

Guidelines for Full-Time Faculty Annual Review
Department of World Languages, Literatures, and
Cultures

Approved by the Dean's Office on January 6, 2025

I. Overview

- A. These guidelines provide additional details related to UNT Policy 06.007 Full-Time Faculty and Academic Administrator Annual Review, and Academic Administrator Reappointment.
- B. UNT Policy 06.007 mentions the Personnel Affairs Committee as the group of full-time faculty who make recommendations to the department chair. In the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, the Lecturers Affairs Committee (LAC) evaluates lecturers, and the Personnel Affairs Committee (PAC) evaluates professors.
- C. Lecturers are the only type of professional faculty in our department; therefore, this document refers only to lecturers.
- D. For annual review, the LAC/PAC and the department chair evaluate workload-based productivity during the three previous calendar years.
- E. Different types of evidence that can be used to demonstrate quality in teaching, scholarship, and service are provided in UNT Policy 06.007.

II. Annual Review Process

- A. Annual review is managed in the university's Faculty Information System (FIS).
- B. Full-time faculty are responsible for uploading their own materials in FIS by the date indicated on the calendar maintained by the Office of the Provost.
- C. The agenda of the first department meeting of every fall semester will include time for a discussion of the previous annual review cycle.
- D. During the fall semester of each year, the department chair will send all full-time faculty instructions for preparing and submitting annual review materials.
- E. The LAC/PAC will vote by secret ballot.
- F. The members of the LAC/PAC will evaluate the materials for annual review submitted by each full-time faculty member and prepare a written recommendation to the department chair. The recommendation will include a level for each applicable category (teaching, scholarship, service), based on the evaluation rubrics provided in the appendix.

- G. Level 1 is the highest level. This level includes scores of 8, 9, or 10.
Level 2 is the middle level. This level includes scores of 5, 6, or 7.
Level 3 is the lowest level. This level includes scores of 1, 2, 3, or 4.
- H. During the first and second year of full-time employment at UNT, faculty members will not be placed in Level 3 (based on the overall score), except in cases where Level 3 is recommended by the LAC/PAC and approved by the department chair.
- I. The members of the LAC/PAC do not need to agree on a level for each category. In the annual review recommendation for each full-time faculty member, the LAC/PAC will record the number of votes for each level in each category.
- J. The chairs of the LAC/PAC will upload written recommendations for each full-time faculty member in FIS.
- K. The department chair will prepare an annual review report for each full-time faculty member.
- The score for each category will be a whole number between 1 and 10.
 - The overall score will be calculated by multiplying the score for each category by the percentage of the corresponding category in the workload. The calculation of the overall score will often result in a number with a decimal point. The overall score will not be rounded up or down.
 - The overall score will determine the level (i.e., 1, 2, or 3, based on II. G. above).
- L. The department chair will send each full-time faculty member an initial annual review report by e-mail. This message will include instructions for appeals.
- M. The period for appeals will include five full business days. A business day is defined as a day (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.) when the University of North Texas is open and faculty are expected to be working. The period for appeals will not include any part of Spring Break.
- N. Once the period for appeals has ended, the department chair will upload the final annual review report for each full-time faculty member in FIS.
- O. The department chair will notify the LAC/PAC of the result of each appeal.

Appendix A - For Lecturers (Taken from the rubrics revised on October 10, 2015)

Level 1: score 8, 9, 10; Level 2: score 5, 6, 7; Level 3: score 1, 2, 3, 4

Evaluation Rubric – Teaching	
10 Consistently goes far beyond job requirements in language section and/or profession with exceptional quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	Exceptional <i>Consistently far exceeds expectations</i> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• May include many of the items in the “Outstanding” category below• Demonstrates sustained exceptional performance for the three-year evaluation period
8, 9 Goes beyond job requirements in language section and/or profession with outstanding quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	Outstanding <i>Significantly exceeds expectations</i> <hr/> <p><u>May include items such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Takes on challenging courses (i.e. upper-level courses, blended courses, new preparations)• Designs new courses or redesigns courses (i.e. new textbook, significant curriculum changes)• Works with special programs (i.e. Honors students, special problems courses)• 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, 7 Meets all job requirements with higher quality and/or takes on additional responsibilities above basic job duties 5 Meets all basic job requirements	Satisfactory <i>Meets expectations</i> <hr/> <p><u>Required:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.)• Keeps Faculty Profile up to date <p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Carries out additional duties satisfactorily• Cooperates with language section (i.e. attending meetings, follows coordinated sections’ policies and syllabi, etc.)
3, 4	Needs Improvement <i>Inconsistently meets expectations</i> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not consistently meet expectations as described in the “Satisfactory” category above• Misses classes without making appropriate arrangements
1, 2	Unsatisfactory <i>Does not meet expectations</i>

