UNCW

BOARD *of* TRUSTEES

Educational Planning and Programs Committee
February 6, 2025

AGENDA

(1)	**Call to Order**	**Trustee Perry Chappell**
(2)	**Statement from State Government Ethics Act**	**Trustee Perry Chappell**
(3)	**Approval of Minutes from October 24, 2024**	**Trustee Perry Chappell**
(4)	**Update Report from Faculty Senate**	**Dr. Colleen Reilly, President**
(5)	**Academic Affairs Report**	**Provost James J. Winebrake**
	a. RTP and PTR Policy Updates	**Provost James J. Winebrake**
(6)	**Student Affairs Report**	**Vice Chancellor Christine Reed Davis**
(7)	**Building Bridges: Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Collaborations in Community Engagement**	**Dr. Jaime Russell (Student Affairs) and Mr. Gene Felice II (Academic Affairs)**
(8)	**Old Business**	**Trustee Perry Chappell**
(9)	**New Business**	**Trustee Perry Chappell**

(10)   **Adjournment**   **Trustee Perry Chappell**

AGENDA ITEM

Approval of October 2024 EPPC Meeting Minutes, by EPPC Chair Perry Chappell.

Situation:
Approval of the minutes from the October 24, 2024 EPPC committee meeting.

Background:
N/A

Assessment:
N/A

Action:
This item requires a vote by the committee.

Supporting Documentation:
Draft Educational Planning and Programs Committee Minutes from the October 24, 2024 meeting.

Educational Planning and Programs Committee

Board of Trustees—The University of North Carolina Wilmington

Thursday, October 24, 2024, 12:30pm Burney C

<u>MINUTES</u>

Chair Chappell called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. in person.

The following members in attendance: Ms. Traci Butler, Mr. Earl Caison, Ms. Perry Chappell, Mr. Jeff Clark, Mr. Malcom Coley, Mr. Carlton Fisher, Mr. Steve Griffin, Mr. Robert Rippy, Dr. Yousry Sayed, Mr. Kevin Sills, Mr. Skyler Stein, Dr. Jimmy Tate and Dr. Aldona Wos were present. Dr. Aswani Volety, Chancellor; Vice Chancellors Mr. Eddie Stuart, University Advancement; Mr. Miles Lackey, Business Affairs and Vice Chancellor Dr. Chrisine Reed Davis, Student Affairs, represented the university. Deans attending were: Dr. Rob Burrus, Cameron School of Business, Founding Dean Dr. Stephanie Caulder, College of Humanities, Social Sciences and the Arts, Dr. Tracy Linderholm, Watson College of Education and Founding Dean Dr. Ronald Vetter, College of Science and Engineering. Also attending were other university administrative personnel.

The meeting moved into the Business portion of the meeting. Chair Chappell read the Conflict of Interest Policy to all and asked if anyone had a conflict of interest. No such conflicts from the Board members were noted for the open session.

Chair Chappell asked Ms. Sharon Lindgren to call the Roll and it was determined that a quorum was present.

A motion was made to approve the August 1, 2024 meeting minutes. The motion for approval was duly carried on behalf of the committee.

Chair Chappell introduced Dr. Winebrake, Provost and Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs.

Provost Winebrake presented the Academic Affairs report. He highlighted a few recent AA activities including: Celebrating Tenure and Promotion and the CMS Open House. Provost Winebrake then introduced Dr. Lauren Franklin, Director of Admissions. She provided the Board with an update on enrollment status as of meeting date, including numbers of first year students, new transfer students, and new graduate students, as well as overall enrollment.

Provost Winebrake presented on Teaching Effectiveness including information on the process the university uses to assess teaching effectiveness, with particular emphasis on the tools used for student course evaluations. Data was presented on UNCW's teaching effectiveness scores from these evaluations. He also presented information on the Distinguished Professorship vacancy in the College of Education.

Dr. Winebrake then introduced Dr. Christine Reed Davis, Vice Chancellor Student Affairs, who introduced Chris Lewandowski, Associate Director for Career Development and Janeé Folston, Associate Director for Employer Development. They presented on the progress made in workforce development initiatives, including internship programs, skills building with employer partners and overall student preparedness. which highlighted data on internships, academic credit programs and strategies to increase student participation. A pamphlet "Career & Internship Fair Employer Opportunities by Industry (Fall 2024 Student Guide) was distributed to the trustees.

