PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION
Adopted by the DAC December 4, 2002
(As amended 8 March 2006, May 2017, 26 August 2022, 5 February 2024)

Each year, according to a schedule established annually by the Provost's office, each faculty member in the Department of History updates their activities and accomplishments during that calendar year, plus the preceding two calendar years, using the Faculty Information System. FIS will generate an annual review report, which, according to policy must be considered in the annual review process. In addition, the DAC asks faculty members to submit other materials.

After updating their activities on FIS, faculty should upload evaluation materials required by the Departmental Affairs Committee. These will include:

1. A preferred CV that covers the faculty member's entire career (not just the three-year window).
2. An "Executive Summary" of approximately 750 words, which highlights major accomplishments; gives the DAC the context needed to appreciate the significance of field-specific publication venues, organizations, activities, etc.; and gives explanations for failure to make progress or perform satisfactorily in any area of a faculty member's workload. Faculty members have the discretion to craft these summaries as they see fit with the goal of giving the DAC better tools to evaluate their performance.
3. Other documents that the DAC requires in any given year.
4. Optional additional materials uploaded at a faculty member's discretion to document achievements, progress, and effort expended in any area of a faculty member's workload. For example, faculty may wish to upload drafts of unpublished manuscripts, course syllabi, or other evidence of quality teaching.

The evaluation process considers everything included in FIS, which includes student evaluations.

Members of the Departmental office staff prepare Excel spreadsheets to calculate average Performance Evaluation ratings for each faculty member. Each DAC member receives three Excel spreadsheets: one on which they enter their evaluations of all faculty members except the Department Chair and the Secretary of the DAC; one on which they enter their evaluation of the Department Chair only; and one on which they enter their evaluation of the Secretary of the DAC only.

In accordance with UNT Policy 06.052, the process for evaluating tenured faculty members differs slightly. Please see the section below titled "Applying UNT Policy 06.052 Review of Tenured Faculty to the Annual Review Process" for more details.

Each member of the DAC reads the files and prepares an evaluation of each faculty member (except himself/herself), using the Excel spreadsheet to arrive at a quantitative score. This is

accomplished by giving each faculty member a score from 0 to 10 on each of the evaluation categories; i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service. The spreadsheet then multiplies that by the percentage of effort that the faculty member's "contract" (Workload Report Form) dedicates to teaching, scholarship, and service during the three- year period of evaluation.

For example, a faculty member who received a score of 8 on teaching, 8 on research, and 5 on service and whose "contract" dedicated 40 percent to teaching, 40 percent to research, and 20 percent to service, would receive a total score of 7.40 [(8 x .40 = 3.20) + (8 x .40 = 3.20) + (5 x .20 = 1.00) = 7.40].

Each member of the DAC completes the three spreadsheets. They send the spreadsheet with their evaluations of all faculty other than the Chair and the Secretary of the DAC to the Secretary of the DAC with copy to the Chair. They send the spreadsheet with the evaluation of the Chair only to the Secretary of the DAC. They send the spreadsheet with their evaluation of the Secretary of the DAC only to the Chair. DAC members do not evaluate themselves, their spouses or partners.

The Chair and the Secretary of the DAC separately prepare master Excel spreadsheets in which they collate the individual DAC members' evaluations to calculate the DAC's collective evaluation of each faculty member. In addition, the Department Chair will draft a narrative evaluation for each faculty member other than themselves; the Secretary of the DAC will draft an evaluation of the Department Chair.

The DAC will then meet to discuss the annual evaluations. The DAC will discuss each faculty member's numerical evaluation and narrative evaluations in turn. During the discussion, DAC members may decide to change the evaluation numbers that they had assigned to individual faculty members. The Chair and the Secretary of the DAC will enter those changes on their master spreadsheets. Every effort is made to arrive at a consensus, but if necessary a secret ballot is taken to determine the Performance Evaluation of a faculty member. Members of the DAC leave the room when the DAC discusses their evaluation or the evaluation of a spouse or partner.

Once the DAC has agreed on overall scores for each faculty member, the Secretary of the DAC will put all the scores—without names attached and excluding the Department Chair's score—up on the whiteboard. The DAC will then determine where the logical breaks are to divide the scores into groups (Group 1 being the highest and Group 5 being the lowest). If no score is low enough to justify a ranking of "Group 5," the DAC will divide the scores into four groups. If no score is low enough to justify a ranking of "Group 4," the DAC will divide the scores up into three groups.

The secretary of the DAC, will then compile: a list of the names of all members of the faculty (other than the Department Chair) and the group in which they were placed and will forward that list to the Department Chair.

The secretary does not receive information on the group in which they were placed. For purposes of confidentiality, that information is given to the Department Chair to be compiled. After the meeting is over the Department Chair uploads the narrative evaluation and group ranking to FIS and informs the faculty that appeals to the DAC may be made within ten calendar days.

