

DAC Policy on “Satisfactory” and “Unsatisfactory” Annual Evaluations

(Adopted December 15, 2020, revised February 5, 2024)

[UNT Policy 06.035 Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility](#) describes the general rights and responsibilities of all faculty members. The DAC advises all faculty to familiarize themselves with the responsibilities clearly detailed in this policy. Adhering to these guidelines is an essential component of “satisfactory” job performance.

During the annual review process, the DAC evaluates tenure-system faculty on the categories of teaching, research, and service and lecturers on the categories of teaching and service. The DAC utilizes the definitions of teaching, research, and service as outlined in [UNT Policy 06.007 Full-time Faculty and Academic Administrator Annual Review, and Academic Administrator Reappointment](#).

Faculty are expected to earn “satisfactory” evaluations in each relevant field.

The DAC expects faculty to engage consistently in satisfactory teaching but acknowledges that there may be some natural variation in research productivity or engagement in service at different moments in faculty members’ careers. For this reason, UNT includes three years of activities in each annual evaluation cycle, and the Department of History recognizes the publication of a book as evidence of scholarly activity for five years. Furthermore, evaluations of “unsatisfactory” performance in the areas of service and research will typically not be made based on performance during any single calendar year but instead will be the reflection of ongoing trends of uncorrected deficient performance for two or more years. Any “unsatisfactory” ratings will require a majority vote by the DAC.

Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Research

Tenure-system faculty members are expected to demonstrate ongoing scholarly engagement. The [Department of History Workload Policy](#) clearly outlines expectations for faculty who wish to maintain a research-emphasis workload. Meeting the qualifications for a research-emphasis workload is evidence of “satisfactory” performance.

Anyone who does not meet these criteria will be placed on a more teaching or service-intensive workload. However, they must still maintain an appropriate level of research to receive a “satisfactory” evaluation. The paths for demonstrating satisfactory engagement vary, but faculty members on a teaching or service-intensive workload must demonstrate some research activity each year—whether measured by publications, applying for grant funding, presenting research at conferences and other venues, or by providing the DAC with evidence of new scholarly work in progress.

It is expected that all faculty members develop plans appropriate to the research percentage of their workload to disseminate their research through publication or by other means, such as digital research projects. Faculty members who do not have an

active and demonstrable plan to disseminate their research, may be deemed “unsatisfactory” in this area.

Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Teaching

Satisfactory teaching requires that faculty meet their classes as scheduled, prepare appropriately for in-person and online teaching assignments, create and upload syllabi in a timely manner, adhere to accessibility guidelines, turn in audit rolls and grades on time, and be responsive to both undergraduate and graduate students. SPOT scores at or above the departmental average will provide evidence of satisfactory teaching. However, the DAC acknowledges that teaching evaluations do not provide a holistic picture. Furthermore, they are imperfect instruments that statistically favor members of some identity groups over others. For these reasons, faculty may provide additional evidence of “satisfactory” teaching. Additional materials which may include, but are not limited to, peer observation reports, teaching philosophies, sample syllabi and course materials, evidence of participating in professional development activities sponsored by CLEAR, and written feedback from students may be clearly labeled and uploaded to FIS as supplemental materials during the annual evaluation process. Faculty with below average SPOT scores are urged to provide supplementary materials to demonstrate teaching proficiency and, when appropriate, to detail ongoing efforts to improve their performance in the classroom.

Unsatisfactory teaching will not be measured by SPOT scores alone. However, teaching evaluations that consistently fall substantially below the departmental average or two or more SPOT scores that fall below 3.0 during any three-year evaluation window may be interpreted as evidence of unsatisfactory teaching. Persistent and unaddressed student complaints, refusal to engage—as appropriate—with both undergraduate and graduate students, unsatisfactory peer evaluations of teaching, and failure to follow university policies may also be used as evidence of “unsatisfactory” teaching.

Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Service

Satisfactory performance in service will vary according to rank and according to workload allocation. The Department of History values service to the college, university, and profession and recognizes the varied dimensions of service in the annual evaluation process. However, there is no substitute for maintaining some level of service engagement with the mission of the department.

Lecturers typically have at least a 20% service workload assignment and thus should perform significant service. Among the tenure-system faculty, faculty in their probationary period will generally have the lowest service expectations and full professors will have the highest. Faculty will be expected to take on leadership roles in service work appropriate to their workload percentages and rank.

At all ranks, satisfactory service includes attending scheduled meetings (including department meetings); responding to emails from the Department Chair, committee chairs, and office staff in a timely manner; and participating in committee work as

appropriate. Satisfactory performance will be measured qualitatively as well as quantitatively. During the annual evaluation process, faculty should use the supplemental “Executive Summary” to qualitatively describe their service contributions. When appropriate, the DAC may also ask committee chairs for feedback on quality of service.

Unsatisfactory service includes not performing service at a level appropriate to rank and workload, not attending meetings, not fulfilling service work assignments or doing so inadequately, and not responding to routine e-mails or fulfilling required administrative tasks.

Rewards for Satisfactory Performance

Faculty members who receive “satisfactory” annual evaluations will be eligible for merit raises.

Remedies for Unsatisfactory Performance

During the annual evaluation process, the DAC will notify faculty members of any areas of concern. During the next annual evaluation period, faculty members who received such notifications as part of their annual review will be expected to provide documentation of improvement in the weak area(s). Failure to address the DAC’s concerns may be interpreted as evidence of unsatisfactory performance.

The DAC will recommend workload readjustments in accordance with the [Department of History Workload Policy](#) as appropriate as a response to inferior performance in any area. For example, if someone’s engagement in research is at risk of being deemed as “unsatisfactory,” they may be assigned a higher teaching workload and a lower research workload to reflect their areas of strength and contributions more accurately to the department.

In instances where an unsatisfactory evaluation cannot be remedied by a workload adjustment alone, then the overall evaluation will be deemed “unsatisfactory.” This may be the case, for example, if a faculty member receives “unsatisfactory” ratings in all areas of job performance or in both teaching and research for tenure system faculty or in teaching for lecturers.

In accordance with UNT Policy [06.052 Review of Tenured Faculty](#), tenured faculty members will receive not only an overall evaluation score, but individual assessments of their performance in teaching, research, and service. An “unsatisfactory” ranking in any single area of performance will result in a tenured faculty member being put on a Professional Development Plan.