Department of History Triennial Review (Faculty Performance Evaluation) Guidelines

Approved May 12, 2021

Overview

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching, scholarship, and service activities by September 20 each year for the previous August 1-July 31 period. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated for each assigned component (teaching, scholarship, and service) annually. The individual categories will be designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

In Years 1 and 2 of the cycle they will be evaluated by their chair and dean, either of whom may trigger a review by the college personnel committee, which may then lead to a full review or not. In year 3, faculty will be evaluated by their department personnel committee and department chair in independent reviews.

Annual Data Entry

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching, scholarship, and service activities by September 20 each year for the previous August 1-July 31 period. All faculty provide evidence of teaching effectiveness including, at a minimum, syllabi and the University-wide student course evaluations for any courses taught during the review period*. Faculty may include evidence providing support of effectiveness in other domains, but only the domains in which the faculty member has an assignment shall be considered relevant. Faculty who serve as chairpersons also may submit materials related to their administrative duties in the three faculty domains, as appropriate.

*Exempting those for Spring 2020

(It should be noted that faculty who serve as chairpersons undergo a separate, triennial evaluation of their administrative effectiveness. See Faculty Handbook, Section 350.4). Only that portion of the chairperson's activities related to the faculty-specific domains shall be evaluated within the framework of the Faculty Performance Evaluation as described in this document.

Process for Years 1 and 2

Chair Review

Each year, after September 20, the chairperson shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains. The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by October 20.

Dean Review

Each year, after September 20, the Dean shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. The Dean will also review department chairpersons in the three faculty domains. This evaluation

will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains. The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by November 10.

For these annual reviews, the Chair and the Dean in evaluating scholarship and service expectations should consider that the DOH guidelines for "meeting" expectations in scholarship and service were created with the understanding that this would occur within the 3-year time-frame and not annually. Any annual evaluations of scholarship and service should proceed within the spirit of those guidelines drawn up by the department, excepting those annual stipulations drawn up following a "Does Not Meet" rating of a faculty member after a 3rd-year review.

Outcomes of Chair and Dean Reviews

If both the chair and the Dean agree that the faculty member is meeting expectations in all three domains, the review is complete.

If they do not agree, then the college personnel committee shall determine by November 30, based on the faculty member's materials and the review by the chair and Dean whether a full review is required. If they determine that a full review is not required, the review process is complete.

If both the chair and the Dean agree that the faculty member is NOT meeting expectations in at least one of the three domains, a full review will be conducted.

Full Review

If a full review is required, the faculty member will have the opportunity to provide a one page narrative of no more than 3000 characters to explain, rebut, or appeal the finding of not meeting expectations. This narrative will be due no later than December 10.

A full review involves review by the departmental personnel committee, department chair, college personnel committee, and Dean. Each level of review will consider the narrative submitted by the faculty member along with the faculty member's FAD materials for the review period. The department personnel committee and chair will have their independent evaluations made by January 20 and will meet to reconcile any differences and forward their findings to the college by January 25. If the two evaluations are not reconciled, the college personnel committee and the Dean, working together, will make a final determination. When the department level evaluations are reconciled but the Dean disagrees with the evaluations, the college personnel committee will make a final determination. The review process must be completed no later than February 10.

Faculty who undergo a full review in year 1 or year 2 and are found not to be meeting expectations in all faculty domains, may not receive their anticipated across-the-board pay increase in the same payroll that all faculty receive theirs. Those impacted will receive those increases (current month and back pay) on the next monthly payroll.

Completed Review

Once the review process is complete, the chair shall meet with each faculty member within one month of the completion date to discuss the previous years' activities and goals for subsequent years.

Process for Year 3

In every year 3, faculty have the option to submit a one page narrative that briefly summarizes their activities, with no more than 1000 characters (approx. 143 words) devoted to each domain of faculty work in the FAD.

