



**North Carolina School of
Science and Mathematics**

Title	Administrative Procedures for Faculty Evaluation
Authority	Chancellor
History	Revised July 25, 2007
Legal Reference	
Additional References	
Responsible Offices	Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs
Classification	3330

OVERALL PROCESS

The Administrative Evaluation Committee (AEC) is composed of the Director of Academic Programs, who convenes the committee, and the Dean of Counseling Services, Dean of Distance Education, Dean of Humanities, Dean of Mathematics, and Dean of Science. If necessary to appropriately evaluate a faculty member, other individuals may be designated to take part in AEC deliberations by the Vice Chancellor of Academic Programs, Vice Chancellor of Distance Education and Extended Programs, or Vice Chancellor of Student Life.

Administrative assessment of faculty performance is documented annually in the Faculty Performance Appraisal, which includes goal setting and self-evaluation along with the appropriate Department Dean's direct response. For those Faculty members serving in two Divisions (e.g. Academic and External Programs), the completed Appraisal form is submitted to both responsible Department Deans for their individual responses. Each faculty member's Division Vice Chancellor (or appropriate Dean or Director) also makes a formal observation every year and prepares a written report to be shared with the faculty member and forwarded to his/her performance record.

When an administrative recommendation is scheduled for a faculty member, the AEC reviews the contents of the performance record and input from the appropriate Department Dean(s) including, when necessary, performance information from the personnel file. It then makes a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment to the Vice Chancellor(s) in whose program(s) the faculty member worked during the current contract period. The Vice Chancellors in turn meet and make a joint recommendation on reappointment to the Chancellor.

In formulating a recommendation for reappointment or non-reappointment, the AEC and Vice Chancellors consider the following factors relevant to the welfare of the School:

- a. the faculty member's demonstrated professional competence;
- b. evidence of career development and the faculty member's potential for future contributions;
- c. evidence of the faculty member's contributions to the School community; and
- d. an assessment of the educational needs and resources of the School.

Consideration of factors a-c entails reviewing the faculty member's record with respect to specific criteria developed through collaboration between the Faculty Council and administrators. The purpose of these criteria is to ensure that students are provided an educational experience of the highest quality. Emphasis on student outcomes prevails throughout the evaluation process. Consideration of the educational needs and resources of the School (factor d) is described in Section II.C.2 of the Regulations on Faculty Employment.

EVALUATION CRITERIA*

- A. Knowledge of, experience with, and mastery of subject matter.
- B. Enthusiasm for teaching subject matter and students.
- C. Methodology of teaching (communication of knowledge to students).
- D. Availability and sensitivity to, and professional interaction with, students.
- E. Extracurricular work with students in residence at NCSSM.
- F. Curriculum and educational program/project/product development.
- G. Committee work, mentoring NCSSM faculty, and additional staff work within the NCSSM community, not necessarily with students.
- H. Outreach activities directed outside NCSSM designed to improve teaching and learning in North Carolina and the nation.
- I. Professional growth.
- J. Compliance with institutional and departmental expectations and guidelines.

*Certain of these criteria are modified for evaluating Guidance Counselors, as follows:

- A-1. Knowledge of counseling theoretical approaches, experience in counseling, and mastery of counseling skills.
- B-1. Enthusiasm for counseling students.
- C-1. Methodology of counseling.
- E-1. Summary of student evaluations of counselors.

*Certain of these criteria are modified for evaluating Librarians, as follows:

- A-2. Knowledge of standard library operating procedures.
- B-2. Ability to maintain effective communication with students and staff pertaining to their library/media needs.

- C-2. Provision of group and individual instructions on use of library resources and services.
- D-2. Accessibility of resources and facility, including operating hours and resources inside/outside NCSSM.
- F-2. Coordination of resource acquisition and maintenance, including distribution of library budget and quality of collection.

