ECE Policy Annual Faculty Evaluation

October 2022

Introduction:

UCCS Compensation Principles for Faculty, Policy number 300-016 requires for tenured, tenure track, and non-tenured track faculty that the dean of each College shall through a collegial and consultative process with the faculty develop clearly articulated standards of annual merit review.

The annual merit review process for faculty is governed by Article V of the Laws of the Regents and CU Regent Policies 5 and 11. These are further delineated in CU Administrative Policy Statements 1006, 1009 and 5008.

- CU Laws of the Regents Article V: https://www.cu.edu/regents/law/5
- CU Regent Policy 5: https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5
- CU Regent Policy 11: https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/11
- CU Administrative Policy Statement 1006: https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1006
- CU Administrative Policy Statement 1009: https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009
- CU Administrative Policy Statement 5008: https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5008

Annual merit review assists faculty in their professional development by providing frequent feedback on progress and helping faculty to set goals for continued development.

The annual review includes flexibility in times of significant disruptions (e.g., work life, pandemic, etc). Impacts of major life, health, professional and personal factors may be taken into account when appropriate in understanding the context in which the work was performed and may reduce expectations.

Faculty in their first few years of service may be evaluated with slightly lower expectations as they become familiar with teaching our students and develop a research program. This is particularly true of service expectations in the first few years.

ECE guidelines are in line with EAS policy : EAS-FAC-011. The performance rating is the overall summary rating of the individuals performance on a five point scale and constitutes the public record of rating in accordance with the open records act.

The faculty member's weights in the workload assignment for the particular calendar year and the academic rank will be used for the yearly evaluation.

We value the efforts of our faculty in the area of diversity, equity and inclusion both in support of our students and in support of one another. These efforts can exist within any of the traditional divisions of teaching, research and service/leadership and include aspects of mentoring, recruitment, and retention of students and faculty from groups which are underrepresented in ECE. These efforts will be considered in annual merit evaluation in accordance with their quality and quantity.

Department faculty members who have appointments outside of the college will be evaluated for the approved contracted load within the department. Their rating for the calendar year will be combined proportionately with the rating given by the supervisors outside the department.

In the assessment of research and creative work, the department places greater weight on items which have undergone some form of peer review than those that have not. In cases where an item does not undergo peer-review (for instance, reports, or articles in the popular press), such material may be submitted to outside readers for evaluation. Our department encourages collaborative research and so co-authored papers may be considered as equivalent to sole-authored papers if the candidate provides clear evidence of a significant contribution by the candidate to the paper.

Each of the three areas of teaching, research/scholarship and service will be evaluated using the scale below. Then the overall value will be calculated using the three ratings proportionately applying the weights in the workload plan. The overall value from the current evaluation will be mapped to range-based performance rating for the year using the same scale.

1.0 - 1.4: Fail to Meet Expectations
1.5 - 2.4: Below Expectations
2.5 - 3.4: Meeting Expectations
3.5 - 4.4: Exceeding Expectations
4.5 - 5.0: Outstanding

Evaluation of Rating factors:

Teaching:

The faculty member will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Numerical ratings of student evaluations are used for no more than one third of the overall teaching rating. Examples of appropriate factors for teaching evaluation are provided in the following section. This evaluation includes contributions to the instructional breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. Mentoring of graduate students will be considered, if appropriate, and the quality of the mentoring will be assessed. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a general mentor, research advisor, independent study director, lab supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here.

It has been shown that a standard "Evaluate this instructor" question on student evaluations of teaching sometimes shows a bias in results based on gender, ethnicity, and age. To help avoid this, we use an average of scores over several questions relating, not only to the instructor, but to the effectiveness of the instruction. We average the scores (0-7) to the following five questions:

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 8: The instructor encouraged interest in this subject.
Question 9: The instructor demonstrated interest in student learning.
Question 11: The instructor communicated effectively with students about this course

An average rating of 4.5 – 5.24 for the questions, listed above, which evaluate the instruction, is viewed as meeting expectations; an average rating of 5.25 – 5.99 is viewed as exceeding expectations; a rating of 6.0 or above will be viewed as outstanding. In cases where the professor teaches small classes, provisions shall be made for the possibility of the average being lowered because of the effect of a few low FCQ scores. In those cases, the individual student evaluations shall be provided to the evaluator(s) for a more detailed analysis. Course content, appropriateness of the level of the instruction, and size of class will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

