GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, 
TENURE AND PROMOTION OF PROFESSORS 
DEPARTMENT OF SPANISH 
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

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

These guidelines are based on and informed by UNT Policies 06.004 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, 06.007 Annual Review and 06.014 Evaluating Tenured Faculty.

I. Guidelines and Standards for the Annual 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. Refer to the departmental Performance Evaluation Rubrics in the Appendix.

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 (Personnel Affairs Committee), 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
• Coordination and/or supervision of teaching assistants and/or teaching fellows, with due consideration given to the special demands and responsibilities of the job.
• 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 committee director or member
• Teaching-related grants
• Course and curriculum development
• Teaching-related professional development

B. Evaluation of Scholarship

The scholarly journal or scholarly book publisher must have a peer-review process in place. For journal articles, the faculty must provide proof of peer review procedure by using reliable databases such as the MLA Directory of Periodicals or simply providing actual external reviews. For book publications, a contract and proof of peer review process (e.g. external reviews) must be provided as evidence of the peer-review process. Publications will not count if no peer-review process is used by the publisher or that the peer-review process does not include reviews by external reviewers.

B.1 Quality of Scholarly Journals

The quality of peer-reviewed journal publications will be determined by their acceptance rate or Google Scholar Index as follows:

Tier 1: acceptance rate 20% and lower or a Journal H-Index of 5 and higher
Tier 2: acceptance rate between 21% and 40% or a Journal H-Index of 3 or 4
Tier 3: acceptance rate higher than 41% or a Journal H-Index between 1 and 2

Journal acceptance rates must be verified by reputable databases such as the MLA Directory of Periodicals, or through an official letter from a journal editor. The journal’s H-Index must be also verified by the information available at www.scholar.google.com or www.scimagojr.com. If the acceptance rate information or the H-Index is not available for a journal, the chair or the PAC will determine the journal’s tier based on the documentation provided by the faculty regarding the peer-review process of the publication/s being considered.

The following factors are also critical in determining the quality of a journal publication:

1. The editor-in-chief of the scholarly journal has a reputation as an expert in his/her field.
2. The scholarly journal has an editorial board composed primarily of recognized academic professionals
3. Leading scholars in the field publish in this journal

B.2 Quality of Book Publications

Books presented for tenure and promotion must be published by a highly reputable university or non-university book publisher in the U.S. or abroad that is recognized nationally and/or internationally as a source of respectable research or, in the case of creative books, by a reputable publisher or the reputation of other known authors published in a given venue. Books published by pay-to-publish vanity presses will not be considered. Occasionally,
subvention fees are requested by publishers, however, a book publication must not be contingent upon such payments.

Role in Collaborative/Interdisciplinary Publications

1. Faculty members who engage in collaborative/interdisciplinary work resulting in multi-authored publications must explain their role in terms of percentage of work performed in each collaborative project.
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/interdisciplinary work that results in co-authored publications.
3. Collaborative/interdisciplinary work resulting in co-authored publications with students is recognized as an important part of mentoring future teachers/scholars.

Examples of Scholarship

Typical areas of scholarship for faculty comprise six broad, slightly overlapping categories: analytical research, critical theory, translation, creative writing, linguistic studies and pedagogical studies. Venues include traditional as well as electronic ones that adhere to standards outlined above.

Primary published scholarship includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Peer-reviewed single-author book-length monograph
- Peer-reviewed articles and essays
- Peer-reviewed scholarly book (e.g., collection of edited essays, critical edition of an important work of literature, etc.)
- Peer-reviewed book chapters

Secondary forms of scholarship that have less weight include, but are not limited, to the following:
- Entry in a work of reference (e.g., encyclopedia)
- Editorial work involving scholarly publications
- Book review in a scholarly or creative journal
- Research-related grants
- Invited keynote address at professional conferences
- Presenting scholarly papers or workshops at professional conferences