*Certain of these criteria are modified for evaluating Distance Learning Faculty, as follows:

C-3. Under "Methodology of teaching:"

- explores new topics and presentation techniques in presenting innovative ideas that are pertinent to the subject matter at hand
- has adapted course to take into account making the most of broadcast format
- uses visual medium to represent key ideas effectively
- maximizes student involvement and is attentive to student needs and input

Evidence regarding these criteria is to be found in the performance record and personnel file of the faculty member. This information is available to appropriate members of the AEC in their role as supervisor of the faculty member.

EVALUATION SCHEDULE

The first two years of employment at NCSSM are characterized by readily available support and careful monitoring. New faculty members need to learn about the community and discover how they can contribute most effectively. The community in turn needs to both provide the opportunity for the faculty member's growth as well as decide whether it is in the best interests of the School and the of faculty member for the relationship to continue. By the beginning of the third year, the School and the faculty member should have a reasonable expectation that the "fit" is a good one, and a series of regular multi-year (2, 3, 5, 7 & 10) contracts may begin—pending a positive performance record and the availability of continuing funding. The level of support and monitoring provided during the first two years of employment and the initial regular contract subsequently is reduced, except for a teacher whose assignment changes significantly or whose performance gives reason for concern.

The annual activities necessary for the AEC—in conjunction with the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and Division Vice Chancellors—to complete the evaluation of each faculty member are scheduled as follows:

Schedule -

Yr	Appra	Obser	Std Eval	Review	Dis Rept	FOT Rept	VC Rec	All Recs
1	X	X	X	X	X		X	
2	X	X	X	X		X		X
3	X	X	X	X	X			
4	X	X	X	X				X
5	X	X	X	X		X		
6	X	X	X	X	X			
7	X	X	X	X				X
8	X	X	X	X				
9	X	X	X	X				
10	X	X	X	X		X		
11	X	X	X	X	X			
12	X	X	X	X				X

Abbreviations:

Appra	Annual Performance Appraisal (Goals and Dept Dean Assessment)
Obser	Class Observation Report by Division Vice Chancellor or Director
Std Eval	Summary of Student Course Evaluations
Review	Summary of Performance Review by Division Vice Chancellor
Dis Rept	Discipline Report
FOT Rept	Faculty Observation Team Report
VC Rec	Recommendation on Contract Reappointment from Division Vice Chancellor
All Recs	Recommendations on Contract Reappointment from FEC, AEC, Vice Chancellors, and Chancellor

The 7- and 10-year contracts follow the pattern established in the 5-year contract—the FOT Report occurs in the n-2 year, the Discipline Report occurs in the n-1 year, and the FEC, AEC, Vice Chancellors, and Chancellor Recommendations occur in the n year, of an n year contract.

Any faculty member who continues on a series of one-year contracts beyond the second year of employment is evaluated in a similar manner as follows:

Schedule –

Yr	Appra	Obser	Std Eval	Review	Dis Rept	FOT Rept	VC Rec	All Recs
3	X	X	X	X	X		X	
4	X	X	X	X				X
5	X	X	X	X		X	X	
6	X	X	X	X	X		X	
7	X	X	X	X				X

The established pattern of evaluation continues until the faculty member is hired on the expected series of multi-year contracts, at which time evaluation reverts to the multi-year pattern above.

Retired faculty who return to NCSSM employment to provide instructional services on a part-time basis are evaluated on a similar schedule as faculty on one-year contracts except there is no report required from the Faculty Observation Team.

FACULTY MENTORS

To provide support for new faculty members, a Mentor (from the appropriate Discipline wherever possible) is assigned to each newly hired instructor in the first and second year of employment. This assignment is made by the Department Dean for the duration of two years. No report is required as a result of this assignment, but one can be completed upon joint agreement between the faculty member and Mentor and placed in the performance record.

IMPROVEMENT PLANS

During any year, an Improvement Plan is developed for a faculty member for whom there are documented concerns related to his/her performance, regardless of whether it might affect a reappointment decision. The faculty member and appropriate Department Dean(s) meet to discuss the issues involved and design the Improvement Plan, subject to approval by the appropriate Vice Chancellor(s). This Improvement Plan gives the faculty member at least one trimester to address the causes for administrative concern.

