GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR
REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF PROFESSORS

DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND CULTURES

Revised April 1, 2017; updated April 27, 2017
_____

These guidelines and standards for the evaluation of professors apply to annual performance review, reappointment review, tenure/promotion review, and post-tenure review.

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

Since the lists of activities to be considered in each of the three areas of evaluation below are not intended to be exhaustive, it is recognized that relevant contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, 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), peer evaluations by the PAC, nomination and reception of teaching awards, and an examination of instructional materials. Faculty members will need to supply course syllabi and examination samples for each course taught.

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 M.A. thesis/Ph.D. dissertation committee director or member
- Teaching-related grants
- Course and curriculum development
- Teaching-related professional development

B. Evaluation of Scholarship

Generally, the value assigned to items of scholarship will be determined by the following criteria:

Peer-review[1] process

_____

[1] At the University of North Texas, the term *refereed* is often used interchangeably with *peer-reviewed*.

1. The scholarly journal or scholarly book publisher has a peer-review process in place, and this process is clearly explained on the publisher's website, in its publications, or in some other official communication from the publisher. Publications, conference presentations, and other disseminated research will not count if it is determined by the Personnel Affairs Committee or the Department Chair that no peer-review process is used by the publisher or that the peer-review process does not include review by two or more reviewers (e.g., editor-in-chief, members of an editorial board, and/or external reviewers; see paragraph 3 below).

2. Publications in a scholarly journal with a double-blind peer-review process will generally be more valued than publications in a journal with a single-blind peer-review process. Publications without at least a single-blind level of peer review generally will not be counted.

3. Given the variety of worthy scholarly production, some non-peer-reviewed publications may be considered, but publications that are not peer-reviewed should comprise a very small proportion of any faculty member's publications.

Publisher

1. A university press in the U.S. will generally be considered an acceptable publication venue; however, other university presses will be evaluated by the PAC based on evidence provided by faculty members.

2. A publication venue will generally be considered acceptable if it is a scholarly journal or an academic book publisher that is recognized nationally or internationally as a source of reputable research by leading scholars in the field and/or other factors determined by the PAC.

Editorial board

1. The editor-in-chief of the scholarly journal or publisher of scholarly books has a reputation as an expert in his/her field.

2. The scholarly journal or scholarly book publisher has an editorial board composed primarily of university faculty and/or recognized non-academic professionals.

3. The editorial board of the scholarly journal or scholarly book publisher is comprised of scholars who are widely recognized as specialists in the field and/or employed at academic institutions (or top-tier corporate, government, or creative centers/organizations).

Other Indicators of Quality/Value

1. The scholarly journal, book series, or book publisher is recognized by top-tier universities as a source of very reputable academic research.

2. Leading scholars in the field publish in this journal or book series or publication venue on a regular basis.

3. Impact factor (compared to the impact factor of other scholarly journals in the same area).

4. Acceptance rate (such information should also include a date).

5. Additional verifiable evidence of quality/value (provided by faculty members).

Role in Collaborative Work

1. Faculty members who engage in collaborative work resulting in multi-authored publications must explain their role in each collaborative project so that any multi-authored publications can be evaluated within the context of the faculty member's scholarly production as a whole.

2. Serving as the Principal Investigator of a study or serving as the lead author of a grant project are possible ways to demonstrate a leadership role in collaborative work that results in co-authored publications.

3. Being mainly or solely responsible for one or more essential parts of a research project (e.g., background research, data collection, data analysis, preparation of the manuscript, and/or revision of the manuscript during the peer-review process) can demonstrate a key role in collaborative work that results in co-authored publications.

4. Collaborative work resulting in co-authored publications with students is encouraged as an important part of mentoring future teachers/scholars.

Examples of Scholarship

The Personnel Affairs Committee will consider all documented peer-reviewed scholarship in accordance with the College "Guidelines" and in consultation with any other appropriate evaluation guidelines.

Scholarship includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Peer-reviewed book-length publication
- Peer-reviewed article, essay, and book chapter
- Research-related grant
- Entry in a work of reference (e.g., encyclopedia)
- Book review in a scholarly or creative journal
- Invited keynote address at a professional conference
- Presenting peer-reviewed scholarly paper or workshop at a professional conference

C. Evaluation of Service and Engagement

Examples of Service and Engagement

Service- and engagement-related activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Department Chair, Assistant/Associate Chair, or other special functions (e.g., advising, coordination, mentoring junior faculty)
- 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 department (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).

