

## Annual Merit Evaluation Criteria - Tenure Track

### UCCS Department of English

The department is committed to quality teaching, strong scholarly/creative work, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. The department recognizes that self-reflection is essential to realizing these values and likewise affirms the importance of rendering faculty labor visible.

The department also recognizes that there are many ways to comprehend annual self-reflection, and that performance metrics and accountability audits are only one way to do this. In the department's understanding, the yearly evaluation provides an opportunity for faculty to take stock of the year's accomplishments as they begin another year: incremental advancements in their research agenda, improvements in their teaching practices, and contributions to service. Further, viewed as a practice of collegial care, annual self-reflection also becomes a space for departmental mentoring and guidance.

[Per CU Regent Guidelines](#), this document provides a rubric to guide faculty annual self-evaluations and the chair's evaluations in the Department of English at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. The criteria provided are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline, and indicate whether the faculty person is meeting expectations, exceeding expectations, or completing outstanding work. In addition to a numerical system, supported by qualitative evidence and narration, this document makes use of a graduated color scheme that runs from red (failing to meet expectations) to violet (outstanding). Since during active years most department faculty exceed expectations, that category encompasses gradations of green, blue, and indigo to denote degrees of progress toward outstanding. Meeting expectations designates the basic delivery of one's job description.

Each faculty member's case is reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department aims to assess holistically the total record of the faculty member during the review period. Faculty may evaluate their work as falling between rankings when they have accomplished several of the markers for a given ranking. Rankings should reflect contractual workloads appropriately. It is the job of individual faculty members to make the case for the self-assessed ranking in their self-evaluations. Each faculty member's self-evaluation informs the chair's evaluation that is submitted to the LAS Dean. When appropriate, evaluation of faculty work should take into consideration significant disruptions that may have occurred in the time under review.

The examples listed are neither all-inclusive nor a list of requirements. There is no expectation by the department that these are the only things that might be used or that all of these items must be used. If a faculty member has an achievement that does not appear to fit into a pre-articulated category or one that may belong in more than one category (for example, a publication with a student being either teaching or research), they may discuss where it might be placed with the chair. A single achievement may not count in more than one category.

The evaluation process assumes conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge, and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities. One condition for receiving a ranking of meeting expectations in each category is submitting the Annual Merit Self-Evaluation according to department and college requirements and deadlines. Self-evaluations are expected to reference this document.

**Document created:** November 2021; **Revised:** March 2022

## TEACHING

Teaching can be evaluated by multiple means (see below for examples), which include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires, considered as no more than 30% of the evaluation per the UCCS Faculty Assembly's recommendation. At all levels of the evaluation of teaching, evaluators should consider class size, content, level, student population, and delivery method (e.g. online, hybrid) in interpreting FCQs. The department recognizes the concerns about FCQ validity raised, and recommendations for FCQ use outlined, by the [2019 UCCS Faculty Assembly Teaching Evaluation Task Force](#).

### 5: Outstanding (Violet)

To receive an evaluation of outstanding, faculty who meet either of the two following criteria automatically receive this rating:

- Receiving a teaching award or other significant recognition of instruction
- Receiving a significant pedagogical development grant

Consistent FCQ ratings between 6 and 7 (scale used in 2022) on all questions except those asking about prior interest and workload may also be indicative of teaching at the outstanding or exceeding expectations levels, but a ranking of outstanding in teaching is not contingent upon these ratings. The department also values student qualitative feedback in interpreting these ratings.

Further, faculty may also be judged as outstanding if they demonstrate multiple examples of the most intensive markers denoting teaching that exceeds expectations (for example, early career faculty creating and delivering numerous new courses upon arriving at UCCS).

### 4: Exceeding Expectations (Indigo-Blue-Green)

To receive an evaluation of exceeding expectations, faculty must demonstrate achievement in any of the measures listed in the table (table 1) on the following page.

### 3: Meeting Expectations (Yellow)

Faculty are expected to demonstrate achievement of the following measures to be meeting expectations:

- Preparation of course materials for scheduled courses
- Delivery of scheduled courses including timely grading of assignments
- Advising of students in the major
- Student evaluation of teaching
- Assessment of students in the English degree plan
- Reasonable and regular availability for student questions and concerns

Faculty may be evaluated between 3 and 4 by demonstrating significant accomplishment in any of these criteria.

