

GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF LECTURERS
DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND CULTURES
Revised March 31, 2016; updated April 27, 2017

Note: For guidelines and policies related to qualifications, terms of appointment/reappointment, responsibilities, and promotion of Lecturers, see the most recent version of the Guidelines for Hiring, Evaluating, and Promoting Lecturers of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences. The most recent version of this document will be given to all new Lecturers, and it is available on line in UNT's internal repository for administrative documents (UNTranet) at the following address: <https://untranet.unt.edu/>

I. Guidelines and Standards for the Evaluation of Teaching and Service/Engagement

Since the lists of activities to be considered in each of the areas of evaluation below are not intended to be exhaustive, it is recognized that relevant contributions in the areas of teaching and service/engagement may take other forms as well. It should also be noted that the various examples are not necessarily listed in order of significance. Each contribution must be judged on its own merit.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

Evaluation of teaching must address the quality of instruction, the faculty member's interaction with students, and/or the students' learning and achievement, and must be based on student evaluations (quantitative/qualitative), nomination and reception of teaching awards, and an examination of instructional materials.

Bases for the evaluation of teaching may further include, but are not limited to, the following instructional activities:

- Level, number, and variety of courses taught, including special circumstances
- Developing Internet courses or Internet-supported courses approved by the Center for Learning Enhancement, Assessment, and Redesign (i.e., 50% or more on line)
- Serving as an official mentor to students as part of teaching-related activities (e.g., directing an Honors project/thesis)
- Teaching-related grants
- Course and curriculum development
- Teaching-related professional development and other teaching-related professional engagement

B. Evaluation of Service and Engagement

Examples of Service and Engagement

Activities related to service and engagement include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Special functions (e.g., advising, coordination, mentoring)
- Committee participation at the level of the University, College, Department, or national/international professional organization
- Club, group, or honor society officer, organizer, or sponsor (any area noted above)
- Organizing guest lectures (any area noted above)
- Evaluation of program or department (other than self-assigned)
- Liaison with other departments (other than self-assigned)
- Editorial work involving scholarly publications
- Reviewing manuscripts
- Organizer, chair, secretary, or facilitator of a session/workshop at a conference or professional meeting
- Program development, direction, and/or liaison (e.g., study abroad)
- Contests/fairs/festivals (planning, participation, attendance)
- Securing outside funding for student scholarships/fellowships/assistantships, endowments, and special projects

II. Annual Performance Review

A. Guidelines

The guidelines and procedures provided below are designed to reflect and elaborate upon established University, College, and Department policies.

In accordance with University Policy 15.0.1, "all [full-time] faculty members shall be reviewed annually" (Overarching Principle A).

According to University Policy 15.0.1, "the results of annual performance reviews . . . shall provide input, as appropriate, for evaluation of reappointment, merit, progress toward tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review" (Overarching Principle B). For Lecturers, the results of annual performance reviews will serve as evaluation for reappointment and merit (since tenure and post-tenure review are not applicable).

In accordance with University Policy 15.0.1, "annual reviews will assess faculty productivity within a comprehensive three-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 calendar years" (Overarching Principle D).

The criteria for evaluating Lecturers are teaching and service/engagement. 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.

Insofar as possible, the LAC will base its evaluations on objective evidence. Such evidence must include the information provided in the Faculty Annual Update; the Personal Narrative; copies of teaching-related scholarship; copies of conference programs; and other evidence of accomplishments as determined by the LAC.

B. Procedures

1. LAC members review files and rate independently with scores (round numbers) from 0 to 10 for teaching and service, according to the rubrics provided below in the appendix. Before these scores are officially recorded by the LAC secretary, the committee should discuss any clear cases of substantial disagreement.
2. LAC members average their scores in each of the two categories for each lecturer in order to produce the committee's average score between 0 and 10 for each of the two categories.
3. The LAC meets with the Department Chair in order to compare the committee's evaluation of each Lecturer and the Department Chair's evaluation of each Lecturer. The Department Chair will make the final decision regarding any changes to each Annual Performance Review.
4. After the Annual Performance Review results have been finalized during a meeting of the LAC and the Department Chair, each score will be multiplied by the relevant workload percentage and added to produce the overall score (0-10), which will be converted to a level (see table below).

Table 1—Annual Performance Review Levels

Annual Performance Review Score	Level
9.20-10.0	I (Superior)
8.0-9.19	II (Excellent)
5.0-7.99	III (Good)
3.0-4.99	IV (Unsatisfactory)
0-2.99	V (Very Unsatisfactory)

5. The chair of LAC sends these results to the chair of the PAC. Members of the PAC will have five working days to vote to approve or reject these results. If the PAC rejects the results, the members of the PAC will prepare questions, comments, and/or recommendations for the LAC. The chair of the PAC will work with the LAC to resolve issues related to the PAC's rejection of the initial results.
5. Once the PAC has approved the results of the Annual Performance Review of Lecturers, the LAC will distribute a performance review memo to each Lecturer.

6. After the LAC has distributed performance reviews to all Lecturers, a minimum of five (5) business days will be given for Lecturers to submit an appeal of the Annual Performance Review to the Department Chair.

7. The Department Chair will notify the LAC and the PAC chair of all appeals that resulted in a change of Level.

8. After the appeal process has been completed, the Department Chair will send the final list of levels and/or scores to the Office of the Dean.

C. Note Regarding New Lecturers

During the first year of service, newly hired Lecturers normally receive an annual performance review rating of *Good/Level III* (see II. B.).

During a Lecturer's second and third years of service (i.e., after having completed 2-5 semesters of service), the LAC may recommend a rating higher than *Good/Level III* even if the Lecturer is not able to be evaluated for six full semesters within the current 3-year annual performance review period. This recommendation must be approved by the PAC and the Department Chair.