Creative activities include but are not limited to:
- Published book-length original work of fiction
- Published short stories, poetry or plays in reputable journals or books
- Original film or documentary premiered at national or international festivals
- Public readings of original work
- Commissions of one’s original work
C. Evaluation of Service

The Department of Spanish considers service to the department, as well as the university and the profession, to be an important component of a faculty member’s duties to the department and the institution. Service- and engagement-related activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Department Chair, Associate Chair, Undergraduate/Graduate Advisor, Language Coordinator, etc.
- 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)
- Reviewing manuscripts
- Organizer, chair, secretary, or facilitator of a session/workshop at a conference or professional meeting
- Initiates and/or directs a Study Abroad program
- Contests/fairs/festivals (planning, participation, attendance)
- Securing outside funding for student scholarships/fellowships/assistantships, endowments, and special projects
- Representing the department and university in professional organizations in public-facing capacities

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, especially University Policy 06.007 “Annual Review” (effective 5/05/2017).

According to University Policy 06.007, “Annual reviews provide an assessment of the quality of a faculty member’s contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service and are used to determine merit, review of tenured faculty, and other purposes as required by unit guidelines or university policy”.

Some basic principles to highlight in University Policy 06.007 and which are followed in the Department of Spanish are:
1. “An elected review committee and chair will review all full-time faculty annually”
2. All full-time faculty will be evaluated “within the context of a comprehensive 3-year window, with no single year having more weight than the other two”
3. “Each department shall have approved guidelines for determining which activities fulfill its mission in teaching, scholarship and service”; the Department of Spanish has a specific set of evaluation of rubrics to be used in the annual evaluations
4. “The review committee must consist of no fewer than three, and up to all, eligible faculty members. The composition of the review committee should be determined according to guidelines established by the unit”
5. “The annual review will be based on contributions that are documented and/or can be verified, rather than anecdotal information”
6. “The peer review committee and chair will provide the faculty member a written evaluation using the unit’s documented procedures”

The three areas in which Spanish professors will be evaluated 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 (Personnel Affairs Committee) will base its evaluations on objective evidence. Such evidence must include the information provided in the Faculty Annual Update and/or Faculty Information System (FIS), summary of teaching evaluation scores for the 3-year window under evaluation and carefully documented evidence of accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The PAC will use the departmental Performance Evaluation Rubrics (see Appendix) to carry out annual evaluations of fellow faculty members. The onus falls upon faculty to provide complete documentation.

### 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 evaluation rubrics
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. PAC members prepare a memo to the Department Chair as a recommendation including the committee's average score for each of the three categories and a list of each professor's main accomplishments during the review period.
4. After taking into consideration the recommendation of the PAC, the Department Chair will determine the final score in teaching, scholarship, and service for each professor. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>10.0 – 9.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional/Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.9-8.0 Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9-7.0 Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9-5.1 Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0-0 Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Once the Department Chair 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 in order for the PAC and the Chair to review the appeals together and to determine whether or not a change of score or level is appropriate.
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.
8. The PAC will prepare for the Dean a 2-page evaluation of the Chair with emphasis on the Chair’s performance in three-year cycle under review.

C. Note Regarding New Faculty Members

During the first year of service, newly hired faculty are rated as average in the department or division.

III. Guidelines and Standards for Re-appointment of tenure-track faculty during probationary period

Early in the fall semester of a 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 Spanish
• *Curriculum Vitae Template* (Arts and Humanities, Sciences, or Social Sciences) of the College of Arts & 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 acknowledging receipt of the documents listed above and/or website addresses for the documents listed above.

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 junior faculty shall be reviewed annually during the probationary period. Under normal circumstances, this review is only forwarded to College PAC, the Dean and the Provost for action during the third year (mid-term) and the sixth year (tenure/promotion) of the probationary period.

According to University Policy 06.004 third-year reappointment review is “a more extensive and intensive review that includes the unit, the college, and the provost, but without external letters”. The third-year reappointment review takes place at the beginning of the faculty member’s third year in the department.

