

**GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROFESSORS  
DEPARTMENT OF SPANISH  
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS**

These guidelines are based on and informed by UNT Policy 06.007 Annual Review and 06.014 Evaluating Tenured Faculty.

**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 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, scholarly book publisher or book chapter in edited collections 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 data bases 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](http://www.scholar.google.com) or [www.scimagojr.com](http://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 even reputable publishers and this acceptable.

### B.3 Quality of Book Chapters

Book chapters in edited collections must have undergone a thorough peer-review process and faculty must provide evidence of this through copies of peer-review feedback from the editor, the publisher or both. A statement of the peer-review process must also be clearly stated on the publisher's website or in printed format.

All electronic or open-access digital scholarship must have also gone through the same thorough peer-review process and faculty members must provide evidence through copies of peer-review feedback from the editor, the publisher or both.

### 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. Procedures**

1. PAC members review files and rate independently with scores (round numbers) from 0 to 10 for teaching and service, according to the departmental evaluation rubrics
2. PAC members average their scores in each of the two categories for each professor in order to produce the committee's average score between 0 and 10 for each of the two 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 and upload it to FIS.

4. After taking into consideration the recommendation of the PAC, the Department Chair will determine the final score in teaching, research and service for each professor and upload it to FIS. 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).

<b>Level 1</b>	10.0 – 9.0 Exceptional/Excellent
<b>Level 2</b>	8.9-8.0 Very Good
<b>Level 3</b>	6.0-7.9 Satisfactory
<b>Level 4</b>	3.0-5.9 Unsatisfactory
<b>Level 5</b>	0-2.9 Poor

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.

N.B. : During the first year of service, newly hired tenure-track faculty are rated as “average” in the department.

### **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 UNT websites containing documents that are pertinent to the tenure and promotion process. These documents include:

- *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;

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 upload to FIS by the given deadline the following documents and information for the third-year (or mid-term) review dossier:

- 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

The departmental Review for Promotion and Tenure Committee (RPTC) will evaluate the candidate and upload to FIS their independent evaluation of the candidate and include a vote count (Yes, No, Abstention) of all committee members.

**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”. All tenured faculty members (except for the chair) will serve on the RPTC 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.

Then the Chair will upload to FIS:

- Cumulative results of annual evaluations

- Summary evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- Recommendation of Chair

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.