Dr. Colleen Reilly presented the Faculty Senate report. She provided updates on the activities of the Faculty Senate since August 2024 including: Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee addressing UNC 400.1.5, Fostering Undergraduate Student Success, has made initial recommendations; Evaluation Committee of the Faculty Senate

including supervising the pilot of Blue by Explorance and updating our policy to adhere to UNC 400.3.1; Faculty feedback on UNCW's policy on the Review and Evaluation of Academic Programs (align with UNC 400.1) and the Faculty Senate Steering will discuss UNCW's Post-tenure Review policy in late October (align with UNC 400.3.3)

Chair Chappell thanked everyone for their presentations and information.

At 1:58 pm Chair Chappell asked if there was any old, unfinished or new business to address. Hearing none, a motion was made to adjourn the session.

Chair Chappell

Date Approved

AGENDA ITEM

Faculty Senate Update Report by Dr. Colleen Reilly, Faculty Senate President

Situation:
Update on the activities of the Faculty Senate since the October BOT meeting and highlights of priorities this semester.

Background:
N/A

Assessment:
N/A

Action:
This item is for information only.

Supporting Documentation:
Faculty Senate PowerPoint Presentation, to be included in EPPC PowerPoint.

AGENDA ITEM

Academic Affairs Report, provided by Dr. James J. Winebrake, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Situation:
Provost Winebrake will provide an update on divisional highlights and activity. Topics will include Q2 status for sponsored programs and examples of key community engagements and partnerships.

Background:
N/A

Assessment:
N/A

Action:
This item is for information only.

Supporting Documentation:
Academic Affairs PowerPoint presentation, to be included in the EPPC PowerPoint.

AGENDA ITEM

Updates to UNCW Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Policy, provided by Dr. James J. Winebrake, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Situation:

In partnership with the Faculty Senate, the Office of the Provost has updated institutional governing documents on RTP and PTR to increase consistency and clarity and satisfy new UNC System Office (SO) requirements.

Background:

In the conducted review of UNCW governing language on RTP and PTR, updates in the following areas for RTP were passed as motions by the Faculty Senate: adding self-assessment; and, adding strategies for improvement in teaching.

Assessment:

N/A

Action:

This item is for information only.

Supporting Documentation:

UNC Policy 400.3.1
UNC Regulation 400.3.1.1[R]
(2) Approved Faculty Senate Motions: 2024-12-01, 2024-12-03

Teaching Effectiveness in the University of North Carolina

I.   Purpose. 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 constituent institutions to formulate policies and processes that ensure, recognize, and reward teaching effectiveness.

II.   Scope. This policy applies to full-time tenured and continuing faculty, as defined in Chapter VI of the Code, whose workload plans include teaching.

III.   Definitions.

        A.   Teaching involves a variety of activities that communicate the knowledge and values and impart the skills necessary for individuals to lead responsible, productive, and personally satisfying lives. Such activities include, but are not limited to, the instruction of organized courses, evaluating students, developing materials for new courses, updating materials for existing courses, developing courseware or other materials for technology-based instruction, supervising undergraduate research and masters' theses and doctoral dissertations, directing students in co-curricular activities such as plays, preparing and equipping new laboratories, supervision of teaching assistants, supervision of internships and other experiential learning, academic advising, mentoring, providing accommodations to students with respect to their mental health or physical needs, and other activities that support student success.

        B.   Teaching Effectiveness means providing student-centered learning and assessment experiences in line with clearly articulated learning objectives that are relevant to the discipline and the course. It models and fosters critical, analytical, and creative thinking, while both engaging and supporting students cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally. Effective teaching ensures all students can participate fully and implements regularly revised content via pedagogical techniques that are current, research-informed, and rigorous.

        C.   Annual Evaluations, as defined in UNC Policy 400.3.4, *Policy on Faculty Workload,* Section III. B., are a review of the work of a faculty member by the department chair/head or equivalent relative to the faculty member's approved work plan as defined in UNC Policy 400.3.4, Section III. C., and the faculty member's self-assessment.

        D.   Student Feedback 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.

E.   Peer Assessment 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, to continue to develop a faculty member's instructional skill and practice.

F.   Self-Assessment is a process of deliberative review and critical evaluation of one's own work, while identifying specific strategies for improvement. Self-assessment shall be 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.