Faculty members (i.e. assistant professors) 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 750 words)
• Department of Spanish’s tenure and promotion criteria for professors (this document)
• Where applicable statement on Multi-Authorship (1-page maximum)
• Table of Contents of Supplemental Materials
• Any other documentation or information requested by the University, the College, the Department Chair, or the departmental Personnel Affairs Committee
• Reappointment votes for third year review from PAC

In addition, the Chair will provide:

• Cumulative results of annual evaluations
• Summary evaluation of teaching effectiveness
• Recommendation of PAC
• Recommendation of Chair

IMPORTANT: As per University Policy 06.004 all “eligible tenured faculty members in the unit will vote whether to recommend the probationary faculty member for reappointment in the third year and each year thereafter”. These votes will be included in the faculty member’s third-year review dossier. All tenured faculty will have access to the candidate’s dossier in order to make an informed decision. In other words, all tenured faculty members (except for the chair) will serve on the PAC in evaluating the third-year review candidate and all will vote in favor or against the approval of the assistant professor’s progress towards tenure in their third-year review and each year thereafter until he/she achieves tenure.

All junior faculty during the probationary period will be assigned a mentor with whom he/she will meet regularly to receive advice and gauge progress towards third-year review and eventual achievement of tenure in the sixth year. It is also incumbent upon the junior faculty to regularly attend workshops on tenure and promotion given by the college and the university to be well-informed about practices and policies and changes in the same.

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 CLASS 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 UNT Policy 06.004.

For promotion to tenure, the Department of Spanish requires excellent contributions in all three areas of evaluation: teaching and teaching-related activities, scholarly accomplishments, and service. Sustained excellence is required in the areas of teaching and scholarly/professional accomplishments along with effective service.

Faculty members in the Department of Spanish must remain current in their area(s) of expertise, must demonstrate high standards of quality of instruction. As stated in the section on “Defining Good Teaching” of the ADFL’s Guidelines on the Administration of Foreign Language Departments, “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 Spanish expects a candidate for tenure to have demonstrated excellent scholarly and professional growth throughout the probationary period. Faculty may opt for the
publication of a single-authored book-length monograph, a collection of journal articles and book chapters or a combination of both. In any case, the total number of published words in well-regarded peer-reviewed venues (e.g. books, journal articles, book chapters, etc.) must equal or surpass 50,000 words. If a faculty member opts for journal articles, at least 40,000 words (80%) of the minimum required 50,000 words must appear in tier 1 or tier 2 journals as defined above (p. 2). To further distinguish between tier 1, 2 and 3 publications, the following word count scale will be applied:

Tier 1: number of words x 1.3 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 1,300 words counted, etc.
Tier 2: number of words x 1.0 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 1,000 words counted, etc.
Tier 3: number of words x 0.7 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 700 words counted, etc.

In case a book-length monograph has less than 50,000 words, it could be combined with journal articles. In addition, a book-length monograph with a minimum of 45,000 words will automatically receive a bonus of 5,000 words and an edited book of scholarly essays 4,000 words, taking into account the considerable extra work and dedication required to produce a scholarly book (and co-edited book 2,000 words).

Contributions by multiple authors or editors shall be evaluated according to the percentage of the work done by each and the word count will count accordingly. In cases where one author/editor bears a larger percentage of the work then corroboration in writing by the co-authors/co-editors in question should be provided. Important: only primary scholarship as defined under the “Evaluation of Scholarship” section above (p. 3) will be included in the total published word count.

All guidelines listed in this document for peer-reviewed publications must be fulfilled for all scholarly output to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor.

Also, a faculty member during the probationary period must have published or have accepted at least two journal articles before his/her third-year review or must have received a positive feedback from a publisher about his/her book proposal that includes at least two book chapters. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate’s scholarly accomplishments must be recognized beyond the local level.

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Spanish 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 clearly related to the previously stated areas. 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 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.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will also be evaluated according to University Policy 06.004, which also outlines procedures for cases of denial of reappointment during the probationary period, tenure and promotion.

