

## **Department of Philosophy and Religion Faculty Annual Reviews**

### **A. Guidelines**

The guidelines and procedures provided below are designed to reflect and elaborate upon established university, college, and department policies.

In accordance with UNT Policy 06.007, “[a]n elected review committee and chair will review all full-time faculty annually” (General Guidelines A, p. 2).

In accordance with UNT Policy 06.007, “[a]n elected review committee and chair will assess faculty productivity within the context of a comprehensive 3-year window, with no single year having more weight than the other two; i.e., each year a faculty member presents a record representing the work of the previous three (3) calendar years” (General Guidelines B, p. 2).

According to UNT Policy 06.007, “[t]he results of the annual review will be used, as appropriate, for reappointment reviews, progress toward tenure and promotion, and review of tenured faculty” (General Guidelines C, p. 2).

The department PAC will evaluate the research, teaching, and service of full-time faculty. Percentages for the areas considered are determined by the faculty workload documents that have been submitted to and approved by the department chair.

It is to be understood that the quality as well as the quantity of the contributions will be considered.

The PAC will base its evaluations on factual evidence in the Faculty Activity Report (VPAA 160), a brief narrative that summarizes and supplements faculty accomplishments, and the PAC’s discretion.

### **B. Procedures**

1. Faculty members upload the Faculty Activity Report (VPAA 160) and a brief narrative that summarizes and supplements their accomplishments for the preceding three three calendar years, which may include pertinent information that is not in the Faculty Activity Report (e.g., unfunded grant applications, lengthy letters of recommendation), as well as any other evidence of accomplishments as one sees fit.

2. PAC members review files and rate independently with scores (round numbers) from 0 to 10 for research, teaching, and service, according to the department evaluation rubric. The committee should discuss any cases of substantial disagreement before officially recording the scores, and may request clarification or additional information from faculty.

3. PAC members average the scores in each of the three categories for each faculty member in order to produce the committee's average score between 0 and 10 for each of the three categories.

4. The PAC submits the scores of all faculty members to the department chair. At the discretion of the department chair, a consultation with the PAC about their faculty scores could be scheduled. The department chair will make the final decision regarding the scores.

5. After the Annual Review results have been finalized, the department chair will multiply each score by the relevant workload percentages and add these numbers to produce the overall score (0-10), which will be converted to a five-level scale:

<b>Annual Review Score</b>	<b>Level</b>
<b>9.0-10</b>	<b>Highly Accomplished</b>
<b>8.0-8.9</b>	<b>Exceeds Requirements</b>
<b>6.0-7.9</b>	<b>Proficient/Meets Requirements</b>
<b>3.0-5.9</b>	<b>Developing/Needs Improvement</b>
<b>0-2.9</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>

Highly Accomplished –Performance consistently and significantly exceeds established objectives; achieves significant contributions well beyond normal job requirements.  
*Performance at this level is unique and rarely attained.*

Exceeds Requirements –Performance exceeds established objectives on a regular basis; exhibits a degree of excellence in accomplishing individual and department goals beyond the normal job requirements.

Proficient/Meets Requirements –Performance meets established objectives and fully completes normal job requirements.

Developing/Needs Improvement –Performance of established objectives is inconsistent; meets some of the minimum requirements of the position, but needs to improve performance in other areas.

Unsatisfactory -Performance of established objectives and/or behaviors is deficient; rarely meets established objectives and/or behaviors, consistently fails to meet normal job requirements.

6. The PAC will submit a draft of a memo for each faculty member to the department chair containing a chart with the score in each of the three areas, the overall score, the level of performance. In addition, the PAC will submit to the chair a summary chart of all faculty scores showing the range of scores in the three areas collected during the initial review by the PAC.

7. The department chair will use the recommendation (i.e., the draft of each memo) from the PAC as a starting point for the Annual Review of each faculty member.

**D. Note Regarding New Faculty Members**

8. During the first two years of service, newly hired faculty will receive an Annual Review no lower than *Proficient/Meets Requirements*.