of the Code](#), whose workload plans include teaching.

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1 Teaching refers to all activities involved in preparing and conducting the courses that a faculty member is assigned to teach as well as auxiliary teaching activities. The broad

dimensions of teaching include imparting general and specific knowledge, developing skills, motivating students, setting requirements, evaluating performance, and being successful with effective teaching practices. Teaching communicates the knowledge and values and imparts the skills necessary for individuals to lead responsible, productive, and personally satisfying lives.

3.2 Teaching Effectiveness is the quality of teaching and a teacher's ability to impact student learning. It means providing student-centered learning experiences that are relevant to the discipline and the course. It is a dynamic process that involves creating and adapting learning environments to support all students. Effective teaching imparts regularly revised content and uses pedagogical techniques that are current, research-informed, and rigorous.

3.3 Annual Evaluations are a review of the work of a faculty member by the Department Chair relative to the faculty member's approved work plan and the faculty member's self-assessment. Annual evaluation procedures are designed to provide every faculty member with adequate information on how evaluations will be conducted, promote a reasonable degree of equity and consistency both within and among departments, provide procedures that allow a reasonable degree of flexibility for faculty, and define the relationship between the various components of an evaluation and the final decision of the evaluator. The annual evaluation ensures that students receive quality education and effective teaching from their faculty. It also provides ongoing administrative supervision of faculty and serves as the basis for merit salary increases where appropriate.

3.4 Student Evaluation includes, but is not limited to, instruments used to gather anonymous responses regarding a student's experience of a course, including items such as course organization, course materials, teaching methods, and interaction with the instructor of record. Although student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to assess validly a faculty member's performance as a teacher, they do contribute to the overall faculty evaluation process.

3.5 Peer Evaluation is a process conducted by faculty peers using elements such as observation of instruction, review of teaching portfolios, and discussions regarding pedagogical goals and methods. Faculty peers are responsible for evaluating submitted materials and formulating a coherent evaluation of the faculty member's performance to provide feedback that will assist in the continuous development of teaching.

3.6 Self-Evaluation is a process of deliberative review and critical evaluation of one's own work, while identifying specific strategies for improvement. Self-evaluation is designed to provide a summative review of the faculty member's teaching as well as to identify formative strategies to continue developing skill in teaching. 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. 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.

3.7 Post Tenure Review is a comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of tenured faculty members. Post-tenure review evaluates all aspects of performance including teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty members' performance will be evaluated relative to the mission of UNC Pembroke. The purpose of this review is to support and encourage excellence among tenured faculty by continuing tenure for faculty whose performance has been found to "meet or exceed expectations," and providing a clear plan and timeline for improvement of performance of faculty whose performance has been found to "not meet expectations."

4. POLICY STATEMENTS

4.1 Peer Evaluation

4.1.1 The Peer Evaluation Committee is responsible for preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report in decisions involving tenure and/or promotion, contract renewal, and post-tenure review evaluations. 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.

4.1.2 In preparing the Peer Evaluation Report for a faculty member, a Peer Evaluation Committee should use the Format for Evaluation Reports and be guided by the Standard Performance Rating Scale. Serious consideration must be given to the area weights on the faculty member's Self-Evaluation Report(s) as well as the department's Disciplinary Statements. In cases of tenure and/or promotion review, the Peer Evaluation Committee Report must include sufficient information to justify the Committee's decision. A performance review that includes a recommendation for recognition of performance that exceeds expectations shall include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of how the faculty member exceeded assigned duties and the directional goals established. In the case of a negative review, specific detailed descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties must be provided in the narrative.

4.1.3 As a means to help ensure 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, Peer Evaluation Committees, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each entity in the evaluation process, therefore, is to submit a copy of its report to the faculty member being evaluated.

4.2 Student Evaluation

4.2.1 Major evaluations for renewal, tenure, and promotion 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; Student Evaluation Reports; and other relevant artifacts.