G.   Post Tenure Review, pursuant to UNC Policy 400.3.3, *Performance Review of Tenured Faculty*, is a comprehensive, periodic, cumulative review of the performance of tenured faculty members that shall encompass and include the use of annual evaluations.

IV.   Required Elements for Developing Institutional Policies and Processes on Teaching Effectiveness.

A.   Each institution shall establish policies and processes that define, encourage, and measure teaching effectiveness in accordance with the mission of the institution. Institutions may consider the specific requirements of colleges, schools, departments, other academic units, and academic disciplines in establishing these policies.

B.   Faculty whose work plans include teaching shall be required to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in accordance with applicable institutional policies. Institutions shall use multiple inputs to assess a faculty member's teaching effectiveness and to further develop a faculty member's instructional practice. At the minimum, inputs shall consist of: (1) peer assessment, (2) student feedback, and (3) self-assessment. These inputs shall be utilized, as appropriate, in annual evaluations and comprehensive reviews, including reviews for promotion and post-tenure reviews or reviews for extension of appointment, if applicable.

C.   The constituent institutions shall train faculty members, department chairs, academic unit heads, deans, and other administrators on how to effectively use these inputs to enhance pedagogy, the student learning experience, and student academic success.

D.   Constituent institutions shall offer and encourage professional development opportunities for all faculty members focused on teaching effectiveness.

E.   Constituent institutions shall develop appropriate rewards in recognition of teaching excellence.

F.   The University of North Carolina System Office shall create and maintain an electronic resource center related to teaching effectiveness in personnel decision making to support constituent institutions in developing training regarding upholding these principles.

V.   Outcome and Update Requirements.

A.   In policy and procedures, constituent institutions shall ensure that teaching effectiveness is a component of all reviews of faculty whose workload plans include teaching, including annual faculty evaluations, reappointment and promotion considerations, and post-tenure review.

B.	The chief academic officer at each institution, however titled, shall work with faculty via the representative body of the faculty to review and update, as needed, policy and procedures on teaching effectiveness on a regular timeline in accordance with appropriate institutional policies.

VI.	Other Matters.

A.	Effective Date. The requirements of this policy shall be effective with the 2024-2025 academic year. Institutions shall have internal policies in place at the beginning of that academic year.

B.	Relation to Federal and State Laws. The foregoing policy as adopted by the Board of Governors is meant to supplement, and does not purport to supplant or modify, those statutory enactments which may govern or relate to the subject matter of this policy.

C.	Regulations and Guidelines. This policy shall be implemented and applied in accordance with such regulations and guidelines as may be adopted by the president.

D.	Periodic Review. Each institution shall review their institutional policy at least every five years and submit a copy of that review and any changes made to the president.

E.	Approvals. All policies and procedures required under this policy must be submitted by the constituent institutions to the UNC System Office and approved by the president.

*Supersedes and replaces the prior UNC Policy 400.3.1, "Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina" as this version was approved by the Board of Governors on January 25, 2024.

Regulation on Teaching Effectiveness in the University of North Carolina

I.   Purpose. This Regulation is designed to assist constituent institutions in formulating policies and procedures related to teaching effectiveness, and to ensure those policies and procedures are promulgated and periodically reviewed.

II.   Guidelines for Development and Approval of Institutional Policies and Procedure. In addition to the parameters set forth in UNC Policy 400.3.1, *Teaching Effectiveness in the University of North Carolina,* each constituent institution shall observe the following in developing or revising institutional policies and procedures for teaching effectiveness:

   A.   Establishing Measures. These measures are designed to assist faculty members in identifying their strengths and weaknesses regarding teaching effectiveness as well as to continue developing and refining instructional practices that support student success.

      1.   Peer Assessment:

         a.   Institutions shall develop an appropriate policy and process for peer assessment of faculty at regular intervals. These assessments shall occur at least one time per appointment period or post-tenure review interval. For full-time, tenured faculty, the peer assessment should occur, at the latest, between the second and third year after granting of tenure or the previous post-tenure review.

         b.   Institutions shall ensure that the peer assessment process generates a written report and permits the faculty member the opportunity to provide a written response, should the faculty member choose to do so.

      2.   Student Feedback on Faculty Instruction:

         a.   Institutional policies shall clearly articulate in what form student feedback on faculty instruction shall be gathered, how often such feedback shall be required, and how the instruments shall be administered and reported.

         b.   Institutional policies shall explore systematic ways to engage students in the feedback process to the maximum extent possible, including practices to obtain student feedback on faculty instruction at periodic intervals (e.g., mid-course) to provide better data.

         c.   Institutions shall ensure that data collection systems for student feedback on faculty instruction are transparent, effective, and efficient.

