**PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION**

Adopted by the DAC December 4, 2002
(As amended 8 March 2006)

(With updates suggested by the Chair May 2017, pending DAC approval)

1. Each year, according to a schedule established annually by the College of Arts and Sciences, each faculty member in the Department of History fills out a Faculty Annual Update Information Form (VPAA-160; see Department website) with his/her activities and accomplishments during that calendar year, plus the preceding two calendar years. In the words of the University Faculty Handbook: "Use of this three-year time period lessens both the impact of temporary aberrations in a faculty member's usual productivity and year-to-year differences in funds available for faculty salaries." (Faculty Handbook Sect. II.E)
2. The Department Chair compiles a file for each faculty member consisting of the Faculty Annual Update Information Form and supporting information such as copies of publications and summaries of student evaluations. This file thus includes information on teaching (classes taught, new classes, effectiveness of instruction, etc.); research, publication, and professional activities (books, articles, papers presented, etc.); and service (committee memberships, offices held in professional societies, etc.). The evaluation process takes into account everything in this file. (A faculty member may request that a book that appears near the end of an evaluation period—2003-2005, for example—with a copyright date for the following year—2006, in this example—be counted for the just-completed evaluation period, providing that the book is in hands of the Departmental Affairs Committee [DAC] by the time of the DAC’s annual evaluation meeting and that the faculty member in question makes the request in writing and places a copy of the request in his/her annual update files in succeeding years.)
3. Members of the Departmental office staff prepare Excel spreadsheets to calculate average Performance Evaluation ratings for each faculty member. These spreadsheets take the place of, and perform the same function as, the paper “Performance Evaluation Forms” previously used. 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*.
4. 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.

Faculty members with special workloads determined by the Dean will be evaluated as directed by the Dean.

1. 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 evaluation paragraphs for each faculty member other than himself; the Secretary of the DAC will draft an evaluation of the Department Chair.
2. The DAC will then meet to discuss the annual evaluations. The DAC will discuss each faculty member’s numerical evaluation and paragraph 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.
3. 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 he/she was placed or his/her Performance Evaluation Forms. For purposes of confidentiality, that information is given to the Department Chair to be compiled.

1. After the meeting is over the Department Chair gives each faculty member a copy of his/her paragraph, Performance Evaluation Rating, and the group to which he/she has been assigned and informs him/her that appeals to the DAC may be made within ten calendar days.
2. At the end of ten calendar days, final versions of the paragraphs and Performance Evaluation Forms and a final group for each member of the faculty are approved. The Department Chair then forwards these evaluations to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences.
3. 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.

CRITERIA FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Adopted by the Department January 22, 2003

The Department Affairs Committee (DAC) will assess the work of full-time tenured and tenure track faculty on the basis of the work distribution outlined in each faculty member’s Total Workload Report Form for the three-year period under evaluation.

Because the Department of History is a Ph.D. granting department, it is expected that full-time faculty members will be active in the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Therefore, faculty members shall choose some variant of workload option 1 or workload option 3. Exceptions may be made for faculty members who have significant administrative duties which bring them under the direct supervision of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and who have received permission from the Dean to adopt a workload distribution that does not fall into category 1, 2, or 3.

The DAC will assess each faculty member’s three-year record of scholarship, teaching, and service in light of the following considerations:

1. Evaluation of scholarship will take into consideration a faculty member’s published research and work in progress including:

1. 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.)
2. 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.)
3. Encyclopedia entries of substantial size (more than a few hundred words) that show evidence of significant research in scholarly sources.
4. 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.

2. The DAC will assess a faculty member’s teaching on the basis of:

1. Numerical student evaluations
2. Written student evaluations (if submitted by the faculty member)
3. Supervision of graduate students
4. Syllabi and other course materials submitted by the faculty member
5. Statement of teaching philosophy

3. The DAC will assess a faculty member’s record of service including:

a. Service on Department committees
b. Service on College of Arts and Sciences committees
c. Service on University committees

d. Other service to the Department, the College, the University, profession, and/or the community.