V. Promotion to Professor

According to University Policy 06.004, "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".

The promotion of an Associate Professor to the rank of Professor in the Department of Spanish is based on the scholarly work and achievements of the faculty member since promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. Faculty may opt for the publication of a single-authored book-length monograph, a collection of journal articles and book chapters or a combination of both. In any case, the total number of published words in well-regarded peer-reviewed venues must equal or surpass 60,000 words. If a faculty member opts for journal articles, at least 50,000 words (83%) out of the minimum required 60,000 words must be in tier 1 or tier 2 journals as indicated above (p. 2). To further distinguish between tier 1, 2 and 3 publications, the following word count scale will be applied:

Tier 1: number of words x 1.3 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 1,300 words counted, etc.
Tier 2: number of words x 1.0 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 1,000 words counted, etc.
Tier 3: number of words x 0.7 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 700 words counted, etc.

In case a book-length monograph has less than 60,000 words, it could be combined with journal articles. In addition, a book-length monograph with a minimum of 50,000 words will automatically receive a bonus of 5,000 words, and an edited book of scholarly essays 4,000 words (and co-edited book 2,000 words), taking into account the considerable extra work and dedication required to produce a scholarly book.

Contributions by multiple authors or editors shall be evaluated according to the percentage of the work done by each and the word count will count accordingly. In cases where one author/editor bears a larger percentage of the work then corroboration in writing by the co-authors/co-editors in question should be provided.

All guidelines listed in this document for peer-reviewed publications must be fulfilled for all scholarly output to be considered for promotion to Full Professor. In addition, the candidate for promotion to Professor must have applied for at least one major internal or external research
fund since tenure even if it was not obtained. For promotion to Professor, the candidate’s scholarship should have earned national or international recognition.

Although the department places a high value on scholarship for promotion to Full Professor, it expects demonstrated consistent quality in teaching and major service activities at the departmental and university levels during time-in-rank as Associate Professor. Service to the profession is also an important component. Service activities to the profession, particularly the leadership roles in scholarly communities, are also an important component. Such roles include, but are not limited to, organizing professional conferences/symposia/workshops, initiating/participating in academic forums, collaborating and/or initiating projects with leading scholars, serving on professional organizations and/or journals, evaluating tenure and/or promotion files for other universities, reviewing manuscripts for major journals and book publishers, etc.

Standards for documentation and evidence to support promotion are the same as those to support tenure.

Candidates for promotion to Professor will also be evaluated according to UNT Policy 06.004.

VI. Procedures for the Tenure/Promotion Process

1. In the spring semester preceding the fall semester in which the faculty plans to apply for tenure or promotion, he/she will provide the chair with at least 5 names of suggested outside reviewers for his/her tenure or promotion case. The candidate must not have any personal relationship with any suggested outside reviewers. The faculty member may also include names of outside reviewers not to be invited. The chair will also solicit 5 names of outside reviewers from the PAC as well as come up with five of his/her own. The chair will consult this list of 15 names when contacting outside reviewers for the tenure/promotion case and obtain at least one reviewer from each list. For both tenure and promotion at least 5 outside reviewers’ letters will need to be on file. According to UNT Policy 06.004 outside reviewers “must hold the rank at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires or have demonstrably equivalent qualifications and position in non-academic organizations”. Thus, for promotion to Associate Professor outside reviewers must at the least be Associate Professors themselves, or Full Professors. For promotion to Full Professor, outside reviewers must be Full Professors.

2. By the month of May preceding the fall semester in which the faculty plans to apply for tenure or promotion he/she will have to prepare and give the chair the following items 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 750 words)

• Department of Spanish’s Promotion & Tenure policy (this document)

• Where necessary, a statement on Multi-Authorship (1-page maximum)

• Table of Contents of Supplemental Materials (see 4 below)

• Any other documentation or information requested by the University, the College, the Department Chair, or the departmental Personnel Affairs Committee.

