

**Department of Biology
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado Colorado Springs**

**Criteria and Processes for Annual Merit Review
Tenure-Track Faculty**

Annual Review: Importance and Process

Biology TT faculty must evaluate themselves annually (guidelines for faculty evaluation appear in [APS #5008](#)). The Chair's duty is to evaluate all faculty annually, and to discuss evaluations with faculty members. This evaluation serves to measure and report Biology faculty members' performance so that continued progress toward excellence in teaching, research and service can be achieved, and merit and other pay adjustments can be made. Evaluation ratings are based on criteria that the Biology Department has developed with input among faculty members and the Dean of LAS. Principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) are included throughout the evaluation criteria because DEI is valued greatly by the department, college and university. Faculty must provide evidence or appropriate documentation for each criterion selected. The list of criteria is not exhaustive, and new and different forms of teaching, research and service will be considered at each Tier. It is up to the faculty member to defend the worth of an item that is not currently listed in the agreed-upon criteria contained herein. Merit scores in teaching, research and service reflect where the faculty member appears in the rating scale below.

1. Fails to Meet Expectations - Fails to meet expectations and improvement is needed in most aspects of position.
2. Below Expectations - Fails to meet expectations and improvement is needed in some areas.
3. Meeting Expectations - Fulfills performance expectations and may exceed some. Work is of high quality in all significant areas of responsibility.
4. Exceeding Expectations - Achieves performance expectations and frequently exceeds them. Demonstrates performance of a very high level of quality in all areas of responsibility.
5. Outstanding - Far exceeds performance expectation. Work is of exceptional quality in all essential areas of responsibility. In addition, makes an exceptional or unique contribution in achievement to department, college, and/or University objectives.

Special Circumstances

If a faculty member is rated as below expectations, they will be required to participate in the creation of a Performance Improvement Agreement in accordance with APS 5008. Faculty members who do not follow the annual review process will receive a "below expectations" review and be considered for disciplinary action in accordance with APS 5008. If a significant disruption to the well-being of the faculty member occurs, the Chair may request that the Dean delay this evaluation.

Faculty on sabbatical during the evaluation period must include a Sabbatical Report in the evaluation. It is expected that the faculty member use the sabbatical assignment in a manner that will enhance teaching or research competence and potential to advance departmental, college and/or university strategic goals.

For faculty working under a differentiated workload during the review period, points will be weighted by an adjustment factor determined by normal workload divided by differentiated workload (for example, a faculty member with a differentiated 50 percent research workload would have a research adjustment factor of $40/50 = 0.8$).

The Biology department has different service expectations of early career faculty. Therefore, an additional 4 pts will be awarded to the service score of Assistant Professors.

Annual Evaluation Merit Value: Teaching

Scale:	5 = Outstanding
	4.0 to 4.9 = Exceeding Expectations
	3.0 to 3.9 = Meeting Expectations
	2.0 to 2.9 = Below Expectations
	1.0 to 1.9 = Fails to Meet Expectations

Summary: The mean FCQ value of Questions 1,3,4,7,9,10,11 for all courses taught during the evaluation period will be adjusted (mean FCQ X 5/7). The final merit value is calculated after adding the adjustment factors below. The annual merit value will be rounded to the nearest ¼ point. Any deviation from the calculated value must be explained in the written comments and should only occur in unusual circumstances.

FCQ questions considered in the Annual Evaluation

Question 1 - Course materials (including any textbooks, readings, lectures, online content, etc.) were organized effectively.

Question 3 - Exams and graded assignments were clearly related to the course content (including lectures, assigned readings, etc.).

Question 4 - The course made it possible for me to increase my knowledge, skills, and understanding of the subject.

Question 7 - The instructor explained course ideas in a clear and understandable manner.

Question 9 - The instructor demonstrated interest in student learning.

Question 10 - The instructor demonstrated respect for and professional treatment of all students.11.

Question 11 - The instructor communicated effectively with students about the course.

Teaching Criteria with 0.1 adjustment factor

*Creating an inclusive and/or engaging teaching environment

*Peer teaching evaluations (using Peer Observation Rubrics)

*Lower Division / Required Majors course*Assessment activities to inform on one's teaching practices (e.g. pre/post surveys, formative assessments, mid-course evaluations)

*Involvement of students in research-related projects (e.g. Masters and Honors theses, undergraduate research projects) per student

*Faculty advisor of student interns, externs and service-learners

*Thesis committee memberships (per committee)

*Department assessment activities or program review

*Collaborative teaching or instructional activities

*Seeks funding or collaborations to enhance teaching practices

*Design of public outreach materials based on expertise

*Engagement in public forum on pedagogy (syllabus sharing, e.g.)