B.   Evaluative Measures. Evaluative measures are designed to assess a faculty member's progress toward stated goals related to institutional (department, college/school, university, academic discipline, etc.) requirements and standards.

1. Annual Evaluation:

   a. In accordance with UNC Policy 400.3.4, a faculty member whose duties include teaching shall have a work plan, which identifies the specific teaching-related outputs and efforts the faculty member is expected to complete in the academic year.

   b. The specific goals of the work plan should build towards and align with the expectations of the next summative/comprehensive review that a faculty member undergoes (e.g., appointment and/or reappointment, promotion, tenure, post-tenure review), all in accordance with Chapter VI of *The Code*, and UNC policies on faculty workload and post-tenure review.

   c. A faculty member who does not adequately satisfy their workload expectations, or the goals of the work plan, for teaching in the annual review period shall be subject to a faculty success plan.

      i.   The faculty success plan shall be formative in nature, including specific steps designed to lead to improvement, a specified timeline of no less than twelve months from the date of the success plan, and a clear statement of consequences should improvement not occur within the designated timeline.

      ii.   Institutions shall develop procedures for the development of faculty success plans. The faculty member shall take part in the development of the success plan. Faculty success plans shall be approved by the department head or dean.

2.   Reappointment, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review. In accordance with policies on reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review, a cumulative review of the faculty member's record shall take place. With regard to teaching effectiveness, this review shall rely on annual evaluations, peer assessments, student feedback that meets the requirements of this Regulation, as well as other inputs (e.g. faculty teaching awards) available to the review committee.

C.   Self-Assessment: In both annual and comprehensive reviews, institutional policies and procedures shall include faculty self-assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Faculty Senate, University of North Carolina Wilmington

Motion 2024-12-01

1. **Maker**: Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee

2. **Dates discussed in Faculty Senate**: December 10, 2024

3. **Rationale**:

The UNC Policy Manual, section 400.3.1, was updated on January 25, 2024, to require that evaluations of teaching effectiveness include "(1) peer assessment, (2) student feedback, and (3) self-assessment." Regulation 400.3.1.1 [R] reinforces this requirement.

Our current Faculty Handbook language describes the importance of peer assessment and student feedback, among other factors, but does not delineate self-assessment as a required element. This motion proposes language to bring the Handbook and institutional policy into compliance with 400.3.1.

4. **Motion**:

CH IV.H. 3. Teaching Evaluations (pp. 108–109)

The Evaluation Committee (Senate Bylaws, Ch. III.C, Art. V.B.1) of the Faculty Senate is charged with regularly reviewing both student and peer evaluation procedures, and with reporting and making recommendations for improvement to the Senate. ~~Because numerous studies have indicated that both peer and student evaluations are necessary for the equitable evaluation of teaching effectiveness, it is strongly suggested that both peer and student evaluations be given emphasis in personnel recommendations.~~ In accordance with UNC System Policy 400.3.1, evaluations of teaching must include, at minimum, peer evaluations, student evaluations, and self-assessment.

c. Self-assessment of Teaching

UNC System Policy 400.3.1 requires that faculty evaluations of teaching effectiveness include the review and evaluation of the faculty member's own work (Policy 400.3.1.1). Both annual and comprehensive reviews for all faculty who have teaching responsibilities must include faculty self-assessment of teaching effectiveness (Regulation 400.3.1.1 [R]). Each academic unit must have specific and easily accessible guidelines for self-assessment of teaching in annual and comprehensive reviews.

Self-assessment must include a deliberative overview of the faculty member's teaching and specific strategies for continuing to develop pedagogical skills and expertise, which can be satisfied in a variety of ways depending upon unit policies. For example, a one-page reflective statement may be attached to the annual report, unit-specific surveys may be developed, etc.

For reappointment, tenure, and promotion, self-assessment is part of the RTP application form and does not need to be completed separately.

5. **Senate action**: Approved.

6. **Necessary/requested effective date**: Upon full approval.