3. In addition, the candidate must prepare a second binder containing all relevant publications and documentation of scholarly activities.

4. In the summer preceding the fall semester in which the faculty member plans to apply for tenure or promotion the chair will send to all outside reviewers the following: the candidate’s CV, personal narrative, all publications and the department’s Promotion and Tenure policy (this document). The chair will ask the outside reviewers to evaluate the tenure/promotion case based on the publication record and the department’s guidelines.

5. At the beginning of the fall semester in which the faculty member is applying for tenure/promotion the chair will add the following documents to the candidate’s dossier:

   • Cumulative results of annual evaluations
   • Summary evaluation of teaching effectiveness
   • At least 5 external referee letters (all referee letters received must be included)
   • External referee information and CV’s

The chair will then give the candidate’s dossier to the departmental PAC by September 1st in order for this committee to evaluate the candidate’s case for tenure/promotion. In cases of tenure all tenured faculty will participate in the evaluation process and vote on the case. In cases of promotion only full professors may serve on the PAC.

Once the chair receives the departmental PAC’s letter of evaluation and recommendation, he/she will include it in the candidate’s dossier along with his/her own letter of evaluation and recommendation. The candidate’s dossier will then be sent to the college dean’s office to be evaluated by the college PAC and the dean before it is sent to the provost. All college and university deadlines will be followed. In case of any negative recommendations at any stage, procedures outlined in UNT Policy 06.004 will be followed.
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.

The procedures outlined above (in section VI.) are identical for probationary faculty going up for third year review (at the beginning of their third academic year) with the exception of the 5 outside reviewers who will not be needed.

VII. Post-Tenure Review of Faculty

In accordance with University Policy 06.014, all tenured faculty will be evaluated during "the annual performance evaluation [which] covers the same three-year period as other faculty evaluations".

If a tenured faculty member receives an “unsatisfactory” yearly evaluation from the PAC and chair, he/she will be required to enter a “Professional Development Program”, as clearly outlined by UNT Policy 06.014
## Performance Evaluation Rubrics

### TEACHING

**(Lecturers & Professors)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Consistently meets stipulations under “Satisfactory” in addition to carrying out any combination of activities and achievements for “Very Good” totaling at least 20 points for repeatable items over 3-calendar-year period under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mandatory for level 10: SPOT average of 4.4 or above in the 3-year-calendar period under review and at least 70% completion rate</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Consistently meets stipulations under “Satisfactory” in addition to carrying out any combination of activities and achievements for “Very Good” totaling 15-19 points for repeatable items over 3-calendar-year period under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mandatory for level 9: SPOT average of 4.2 or above in the 3-year calendar period under review and at least 70% completion rate</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consistently meets stipulations under “Satisfactory” in addition to carrying out any combination of activities and achievements listed below totaling 12-14 points for repeatable items over 3-calendar-year period under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One point per item and/or per semester unless indicated otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Develops and teaches new blended and/or online courses (3 pts./item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develops and teaches new course (2 pts./item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Teaches new preparation (1 pt./item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Adopts new (not revised) textbook and makes substantial changes to syllabus of existing course (1 pt./item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Works with special programs (i.e. Honors Thesis, Special Problems courses, etc.) (1.5 pt./case)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Directs Master’s theses (maximum four semesters/student) (1.5 pt./semester)
7. Takes webinars to maintain pedagogical expertise (1/2 pt. per webinar; maximum 6 pts.)
8. Presents at teaching-related workshops and/or conferences on/off-campus (2 pts./event)
9. Attends teaching-related workshops and/or conferences on or off-campus (1 pt./event)
10. Receives teaching award (2 pts./item)
11. Nominated for any teaching award at any level (1 pt./item)
12. Undergoes a voluntary peer class observation by LAC/PAC (1 pt.; 1 observation per evaluation period)
13. Other significant teaching-related activities and accomplishments (i.e. tutoring, reviewing textbooks, substituting classes, Canvas training, etc., ½-1 pt./item)
   ❖ Mandatory for level 8: SPOT average of 4.0 or above in 3-year evaluation period under review and at least 70% completion rate (6 pts.)

