

BY-LAW I

ACADEMIC WORKLOAD AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PEER EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Revised October 4, 2019)

GENERAL GUIDELINES

It is the responsibility of the Executive Committee to conduct annual reviews of each faculty member. In doing this the Committee will review three years of information unless the faculty member has fewer than three years of service. Three evaluation categories will be used: teaching, professional development, and service. In their first evaluation period upon arriving at UNT, professors will automatically receive the mean score in all three areas unless the actual record (of work accomplished at UNT) merits a higher score.

In evaluating professional development, the committee will generate a ranking of faculty members based on the publication of books, monographs, articles and book chapters, book reviews, research grants and grant applications, on papers read at professional meetings and participation at such meetings, as well as related professional service and activities, such as editing a journal.

In evaluating teaching, the committee will take into account at least the following factors: student evaluations of teaching, new course preparations, willingness to teach service courses, multiple simultaneous preparations, teaching innovations and grants, teaching awards, faithful meeting of classes, accessibility to students, and syllabi, and other course materials submitted for consideration.

In evaluating service, the committee will take into account activities such as service on departmental committees and offices, university committees and offices, and community services that have professional implications, such as media interviews. Advising and other administrative responsibilities are considered service. The willingness to bear one's share of departmental obligations is an essential part of properly collegial behavior. The committee is charged with evaluating collegiality and counseling members who demonstrate conduct outside the norms of courteous professional conduct.

WORKLOAD

I. Standard Workload Definitions

Standard workload assignments are defined in the following ways:

- Tenure-track faculty: 50% professional development, 40% teaching, and 10% service
- Tenured faculty: 40% professional development, 40% teaching, and 20% service
- Advising emphasis tenure-system faculty: 40% professional development, 30% teaching, and 30% service.
- Department Chair: 20% professional development, 20% teaching, and 60% service
- Teaching emphasis tenure-system faculty: 20% professional development, 60% teaching, and 20% service

- Non-tenure system faculty: 80% teaching and 20% service
- Advising emphasis non-tenure system faculty: 40% teaching and 60% service

II. Process for Assigning and Adjusting Workload

Workload for the following academic year is assigned in negotiation with the chair during annual evaluations meetings each spring semester. Workload assignments shall be reported by academic and calendar years.

Although each faculty member is assigned the standard workload by default, faculty members may change the percentage of their time dedicated to their teaching, professional development, and service activities over the three-year window used for annual faculty evaluation, consistent with University procedures and guidelines.

Faculty who wish to initiate an adjustment to their workload shall petition the chair by providing a memo that justifies the adjustment with respect to the above criteria, explains how the adjustment will affect their professional development, teaching, and service responsibilities, and provides a timeline for the adjustment. These adjustments shall not be permanent and shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee. Requests shall normally be made during the annual review process but no later than in early fall semester and prior to University validation of workload for that academic year.

Moreover, the chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee and the faculty member shall have the discretion to adjust faculty workload when the adjustment serves the best interests of the Department. This includes adjusting workloads in response to grant buy-outs, counter offers, initial tenure-track appointments, and for program coordinators, faculty advisors, and other similar service activities.

Those tenured faculty members scoring below four in professional development on their annual evaluation for three successive evaluation periods shall be assigned higher teaching loads in the following academic year, which will be reflected in the faculty member's workload percentages. Such members will be given priority in class scheduling. Deviations from this policy will be made only for reasons of pressing departmental need.

III. Workload Expectations

A standard expectation for professional development—a 40 percent workload—is demonstrating a sufficient amount of productivity per calendar year as determined through the annual review process. Some examples of a sufficient amount of professional development per year include some combination of a published article, a large grant, a series of conference papers, book chapters, or significant professional service, such as editing a journal. A 40 percent annual workload amounts to about 2 days of a 40-hour workweek.

A standard expectation for teaching is based on 10 percent workload for each political science class taught. Thus, a 40 percent annual workload is based on teaching two classes per semester and devoting approximately 2 days per 40-hour workweek to teaching. Teaching workload may consider other teaching activities, such as directed readings and serving on students' committees.

A standard expectation for 10 percent annual service workload is devoting approximately one half of a day per 40-hour workweek to service activities.