Faculty Senate, University of North Carolina Wilmington

Motion 2024-12-03

1. **Maker**: Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee

2. **Dates discussed in Faculty Senate**: December 10, 2024

3. **Rationale**:

The UNC Policy Manual, section 400.3.1, was updated on January 25, 2024, to require that evaluations of teaching effectiveness include "(1) peer assessment, (2) student feedback, and (3) self-assessment." UNCW's current RTP application meets the requirements in the definition of self-assessment given in 400.3.1.1 except that it does not require "identifying specific strategies for improvement." The changes in the RTP form proposed below would enable faculty to identify specific strategies while staying within the current format and process for the RTP application.

4. **Motion**:

To bring UNCW into compliance with the requirements for self-assessment in Policy 400.3.1.1 and Regulation 400.3.1.1 [R], the application for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion should be amended to include an item requiring faculty to list specific strategies for improving their teaching effectiveness.

Proposed RTP application language:

IV.A.5.i. List and describe the best examples of your teaching strengths. Limit to a maximum of three unique examples, with no more than 3–4 sentences for each example.

IV.A.5.ii. List and describe the best examples of actions taken to implement improvements in your teaching. Limit to a maximum of three unique examples, with no more than 3–4 sentences for each example.

IV.A.5.iii. List and describe specific strategies to improve your future teaching. Limit to a maximum of three unique examples, with no more than 3–4 sentences for each example.

5. **Senate action**: Approved.

6. **Necessary/requested effective date**: Upon full approval.

AGENDA ITEM

Updates to UNCW Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Policy, provided by Dr. James J. Winebrake, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Situation:

In partnership with the Faculty Senate, the Office of the Provost has updated institutional governing documents on reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) and PTR to increase consistency and clarity and satisfy new UNC System Office (SO) requirements.

Background:

In the conducted review of UNCW governing language on RTP and PTR, updates in the following areas for PTR were passed as motions by the Faculty Senate: specifying timing for peer evaluation; clarifying the format and content for long-term work plans; specifying that the dean's rating is final; and, clarifying the timing of a faculty member's response to PTR decision.

Assessment:

N/A

Action:

This is an action item.

Supporting Documentation:

UNC Regulation 400.3.3.1[R]
(4) Approved Faculty Senate Motions: 2024-12-02, 2024-12-04, 2024-12-05, 2024-12-06

Regulation on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

I.   Purpose. This Regulation is designed to assist constituent institutions in formulating policies and procedures concerning performance reviews of tenured faculty, and ensuring those policies and procedures are both promulgated and periodically reviewed to continue the rigorous application of post-tenure review as intended by the Board of Governors in UNC Policy 400.3.3.

II.   Development and Approval of Institutional Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Policies and Procedures. In addition to the parameters set forth in UNC Policy 400.3.3, each constituent institution shall observe the following in developing or revising institutional policies and procedures for post-tenure review:

A.   PTR policies and procedures shall be developed by the chief academic officer, however titled, or designee, in consultation with the representative body of the institution's faculty.

B.   PTR policies and procedures shall examine faculty performance relative to the mission of the institution, college, and department/program, and consistent with Chapter VI of *The Code*.

C.   As part of the PTR policies/regulations, each institution shall develop and publish procedures/guidance on tenured faculty member long-term work plans. These long-term work plans shall cover the five years of the post-tenure cycle. Institutional policies/regulations shall include the format and any requirements required of all long-term work plans.

D.   PTR policies shall be approved by the constituent institution's board of trustees.

II.   Post-Tenure Scope and Review Categories:

A.   Post-tenure reviews shall evaluate all aspects of the professional performance of tenured faculty members, whose primary responsibilities are teaching, research/creative activity, and service. These evaluations shall be based on the faculty member's long-term work plan.

1.   Post-tenure review and resulting recommendations shall take the allocation of a faculty member's responsibilities into account.

2.   If a faculty member is reassigned to other duties (e.g., department chair or academic unit head) for .50 FTE or more, or is occupying a leave-earning position (e.g., SAAO Tier I or Tier II), that faculty member shall not be required to undergo post-tenure review until having completed a five-year cycle following the reassignment.

B.   Institutional post-tenure review policies and procedures shall utilize the three assessment categories defined in UNC Policy 400.3.3: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, and does not meet expectations. Per UNC Policy 400.3.3, *Performance of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)*, Section III. D., if a constituent institution has developed and published refinements to the

definitions of the evaluation categories, those requirements must be employed in the review process.