In the event that the DAC rejects a faculty member's appeal of the annual evaluation, the faculty member may then file a grievance under the procedures outlined in the Department Charter, Article IX. Appeals of an annual evaluation may be taken to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences only after the faculty member has been through the grievance procedure at the department level.

During the annual evaluation, the DAC will also make recommendations about faculty workload for the next academic year, using the Department of History Workload Policy guidelines.

CRITERIA FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
Adopted by the Department January 22, 2003
(As amended by the DAC 26 August 2022)

The Department Affairs Committee (DAC) will assess the work of full-time faculty on the basis of the work distribution outlined in each faculty member's workload assignment for the three-year period under evaluation.

Tenure-system faculty members will be evaluated in the three areas: scholarship, teaching, and service. Lecturers will be evaluated in two areas: teaching and service.

The DAC will assess each area in light of the following considerations:
Evaluation of scholarship will take into consideration a faculty member's published research and work in progress including:
Research monographs (books) that are the product of substantial research based on primary sources. (Because a research monograph requires years of research and writing, such books will be counted for five years beginning with the year of publication.)
Edited books involving significant primary research; major works of synthesis such as textbooks; research articles and book chapters based on scholarly research; anthologies and readers; and presentation of research at professional conferences, with particular value placed on participation in national and international conferences of major professional organizations. (Items in this category are not listed in any rank order of importance. Each will be considered as having secondary importance only to a research monograph. However, any book-length item in this category that is reviewed in a scholarly journal may be submitted for consideration during the fourth and fifth years after its publication.)
Encyclopedia entries of substantial size (more than a few hundred words) that show evidence of significant research in scholarly sources.

Minor encyclopedia and historical dictionary entries (those of only a few hundred words), book reviews and "think pieces" (reflective articles expressing opinions or conclusions but not presenting the results of research). However, such items are not as important as those listed in a., b., and c. above.

The DAC will consider digital scholarship and other scholarly activities that fall outside of the traditional model of printed books and articles, but in those instances, faculty members are responsible for providing the DAC with the necessary context, peer reviews, and/ or explanations to enable the committee to properly assess these contributions.

The DAC will assess a faculty member's teaching on the basis of:
Numerical student evaluations
Written student evaluations
Supervision of graduate students
Syllabi and other course materials submitted by the faculty member
Statement of teaching philosophy

The DAC will assess a faculty member's record of service including:
Service on Department committees
Service on College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences committees
Service on University committees
Other service to the Department, the College, the University, profession, and/or the community.

The DAC will also evaluate faculty using the guidelines described in the DAC Policy on Teaching Evaluation and the DAC Policy on Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Annual Evaluations.

DAC Advice for Serving as a DAC Member, Compiling Evaluation Materials, and Interpreting Evaluation Results
Adopted by the DAC on August 26, 2022, updated on February 5, 2024)

Although the DAC strictly adheres to the "Procedures for Annual Evaluation" and attempts to be as transparent as possible about the process, questions inevitably arise. The purpose of this document is to offer advice and to clear up potential misconceptions related to the evaluation process.

Advice for New DAC Members

Excellence and top performance are moving targets. Individual faculty are evaluated within the context of what other faculty accomplished in any given three-year evaluation period. Not only are faculty rated relative to each other, this is done with the expectation that each of us will have valleys and peaks in our careers. As long as overall job performance is satisfactory, some variation in accomplishments from year to year is expected and is a natural part of the academic career.

There are no specific guidelines for how individual evaluators utilize the 1-10 scale rating system. Some members use all of the numbers between 1 and 10; others prefer to make 5 or 6 their lowest score. During the course of many years of debate and discussion, the DAC has determined that variations in how the scoring system is applied are fine as long as each member is consistent within their own evaluation schema.

As a DAC member you should outline your evaluation criteria system and scale *before* you being the process of evaluation. This will enable you to be more objective in both creating and in applying your evaluation plan.

One of the most important aspects of the evaluation process is the committee's discussion of each faculty member, which takes place after each individual finishes their scoring. This is an important opportunity for the committee to identify any inconsistencies with individual or with overall ratings. *DAC members may change their scores if inconsistencies or errors are found during these discussions.* The DAC is committed to taking the time necessary to build a consensus and ultimately to endorse final evaluation scores agreed upon by the entire committee.

One possible model for applying the 1-10 scale is as follows:

1-4: Needs Improvement
5-7: Satisfactory
8-10: Excellent

Advice for Compiling Annual Evaluation Materials

Make sure that you carefully follow the DAC instructions each year. In addition to updating your information on FIS, each year you should upload a copy of your entire CV (which the DAC needs in order to apply the workload policy effectively) and your Executive Summary. Sometimes the DAC may ask for additional materials. For example, the committee asked for COVID impact statements in 2020 and 2021. In 2022, faculty were asked to upload a report of their efforts to evaluate and improve their teaching.

Arguably, the Executive Summary is the most important part of the entire submission. Use this document to highlight your greatest accomplishments and to explain and contextualize any weaknesses.