Appendix B - For Lecturers (Taken from the rubrics revised on October 10, 2015)

Level 1: score 8, 9, 10; Level 2: score 5, 6, 7; Level 3: score 1, 2, 3, 4

Evaluation Rubric – Service	
<p style="text-align: center;">10</p> <p>Consistently goes far beyond job requirements in department and/or profession with exceptional quality and/or significant additional responsibilities</p>	<p>Exceptional</p> <p><i>Consistently far exceeds expectations</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May include many of the items in the “Outstanding” category below • Demonstrates sustained exceptional performance for the three-year evaluation period
<p style="text-align: center;">8, 9</p> <p>Goes beyond job requirements in department and/or profession with outstanding quality and/or significant additional responsibilities</p>	<p>Outstanding</p> <p><i>Significantly exceeds expectations</i></p>
	<p><u>May include items such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performs assigned departmental service with excellence • Organizes and/or assists with extra events, projects, or programs for the department • Demonstrates leadership in the department • Implements innovative projects for the benefit of the department • Mentors new faculty • Performs other service to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The college ○ The university (committees, student mentoring, student organizations, etc.) ○ The community • Is highly involved in a professional organization related to teaching field
<p style="text-align: center;">6, 7</p> <p>Meets all job requirements with higher quality and/or takes on additional responsibilities above basic job duties</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>Meets all basic job requirements</p>	<p>Satisfactory</p> <p><i>Meets expectations</i></p>
	<p><u>Required:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attends departmental meetings • Satisfactorily performs committee service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Serves willingly ○ Attends meetings, responds to emails in a timely manner, completes tasks expeditiously and correctly ○ Fulfills role as officer when applicable (i.e. leadership as Chair; note-taking & minutes as Secretary) <p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performs other service to the department (conversation groups, film series, honor society events, student outings, etc.) • Satisfactorily performs special departmental functions (e.g., advising, coordination, study abroad, etc.)
<p style="text-align: center;">3, 4</p>	<p>Needs Improvement</p> <p><i>Inconsistently meets expectations</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not consistently meet expectations as described in the “Satisfactory” category above • Does not demonstrate professional and/or collegial behavior, etc.
<p style="text-align: center;">1, 2</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p><i>Does not meet expectations</i></p>

APPENDIX C - For Professors (Taken from the guidelines revised on May 3, 2023)

Level 1: score 8, 9, 10; Level 2: score 5, 6, 7; Level 3: score 1, 2, 3, 4

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 <i>Consistently far exceeds expectations</i> <i>(some of the criteria for 8 are met for at least five semesters)</i>
9	Outstanding <i>Consistently exceeds expectations</i> <i>(some of the criteria for 8 are met for at least four semesters)</i>
8 Goes above and beyond teaching expectations within the language section and/or in the profession with exceptional quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	Excellent <i>Significantly exceeds expectations</i> <i>(some of the criteria below are met for at least two semesters)</i> <u>May include items such as:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>Exceeds minimum expectations</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>Inconsistently meets expectations</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)
1, 2	Unsatisfactory <i>Does not meet most/all minimum expectations</i>

Appendix D – For Professors

This rubric was approved unanimously by Kaori Furuya, Adam Manfredi, Christoph Weber, and Lawrence Williams on December 5, 2024. All tenure-track faculty will meet during Spring 2025 to revise this rubric after it has been used for the 2022/2023/2024 annual review cycle.