Department Committee and Chair Review

The department committee *and* the department chairperson will independently read and evaluate the submitted materials for each faculty member. Department chairs will be evaluated by their department committee. The department committee and department chair will then meet together to discuss their evaluations and reconcile them if they disagree. Faculty who are chairing departments other than the department of their faculty status shall have their performance in the domains of faculty work assessed by their home department.

During this meeting, the chairperson may provide to the department committee official university data, peer or professional teaching evaluations, and/or sensitive personnel information documented in the faculty member's official personnel file (see Faculty Handbook, Section 570) that is germane to the review. Individual or collected student complaints shall not be inserted unless they have resulted in a letter of admonishment regarding deficient performance.

The department will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member and notify them of the results by October 31.

College Review

Each year 3, after September 20, the Dean shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. The Dean will also review department chairpersons in the three faculty domains. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains. The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by November 10.

Unreconciled Evaluations

When any of the domain-specific performance evaluations are not reconciled at the department level, the college personnel committee and the dean, working together will make a final determination. When the department level evaluations are reconciled but the Dean disagrees with the evaluations, the college personnel committee will make a final determination. The review process must be completed no later than December 10.

Completed Review

Once the review process is complete, the chair shall meet with each faculty member within one month of the completion date to discuss the previous years' activities and goals for subsequent years.

Department of History Triennial Review (FPE) Guidelines and Definitions

In making determinations of "Meets Expectations," the Salary Committee, Department Chair, and the CAS Dean should reference the types of activities enumerated in the departmental PRT

guidelines for "Sustained" performance in each of the faculty work domains (noted below). In doing so, all such parties should also give consideration to and make adjustments for the more compressed timeframe involved in the Triennial Review.

Evaluation Definitions:

1.   Teaching:

   a.   **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: At a minimum, to satisfy the requirements of the Triennial Review evaluation in the category of Teaching the History Department expects its faculty to submit a report demonstrating that he/she meets the following expectations:

   - Has taught the courses assigned to him/her during the period under review
   - Has completed required attendance, midterm and final grade reporting
   - Has provided evidence of teaching effectiveness (approved teaching evaluations: student, peer, and/or chairperson*)

   b.   Does Not Meet Expectations: This category will be designated for a faculty member who regularly engages in one or more of the following practices:

   - Teaches courses in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism, which may include failure to complete required attendance, midterm or final grade reporting, or violations of student confidentiality
   - Refuses to have his/her teaching evaluated*
   - Does not substantively cover the prescribed course content
   - Has evaluations well below those typical of departmental colleagues or generally fails to provide an appropriate environment to facilitate learning

   Faculty who do not submit material for the Review Process will also fall into this category.

*N.B. The Faculty Senate established as policy the right of students to evaluate teaching. That policy, however, does not imply that those evaluations should be the sole source of information regarding quality of teaching. The Faculty Senate strongly encourages departments and colleges to use teaching evaluation systems with multiple sources of input that includes student, peer, and chairperson evaluations.

2. Scholarship:

   a.   **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: At a minimum, to satisfy the requirements of the Triennial Review evaluation in the category of Scholarship the History Department

expects its faculty to submit a report demonstrating that he/she meets the following expectations:

- Is engaged in at least one on-going research project
- Has published or otherwise presented his/her scholarship in public during the period under review

b. Does Not Meet Expectations: This category will be designated for faculty members who:

- Have a current record of not producing or presenting in public scholarship of any form, or cannot show substantive progress on any long-term project

Faculty who do not submit material for the Review Process will also fall into this category.

3. Service:

a. **MEETS EXPECTATIONS**: At a minimum, to satisfy the requirements of the Triennial Review evaluation in the category of Service the History Department expects its faculty to submit a report demonstrating that he/she meets the following expectations:

- Participates in service activities within the Department
- Participates in service activities within the College and/or University
- Participates in service activities within the discipline

b. Does Not Meet Expectations: This category will be designated for faculty members who regularly engage in one or more of the following practices:

- Fails to participate in assigned departmental committee work
- Fails to work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University
- Refuses to participate in any substantive service activities at the university or in the discipline

Faculty who do not submit material for the Review Process will also fall into this category.