In addition to FCQ scores, teaching evaluations will consider the following factors (possible means of demonstrating each factor are provided). Effective mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students is considered an important aspect of teaching as indicated below. Effective mentoring is reflected in the publications, retention, and graduation of students as well as in student assessment of their mentoring experiences. Additional ways of satisfying the factors are included in Appendix A. In all cases both the quantity and quality of the activity will be considered. When appropriate, the impact on student learning should be demonstrated. Exceptional accomplishments in one factor may be considered when accomplishments in other factors are not as strong.

A rating of Meeting Expectations is consistent with the following:

a) All faculty are expected to deliver their assigned courses appropriately. This means teaching at the appropriate level, grading and returning homework in a reasonable time frame, and having exams/projects which are commensurate with the course level and material. It also involves creating an engaging and inclusive environment. (Success will be measured by occasional checking of exams, homework, and by monitoring student comments.
b) We are a PhD granting department and so all tenured/tenure-track faculty are expected to mentor graduate students. An occasional period without students is acceptable, but extended periods (years) is not appropriate and will result in a reduced rating.
c) An average FCQ rating of 4.5-5.24 as described above
d) Service on student-related departmental committees such as comprehensive examinations, PhD committees and MS committees.

A rating of Exceeding Expectations would be consistent with a faculty member demonstrating significant contributions in most of the following:

a) Achievement of the Meeting Expectations guidelines
b) An average FCQ rating of 5.25-5.99 as described above.
c) Effective mentoring of 1-2 graduate and undergraduate students for tenured/tenure-track faculty

d) Engaging with students (in addition to research mentoring) outside the classroom in at least one activity, e.g. independent study courses, student advising, Open House presentations, etc.

e) Service on student-related departmental committees such as comprehensive examinations, PhD committees and MS committees.

A rating of Outstanding would be consistent with a faculty member demonstrating significant contributions in most of the following:

a) Achievement of the Meeting Expectations guidelines
b) An average FCQ rating of 6.0 or higher as described above.
c) Effective mentoring of 3 or more graduate and undergraduate students for tenure/tenure-track faculty
d) Engaging with students (in addition to research mentoring) outside the classroom in multiple activities, e.g. independent study courses, student advising, Open House presentations, etc.
e) Service on student-related departmental committees such as comprehensive examinations, PhD committees and MS committees.

Bonus Factors: These additional factors will be considered for enhancing the 1-5 teaching rating determined above. In some cases, these bonus factors could move a faculty member from one rating to a higher rating.
a) Developing and teaching of a new course for the department – adds about 0.3 to score
b) Teaching a course that is new to the faculty member – adds about 0.2 to score
c) Engaging in special) DEI (Diversity Equity and Inclusiveness) aspects in a course - adds about 0.2 to score
d) Winning a Teaching Award - adds about 0.5 to score
e) Receipt of teaching and curriculum related grants - adds about 0.5 to score
f) Participation in teaching improvement activities - adds about 0.2 to score

Examples of Appropriate Factors for Teaching Evaluation:

Credit hours taught.
FCQ ratings.
FCQ student comments.
Teaching awards.
Nature of classes taught.
MS and PhD student projects/portfolios/thesis/dissertations credit hours that were not given formal credit as overload.
New course development (unless used to reduce teaching workload).
New material in existing courses.
Teaching laboratory development.
Flexibility in accommodating teaching needs of the department.
Senior design supervision.

External funding related to class use (instruction).
Research publication related to pedagogy.
Teaching overload courses beyond the workload without proper compensation.
Others related to instruction in the department.

Teaching Rating Guidelines: Rating of 3 if credit courses are taught per workload agreement, FCQ overall faculty and course ratings within the range set by the department.

Ratings will be based on quantity and quality of contributions to the Teaching factors listed above. Peer evaluation of teaching will be performed by faculty members approved by a majority of the faculty, elected each year at the beginning of the academic year. They will provide written feedback to the chair and the rated faculty.

Research and creative works:

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge and applied research. We also recognize the scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

Research and creative work evaluations will consider the following factors (possible means of demonstrating each factor are provided). Additional ways of satisfying the factors are included in Appendix A. In all cases both the quantity and quality of the activity will be considered. Exceptional accomplishments in one factor may be considered when accomplishments in other factors are not as strong.

