

Guidelines for the Annual Evaluation of Faculty
History Department, University of Georgia

I. Rating System and Application

In each of two categories, Teaching and Research, faculty members will be assigned a rating from 1 to 5. One (1) is unsatisfactory and 5 is outstanding; 2-4 is the range of normal performance. A third category, Service, will be weighted 0-10 per cent of the Overall Rating, and will always be given the highest rating of 5. For faculty who did no substantial service, no service will be factored into their overall rating. For others, service will be factored in to varying percentages up to 10 per cent, based on the amount and efficacy of the service.

(These numbers map onto the language in the Academic Affairs Policy Manual, 1.06-1, as follows: 1 “does not meet expectations”; 2-4 “meets expectations”; 5 “exceeds expectations.”)

Ratings in Teaching and Research, and the Overall Rating that combines Teaching, Research, and Service, will be expressed as whole numbers.

Raises should be determined as dollar amounts, not percentages. That is, two faculty with equal evaluations should receive roughly the same raise in dollars, not in percentages.

Data for evaluating faculty will be collected through an annual UGA Elements Activities Summary (EAS). As described below, faculty are required to add to the EAS a statement of teaching activities and a statement of research activities, each not to exceed 300 words. A statement on service is optional.

II. Teaching

Standards:

—A rating of 2 for minimum normal teaching performance indicates that the faculty member has taught his or her assigned course load for that year with no unusual problems. If an individual class is cancelled, this will not be held against the faculty member; a pattern of cancellations should lead to a consultation with the Head and DUS about how to reverse the trend and may eventually lead to a rating of 1 in the Teaching category. Similarly, one class that went badly is not beyond the bounds of normal; a pattern should lead to consultation and could eventually result in a ranking of 1.

—A ranking of 5 may be assigned if, for example, the faculty member won a teaching award, received a large pedagogical grant, founded a new program, or created an exceptionally innovative course that involved substantial extra effort.

—Rankings from 2 to 5 will be assigned based on the following items, which the faculty may present for consideration:

- Statement of teaching activities. In addition to a list of items responsive to the categories below, all faculty are required to submit a statement of teaching activities for the

calendar year, not to exceed 300 words. This statement may describe any additional factors that the faculty member would like to submit for consideration.

- Teaching awards
- Grants relating to pedagogy
- Course and program development
 - Developing new courses or major revisions to existing courses (describe)
 - Developing or using new, innovative, or creative pedagogical methods (this category includes assignments, testing methods, in-class and out-of-class activities, etc.)
 - Creating or developing programs, e.g. study abroad, exchange program, new minor field
 - Collaborative work on interdisciplinary courses, programs and curricula within the University or across institutions
- Pedagogical publications and professional activities
 - Authorship or editorship of textbooks, sourcebooks, or other pedagogical materials, in print or online
 - Contributions to pedagogical materials in print or online
 - Organization of, or participation in, workshops, symposia, panels, or conferences on pedagogy
 - Publication of original research on pedagogy
 - Any formal training or professional development relating to pedagogy
- Advising and supervision
 - Number of graduate advisees (distinguish MA and PhD). Note: If the number of concurrent advisees in a calendar year is 5 or more, this may also be reported in the Service section.
 - PhD advisees who graduated in the year under review
 - Graduate committees served on
 - Grants, prizes, and awards to students for work produced in the faculty member's class or under his/her supervision
 - CURO mentoring
- Organization of extracurricular activities with students, e.g. trip to a conference or field trip (describe); if this is within one of your classes, please list as "innovative pedagogical methods," above.
- Recruitment
 - Participation in recruitment activities (e.g. Lunchtime Time Machine, Black History Month)
 - Diversity recruitment and retention
 - Efforts in the recruitment of graduate students
- Participation in special teaching activities outside the University, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminars, and international study and development projects.
- Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, such as accreditation teams and special commissions.
- Other (describe)

III. Research

Standards:

Minimum acceptable research (rating of 2) is significant progress commensurate with the faculty member's research EFT in any phase of any project (example: acquiring new skills, archival research, pages written but not published, etc.). A rating of 1 will be assigned if the faculty member has no research agenda or an agenda that has made no progress over multiple years, and should prompt discussion with the Department Head to develop a plan for improvement. Outstanding progress (rating of 5) may include, but is not necessarily limited to, the publication of a scholarly book with a highly ranked press, the publication of multiple substantial articles in high-ranking journals, the launching of an important new digital project or publication, or the receipt of a major national research award, fellowship, prize, or grant. Intermediate numbers from 2 to 4 may be assigned in consideration of the following list of items, including the required statement on "work in progress."