Level 1: score of 8, 9, 10; Level 2: score of 5, 6, 7; Level 3: score of 1, 2, 3, 4

Evaluation Rubric - Scholarship	
8-10 (Level 1)	<p>Quality/value of scholarship can be used to reach a score of 8, 9, or 10.</p> <p>It is the faculty member’s responsibility to consider the evidence that can demonstrate quality/value before sending a manuscript to a publication outlet.</p> <p>Indicators of quality/value for publications may include (but are not limited to) the types of evidence listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact factor • Journal ranking (e.g., SciMago quartile or Journal Citation Reports) • Acceptance rate • Length (This can be a factor, but there is no expectation for an automatic boost in the score.) • Academic press vs. commercial press [see related remark below] <p>Indicators of quality/value for grants may include (but are not limited to) the number of dollars and the funding source (i.e., local, state, federal, international).</p>
5-7 (Level 2)	<p>Different types of evidence can be used to reach a score of 5, 6, or 7.</p> <p>Any evidence used to determine a score for scholarship should include an evaluation of quality/value and consideration of the amount of time negotiated in the official workload for scholarship.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-reviewed monograph • Peer-reviewed edited volume • Peer-reviewed journal article(s) • Peer-reviewed book chapter(s) • Conference presentation(s) • Research grant(s) • Quantifiable impact on the field (e.g., citation counts) • Research-related awards • Other evidence of scholarly activity
1-4 (Level 3)	<p>Very little evidence of scholarship and/or a lack of evidence demonstrating quality/value of scholarship can result in a score of 1, 2, 3, or 4.</p>

Remarks

- 1) This model of a rubric offers flexibility, which seems to be necessary since professors in our department have different profiles, ranks, responsibilities, and workload percentages.
- 2) This model of a rubric moves away from a stipulated number of publications required for a score of 5, 6, or 7 with the aim of mitigating the potentially inequitable treatment for professors who agree to take on additional responsibilities and tasks among our ever-shrinking faculty numbers.
- 3) For this model of a rubric, Level 2 is seen as an expected level of performance.
- 4) For this model of a rubric, a base score is assigned in Level 2 or Level 3, and then quality/value can be used to raise or lower the base score.
- 5) For this model of a rubric, a record of scholarship that includes publications only (and none of the other types of evidence of scholarly activity) must include 1-3 peer-reviewed journal articles/book chapters to reach a base score of 5, 6, or 7.
- 6) We should recognize that academic presses and commercial presses are for-profit presses, but they have—in some ways—different operating practices, reputations, and traditions. We might want to consider the academic press as needing less justification to be considered an indication of quality/value, and a commercial press will need some type of explanation if it is going to be taken as a reputable/respectable/prestigious press.

Appendix E – For Professors (Taken from the guidelines revised on May 3, 2023)

Level 1: score of 8, 9, 10; Level 2: score of 5, 6, 7; Level 1: score of 1, 2, 3, 4

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 <i>Consistently far exceeds expectations</i> <i>(some of the criteria for 8 are met for at least five semesters)</i>
9	Outstanding <i>Consistently exceeds expectations</i> <i>(some of the criteria for 8 are met for at least four semesters)</i>
8 Goes above and beyond job expectations in language section and/or in the profession with exceptional quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	Excellent <i>Significantly exceeds expectations</i> <i>(some of the criteria below are met for at least two semesters)</i> May include items such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The college ○ The university (committees, student mentoring, student organizations, etc.) ○ 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 <i>Exceeds minimum expectations</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)

<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>Meets all basic job requirements</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Minimum Expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completes assigned tasks • Attends departmental meetings • Satisfactorily performs committee service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attends meetings ○ Responds to emails in a timely manner <p>If relevant to job assignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Satisfactorily performs special departmental functions as assigned, such as graduate advisor, associate chair, course coordinator, etc.
<p style="text-align: center;">3, 4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Needs Improvement <i>Inconsistently meets expectations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not consistently meet expectations in the "Minimum Expectations" category above • Does not demonstrate professional and/or collegial behavior, etc.
<p style="text-align: center;">1, 2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Unsatisfactory <i>Does not meet most/all minimum expectations</i></p>