Inevitably, anyone who does not follow instructions will receive a lower final evaluation score than they would have otherwise. The DAC reads all faculty files in conversation with each other, and the committee is far better equipped to understand the accomplishments of those who submit well-organized and complete materials.

Advice for Interpreting Your Annual Evaluation

We were all "A" students, but we will not all be in Group 1 each year. Generally speaking, faculty in Groups 1-3 are performing satisfactorily; faculty in Group 4 have areas of needed improvement; and faculty in Group 5 are performing unsatisfactory work. However, group rankings must be considered in relation to the narrative evaluation and cannot be interpreted separately.

Throughout different stages of your career you will end up in different evaluation groups. This is because major accomplishments, which earn top scores, are sometimes seasonal and/ or take a long time to develop. For example, your research scores will be higher when you have a book in the evaluation window than when you don't, and higher still if you have other publications beyond the book or have multiple books in the window. In the realm of teaching, you will likely advise more graduate students later in your career than you will earlier. There may be moments when you are deeply engaged in developing new, innovative courses and others when you are not. In service, you may hold leadership roles during some seasons of your career and not others. (These are just a few examples of how our careers morph over time.)

We have *excellent* faculty. For this reason, the DAC must often look to those who have gone "above and beyond" in some capacity when giving evaluation scores that differentiate levels of achievement as we are required to do. For example, if a majority of faculty members have recently published books, the highest research scores might go to those with additional, recent research achievements. In the realm of teaching, many faculty members have excellent SPOT scores. Therefore, the highest ratings may be given to those who advise a disproportionate number of graduate students, win teaching awards, or work with CLEAR to develop innovative new courses, to give a few potential examples. The highest service scores will likely go to those with leadership roles, multiple and time-consuming service assignments, or who are particularly engaged with and proactive about finding ways to serve our community.

We cannot all go "above and beyond" in each area all of the time. It is unreasonable to expect that all of our outstanding faculty can be placed in Group 1 every year.

Please note, Group 2 invariably contains very good scholars, teachers, and departmental citizens. Anyone in that group in any given year is in excellent company.

If you receive a Group 3 evaluation, it *might* mean that you have an area of weakness that you need to address. However, it may not. Often early-career faculty land in Group 3 despite the fact that they are excelling in all areas of their jobs according to their career stage. For example, a new faculty member who has not yet had time to publish a book will naturally receive a lower research score than a full professor with two books in the window. New faculty should not interpret a Group 3 ranking as evidence of poor performance.

A Group 4 evaluation will generally indicate that improvement is needed in order to avoid future unsatisfactory evaluation scores. A Group 5 evaluation will indicate unsatisfactory performance.

Regardless of group ranking, the most important part of your annual evaluation is the narrative evaluation of your performance. This document should highlight your contributions and, most importantly, outline any areas of needed improvement. The narrative evaluation will clearly identify achievements as well as areas of needed improvement. The DAC is committed to appropriately recognizing achievements and contributions and to helping people improve their performance and grow in the profession. Please feel free to reach out to any member of the committee to discuss any questions you have about either the evaluation process or its outcome.

Applying UNT Policy 06.052 Review of Tenured Faculty to the Annual Review Process

In responses to changes in Texas state law regarding tenure, Policy 06.052 was revised in 2023. It states that a tenured faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory evaluation in any area of work—teaching, research, or service—"shall be placed on a PDP" (professional development plan).

In 2024, the annual review process in the FIS system was amended for tenured faculty members. Now unit administrators are required to evaluate tenured faculty on each, individual area of performance and also give an overall evaluation using a drop-down menu.

For each domain (teaching, research, service)*, the choices from the drop-down menu are:

Exemplary
Satisfactory
Unsatisfactory

For a faculty member's overall evaluation rating, the choices from the drop-down menu are:

Exemplary
Sustained effectiveness
Unsustained effectiveness

In response to these changes, the DAC has implemented the following changes, which will be implemented in 2024 for the 2021-2023 evaluation cycle:

-Tenured faculty members will be assigned a group ranking (from 1 to 5, with one being the highest), not only for their overall evaluation score. They will receive a group ranking for each area of performance (teaching, research, and service), for a total of four group rankings:
1.Teaching
2. Research
3. Service
4. Overall

Although tenured faculty members will receive four group rankings, the overall ranking will be used for the purpose of assigning future merit increases.

The DAC will correlate group rankings to the drop-down menus in the following manner:

Group 1= Exemplary
Groups 2-4= Satisfactory or Sustained Effectiveness
Group 5= Unsatisfactory

Faculty members placed in Group 4 in any single category or in their overall evaluation, may be in danger of future "unsatisfactory" evaluations. In such an instance, the DAC will provide feedback about what a faculty member needs to do in order to improve their performance.

*Faculty with "administration" as part of their workload will receive an evaluation for that domain as well, for a total of four domains.