**Satisfactory**
1. Creates and executes effective materials and lessons
2. Arrives to class on time and meets for the entire period
3. Teaches in Spanish
4. Maintains a positive regard in the eyes of the students (i.e. creates positive learning environment, is available for assistance outside of class, etc.)
5. Arranges for class substitution or alternative activity instead of canceling class
6. Keeps Faculty Information System (FIS) up to date; uploads syllabi in timely manner
   ❖ Mandatory: SPOT average of 3.8 or above in 3-year evaluation period under review and at least 60% completion rate

**Needs Improvement**
❖ Occasionally fails to meet expectations described under “Satisfactory”
❖ Mandatory: SPOT average of 3.6 or above in 3-year evaluation period under review and at least 60% completion rate

**Unsatisfactory**
❖ Consistently fails to meet expectations described under “Satisfactory”
❖ Receives less than 3.4 on SPOT evaluations average
IMPORTANT:
1. For workshops/conferences on pedagogy points are given only per event (i.e. one specific teaching-related workshop/conference) and not per session attended at each event. A pedagogy event attended by a professor cannot be counted for both Teaching and Research; each event may only count once under one of the three categories of evaluation.
2. The minimum SPOT score and completion rate must be reached in order to move up from one category to the next (i.e. to reach category 8 one must have a SPOT score average of at least 4.0 and a 70% completion rate or more)
3. Mandatory workshops on campus (i.e. FIS, Curriculog training, etc.) do not count as pedagogical workshops
4. It is up to the discretion of the PAC, LAC and/or chair to decide how many points (if any) to award items included under #13 in category 8
5. Activities not fully documented may not be awarded any points
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Performance Evaluation Rubrics

RESEARCH
(Professors)

- The scholarly journal or scholarly book publisher must have a peer-review process in place. For journal articles, the faculty must provide a proof of peer review procedure by using reliable databases such as the MLA Directory of Periodicals or simply providing actual external reviews. For book publications, both contract and external reviews must be provided as evidence of the peer-review process. Publications will not count if no peer-review process is used by the publisher or the peer-review process does not include reviews by external reviewers.

- There is no minimum/maximum number of word-length required for original scholarship, such as articles, book-length monographs, book chapters, etc. Rather, only the sum total of PR words published during the 3-calendar-year under review will be taken into account to determine the final score.

- Contributions by multiple authors or editors shall be evaluated according to the percentage of the work done by each and the word count will count accordingly. In cases where one author/editor bears a larger percentage of the work then corroboration in writing by the co-authors/co-editors in question should be provided.

- At all times faculty members must refer to the departmental Annual Review, Tenure & Promotion Guidelines regarding all the expectations for acceptable scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>• 30,000 or more published PR words of original scholarship in reputable scholarly venues in the 3-year-calendar period under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must include at least 2 other scholarly activities listed in “Very Good” category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>• 25,000-29,999 published PR words of original scholarship in reputable scholarly venues in the 3-year-calendar period under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must include at least 2 other scholarly activities listed in “Very Good” category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20,000-24,999 published PR words of original scholarship in reputable scholarly venues in the 3-year-calendar period under review in addition to at least 2 of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Other published scholarship: book reviews, performance reviews, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Citations of published work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. At least 3 presentations at international/national venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Securing internal/external funding for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. One’s book reviewed positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Editing a book-length volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Other well-documented relevant scholarly activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th><strong>Satisfactory</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 15,000-19,999 published PR words of original scholarship in reputable scholarly venues in the 3-year-calendar period under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One other relevant scholarly activity as listed in “Very Good category”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th><strong>Needs Improvement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10,000-14,999 published PR words of original scholarship in reputable scholarly venues in the 3-year-calendar period under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One other relevant scholarly activity as listed in category 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 and below</th>
<th><strong>Unsatisfactory</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less than 10,000 published PR words of original scholarship in reputable scholarly venues in the 3-year-calendar period under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not consistently meet expectations as listed in “Very Good” category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT**