4.2.2 Students who take a faculty member's courses play an important role in evaluating the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. They submit information on a Student Evaluation of

Instruction Form consisting of numerical data and student comments from which summaries are compiled for each course. 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.

4.2.3 All teaching faculty (full- and part-time faculty, Department Chairs, and administrators who teach) are evaluated by students using the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form. Although student evaluations by themselves do not provide sufficient information to judge validly a faculty member's performance as a teacher, they do contribute to the overall faculty evaluation process. The data are summarized in a Student Evaluation Report.

4.3.4 Full-time faculty teaching graduate or undergraduate courses are evaluated each semester. Student evaluation of graduate instruction follows the same procedures as in undergraduate instruction using the Student Evaluation of Instruction instrument. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve the Student Evaluation of Instruction Form. A department may add up to five supplementary items or scales to this form without approval from the Senate. Alternatively, a department may develop a substitute Student Evaluation of Instruction Form in lieu of the general form. The Senate of the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate must approve any alternate forms. To ensure a representative response from students, faculty are strongly encouraged to complete the SEIs in class or require it as an assignment in the learning management system.

4.3.5 A quantitative summary of the ratings in each course is prepared as soon as possible. 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 the Student Evaluation Report is included in the annual Chair's Evaluation Report.

4.4 Annual Evaluation/Faculty Work Plans

4.4.1 The process for evaluating a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is outlined in the university's Faculty Handbook.

4.4.2 Each faculty member will engage in activities that contribute to professional growth and development and refinement of their expertise. Each full-time faculty member will work with their Dean or Department Chair to develop a work plan for the upcoming academic year that aligns with the institution's workload expectations and the needs of the academic department, college/school, and institution. Each faculty work plan should account for full-time work by assigning duties to teaching, scholarship, and service or teaching and service in the case of non-tenure-track faculty. Faculty members' work plan should include the proposed initiatives and outcomes a faculty member seeks to achieve in the next academic year and be linked to long-term evaluations such as reappointment, promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review. The faculty work plan is included in the annual Self-Evaluation Report that faculty submit to the Department Chair and Dean. The Department Chair's signature and the Dean's signature on their evaluation

reports indicates their approval of the faculty member's work plan, unless deficiencies are specifically identified in these reports.

4.4.3 All full-time faculty are evaluated annually in three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) according to a four-category Standard Performance Rating Scale. Each full-time faculty member receives an annual evaluation from the Department Chair. Each chair must compile an annual Chair's Evaluation Report for each faculty member they supervise and submit it to the appropriate Dean. This report should contain a narrative synthesis of the faculty member's overall performance in teaching, research, and service relative to their approved work plan, an overall rating of the faculty member using the Standard Performance Rating Scale, and the signatures of the Department Chair and faculty member being evaluated.

4.4.4 A faculty member whose performance is deemed to be deficient in two consecutive years according to the Standard Performance Rating Scale for the review period will be subject to an individual improvement plan. The plan will include steps designed to lead to improvement in the faculty member's performance, 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 not occur within the specified time frame. It will be the responsibility of the Department Chair, in collaboration with the faculty member evaluated, to draw up the individual improvement plan. 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.

4.4.5 At the end of the period specified in the improvement plan, the Provost/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 to have achieved an adequate or better performance for the current annual review cycle. If the provisions of the remediation plan have not been met and the required improvement not occurred, the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will recommend to the chancellor the disciplinary action to be taken.

5. Contract Renewal, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review

5.1 Contract Renewal

5.1.1 Tenure-track faculty members receive a comprehensive contract renewal evaluation in their first year of employment at the university.