Since expectations for productivity vary by workload percentage, the Executive Committee will evaluate contributions in each category relative to the percentage of time assigned.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PEER EVALUATION PROCEDURES

I. Collect Faculty Updates

Each January faculty will provide the Executive Committee a three-year Faculty Update containing a record of the member's activities in the three evaluation categories for the three previous calendar years. This document, which will serve as the primary source of information upon which evaluations are based, is to be submitted according to University policy and guidelines. It is the responsibility of each member to provide the committee with a complete and comprehensive Update by stated deadlines. While the committee is obliged to use the information in the Update, and it may include such other information as becomes known to it, it is not the committee's responsibility to research each faculty member's activities to ensure a complete record. The member may also provide the committee with a narrative summary of their accomplishments and supply the committee with evidence of their productivity, such as published articles that they report.

II. Evaluate Performance in the Mandated Categories

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In evaluating professional growth and development, the Committee will develop a ranking of faculty members based on the criteria outlined in the General Guidelines section above. This will be done by having the Committee members read and evaluate each Faculty Update submitted and assign a number from one (for exceptionally poor performance) to seven (for exceptionally good performance) to the three-year performance reviewed therein. Each evaluation score is to be provided to the PAC or Department Chair prior to discussion. Following a discussion of their initial rankings committee members may alter the assigned scores to reflect new information or changes of judgment. The faculty member's recorded score will be the average of all assigned scores.

TEACHING

In evaluating teaching performance the Executive Committee will make two separate ratings: one based entirely on student evaluations, and another based solely on the committee's own judgment of factors outlined in the following paragraph. In constructing its own rating of teaching, the Executive Committee shall consider the factors noted in the General Guidelines section above. It will then combine the two rankings, weighting the student evaluations three and the peer evaluations one. For teaching emphasis faculty, student evaluations shall be weighted one and peer evaluations three. The faculty member's recorded score will be the average of all assigned scores.

In constructing the student evaluation rating the following procedures shall be used:

- A. The rating scale to be used on the student evaluation instrument will be a seven-point scale, from one (for exceptionally poor performance) to seven (for exceptionally good performance).
- B. In analyzing the student evaluation data, the following procedures shall be used:
 - 1. For each semester, the grand mean on the department's "overall evaluation of the instruction" question (including all sections at all levels taught by full-time faculty) shall be taken as a base.
 - 2. By-level Inflator/Deflator Scores shall be calculated by subtracting the means for 2305-2306 courses, advanced courses, and graduate courses from the grand mean.
 - 3. Individual section means shall be adjusted by adding or subtracting the by-level Inflator/Deflator Scores from each.
 - 4. A final score for each individual shall be calculated by averaging all adjusted means for the three-year evaluation period.
 - 5. The score calculated in step 4 shall be used for the portion of the teaching rating allocated to student evaluations. No further adjustments shall be made by the Executive Committee.
- D. The Department shall rely upon the customized SPOT evaluations in constructing each member's student teaching score. The mean score for "Your Overall Evaluation of This Instructor" shall be converted from its value on a six-point scale (from zero to five) to its value on the department's seven-point scale.

SERVICE

In evaluating departmental, college, University, and community service of a professionally related nature, the Committee will develop a ranking based not only on the total number of activities but also on their substance, importance, and effectiveness. The Committee shall keep in mind those criteria mentioned in the General Guidelines above. The faculty member's recorded score will be the average of all assigned scores. Assistant professors on the tenure track will automatically receive the mean score on service for the first three years unless the actual record merits a higher score.

III. Generate Final Rankings and Narrative Statements

No member of the Committee will rate him or herself or take part in any of the discussions related to her or himself. After the Committee arrives at the rankings above it will draft and agree upon narrative statements for each faculty member and will furnish each member a report that includes this narrative, the high, low, and average composite ratings in each category, the faculty member's own ratings in each category, an overall score based on a member's weighted workload for the calendar year, and a summary of the procedures used to obtain these numbers. The narrative will also denote the member's expected workload for the following academic and calendar years, which may be adjusted according to the procedures outlined above.

The report will provide an invitation to the faculty member to meet with the committee to discuss their annual evaluation or other areas of interest, such as their expected workload for the following academic year. In recognition that a member may prefer to speak with an individual, and not the committee, a member may request to meet with the department chair, chair of the committee, or another member of the committee instead of or in addition to a meeting with the committee as a whole. However, any request to change a score should be made before the committee as a whole.

Time will be set aside for appearances before the committee. Untenured faculty will be counseled as required by University documents, and tenured faculty may meet with the Committee as they wish.

IV. Salary Increments

Salary increments will be calculated based on faculty performance in three categories: professional development, teaching, and service. First-year faculty members will automatically receive the mean salary increment.