

FACULTY EVALUATION F.A.Q.

What is the Faculty Evaluation System?

- The Faculty Evaluation System is a custom-made on-line application for the UNT Health Science Center. Its single purpose is to help the Provost, Deans and Chairs to evaluate their Faculty in a meaningful and relevant way. Each year, each Faculty member is required to go through the evaluation process to assess their past accomplishments and performance as well as establish goals for the upcoming year.
- This system was designed with input from every school, IT, and the Provost's office. This was not designed for one school in mind, but something that all schools can use to fit their needs.

This looks different... Why the change?

1. Old system limitations

- Why did we build this new application? The short answer is that the old system had run its course. It was increasingly difficult to maintain and update. It was also on a platform that our development team was working to phase out, and they were moving to a more flexible platform. Additionally, the old system was complex and confusing. While we can't make the evaluation any less complex, we can make it clearer, and that is what we have accomplished.

2. Profile vs. Evaluation

- In the prior evaluation, faculty "Profile" and "Evaluation" lived side by side, and were often confused as one and the same. "Profile" contains data about each faculty member (courses, grants, mentoring, etc.), and still remains at <https://profile.hsc.unt.edu/>. However, "Evaluation" deals with performance metrics, like competencies and goals, which may (or may not) need to be supported by data from "Profile". This new "Evaluation" system is completely separate from "Profile" and is meant to stand alone as a performance assignment tool. In future versions we will be working on linking profile data to help with meeting goals, but in the current release, all such profile data will need to be copied and pasted.

3. Design Principles

- When we took up the task of designing a new Faculty Evaluation Tool, we wanted to keep some core principles in mind. We gleaned what we could from the old system (both the good and bad) and came up with the outcomes we wanted to see for the new system. They are:

1. Keep it Simple - People should not be overwhelmed by information or confused with this application. The interface should be clear, and intuitive. This is still a complex process, but that does not mean that it has to be a mess.

2. Clear call to action - Each time you login to the Evaluation System, you should be presented with options that are relevant to you. If there is an action that is waiting on you, that should be front and center for you to see. The goal was for Faculty Members to walk through this with a good idea of what needs to be done, without the need for direction.

3. Communication - When the Evaluation moves from Faculty to Evaluator, there needs to be a good, clear message sent out that says "You are now responsible". Emails will be sent during the "passing of the ball", so to speak, from one role to another. You should not have to guess if things are waiting on you, your email in-box should tell you.

4. Power to the Chairs - If we gleaned anything from the past, we learned that every Department is different in how they approach evaluations. So with this system, Chairs now have complete control over who is involved in the Evaluation process for their department. They can assign anyone to be an evaluator, or a support evaluator, or even someone to help with disputes. If new Faculty is missing from their department, they can add them right then. Deans and the Provost also have control over the Schools, customizing the evaluation system to meet their unique structure. This system is designed to help with Evaluation of the Faculty, not simply mirroring organizational structures within UNTHSC.

FACULTY EVALUATION

4. What's new?

• Evaluation is no longer just a long list of goals and compliance questions. There are new sections that will reflect how we are changing at UNTHSC. They are:

- 1. Values** - UNTHSC is moving to a values-based culture. This section will ask about how Faculty are living these values.
- 2. Competencies** - There are some common core competencies that all Faculty need to demonstrate, this section will ask how Faculty are meeting those competencies.
- 3. Compliance** - Compliance is crucial, but it is just as important to know what Faculty are doing to stay in compliance. This is no longer a Yes/No question, but will ask Faculty to evaluate their individual efforts to stay in compliance.
- 4. Percent Allocation** - Each Faculty member needs to report how they are spending their time in different categories, and how things might change.
- 5. Goals** - Goals have been given a bit of a face-lift. No longer are they long narratives by Faculty Members attempting to map out all that they will do, but small categorical goals that align to specific Institution, School, Department or Professional objectives.
- 6. Overall Rating** - Instead of attempting to calculate a complex "final" rating, we provide one page where both the Faculty Member and Evaluator will give a final score, displaying all the prior sections of the evaluation as justification.

Understanding Your Role

- 1. Faculty Member/"Evaluee"** - This role is the reason that this system exists. They will begin and step through each section, then work with their Evaluator to finalize their current year rating, and plan next years goals.
- 2. Evaluator** - Traditionally this has been the Chair but can now be anyone that the Chair assigns. The Evaluator is responsible for reviewing the Faculty Member's comments and self-ratings and providing additional comments and final ratings for the evaluation.
- 3. Chair** - The Chair is responsible for maintaining the Faculty assigned to their department, assigning roles for the evaluation, and defining Departmental objectives. A Chair can assign proxies to help in Chair responsibilities and oversight.
- 4. Adjudicator** - An Adjudicator is responsible for helping Faculty and Evaluators that disagree on final ratings. The Adjudicator will review all comments and ratings and determine a final rating.
- 5. Dean** - The Dean is responsible for establishing Departments and Chairs, as well as defining School Objectives. A Dean can assign proxies to help in Dean responsibilities and oversight.
- 6. Provost** - The Provost is responsible for establishing Schools and Deans, as well as defining Institutional Objectives. A provost also has many management screens to help configure wording, values, competencies, etc., and establish evaluation periods. A Provost can assign proxies to help in Provost responsibilities and oversight.

I have questions..or I just want some help.

This system was developed rapidly, with many people involved. We did our best to test and make sure we had a quality system. Like any new system, there will be bugs. We can fix these quickly, but the key is communication. You have to let us know! The best way you can do this is to use the question/comments link on the bottom of the Evaluation (once you log in), or you can email the [Help Desk, helpdesk@unthsc.edu](mailto:helpdesk@unthsc.edu), and they will route your request to the right team.