At the end of the allotted time period, the faculty member meets with the Vice Chancellor(s) and Department Dean(s) to evaluate progress made in addressing the administrative concerns specified

in the Improvement Plan. The Department Dean(s) drafts a summary of this evaluation, which is submitted to the Vice Chancellor for approval. This summary is provided to the faculty member and placed in his/her performance record. Implementation of an Improvement Plan in the final year of any multi-year contract potentially will require the agreement to delay the notice of reappointment or non-reappointment to permit further evaluation as outlined in II.C.6 of the Regulations on Faculty Appointment.

CONTENTS OF PERFORMANCE RECORD AND PERSONNEL FILE

The performance record resides in the Human Resources Office. Documents sent to the performance record and the person responsible for sending each are listed below:

<u>Performance Record Contents</u>	<u>Person Responsible</u>
Annual Performance Appraisal	Department Dean
Annual Observation Report	Division Vice Chancellor(s)
Student Evaluation Summary	Head of AEC
Discipline Report	Head of FEC
Faculty Observation Team Report	Head of FEC
Improvement Plan Summary (if necessary)	Division Vice Chancellor(s)
Administrative Committee Recommendation	Division Vice Chancellor(s)
Faculty Committee Recommendation	Division Vice Chancellor(s)
Division Vice Chancellor Recommendation	Division Vice Chancellor(s)
Chancellor Recommendation	Chancellor
Faculty Member Response to Items placed in Performance Record (if requested)	Faculty Member

As part of the process of placing an item in the performance record, the responsible person must ensure that a copy is provided to the faculty member.

Information is retained in, or deleted from, the performance record according to the following guidelines. All FEC, AEC, and Division Vice Chancellor and Chancellor Recommendations are retained. All other documentation is retained for the current contract period and the contract period most recently completed. All other information may be deleted.

The personnel file is kept as a separate file in the Human Resources Office. It includes information that may be pertinent to the administrative review of, and recommendation for, reappointment or non-reappointment of a faculty member’s contract, but it is considered confidential and is not made available to faculty committees participating in the review process.

Personnel File Contents

- State Application for Employment
- Resume
- Application Cover Letter
- Signed Offer Letter
- Letters of Commendation (if any)
- Letters of Reprimand (if any)

Improvement Plan (if any)
Annual Performance Record Summary
Miscellaneous Information from Supervisor(s)
Faculty Member Response to Items placed in Personnel File (if requested)

ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The administrative portion of the faculty evaluation process follows this timetable:

September – All faculty members forward completed goals section of annual Performance Appraisal to Department Dean(s). AEC meets with faculty members in reappointment (n) year of a multi-year contract to discuss recommendation process.

October – Recommendations for faculty members in reappointment year of a multi-year contract sent by AEC to appropriate Division Vice Chancellors. Vice Chancellors make a joint recommendation to Chancellor.

November – Chancellor determines recommendation for faculty members in reappointment year of a multi-year contract and communicates that recommendation to the Board of Trustees for its determination whether to authorize another multi-year contract or not reappoint.

December – Faculty member notified of Board of Trustees action.

When continuing funding for additional multi-year contracts is available, a similar recommendation process is followed as early as practicable for faculty members on one year-contracts—for example*

*March – Recommendation on multi-year contract for faculty members in second (or subsequent) one-year contract sent by AEC to appropriate Division Vice Chancellors. Vice Chancellors make a joint recommendation to Chancellor.

*April – Chancellor determines recommendation on multi-year contract for faculty members in second (or subsequent) one-year contract and communicates that recommendation to the Board of Trustees for its determination whether to authorize an initial multi-year contract, issue another one-year contract, or not reappoint. Faculty member notified of Board of Trustees action.

May/June - All faculty members complete annual Performance Appraisal and meet with Department Dean(s). Vice Chancellors send annual observation reports (previously shared with faculty member) to performance record.

July/August – Division Vice Chancellors review performance record of each faculty member and send summary to personnel file with copy to faculty member. Any administrative concerns should already have been discussed with the faculty member.