III.   Post-Tenure Review Processes: Institutional post-tenure review policies and procedures shall require the following:

A.   Institutions shall utilize the training provided by the UNC System for all post-tenure review evaluators, including peer review committee members, department chairs/academic unit heads, and deans.

B.   At the beginning of the post-tenure review cycle, the faculty member and the department chair/academic unit head shall develop a long-term work plan. That plan shall be coordinated with the annual work plans and evaluations required by UNC Policy 400.3.4, *Policy on Faculty Workload*, although annual evaluations are not a substitute for the comprehensive, periodic, cumulative performance (post-tenure) review required by the Board of Governors. The plan shall be approved by the college/school Dean (or appropriate next-level supervisor).

1.   Institutional policies and procedures shall allow faculty members, in consultation with the department chair/academic unit head, to modify the f long-term workplan annually, ifdeemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. Plan modifications must be approved by the college/school Dean (or appropriate next-level supervisor).

2.   Institutional policies and procedures shall address how any faculty success plans resulting from an annual evaluation shall be considered in the post-tenure review process.

C.   A post-tenure evaluation committee, consisting of tenured faculty, for a department/academic unit shall be selected by a process agreed upon by the tenured faculty in that unit, in accordance with the following guidelines.

1.   The faculty member being reviewed shall not have the option of selecting members of the post-tenure evaluation committee.

2.   The post-tenure evaluation committee shall consist of no less than three (3) tenured faculty members from the department/unit.

3.   If the institution's department includes no other expert in the specific field of research/creative activity of the faculty member under review, institutions may establish a process for requesting external faculty experts to provide a review of the candidate's work (e.g., research and publications). The external expert shall be a tenured faculty member and, if available, from a UNC constituent institution.

D.   A self-assessment component shall be part of the post-tenure review processes. This component shall provide faculty members the opportunity to offer the post-tenure evaluation committee an important perspective. Each institution shall design and define the specifics on length, format, and required information for these self-assessments.

E.   The post-tenure evaluation committee shall provide a brief, written rationale for each assessment in each relevant category (teaching, research/creative activity, service), in

accordance with the faculty member's long-term work plan and allocation of duties. The peer review committee shall provide an overall ranking of exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations.

1. Any 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.

2. Any performance review that indicates the faculty member does not meet expectations shall include a statement of the faculty member's primary responsibilities and specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties and the directional goals established.

F. The department chair/academic unit head shall provide a separate, written evaluation of the faculty member. That evaluation shall explicitly state points of concurrence or points of variation from the post-tenure evaluation committee. Any recommendation for a faculty success plan or for recognition of performance that exceeds expectations shall be accompanied by a specific rationale for that recommendation.

G. Before the reviews of the post-tenure evaluation committee and the department chair/academic unit head proceed to the dean, the faculty member shall have no less than fourteen (14) calendar days from receiving these documents to provide a written response. If the faculty member under review disagrees with the evaluation, the response shall offer evidence in support of a different assessment. The response shall become part of the permanent record of the post-tenure review moving forward.

H. The appropriate dean shall provide a written evaluative review based on the faculty member's materials and the reports of the post-tenure evaluation committee, the department chair/academic unit head, and any written response from the faculty member. Other than relief available through an institutional grievance process, the dean's rating is the final rating (and one reported to the UNC System Office).

1. A faculty member whose review results in an overall rating of exceeding expectations shall be considered to have completed the post-tenure review process. Institutions shall create a process to forward recommendations regarding a faculty member exceeding expectations to the chief academic officer, however titled, for recognition and/or reward. Institutional policies shall indicate how the names of faculty who exceeded expectations are advanced for such recognition and/or award, what types of recognition and/or reward are available, and how such recognition and/or award are/is bestowed.

2. A faculty member whose review results in an overall rating of meets expectations shall be considered to have completed the post-tenure review process.

3. A faculty member whose review results in an overall rating of does not meet expectations shall be subject to a faculty success plan.

I. Faculty success plans shall be formative, developed in cooperation with the faculty member, and include specific steps designed to lead to improvement. Institutions shall specify

timelines of at least one year from the date of the implementation of the success plan, or longer, depending on the area in which improvement is required. The faculty success plan must include a clear statement of consequences, in accordance with Chapter VI of *The Code* should improvement not occur within the designated timeline.

      1.   Peer mentoring is encouraged as part of the faculty success plans.

      2.   Progress meetings with the department chair/academic unit head shall occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified timeline.