The departmental ATP (Annual Review, Tenure & Promotion) document has clear guidelines regarding peer-reviewed publications and these must be followed by the PAC and the Chair when evaluating professors’ research activities.
In the departmental ATP peer-reviewed journal publications are divided into three tiers and it is to be used in determining total number of words to be awarded as per the tier category of the journal:

Tier 1: number of words x 1.3 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 1,300 words counted, etc.
Tier 2: number of words x 1.0 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 1,000 words counted, etc.
Tier 3: number of words x 0.7 weight. Example: 1,000 words = 700 words counted, etc.
## Service

(Lecturers & Professors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistently meets stipulations under “Satisfactory” in addition to carrying out any combination of repeatable activities and achievements for “Very Good” totaling 20 points or more during 3-calendar-year period under review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistently meets stipulations under “Satisfactory” in addition to carrying out any combination of repeatable activities and achievements for “Very Good” totaling 18-19 points during 3-calendar-year period under review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistently meets stipulations under “Satisfactory” in addition to carrying out any combination of repeatable activities and achievements listed below totaling 14-17 points during 3-calendar-year period under review. One point per item and/or per semester unless indicated otherwise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Regularly organizes and/or assists with extra events for the department such as Professional Development Day for Teachers of Spanish, departmental receptions and other activities, outreach programs, etc. (2 pts./item)
2. Serves as Secretary or Chair of departmental committee (1 pt./semester)
3. Serves on CLASS or university committee/s and/or Faculty Senate (1.5 pts./semester)
4. Serves on an M.A. Thesis Committee as a reader (1 pt./thesis defense)
5. Initiates and/or directs a Study Abroad program (1 pt./semester)
6. Initiates and directs a student club on a regular basis (1 pt./semester)
7. Reviews articles and books for publications (1 pt./item)
8. Serves as Associate Chair, Undergraduate Advisor, Graduate Advisor, Director of Undergraduate Studies and/or Coordinator of First/Second/Third year classes (1-2 pts./semester)
9. Serves as a faculty advisor to student organizations (1 pt./semester)
10. Plays a leadership (e.g. President, Executive Director, etc.) role in a national professional organization (2 pts./semester)
11. Performs other well-documented valuable service to:
   a. The college
   b. The university
   c. The professional community
   d. The local community
12. Other well-documented relevant service activities (e.g. ad hoc committees, administering/grading language placement exams, cultural activities for students, etc., \( \frac{1}{2} \)-1 pt./item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfactorily performs committee duties as member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attends all departmental meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completes various assigned tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responds to work email in timely manner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not consistently meet expectations in the “Satisfactory” category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not consistently demonstrate professional and/or collegial behavior, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 or below</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not satisfactorily perform assigned service duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPORTANT

1. It is up to the discretion of the PAC, LAC and/or chair to decide how many points (if any) to award items included under #13 in category 8
2. Service activities not fully documented may not be awarded any points

Evaluation Process:

1. PAC/LAC members review files and rate independently with scores 0-10 for teaching, research and service
2. PAC/LAC discusses files and assigns round number scores between 0-10 for teaching, research, and service
3. Teaching, research, and service scores are multiplied by workload percentages and added together
4. Resulting score (between 0-10) is then converted to Levels 1-5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>10.0 – 9.0</td>
<td>Exceptional/Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>8.9-8.0</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>7.9-7.0</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>6.9-5.1</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>5.0-0</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. These scores and a written justification will be forwarded to the Department Chair as a recommendation
6. After taking into consideration the information provided by the PAC/LAC, the Department Chair will make his/her assessment, provide a written assessment to the faculty member, and send the recommendation to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences (CLASS)