A rating of meeting expectations would be consistent with a faculty member demonstrating **a few** of the following:
   a) Quality and Quantity in their scholarly/creative work contributions, as evidenced by the record of high caliber, peer-reviewed publications.
        a. 1 refereed publication (generally required).
        b. Presentations at conferences.
   b) A record in attracting undergraduate and graduate students, stimulating their research efforts, and promoting and directing significant thesis research.
        a. Working with an undergraduate or graduate student.
   c) An ability to initiate, develop and direct significant research projects.
        a. Continued progress in an existing research area.
   d) Initiative and success in attracting research funding.
        a. A funded grant or service contract.
        b. Submission of a grant proposal.
        c. Preparation of a grant proposal for future submission.
   e) Receipt of patent(s),

A rating of exceeding expectations would be consistent with a faculty member demonstrating **some** of the following:
   a) Quality and Quantity in their scholarly/creative work contributions, as evidenced by the record of high caliber, peer-reviewed publications.
       a. 2 refereed publications per year (generally required).
       b. Presentations at conferences.
   b) A record in attracting undergraduate and graduate students, stimulating their research efforts, and promoting and directing significant thesis research.
       a. Working with a couple of graduate students.
   c) An ability to initiate, develop and direct significant research projects.
       a. Progress in developing a significant, new research area.
       b. Continued progress in an existing research area.
   d) Initiative and success in attracting research funding.
       a. A funded grant or service contract.
       b. Submission of one or two grant proposals.
   e) Receipt of patent(s).

A rating of outstanding would be consistent with a faculty member demonstrating **most** of the following:
   a) Quality and Quantity in their scholarly/creative work contributions, as evidenced by the record of high caliber, peer-reviewed publications.
       a. 3 or more refereed publications per year (generally required).
       b. Presentations at conferences.
   b) A record in attracting undergraduate and graduate students, stimulating their research efforts, and promoting and directing significant thesis research.
       a. Working with several graduate students.
   c) An ability to initiate, develop and direct significant research projects.
       a. Progress in developing a significant, new research area.
   d) Initiative and success in attracting research funding.
       a. A funded grant or service contract.
       b. Submission of multiple grant proposals.
   e) Receipt of patent(s).

Additional guidance: The department recognizes that many factors may impact a faculty member's performance during a particular year. Some flexibility is allowed. For example, while publications are expected, a faculty member could still be meeting expectations in a year with no publications if there is significant other research activity. The department also recognizes that new faculty require some time to build their research program. Lower expectations for new faculty would be appropriate for the first few years.

Examples of Appropriate Factors for Research/Scholarship Evaluation:

Published refereed papers/articles.
Published papers/articles (not refereed).
Research merit awards.

Research Expenditures.
Research laboratory development.
Research proposals to external agencies submitted through office of sponsored research.
Theses/reports/dissertations/undergraduate research reports.
Peer reviewed publications related to instruction/curriculum.
Invited talks.
Conference Presentations.
Thesis/dissertation hours if not used elsewhere.
Others relevant to research in the department.

Research/Scholarship Rating Guidelines:

For 30%, 40% or 50% research workload, rating of 3 is based on contributions in research expenditures, proposals and/or publications commensurate with work.

For 20% or 10% research workload, rating of 3 based on contributions in any of the Research/Scholarship factors listed above.

Service and Leadership:

The department recognizes service to the department, college, campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating service, the quality, time commitment, and quantity of service contributions will be considered. We recognize that different faculty will fulfill this requirement very differently.

Given the small size of the department, all tenured and tenure-track faculty members are generally expected to do some departmental service. Examples of this include the following:
      1) Graduate Advisor or Co-Advisor.
      2) Assessment Coordinator.
      3) Undergraduate Advisor.
      4) Seminar Coordinator.
      5) Department web manager.
      6) Departmental Chair.

Service and Leadership evaluations will consider the following factors (possible means of demonstrating each factor are provided). Additional ways of satisfying the factors are included in Appendix A. In all cases both the quantity and quality of the activity will be considered. Exceptional accomplishments in one factor may be considered when accomplishments in other factors are not as strong.