### 2: Below Expectations (Orange)

Faculty will be evaluated between 2 and 3 if they are achieving only some of the expected criteria in teaching.

### 1: Failing to Meet Expectations (Red)

Faculty will be evaluated between 1 and 2 if they are not meeting the expected criteria, **or** if faculty have a consistent pattern of substantiated negative behavior regarding teaching. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, consistent disrespectful behavior toward students (e.g., inaccessibility, excessive missing of classes, mistreatment of students, harassment of students) or poor teaching (e.g., lack of substance in teaching, extreme tardiness in grading, capricious standards for classroom performance, ill-defined curriculum or course planning).

**Table 1: Exceeding Expectations Measures—Teaching**

These measures are arranged in three categories of relative time- and labor- intensiveness and evaluators should consider this scale when deciding where in this ranking the year’s work falls. It is up to the faculty member to argue for level of intensiveness. In the case of several higher-level accomplishments, or when the accomplishment was made more intensive by particular circumstances, evaluators may consider the next higher ranking.

**MOST INTENSIVE (Indigo)**

- New course creation and delivery that the faculty member has never undertaken, including shifting courses across different modalities (e.g. online, hybrid, and/or other formats), or shifting among student populations and/or areas of English studies (e.g. courses for majors versus required GE classes that may or may not draw on a faculty member’s research expertise)
- Being nominated for a teaching award or other significant recognition in instruction
- Participation in teaching improvement activity (semester-long)
- Development of a new academic program
- Sustained educating teachers over and above one’s assigned teaching load at any educational level within or beyond UCCS

**REGULARLY INTENSIVE (Blue)**

- Doctoral dissertation and master’s thesis supervision and graduate committee contributions
- Student supervision in professional experience activities, internships, research, scholarships, publication, and/or independent studies
- Teaching contribution at any institution outside the University of Colorado Colorado Springs
- Contributions to teaching of equity, diversity, and inclusion
- Receiving a minor pedagogical grant
- Significant course revision
- Applying for a pedagogical grant
- New course approved by C&R/Compass Curriculum

**INCIDENTAL, ONGOING, or SHORT-TERM CONTRIBUTIONS (Green)**

- Arranged to have colleague visit classroom
- Visited colleague’s classroom for learning experience
- Mentoring of students, including writing letters of recommendation
- Observing, writing letters of support for, and/or mentoring teachers at any level within or beyond UCCS
- Risk factor involved in teaching venture
- New creative assignment in classroom
- Participation in short-term teaching-related activities
- Student development/encouragement (e.g., Centers of Excellence, library knowledge, learning disability recognition, encouragement of students)
- Participation in one-off teaching improvement activity (e.g. Canvas bootcamp)
- Pedagogical community outreach, e.g., workshops and activities conducted for teachers at any level outside of UCCS
- Creation of new teaching-related documents
- Letters from former students
- Minor course revisions

## RESEARCH

The department recognizes that scholarly and/or creative work can take many forms: digital scholarship and/or projects as well as the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, creative work, administration, and teaching and learning. The department values the integration of research and teaching (e.g., creation of classes around research specializations); in years when departmental teaching needs take faculty away from their research areas, the topic taught may be considered an intensifying factor. Co-authored and collaborative works (including with students) are also recognized as valuable scholarship; in such cases, scope of work must be indicated.

### 5: Outstanding (Violet)

To receive an evaluation of outstanding, faculty may demonstrate achievement in any of the following:

- Contract for peer-judged/refereed single-authored book, peer-judged/refereed co-authored book, edited volume from refereed press, edited journal special issue, volume of creative work or new media composition in competitive venue, peer-judged and/or edited digital project, e.g., programs, artifacts, archives, web-based “living” texts, etc.
- Publication of peer-judged/refereed single-authored book, peer-judged/refereed co-authored book, edited volume from refereed press, edited journal special issue, volume of creative work or new media composition in competitive venue, peer-judged and/or edited digital project, e.g., programs, artifacts, archives, web-based “living” texts, etc.
- Receiving an award for a publication
- Being awarded a significant outside grant to support research that leads to public recognition

Faculty may also be judged as outstanding if they demonstrate multiple examples of the most intensive markers denoting research that exceeds expectations.

### 4: Exceeding Expectations (Indigo-Blue-Green)

To receive an evaluation of exceeding expectations, faculty must demonstrate achievement in any of the measures listed in the table (table 2) on the following page.