*Teaching- or scholarship-related consultation

*Outreach activity

*Attendance at workshop/training

*Guest lecture

*Evidence demonstrating influence on instruction internal to UCCS

*pedagogical improvements and innovations

*Classes that seat 30 to 40 students, and introductory courses (0.1 per class)

Teaching Criteria with 0.2 adjustment factor

- *New course development
- *Evidence demonstrating influence on instruction external to UCCS
- *incorporating interactive technology
- *incorporating evidence-based teaching strategies *Peer-reviewed publications with student authors (per manuscript)
- * field trips or activities external to the classroom *Conferences/workshop presentations
- *Teaching related Publications (pedagogy, lesson plan, lab manual, etc.)
- *Newsletter and Editorial contributions
- *Authorship of textbook or other instructional materials
- *Pedagogical development / teaching related grant
- *Official recognition / award for teaching accomplishments
- *Student accomplishments (e.g. awards and other outstanding achievements, posters, talks, student authorships on publications, pursuit of graduate education or careers)
- * inclusion of topics or teaching methods that take into consideration issues related to DEI
- *Classroom teaching innovations (including online course development, ~~Quality Matters review~~, active learning approaches, innovative assessments or assignments)

Teaching Criteria with 0.3 adjustment factor

- *FRC teaching Certification (per course completion)
- *Quality matters or equivalent distinction of online course
- *LAS / University Teaching or Mentoring Award
- *Development of interdisciplinary programs or degrees

Annual Evaluation Merit Value: Research

<u>Points</u>	<u>Rating</u>
>20	5.0
15-20	4.5
12-14	4.0
10 -11	3.5
8-9	3.0
6-7	2.5
3-5	2.0
2	1.0
1	0.5
0	0

Tier 1 (1 pt each)

- *Collect /analyze data (per project)
- *In compliance with watchdog agencies (IRB / Health and Safety / etc)
- *Collegial (responsible, collaborative, conscientious)
- *Attendance at conference, symposium, workshop
- *Mentoring underrepresented students in research activities
- *Submit internal grant proposal (2 pts)

Tier 2 (3 pts each)

- *Member of a grant review panel
- *Presentation at internal conference, symposium, workshop
- *Submit external grant proposal
- *Internal grant award (each year for duration of award)
- *Collaboration in which progress has been made (data have been collected, study has been designed, etc.)
- *Patent submission
- *Invited speaker
- *Manuscript submission or revision
- *Contribution to DEI scholarship (e.g., conducting research in underrepresented communities, or engaging in typically under-represented forms of scholarship)

Tier 3 (4 pts each)

- *Publish peer-reviewed original journal article, review article, research-related book chapter
- *Presentation at external conference
- *External grant award (each year for duration of award; PI or Co-PI)
- *Patent

Annual Evaluation Merit Value: Service

<u>Points</u>	<u>Rating</u>
>20	5.0
16-20	4.5
14-15	4.0
11-13	3.5
8-10	3.0
6-7	2.5
3-5	2.0
1-3	1.0

Early career faculty have lower service expectations. Therefore, an additional 4 pts will be awarded to the service score of Assistant Professors.

Tier 1 (1 pt each)

- *Department committee member
- *Regularly attendance at department meetings
- *Informal student advising
- *Service at open house or major/minor fair, graduation, or other event participation
- *Letters of recommendation (0.5 pts per letter)
- *Participation in student recruitment activities

Tier 2 (3 pts each)

- *Community service (science fair, science olympiad, community outreach, etc.)
- professional service (e.g. conference organizer, program planner, site visits, local planning committees etc)
- *Reviewer (research proposal, grant proposal, manuscript, book, etc)
- *Primary unit committee member (+2 for chair)
- *Establish internship opportunities for students
- *Alumni outreach initiatives
- *College or campus committees (plus 2 points if committee chair)
- *Editorial board member
- *Search committee (+2 for chair)
- *Overload (compensated or not)
- *Contribution to DEI (involvement in DEI departmental, college, or campus projects or committees)

Tier 3 (4 pts each)

- *University / system committee member
- *Consultant for community/profession
- *Member of professional organization advisory board / committee
- *Faculty governance officer
- *Graduate school director
- *Assessment Director
- *Department chair or associate chair
- *Service on deans review committee
- *Editorial board manager