The following guidelines apply to tenured/tenure track faculty. For instructors with a 20% service/leadership expectation, the distinction between outstanding, exceeding expectations, and meeting expectations determined by the quality with which the activity is performed and the participation in additional activities.

A rating of meeting expectations would be consistent with a faculty member demonstrating **one or two** of the following:

a) Appropriate departmental service, e.g. one or more of the positions described above and service on departmental committees such as promotion and tenure review, and search committees.
b) Professional recognition outside the university community.
   a. membership on professional and scientific committees, councils, boards, and review panels.
   b. Refereeing manuscripts/grant proposals for journals and agencies.
   c. Acting as an external referee on promotion and tenure decisions at other institutions.
   d. Aiding in professional conferences through serving as a session chair, organizer, or similar positions.
c) Development of college programs and facilities that contribute to scholarly/creative work and teaching activities.
d) Participation and leadership in faculty assignments and committees within the department, college or university including faculty governance and diversity, equity and inclusion activities.
e) Outside industrial, governmental experience or K-12 activities to the extent that it contributes to the candidate's effectiveness as a faculty member.

A rating of exceeding expectations would be consistent with a faculty member demonstrating **several** of the following:

a) Appropriate departmental service, e.g. one or more of the positions described above and service on departmental committees such as promotion and tenure review, and search committees.
b) Professional service outside the university community
   a. membership on professional and scientific committees, councils, boards, and review panels.
   b. Refereeing manuscripts/grant proposals for journals and agencies.
   c. Acting as an external referee on promotion and tenure decisions at other institutions.
   d. Aiding in professional conferences through serving as a session chair, organizer, or similar positions.
c) Development of college programs and facilities that contribute to scholarly/creative work and teaching activities.
d) Participation and leadership in faculty assignments and committees within the department, college or university including faculty governance and diversity, equity, and inclusion activities.
e) Outside industrial, governmental experience or K-12 activities to the extent that it contributes to the candidate's effectiveness as a faculty member.

A rating of outstanding would be consistent with a faculty member demonstrating many of the following:

a) Appropriate departmental service, e.g. one or more of the positions described above and service on departmental committees such as promotion and tenure review, and search committees.
b) Professional service outside the university community.
    a. membership on significant professional and scientific committees, councils, boards, and review panels.
    b. Refereeing manuscripts/grant proposals for journals and agencies.
    c. Acting as an external referee on promotion and tenure decisions at other institutions.
    d. Aiding in professional conferences through serving as a session chair, organizer, or similar positions.
c) Development of major college programs and facilities that contribute to scholarly/creative work and teaching activities.
d) Participation and leadership in important faculty assignments and committees within the department, college or university including faculty governance and diversity, equity, and inclusion activities.
e) Outside industrial, governmental experience or K-12 activities to the extent that it contributes to the candidate's effectiveness as a faculty member.

Examples of Appropriate Factors for Service Evaluation:

Committee memberships/chairs at the department level, college level, campus level and university level (if not compensated)
DEI work.
Quality of service to profession, conference/symposium etc.
Quality of committee chair duties.
Quality of committee memberships
Quality of community service including consulting related to UCCS mission
Contribution to accreditation, assessment data collection and analysis to include
ABET and campus assessment reports.
Other relevant service to the department.

Service Rating Guidelines: Rating of 3 if duties assigned by the department chair were performed satisfactorily and at least one service to the profession or community related to ECE/EAS mission.

Evaluation Process:

Faculty members:

1. In January, Faculty members to enter their accomplishments for the previous calendar year into Digital Measures.

2. In February, Faculty members will meet with their department chair for the yearly evaluation using the data from Digital measures and/or self evaluation. The Chair will complete the EAS evaluation Worksheet (EW) at the meeting entering the rating in the three areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service.
3. In March, Chair will meet with the Dean to discuss the EW. Changes may be made to the EW at this meeting and an overall rating on a five-point scale in the Annual Faculty Performance Rating (AFPR) will be generated. Chair will provide the EW and the completed AFPR to faculty member for signatures. Note that the faculty member is required to sign the AFPR even if theye disagree with the evaluation, as signature is required only to acknowledge that evaluation was conducted. The faculty member can appeal the decision according to EAS Policy EAS-FAC-010.