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 three criteria for evaluating faculty members are teaching, scholarship, 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 PAC will base its evaluations on objective evidence. Such evidence must include the information provided in the Faculty Annual Update; the Personal Narrative; copies of publications; copies of conference programs; and other evidence of accomplishments as determined by the PAC.

B. Procedures

1. PAC members review files and rate independently with scores (round numbers) from 0 to 10 for teaching, scholarship, and service, according to the rubrics (approved December 2, 2014) provided as Appendix A. Before these scores are officially recorded by the PAC secretary, the committee should discuss any clear cases of substantial disagreement.

2. PAC members average their scores in each of the three categories for each professor in order to produce the committee's average score between 0 and 10 for each of the three categories.

3. The PAC meets with the Department Chair in order to compare the committee's evaluation of each tenure-stream faculty member and the Department Chair's evaluation of each tenure-stream faculty member. 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 PAC 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
9.0-10	I (Superior)
8.0-8.9	II (Excellent)
5.0-7.9	III (Good)
3.0-4.9	IV (Unsatisfactory)
0-2.9	V (Very Unsatisfactory)

5. Once the PAC has distributed annual performance reviews to all professors, a minimum of five (5) business days will be given for professors to submit an appeal of the Annual Performance Review to the Department Chair.

6. The Department Chair will notify the PAC of all appeals that resulted in a change of Level.

7. 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 Faculty Members
During the first year of service, newly hired faculty normally receive an annual performance review rating of Good/Level III (see II. B.). By unanimous agreement, the PAC and the Department Chair can decide to apply this same policy during the second and/or third year of employment.

III. Guidelines and Standards for Reappointment

The purpose of reappointment reviews during the probationary period is to determine whether or not tenure-track faculty members are making sufficient progress toward tenure. At the same time, reappointment reviews serve as a way for the Personnel Affairs Committee and/or the Department Chair to provide faculty members with guidance during the probationary period.

All professors shall be reviewed annually by the department during the probationary period. Under normal circumstances, this review is only forwarded to the Dean or the Provost for action during the third year (mid-term) and the sixth year (tenure/promotion) of the probationary period. According to University Policy 15.0.6, "the third-year or mid-term review is a more extensive and intensive review that includes all levels of the university, but without external review letters" (¶B).

Faculty members must provide the following documents and information for the third-year or mid-term review dossier:
- Form VPAA-170, *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Checklist*;
- Form VPAA-174, *University Information Form for Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure*;
- Curriculum Vitae (based on the appropriate template provided by the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences);
- Self-evaluation, contextual narrative overview of research, teaching, and service (maximum 1200 words);
- Statement on Multi-Authorship (1 page maximum);

- Table of Contents of Supplemental Materials (see 4 below); and
- Any other documentation or information requested by the University, the College, the Department Chair, or the departmental Personnel Affairs Committee.

For details regarding denial of reappointment during the probationary period, see University Policy 15.0.7, Denial of Reappointment and Tenure for Probationary Faculty.

IV. Promotion to Associate Professor and the Granting of Tenure

The guidelines, standards, and procedures provided in this document are intended to supplement those issued by the Board of Regents, the University (see pertinent sections of the UNT Policy Manual), and the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (see the *Guidelines for Documentation of Promotion and/or Tenure Cases*). University and College guidelines take precedence in case of conflict.

Achievement in only one of the areas of evaluation will not ordinarily suffice for tenure and/or promotion, as explained in Chapter 6 (Faculty Affairs) of the UNT *Policy Manual*.

For tenure and/or promotion, the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures requires meritorious contributions in all three areas of evaluation: teaching and teaching-related activities, scholarly/professional accomplishments, and service. In addition, especially praise-worthy contributions are required in at least one of the first two areas, with scholarly/professional accomplishments being of greater significance for promotion to Professor. (It should be noted that quality of accomplishment is of paramount significance. Sterling performance in a relatively limited number of activities will ordinarily be regarded as more meritorious than mediocre contributions in a broader spectrum of endeavors.)

Faculty members in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures must remain current in their area(s) of expertise, must demonstrate high standards of quality of instruction, and must be willing to assume a fair share of particularly demanding teaching assignments. As stated in the section on "Defining Good Teaching" of the ADFL's *Guidelines on the Administration of Foreign Language Departments* cited above, "A good teacher recognizes that students learn by hearing the foreign language spoken well and by reading authentic texts, as well as by communicating with others in the foreign language, both orally and in writing. Practice in using the productive and receptive skills should be an integral part of every course taught in a foreign language, including those that focus on literature or culture" (https://www.adfl.org/resources/resources_practice.htm).

The Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures expects a candidate for tenure and/or promotion to have demonstrated excellent scholarly and professional growth throughout the probationary period. These accomplishments must represent significant research and professional involvement of sufficient quality and quantity to indicate the faculty member's commitment to scholarly pursuit. Assistant professors are advised to seek as one of their career goals a book-length scholarly or creative work. However, like most institutions nationally, the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures accepts, as partial justification for promotion to Associate Professor, a collection of substantial peer-reviewed creative or scholarly published articles in recognized and refereed professional journals in lieu of a book-length publication. It should be noted that one book alone, especially if it is based on a doctoral dissertation, will not suffice for the awarding of promotion/tenure.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are normally expected to meet the following requirements in the area of scholarship:
- One peer-reviewed book-length monograph plus one or two peer-reviewed articles/book chapters OR
- Eight peer-reviewed articles/book chapters OR
- Some other combination of different types of peer-reviewed publications (e.g., peer-reviewed articles and editing a peer-reviewed book-length publication or preparing a peer-reviewed critical or modern edition).

These requirements are, however, flexible depending on other factors taken into consideration by the Personnel Affairs Committee and the department Chair.

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion must explain his or her role in collaborative work that has resulted in multi-authored work so that such work may be evaluated within the context the candidate's scholarly production as a whole.

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures must demonstrate a willingness to accept service assignments. Relevant service activities may occur in any one or any combination of the following areas: the profession, the discipline, the University, the College, the Department, or the community. (In the latter case, only service clearly related to the profession, the discipline, the University, the College, or the Department will be considered.) The candidate must also demonstrate the ability to perform assigned activities expeditiously and correctly, and to work harmoniously with others involved in the task at hand.

Consideration of promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and a decision regarding tenure, except in unusual cases, will be made concurrently. Therefore, the criteria for promotion regarding teaching/teaching-related activities, scholarship/professional activities, and service are the same as those for tenure decisions. Standards for documentation and evidence to support promotion are the same as those to support tenure.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate's scholarly accomplishments must be recognized beyond the local level.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will also be evaluated according to University Policy 15.0.8.1.

For details regarding denial of reappointment during the probationary period, see University Policy 15.0.7, Denial of Reappointment and Tenure for Probationary Faculty.

V. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based primarily on the work and achievements of the faculty member since promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. Associate Professors are expected to continue the quality and quantity of scholarship that warranted promotion to Associate Professor; promotion to Professor requires that an Associate Professor exceed these scholarship expectations. Moreover, the candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must demonstrate a continuous, productive program of scholarship that is recognized and respected by leading scholars in the field. For promotion to Professor, the candidate's scholarship should have achieved a national or global reputation.

Although the Department places a high value on scholarship for promotion to Professor, it expects demonstrated quality in teaching and major service activities during time-in-rank as Associate Professor. Standards for documentation and evidence to support promotion are the same as those to support tenure.

According to University Policy 15.0.8.2, "an associate professor may undergo the promotion process when, in consultation with the unit administrator and/or unit review committee chair, the faculty member believes his/her record warrants consideration for promotion. If unsuccessful, the candidate may repeat the process when, in the judgment of the unit administrator and/or unit review committee chair, the record has improved sufficiently to warrant reconsideration for promotion" (Section C).

Candidates for promotion to Professor will also be evaluated according to UNT Policy 15.0.8.2.

VI. Procedures for the Tenure/Promotion Process

1. Early in the fall semester of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member's first year, the Department Chair will direct the faculty member toward the websites containing documents that are pertinent to the tenure and promotion process. These documents include:

- *Policy Manual* of the University of North Texas;
- *Guidelines for Documentation of Promotion and/or Tenure Cases* of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
- *Guidelines and Standards for Tenure and Promotion* of the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures
- *Curriculum Vitae Template* (Arts and Humanities, Sciences, or Social Sciences) of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
- the most recent version of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences Calendar;
- form VPAA-170, *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Checklist*; and
- form VPAA-174, *University Information Form for Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure*.

The faculty member will sign a form (Appendix B) acknowledging receipt of the documents listed above and/or website addresses for the documents listed above.

2. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is responsible for submitting the dossier and any other requested documentation or information to the department Chair in accordance with the annual College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences Calendar and in the format required.

3. The following documents for the tenure and/or promotion dossier must be submitted to the department Chair in a binder with tabs, which can be requested from the Office of the Dean at least 5 business days in advance:

- Form VPAA-170, *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Checklist*;
- Form VPAA-174, *University Information Form for Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure*;
- Curriculum Vitae (based on the template provided by the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences);

- Self-evaluation, contextual narrative overview of research, teaching, and service (maximum 1200 words);
- Statement on Multi-Authorship (1 page maximum);
- Table of Contents of Supplemental Materials (see 4 below); and
- Any other documentation or information requested by the University, the College, the Department Chair, or the departmental Personnel Affairs Committee.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are strongly encouraged to attend—as often as possible—the workshops for tenure and/or promotion candidates organized by the department, the Office of the Dean, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This is especially important during the academic year preceding the year when the dossier will be reviewed in order to have the most current information about guidelines, standards, and procedures.

4. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must also submit a binder of supplemental materials. This binder must include copies of all publications and sample syllabi. Candidates may add other supplemental materials that are relevant.

5. The departmental Personnel Affairs Committee and the Department Chair will follow the annual College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences Calendar regarding deadlines related to tenure and/or promotion cases.

6. For details regarding the review process, including the timeline, consult University Policy 15.0.6, Section L, Paragraphs 5 and 6.

VII. Post-Tenure Review of Faculty

In accordance with University Policy 15.0.8.3, "the annual performance review of all tenured faculty members serves as their post-tenure review" (Section I).

"A tenured faculty member whose overall annual performance is determined by an appropriate unit peer committee and the unit administrator to be unsatisfactory shall be required to meet with the unit administrator to identify barriers to sustained effectiveness and outline steps to remedy the deficiencies before the next annual performance review" (University Policy 15.0.8.3, Section J).

Paragraphs b through i in Section J of University Policy 15.0.8.3 provide details regarding cases for which a personal Professional Development Plan is required.

Performance Evaluation Rubric – Teaching

Please note that the description of each level above 5 includes the previous description(s).
For example, a score of 8 includes the descriptions of 6/7 and 5.

10	**Exceptional** *Consistently far exceeds expectations* *(some of the criteria for 8 are met for at least five semesters)*
9	*Consistently exceeds expectations* *(some of the criteria for 8 are met for at least four semesters)*
8 Goes above and beyond teaching expectations within the language section and/or in the profession with exceptional quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	**Outstanding** *Significantly exceeds expectations* *(some of the criteria below are met for at least two semesters)* May include items such as: • Takes on challenging courses (e.g., upper-level courses, blended courses, new preparations) • Designs new courses or redesigns courses • Works on special tasks (e.g., Honors College project, Special Problems course, thesis, dissertation) • Makes an on-going effort to maintain subject-area and methodological expertise • Attends teaching-related workshops and/or conferences • Gives presentations at teaching-related conferences • Receives prestigious teaching award(s) or grant(s)
6 or 7 Meets all job requirements with higher quality and/or takes on additional responsibilities above basic job duties	**Satisfactory** *Exceeds minimum expectations* • Creates and executes effective materials and lessons • Maintains a positive regard in the eyes of the students (i.e. creates positive learning environment, is available for assistance outside of class, etc.) as demonstrated by SETE scores and/or observations by peers
5 Meets all basic job requirements	**Minimum Expectations** • Does not cancel class without permission from the Chair • Arrives to class on time and meets for the entire period • Keeps Faculty Profile up to date; uploads syllabi in timely manner • Cooperates with language section (i.e. attends meetings, follows coordinated sections' policies and syllabi, etc.) • Submits final grades on time • Provides regular and timely feedback on assignments/tests/etc. to students • Follows syllabus and notifies students in writing of changes
3, 4	**Needs Improvement** *Inconsistently meets expectations* • Does not consistently meet expectations as described in the "Minimum Expectations" category above • Misses classes without making appropriate arrangements (while not on medical/sick leave)
0, 1, 2	**Unsatisfactory** *Does not meet most/all minimum expectations*

Performance Evaluation Rubric – Research

- A monograph is expected to be at least 100 pages, approximately.
- An article/book chapter is expected to be approximately 5,000-7,000 words.
- For publications with more than one author, the roles of each contributor will be taken into consideration.
- The value of any monograph, edited book, journal article, or other published work as indicated below should be considered the maximum possible value. The PAC will take into consideration the length, quality, and any additional relevant factors when determining the value of a specific monograph, edited book, journal article, or other published work. For this reason, it is especially important to provide specific details in the Faculty Annual Update.

