

Guidelines and Standards for Annual Review of Professors
Revised May 3, 2023

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

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 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 review committee, nomination and reception of teaching awards, and an examination of instructional materials. Faculty members will need to supply course syllabi 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 process¹

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 review 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.

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

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 review committee 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 review committee.

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 review 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 (e.g., monograph, critical edition, edited book, critical bibliography)
- 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 a peer-reviewed scholarly paper or giving a workshop at a professional conference

C. Evaluation of Service

Examples of Service

Service-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 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 UNT Policy 06.007, “[a]n elected review committee and chair will review all full-time faculty annually” (General Guidelines A, p. 2).

In accordance with UNT Policy 06.007, “[a]n elected review committee and chair will assess faculty productivity within the context of a comprehensive 3-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 (3) calendar years” (General Guidelines B, p. 2).

According to UNT Policy 06.007, “[t]he results of the annual review will be used, as appropriate, for reappointment reviews, progress toward tenure and promotion, and review of tenured faculty” (General Guidelines C, p. 2).

The three criteria for evaluating faculty members are teaching, scholarship, and service. 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 Activity Report (VPAA 160); the Faculty Activity Essay; 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 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 submits the scores of all faculty members to the department chair. At the discretion of the department chair, a consultation with the PAC about their faculty scores could be scheduled. The department chair will make the final decision regarding the scores, which will be provided to the PAC.
4. After the Annual Review results have been finalized, the PAC will multiply each score by the relevant workload percentages and add these numbers to produce the overall score (0-10), which will be converted to a level (see table below).

Table 1—Annual Review Levels

Annual 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. The PAC will submit a recommendation for each faculty member in FIS. This recommendation will include the score in each of the three areas, the overall score, the level of performance, and a list of one or more outstanding achievements, if applicable, in each of the three categories. In addition, the PAC will submit to the chair a summary chart of all faculty scores showing the range of scores in the three areas collected during the initial review by the PAC.

6. The department chair will submit an annual review of each faculty member in FIS. This recommendation will include the score in each of the three areas, the overall score, the level of performance, and a narrative that explains the annual review scores.

7. Once the department chair has finalized and distributed Annual Reviews to all professors, a minimum of five (5) business days will be given for professors to submit an appeal of the Annual Review to the department chair.

8. The department chair will notify the PAC of the outcome of each appeal.

9. 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 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.

VII. Review of Tenured Faculty

The review of tenured faculty (also known as post-tenure review of faculty) was part of a UNT policy that no longer exists. The new policy is currently under review and is anticipated to be UNT Policy 06.008, which currently addresses the time period exclusion from the probationary period; however, the new policy with this number (06.008) is anticipated to address the review of tenured faculty.

APPENDIX A

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 <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)
0, 1, 2	Unsatisfactory <i>Does not meet most/all minimum expectations</i>

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 <i>Far exceeds expectations</i> Monograph or 6 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters
9	Outstanding <i>Significantly exceeds expectations</i> 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	Excellent <i>Exceeds expectations</i> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>Exceeds minimum expectations</i> 3 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters A score higher than 5 may be earned by some of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters • 3 Presentations/workshops at national or regional venues
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 • Does not demonstrate professional and/or collegial behavior, etc.
0, 1, 2	Unsatisfactory <i>Does not meet most/all minimum expectations</i>

***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 <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> <u>May include items such as:</u> <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 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><u>If relevant to job assignment:</u></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;">0, 1, 2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Unsatisfactory <i>Does not meet most/all minimum expectations</i></p>

Appendix B
(revised October 1, 2015)

**Acknowledgment of Receipt of Review, Promotion, and Tenure Documents
and/or Website Addresses for Such Documents**

By my signature, I acknowledge receipt of the following documents and/or the website addresses for the following documents:

- *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;
- *Curriculum Vitae Template* (Arts and Humanities, Sciences, or Social Sciences) of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences;
- *Guidelines and Standards for Review, Tenure, and Promotion of Professors* of the Department of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures;
- the “Recommendation for Probationary Faculty” form;
- the most recent version of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences;
- form VPAA-170, *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Checklist*; and
- form VPAA-174, *University Information Form for Reappointments, Promotion, and Tenure*.

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Original: faculty member’s departmental personnel file
Photocopy: faculty member