Salary Setting:

Dean will provide raise amount to the department upon receipt of the campus allocation of faculty raise pool to the college. Chair recommends to Dean individual salary raises using three-year rolling averages. Dean makes the final decision on faculty raises and forwards per campus process.

Faculty members can appeal the raise amount according to EAS Policy EAS-FAC-010.

Annual raise for ECE will be determined in the month of March. Faculty submit their work accomplishments based on research, teaching and service. As per EAS policy, the following is the workload distribution as approved by the chair and the Dean.
Normal work load: 50% teaching, 30% research and 20% service.
Research dominated workload: 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service.
Teaching dominated workload: 60% teaching, 20% research and 20% service.

The following lists itemize example means to evaluate a candidate's teaching, research, and service. These lists are not intended to be exhaustive.

Appendix A

Example means for evaluating a candidate's contributions to teaching:
- Quality of classroom teaching, as evidenced by student evaluations, peer evaluations, and/or instructor course evaluations.
- Use of innovative teaching techniques and/or technology to improve learning, (e.g., active learning, tailoring activities to student learning styles, incorporating elements to facilitate distance learning).
- Teaching "service" classes in addition to a standard teaching load, such as freshman seminar, special topics, or courses for industry.
- Supervise undergraduate research assistants, independent-study students, senior-design students, masters theses and/or doctoral dissertations.
- Mentor students, including course and/or career advising.

- Create new and relevant courses, programs, and/or instructional laboratories.
- Write course or laboratory readers, educational books, and/or educational software
- Contribute to course and/or program assessment.
- Contribute to the ongoing process of evaluating and updating instructional materials and/or curriculum for courses, laboratories, and programs.
- Present peer-reviewed papers at education conferences.
- Displays flexibility and cooperation required to carry a full share of his or her department's teaching responsibilities over the long term.
- Developing texts or materials which are used at high schools, leading to greater ECE enrollment or success in ECE.
- Developing teaching laboratories and acquiring resources to accomplish the objectives.

Example means for evaluating a candidate's contribution to scholarly and creative work:
- Quality peer-reviewed publications documenting advances in scholarship of discovery (basic research), scholarship of integration (research bringing together knowledge from separate fields or sub-fields), scholarship of application (research applying knowledge to real-world problems), and/or scholarship of teaching and learning in Electrical and Computer Engineering (pedagogical research). Example peer-reviewed outlets include: peer-reviewed conferences, journals and research monographs, and book chapters with research focus.
- Develop high-quality technical reports relating to the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and/or teaching and learning.
- Producing quality research products, such as materials, devices, systems, and software that benefit the research community.
- Research has been directed to problems that are recognized as significant by experts in the field and are consistent with the objectives of the department.
- Seek and/or obtain external funding through research proposals for single and/or multidisciplinary work in the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and/or teaching and learning.
- Seek and/or obtain funding and research opportunities for students.
- Strong record in attracting graduate students and directing their research
- Develop or acquire laboratory facilities to support research, such as seeking and/or obtaining equipment grants.
- Patent disclosures submitted/awarded.

Example means for evaluating a candidate's contribution to leadership and service:
- Serve as an active member of departmental, college, campus, and/or system committees.
- Participates in activities intended to improve the quality of the university's program.
- Serve as chair of departmental, college and campus, and/or system committees.
- Serve as chair of department or associate dean.
- Serve as teaching mentor to junior faculty, honoraria, and/or teaching assistants.
- Serve as research mentor to junior faculty, including helping with proposal writing to enhance their success in obtaining research funding.
- Participate in activities that contribute to recruiting and retention, at the department, college and/or campus levels (e.g., high-school visits, engineering challenge, freshman welcome, EAS ambassador, etc).

- Contribute to efforts that establish strategic partnerships with industry and the military.
- Set up multi-institution higher education or technical collaboration.
- Service for technical journals (e.g., editor and/or reviewer).
- Service for technical and/or education conferences (e.g., workshop organizer or presenter, session chair, session organizer, reviewer).
- Service to profession and discipline at the state, national and/or international levels, such as within professional organizations (e.g., on a technical program committee).
- Serve on proposal review panels.
- Seek and/or obtain funding for student scholarships.
- Serve as student club advisor.
- Participate in technical or higher education-oriented service in the community, such as mentoring high-school students on projects.