      3.   The department chair/academic unit head, in consultation with the dean, may redefine faculty workloads and distribution of teaching, research/creative activity, and service in cases where a faculty member receives a does not meet expectations post-tenure review assessment.

          a.   The chair/head and dean shall ensure any changes to these duties are not punitive responses to the faculty member and instead address ways to support the department, school/college, and institution to better leverage the faculty member's expertise and abilities and improve their performance.

          b.   The faculty success plan shall detail the changes in duties and responsibilities the faculty member's annual work plan shall also change accordingly to ensure the faculty member is evaluated appropriately, based on the relevant allocation of workload.

J.   The department chairs/academic unit heads, through their deans, shall certify compliance with all aspects of the post- tenure review process and with UNC policy and guidelines to the chief academic officer, however titled. The chief academic officers, in turn, shall note the institution's compliance in an annual report on post-tenure review to the UNC System Office.

IV.   The UNC System Office shall review the post-tenure review processes of all institutions on a five-year rotating cycle, unless irregularities at a particular institution are identified.

A.   If/when such irregularities are identified, then the UNC System Office shall conduct more frequent reviews of that institution, as deemed appropriate by the president or designee.

B.   As part of this review, the president or designee shall certify that the constituent institution is in compliance with all aspects of the policy and guidelines.

Faculty Senate, University of North Carolina Wilmington

Motion 2024-12-02

1. **Maker**: Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee

2. **Dates discussed in Faculty Senate**: December 10, 2024

3. **Rationale**:

To bring UNCW into compliance with UNC System Regulation 400.3.1.1 [R], UNCW will need to adjust its timeline for the peer assessment portion of the teaching evaluation done for post-tenure review. After parsing the new policy and checking with Dr. Soler at the System Office, we confirmed that the intent of the new policy is to move peer assessment of teaching to the halfway point in the post-tenure review process. This requirement can be found in II.A.1.a of Regulation 400.3.1.1 [R].

4. **Motion**:

To comply with UNC System Regulation 400.3.1.1 [R], the Faculty Handbook procedures governing post-tenure review should be revised as follows:

CH IV.H. 5.d. (p. 114)

Performance shall be reviewed for the preceding five years, unless one or more of the above conditions exists. At the beginning of the PTR cycle, faculty members will prepare, in consultation with their chair/school director, a brief written five- year plan or set of goals consistent with the expectations of the department/school. This plan can be modified annually by the faculty member in consultation with the department chair/school director as deemed appropriate.

Peer evaluation of teaching for the purposes of post-tenure review shall take place between the second and third years after the most recent post-tenure review, promotion, or return to full-time faculty status after serving in an administrative position. A written report must result from this review within 14 days, to which the faculty member will have the opportunity to respond within 14 days.

No later than the fifth academic year following the events outlined in IV.H.5.c. ("Timetable") above, a faculty member being reviewed shall provide a succinct written report, for the period being evaluated, on all aspects of professional activities in teaching, research/artistic achievement, and service. Faculty members who have professional responsibilities or modified assignments that affect the balance of their duties between teaching, research, and service must note this in their report . . .

5. **Senate action**: Approved.

6. **Necessary/requested effective date**: Upon full approval.

Faculty Senate, University of North Carolina Wilmington

Motion 2024-12-04

1. **Maker**: Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate

2. **Dates discussed in Faculty Senate**: December 10, 2024

3. **Rationale**:

UNC Regulation 400.3.3.1[R] requires each institution to specify the format and content for long-term work plans:

"II.C As part of the PTR policies/regulations, each institution shall develop and publish procedures/guidance on tenured faculty member long-term work plans. These long-term work plans shall cover the five years of the post-tenure cycle. Institutional policies/regulations shall include the format and any requirements required of all long-term work plans. "

4. **Motion**:

To bring UNCW into compliance with UNC 400.3.3.1[R], we propose the following change/addition to the Faculty Handbook:

CH IV.5.d (p. 114)

By the end of the academic year following the last personnel action, tenured faculty members will prepare, in consultation with their chair/school director, a brief written five-year plan consistent with the expectations of the department/school. This plan, in no more than three pages, outlines professional goals in teaching, scholarship/research/artistic activity, and service, that align with departmental/school expectations and institutional mission. The plan is approved by the department chair/director and dean.

5. **Senate action**: Approved.

6. **Necessary/requested effective date**: Upon full approval.

