

**GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF LECTURERS**  
**DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND CULTURES**

Revised November 7, 2017

---

**I. Guidelines and Standards for the Evaluation of Teaching and Service**

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 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**

## ***Examples of Service***

Activities related to service 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 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). 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).

According to UNT Policy 06.007, “[t]he results of the annual review will be used, as appropriate, for reappointment reviews, progress toward promotion, and review of tenured faculty” (General Guidelines C, p. 2). For Lecturers, the results of the annual review will serve as evaluation for reappointment and merit (since tenure and post-tenure review are not applicable).

Lecturers are evaluated in the areas of teaching and service. Percentages for these areas 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 Activity Report (VPAA 160); the Faculty Activity Essay; 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 each file 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 areas for each lecturer in order to produce the committee's average score between 0 and 10 for each of the two areas.
3. The LAC submits the scores of all faculty members to the Department Chair. At the discretion of the Department Chair, a consultation with the LAC about faculty scores could be scheduled. The Department Chair will make the final decision regarding the scores.
4. After the Annual Review results have been finalized, the LAC 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

<b>Annual Review Score</b>	<b>Level</b>
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 LAC chair will submit a partial draft of a memo for each lecturer to the Department Chair containing (1) a chart with the score in each of the two areas, (2) the overall score, (3) the level of performance, (4) and a list of one or more outstanding achievements, if applicable, in each category. In addition, the LAC chair will submit to the Department Chair a summary chart of all lecturers' scores showing the range of scores in the two areas collected during the initial review by the LAC.
6. The Department Chair will use the recommendation (i.e., the draft of each memo) from the LAC as a starting point for the Annual Review of each Lecturer.

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

8. The Department Chair will notify the LAC chair 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 Lecturers**

During the first year of service, newly hired Lecturers normally receive an annual 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 Department Chair.

### **D. References**

- UNT Non -Tenure Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion policy:  
<https://policy.unt.edu/policy/06-005>
- UNT Annual Review policy:  
[https://policy.unt.edu/sites/default/files/06.007\\_AnnualReview\\_2017\\_0.pdf](https://policy.unt.edu/sites/default/files/06.007_AnnualReview_2017_0.pdf)
- Faculty Activity Report (VPAA 160):  
<http://vpaa.unt.edu/faculty-resources/forms-and-templates>

<b>Performance Evaluation Rubric – Teaching</b>	
<b>10</b> Consistently goes far beyond job requirements in language section and/or profession with exceptional quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	<b>Exceptional</b> <i>Consistently far exceeds expectations</i> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• May include many of the items in the “Outstanding” category below</li><li>• Demonstrates sustained exceptional performance for the three-year evaluation period</li></ul>
<b>8, 9</b> Goes beyond job requirements in language section and/or profession with outstanding quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	<b>Outstanding</b> <i>Significantly exceeds expectations</i> <hr/> <p><u>May include items such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Takes on challenging courses (i.e. upper-level courses, blended courses, new preparations)</li><li>• Designs new courses or redesigns courses (i.e. new textbook, significant curriculum changes)</li><li>• Works with special programs (i.e. Honors students, special problems courses)</li><li>• Makes an on-going effort to maintain subject-area and methodological expertise</li><li>• Attends teaching-related workshops and/or conferences</li><li>• Gives presentations at teaching-related conferences</li><li>• Receives prestigious teaching award(s) or grant(s)</li></ul>
<b>6, 7</b> Meets all job requirements with higher quality and/or takes on additional responsibilities above basic job duties  <b>5</b> Meets all basic job requirements	<b>Satisfactory</b> <i>Meets expectations</i> <hr/> <p><u>Required:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Creates and executes effective materials and lessons</li><li>• Maintains a positive regard in the eyes of the students (i.e. creates positive learning environment, is available for assistance outside of class, etc.)</li><li>• Keeps Faculty Profile up to date</li></ul> <p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Carries out additional duties satisfactorily</li><li>• Cooperates with language section (i.e. attending meetings, follows coordinated sections’ policies and syllabi, etc.)</li></ul>
<b>3, 4</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <i>Inconsistently meets expectations</i> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not consistently meet expectations as described in the “Satisfactory” category above</li><li>• Misses classes without making appropriate arrangements</li></ul>
<b>0, 1, 2</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> <i>Does not meet expectations</i>

<b>Performance Evaluation Rubric – Service</b>	
<b>10</b> Consistently goes far beyond job requirements in department and/or profession with exceptional quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	<b>Exceptional</b> <i>Consistently far exceeds expectations</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May include many of the items in the “Outstanding” category below</li> <li>• Demonstrates sustained exceptional performance for the three-year evaluation period</li> </ul>
<b>8, 9</b> Goes beyond job requirements in department and/or profession with outstanding quality and/or significant additional responsibilities	<b>Outstanding</b> <i>Significantly exceeds expectations</i>  <u>May include items such as:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performs assigned departmental service with excellence</li> <li>• Organizes and/or assists with extra events, projects, or programs for the department</li> <li>• Demonstrates leadership in the department</li> <li>• Implements innovative projects for the benefit of the department</li> <li>• Mentors new faculty</li> <li>• Performs other service to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The college</li> <li>○ The university (committees, student mentoring, student organizations, etc.)</li> <li>○ The community</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Is highly involved in a professional organization related to teaching field</li> </ul>
<b>6, 7</b> Meets all job requirements with higher quality and/or takes on additional responsibilities above basic job duties  <b>5</b> Meets all basic job requirements	<b>Satisfactory</b> <i>Meets expectations</i>  <u>Required:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attends departmental meetings</li> <li>• Satisfactorily performs committee service:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Serves willingly</li> <li>○ Attends meetings, responds to emails in a timely manner, completes tasks expeditiously and correctly</li> <li>○ Fulfills role as officer when applicable (i.e. leadership as Chair; note-taking &amp; minutes as Secretary)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <u>Other:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performs other service to the department (conversation groups, film series, honor society events, student outings, etc.)</li> <li>• Satisfactorily performs special departmental functions (e.g., advising, coordination, study abroad, etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>3, 4</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b> <i>Inconsistently meets expectations</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not consistently meet expectations as described in the “Satisfactory” category above</li> <li>• Does not demonstrate professional and/or collegial behavior, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>0, 1, 2</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> <i>Does not meet expectations</i>