10	**Exceptional** *Far exceeds expectations* Monograph or 6 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters
9	*Significantly exceeds expectations* Critical edition* or 5 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters
8 Goes above and beyond research expectations by publishing in the highest quality presses/journals and presenting at international or national conferences	**Outstanding** *Exceeds expectations* Edited book** or 4 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters Fewer than the required number of items for categories 8, 9, and 10 may be compensated by some of the following: • Quality of publications (as indicated on the Faculty Annual Update) • 6 or more presentations/workshops at international or national venues • Receives awards or other external recognition from the discipline • Secures external funding to support research and scholarly endeavors
6 or 7 Meets all job requirements with higher quality and/or takes on additional responsibilities above basic job duties	**Satisfactory** *Exceeds minimum expectations* 3 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters A score higher than 5 may be earned by some of the following: • 6 or more presentations/workshops at international or national venues • Awards or internal recognitions from the Department, College, or University • Internal funding to support research and scholarly endeavors
5 Meets all basic job requirements	**Minimum Expectations** • 3 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters • 3 Presentations/workshops at national or regional venues
3, 4	**Needs Improvement** *Inconsistently meets expectations* • Does not consistently meet expectations as described in the "Minimum Expectations" category above • Does not demonstrate professional and/or collegial behavior, etc.
0, 1, 2	**Unsatisfactory** *Does not meet most/all minimum expectations*

*Note on critical edition: In order to obtain a score of 9, a critical edition must include a newly edited text based on the consultation of the manuscript(s), an introductory chapter, and glosses. The PAC may consider additional contributions (translation, glossary etc.) to be worthy of separate, additional credit for the faculty member's file.

**Note on edited books: In order to obtain a score of 8, an edited book must include both an introductory chapter and a regular chapter (5,000 - 7,000 words). If a chapter is shorter or absent, the score for the edited book will be lower; if a chapter is longer, the PAC may consider additional credit for the faculty member's file.

Performance Evaluation Rubric – Service	
Please note that the description of each level above 5 includes the previous description(s). For example, a score of 8 includes the descriptions of 6/7 and 5.	
10	**Exceptional** *Consistently far exceeds expectations* *(some of the criteria for 8 are met for at least five semesters)*
9	*Consistently exceeds expectations* *(some of the criteria for 8 are met for at least four semesters)*

8
 	
 Goes above and beyond job expectations in language section and/or in the profession with exceptional quality and/or significant additional responsibilities
	Outstanding
	 Significantly exceeds expectations
	 (some of the criteria below are met for at least two semesters)
	
	 May include items such as:
	 • Performs assigned departmental service with excellence
	 • Organizes and/or assists with extra events for the department such as outreach programs, etc.
	 • Serves on CLASS or university committees and/or Faculty Senate
	 • Demonstrates leadership in the department
	 • Develops and implements innovative projects for the benefit of the department
	 • Mentors new faculty
	 • Performs other service to:
	    o The college
	    o The university (committees, student mentoring, student organizations, etc.)
	    o The community
	 • Plays a leadership role in a professional organization

6 or 7 Meets all job requirements with higher quality and/or takes on additional responsibilities above basic job duties	**Satisfactory** *Exceeds minimum expectations* • Volunteers and serves willingly in a variety of capacities • Performs other service to the department (conversation groups, film series, honor society events, organizing student outings, etc.) • Completes tasks expeditiously and correctly • Fulfills role of committee officer (e.g. Chair, Secretary)

5
Meets all basic job requirements
	Minimum Expectations
	• Completes assigned tasks
	• Attends departmental meetings
	• Satisfactorily performs committee service:
	   ○ Attends meetings
	   ○ Responds to emails in a timely manner
	If relevant to job assignment:
	   ○ Satisfactorily performs special departmental functions as assigned, such as graduate advisor, associate chair, course coordinator, etc.

3, 4	**Needs Improvement** *Inconsistently meets expectations* • Does not consistently meet expectations in the "Minimum Expectations" category above • Does not demonstrate professional and/or collegial behavior, etc.
0, 1, 2	**Unsatisfactory** *Does not meet most/all minimum expectations*