- Publications. Evaluations should take account not only of absolute numbers of publications, but of quality; in particular, the reputation and impact of presses and journals should be considered for all publications. Also, evaluations will reflect that some publications represent a greater investment of time, effort, and skill than others. *Note that sourcebooks, textbooks, and other pedagogical publications should be listed in the Teaching category.*
 - Single-authored or co-authored scholarly books
 - Critical editions of texts
 - Edited collections of articles
 - Journal articles
 - Book chapters
 - "Notes" and other short publications in journals
 - Book reviews
 - Digital publications
 - Software
 - Other publications (describe)
 - Impact of publications.
 - Prestige and reputation of press (for books)
 - Reputation of journals
 - Reviews of published research
 - Other evidence of impact (describe).
 - Mass media: contributions to print or online newspapers or magazines, blogs, television appearances, and other mass media, if these contributions relate to the faculty member's research activities.
- Work in progress. Faculty are required to append a brief description of research conducted during the calendar year under review, not to exceed 300 words. This may include archival research, reading primary or secondary sources, collecting oral histories, collecting or analyzing data, pages written but not yet published, and so forth.
- Presentations at conferences, invited lectures, and similar activities. Consideration will be given to the scope of conferences (national, international) and to the prestige of inviting institutions. Quality is more important than quantity.

- Professional development: This includes learning new languages, methods, or skills that will be applied in future research.
- Research fellowships, grants, awards, and prizes.
- Other (describe).

IV. Service

Standards: Service will constitute a percentage, up to 10 per cent, of the faculty member's overall rating for the calendar year. For faculty who did no substantial service, no service will be factored into their overall rating. For others, service will be factored in at the maximum rating of 5, to varying percentages up to 10 per cent, based on the amount and efficacy of the service.

Service to the department, the university, and the local community shall be given more weight than service to the profession and other service, which, however, will also be considered. *For the purposes of annual evaluation in the History Department, service for which one has received substantial remuneration will not be considered. Please report only unpaid or minimally paid service.*

- Examples of service to the department:
 - Search committees chaired.
 - Departmental committees chaired.
 - Service on Department-level committees.
 - Attendance at department meetings.
 - Supervision as the major advisor of 5 or more graduate students concurrently may count in this category (Service) as well as in the Teaching category.
- Examples of service to the University:
 - Participation in faculty governance (e.g. service on University Council or Franklin Senate)
 - University-level committees chaired.
 - Service on University-level committees (e.g. P&T committees, search committees, award committees, President's Advisory Committee)
 - Directorships of centers or programs
- Examples of service to the local community:¹

¹ We adopt criteria for "Service to Society" from the *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure*, Spring 2014 revision, pp. 18-19:

"A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service to society...if the following conditions are met:

1. There is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise.
2. There is a direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns.
3. The ultimate purpose is for the public or common good.

- work with public K-12 schools
 - unpaid service to local and state government agencies
 - work with non-profit organizations
 - community lectures
 - organization of community events
 - Service in this category must involve “utilization of the faculty member's...academic and professional expertise,” and see other criteria in footnote.
- Examples of service to the profession:
 - anonymous, unpaid or minimally paid review services shall count in this category (tenure reviews, manuscript reviews, grant proposal reviews).
 - organizing conferences or panels
 - service as series editor
 - service as journal editor
 - service on editorial boards of presses or journals
 - offices held in professional associations
 - service or leadership on committees of professional associations
 - Examples of other service (please see note about remuneration, above)
 - service to industry
 - service to society outside the state of Georgia
 - Grants for service activities: please list under service to department, service to the university, service to the local community, service to the profession, or other service, as appropriate.

V. Overall Rating

An Overall Rating of whole numbers 1-5 will be assigned by the Head based on ratings in the individual categories of Teaching, Research, and Service, described above. In assessing what weight to give individual category ratings in the Overall Rating, the Head will consider the faculty member’s EFT and any special circumstances, such as a reduction in teaching load due to a leave or fellowship, or an unusually demanding teaching year. We note here that a faculty member’s contractual EFT is only a rough approximation of departmental expectations for that faculty member, which may fluctuate from year to year, and which may include service obligations not reflected in the EFT.

The Head will meet with tenure-track faculty who receive an overall rating of 1 to discuss ways to improve. The Head will meet with other faculty at their request.

-
- 4. New knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele.
 - 5. There is a clear relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit’s mission.”