5.1.2 The faculty member being evaluated for an initial contract renewal must submit a portfolio which includes a copy of the completed Peer Evaluation Nomination Form, current Curriculum Vitae, Self-Evaluation Report, copy of the Disciplinary Statement in effect for the faculty member's department, Student Evaluation Reports for all courses evaluated during the evaluation period, and documentation of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and other professional activity in the faculty member's discipline, and service. Contract renewal evaluations

subsequent to the initial probationary evaluation should also include a section for copies of signed Department Chair annual evaluations.

5.1.3 The Department Chair completes a Chair's Evaluation Report, and the Peer Evaluation Committee completes a Peer Evaluation Report. The Dean of the relevant school or college reviews the reports from the Chair and the Peer Evaluation Committee as well as any rebuttals by the faculty member and then completes the Dean's Report of Contract Renewal Evaluation.

5.2 Tenure and/or Promotion Evaluation

5.2.1 All tenure track faculty are evaluated for tenure and/or promotion, a major evaluation, no later than their sixth year of employment at the university.

5.2.2 A faculty member being evaluated for promotion and/or tenure must submit a portfolio which includes a completed Peer Evaluation Nomination and Evaluation Form, current Curriculum Vitae, expanded Self Evaluation Report covering the full period under consideration, the departmental Disciplinary Statements to be used in the evaluation, signed Department Chair's Annual Evaluations received since the last successful major evaluation, Student Evaluation Reports for the full period under consideration, including the quantitative summary of ratings and transcripts of student comments, and documentation of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and other professional activity in the faculty member's discipline, and service, including relevant materials that illustrate contributions in the areas of university, professional, and community service.

5.2.3 The Department Chair must prepare a report and make a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. The Peer Evaluation Committee is charged with preparing and submitting a Peer Evaluation Report based on the portfolio submitted by the faculty member. The Dean will review all evaluation materials and any rebuttal(s) and complete the Dean's Report for Tenure/Promotion. The Promotion and Tenure Committee examines all facets of the application, reaches an equitable decision in accordance with the provisions of the [Faculty Evaluation Policy](#), prepares a report on the candidate, and completes a Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Form.

5.2.4 The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs considers all recommendations and supporting materials and submits a final recommendation to the Chancellor. After reviewing the materials produced by the final evaluation process, the Chancellor acts regarding salary and employment.

5.3 Post-Tenure Review

5.3.1 Tenured faculty must undergo a cumulative review process every five years following the award of tenure (or following the award of promotion if such review occurs within the five-year period after tenure review). Post-tenure review evaluates all aspects of performance including teaching, scholarship, and service.

5.3.2 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." Evaluators

will consider the annual weights assigned to each area by the individual being evaluated and the appropriate Disciplinary Statements. 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.

5.3.3 The faculty member will submit to their Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or school for the evaluation of the evaluation of Department Chairs) a Self-Evaluation for the previous five years, Student Evaluation summaries for the previous five years, Chair Evaluations for the previous five years, Dean's annual evaluation reports for the previous five years, faculty member's five year plan, any additional information since the last annual evaluation that is deemed pertinent, and a completed copy of the Peer Evaluation Committee Nomination Form.

5.3.4 The Peer Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair (Dean of relevant college or school for the evaluation of Department Chairs) are responsible for preparing and submitting a Post-Tenure Evaluation Report 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 "exceeds expectations, meets expectations or does not meet expectations," and a narrative justification.

5.3.5 The Dean of the relevant college or school will review the reports from the Department Chair (if the evaluated member is not the Department Chair) and the Peer Evaluation Committee, including supporting materials and any rebuttals submitted by the evaluated faculty member being evaluated and complete the Dean's Report for Post-Tenure Review, including his or her evaluation of the faculty member's performance as "exceeds expectations, meets expectations or does not meet expectations."

5.3.6 The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will review all documents, reports, and supporting materials. In the event that the ratings in the reports submitted indicate "does not meet expectations," 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. If any elements of performance that "do not meet expectations" have not been improved to a "meets or exceeds expectations" level in the period specified in the plan, the Provost's action may include discharge as specified by The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina Section 603 (1).