### 3: Meeting Expectations (Yellow)

As scholar-teachers, all faculty are expected to maintain an active research program. English faculty should be accessing and reading materials related to their fields. In order to be meeting expectations, faculty should be able to demonstrate that they have participated in some of the following activities, all of which are implicit in, or in some way contribute to, activities in the exceeding expectations range:

- Keeping abreast of conversations occurring in their fields by reading journal articles and monographs
- Reading and taking notes on works related to their course syllabi and connected topics and fields
- Reading works and taking notes on works related to their future publications
- Accessing libraries and online archives to accumulate materials for their research
- Communicating (early stage) with scholars/editors toward collaborations, publication, and presentations
- Drafting book chapters, articles, and creative works that may not yet be ready for submission
- Researching and making inquiries into granting agencies relevant to their research

Faculty will be evaluated between 3 and 4 if the evidence of potential for accomplishment is significant and active, e.g., the research is forthcoming, an invitation or a proposal has been accepted, more than one chapter drafted, informal recognition of research potential, local workshopping of materials, etc.

### 2: Below Expectations (Orange)

Faculty will be evaluated between 2 and 3 if their research is inactive or evidence of it is unclear or weak.

### 1: Failing to Meet Expectations (Red)

Faculty will be evaluated between 1 and 2 if they do not have a research program, **or** if faculty have substantiated negative behavior regarding research. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, plagiarism, falsification of data or results, or mismanagement of research funds.

**Table 2: Exceeding Expectations Measures—Research**

These measures are arranged in three categories of relative time- and labor- intensiveness and evaluators should consider this scale when deciding where in this ranking the year’s work falls. It is up to the faculty member to argue for level of intensiveness. In the case of several higher-level accomplishments, or when the accomplishment was made more intensive by particular circumstances, evaluators may consider the next higher ranking.

**MOST INTENSIVE (Indigo)**

- Publication of a peer-judged article or book chapter (Article-length contributions to peer-reviewed edited books are evaluated in the same fashion as peer-refereed journal articles.)
- Publication of an edited research work
- Publication of a textbook
- Publication of non-reviewed digital project, e.g., programs, artifacts, archives, web-based “living” texts
- Exhibits in scholarly venues
- Publication of peer-judged creative work
- Publication of peer-judged new media composition
- Award of substantive university/local fellowship/grant application (e.g., CRCW)
- Significant public recognition, e.g., invited keynote at academic convention

**REGULARLY INTENSIVE (Blue)**

- Papers accepted for and presented at professional conferences and/or workshops
- Proposing and organizing a conference panel
- Being a respondent on a conference panel
- National grant/fellowship applications submitted (awarded or not)
- Book prospectus submitted to publisher (accepted or not)
- Journal article or book chapter proposal submitted (accepted)
- Invited readings/talks
- Risk factor involved in the research venture
- Peer-reviewed publications in conference proceedings
- Reviewing books in scholarly journals
- Contributions to equity, diversity, and inclusion
- Managerial and/or curatorial work related to research
- Inclusion of undergraduates in research (over the course of a semester)
- Article revised per editor’s suggestions (extensive)
- Award of a minor grant to support research (e.g., Faculty Assembly Women’s Committee)
- Page-proofs for a book-length project (or the equivalent for digital project)
- Creating an index for a book-length project (or the equivalent for a digital project)
- Participation in development activity (workshops, conferences) at national level

**INCIDENTAL, ONGOING, or SHORT-TERM CONTRIBUTIONS (Green)**

- Papers submitted for presentation at professional conferences and/or workshops
- Chairing a conference panel
- Article/book chapter page-proofs edited
- Journal article submitted (not yet accepted)
- Article revised per editor’s suggestions (minor revisions)
- Public presentations of research, public readings, or research-related performances
- Recognition by other scholars of research and publications
- Participation in campus development workshops
- Expert and technical consultation on research projects
- Role-modeling and mentoring of research on any educational level
- Inclusion of undergraduates in research (one-time)
- Local/campus grant/fellowship applications

## SERVICE

As members of the UCCS and larger scholarly community, faculty are expected to maintain regular roles in service. In evaluating the intensity and time of a task or position evaluators should consider the existence or non-existence of commensurate offloads or stipends, whether or not it is part of one's job description, the quality of the work done, and the difficulty of the tasks involved. Service contributions also should be understood in light of faculty tenure status and career trajectory; for example, the evaluators should consider that for early-career faculty, the task of learning about department, campus, and professional culture can contribute to the time and intensity of taking on new service.