Faculty Senate, University of North Carolina Wilmington

Motion 2024-12-05

1. **Maker**: Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate

2. **Dates discussed in Faculty Senate**: December 10, 2024

3. **Rationale**:

UNC Regulation 400.3.3.1[R] requires each institution to specify that the dean's rating is the final rating for PTR:

"III. H. The appropriate dean shall provide a written evaluative review based on the faculty member's materials and the reports of the post-tenure evaluation committee, the department chair/academic unit head, and any written response from the faculty member. Other than relief available through an institutional grievance process, the dean's rating is the final rating (and one reported to the UNC System Office)."

4. **Motion**:

To bring UNCW into compliance with UNC 400.3.3.1[R], we propose the following change/addition to the Faculty Handbook:

CH IV.5.d (p. 115)

The dean will conduct an evaluative review of these materials and provide the department chair/school director and the faculty member a written statement reporting the outcome of the review (*exceeds expectations, meets expectations* or *does not meet expectations)* and the major reasons for the determination. Other than relief available through an institutional grievance process, the dean's rating is the final rating (and one reported to the UNC System Office).

5. **Senate action**: Approved.

6. **Necessary/requested effective date**: Upon full approval.

Faculty Senate, University of North Carolina Wilmington

Motion 2024-12-06

1. **Maker**: Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate

2. **Dates discussed in Faculty Senate**: December 10, 2024

3. **Rationale**:

UNC Regulation 400.3.3.1[R] requires that faculty have 14 days to write a response to their PTR:

III. G. "Before the reviews of the post-tenure evaluation committee and the department chair/academic unit head proceed to the dean, the faculty member shall have no less than fourteen (14) calendar days from receiving these documents to provide a written response. If the faculty member under review disagrees with the evaluation, the response shall offer evidence in support of a different assessment. The response shall become part of the permanent record of the post-tenure review moving forward."

4. **Motion**:

To bring UNCW into compliance with UNC 400.3.3.1[R], we propose the following change/addition to the Faculty Handbook:

CH IV.5.d (p. 115)

The department chair/school director shall provide a copy of the chair's/director's written evaluation and the peer review committee recommendation to the faculty member and shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation. The faculty member has the option of attaching a written response to this evaluation within fourteen days of receiving the evaluation. After fourteen days, the department chair/school director shall forward the faculty member's PTR report, a list of the peer evaluators, a copy of the written evaluation, and the faculty member's written response, if any, to the appropriate dean.

5. **Senate action**: Approved.

6. **Necessary/requested effective date**: Upon full approval.

AGENDA ITEM

Student Affairs Report
Presented by Dr. Christine Reed Davis, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Situation:
Highlight significant events, accomplishments, and progress made on ongoing projects, as well as outline any new strategic efforts undertaken to enhance student life and support services. The goal is to keep the Board informed of the division's contributions to the university's overall mission and to foster continued alignment with institutional pillars and priorities.

Background:
Since the October 2024 Board of Trustees meeting, the Division of Student Affairs has continued to focus on enhancing the student experience through various initiatives, programming, and strategic projects. These efforts are directly aligned with the university's strategic plan, specifically Priority 2: To enhance student services/success.

Assessment:
N/A

Action:
This item is informational only.

Supporting Documentation:
N/A

AGENDA ITEM

Building Bridges: Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Collaborations in Community Engagement
Presented by Dr. Jaime Russell, Director of Student Community Engagement, and Mr. Gene Felice II, Associate Director of Community Based Learning and Scholarship

Situation:

Dr. Russell and Mr. Felice will explore the essential role of both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in creating a sense of belonging, connection, and active participation for students within the university and greater Wilmington communities. The presentation will highlight how both divisions contribute to bridging gaps among students, faculty, staff, administration, and Wilmington community members through programs, services, and initiatives designed to enhance community engagement. Emphasis will be placed on how these efforts foster a vibrant environment for academic and social growth.

Background:

Community Commitment is a key pillar of the UNCW Strategic Plan and includes Priority 12: Increase opportunities for community engagement. Our joint efforts to increase opportunities for our university to engage with the community will also support our efforts in preparing our application for Reclassification as a Carnegie-designated Community Engaged institution. This agenda item will update the board on recent community engagement initiatives and efforts.

Assessment:

N/A

Action:

This item is informational only.

Supporting Documentation:

Building Bridges: Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Collaborations in Community Engagement PowerPoint Presentation