### 5: Outstanding (Violet)

To receive an evaluation of outstanding, faculty who meet either of the two following criteria may receive this rating:

- Serving as Department Chair
- Serving in campus administrative position: e.g., directing FYRW, Heller Center, Humanities Program

Such service roles may be sufficient for achieving an outstanding rating in service, but they are not necessary. Faculty may also be judged outstanding if they demonstrate particularly work-intensive examples of the most intensive markers denoting service that exceeds expectations, e.g., chairing a search committee with an inordinate number of applications; in addition, early-career faculty may be judged outstanding if they demonstrate particularly work-intensive examples at the regularly intensive level of service that exceeds expectations (for example, hosting multiple campus events or serving as a *member* of the aforesaid search committee). Regarding early-career faculty see the note just above addressing tenure status, career trajectory, and the work of learning new department, campus, and professional cultures.

### 4: Exceeding Expectations (Indigo-Blue-Green)

To receive an evaluation of exceeding expectations, faculty must demonstrate achievement in any of the measures listed in the table (table 3) on the following page.

### 3: Meeting Expectations (Yellow)

To be meeting service expectations, all faculty must be able to demonstrate:

- Attendance and participation on the Representative Council or equivalent body
- Participation on one English Department sub-committee

### 2: Below Expectations (Orange)

Faculty will be evaluated between 2 and 3 if they regularly neglect their departmental duties without viable explanation, depending on the rate of regularity.

### 1: Failing to Meet Expectations (Red)

Faculty will be evaluated between 1 and 2 if they completely neglect their departmental duties without viable explanation, **or** if faculty have substantiated negative behavior regarding service. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, disrespect toward or harassment of other faculty and staff; flagrant disregard for department, campus, or system policies; disengagement from service activities (e.g., repeated arbitrary or unexcused instances of not attending faculty meetings or other committee meetings), misrepresentation of self in the community, misuse of university resources.

### Table 3: Exceeding Expectations Measures—Service

These measures are arranged in three categories of relative time- and labor- intensiveness and evaluators should consider this scale when deciding where in this ranking the year’s work falls. It is up to the faculty member to argue for level of intensiveness. In the case of several higher-level accomplishments, or when the accomplishment was made more intensive by particular circumstances, evaluators may consider the next higher ranking.

#### MOST INTENSIVE (Indigo)

- Chairing a departmental/campus search committee
- Serving in a leadership position on, e.g., a CU-system committee, University committee, Campus Faculty Assembly, etc.
- Serving on a notoriously work-intensive committee, e.g., Dean’s Review Committee
- Hosting a large-scale campus event
- Chairing a PUC

#### REGULARLY INTENSIVE (Blue)

- Serving on a departmental/campus search committee
- Serving as a consultant or in public service
- Serving on a college, or campus committee that meets monthly or with roughly comparable frequency
- Serving on a departmental committee, beyond the one listed under “meeting expectations,” that meets monthly or with roughly comparable frequency.
- Contributions to faculty governance
- Contributions in service to equity, diversity, and inclusion
- Hosting a medium-scale campus-wide event
- Serving on a PUC
- Serving on an editorial board for a journal
- Serving in a leadership position in the profession and/or discipline
- Consistently time-intensive mentoring on any educational level
- Outside reviewer for tenure file or program review
- Refereeing book manuscripts
- Managerial and/or curatorial work as service

#### INCIDENTAL, ONGOING, or SHORT-TERM CONTRIBUTIONS (Green)

- Serving on a campus or college committee that meets ad hoc, once a semester, or infrequently
- Writing letters of recommendation or support for colleagues
- Nominating students or colleagues for fellowships, awards, etc.
- Contributing to non-reviewed digital public humanities projects
- Contributing to non-reviewed digital humanities projects prepared for professional organizations
- Incidental mentoring on any educational level
- Reviewing research proposals or grant proposals and/or article manuscripts, and/or conference paper proposals
- Attending commencement ceremonies
- Hosting a small-scale on-campus or in-house department event
- Participation at professional conferences, specifically organizational activities
- Service contribution at any level and any institution outside the University of Colorado Colorado Springs