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**Instructional, Research, and Clinical Faculty Annual Review Criteria**

**Overview**

Consistent with the University of Colorado Regent Law and UCCS Campus Policy, all instructional, research, and clinical (IRC) faculty in the Department of Leadership, Research, and Foundations with an FTE appointment >0.5 will be evaluated each academic year using the annual review criteria outlined in this document. Since presently, all IRC faculty in the department are instructional faculty, they will all be evaluated on the merit of their performance in the categories of: (1) teaching and (2) leadership and service. The annual performance evaluation is used to determine an overall workload rating that serves, at least in part, as the basis for merit pay increases. Faculty will be assigned numerical ratings (1.0-5.0) in each of the categories as outlined in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating (Score)** | **UCCS Campus Definition** |
| **Outstanding** (5) | Far exceeds performance expectations on a consistent and uniform basis. Work is of exceptional quality in all essential areas of responsibility. In addition, makes an exceptional or unique contribution in achievement of the unit, department, and university objectives. |
| **Exceeding Expectations** (4) | Always achieves performance expectations and frequently exceeds them. Demonstrates performance of a very high level of quality in all areas of responsibility. |
| **Meeting Expectations** (3) | Consistently fulfills performance expectations and periodically may exceed them. Work is of high quality in all significant areas of responsibility. |
| **Below Expectations** (2) | Frequently fails to meet expectations and improvement is needed in areas of responsibility. |
| **Fails to Meet Expectations** (1) | Consistently fails to meet expectations and improvement is needed in most areas of responsibility. |

**Final ratings will be averaged according to workload percentage and rounded as follows:**

Outstanding = >4.5 – 5.0

Exceeding Expectations = 4.0 – 4.5

Meeting Expectations = 3.0 – 3.9

Below Expectations = 2.0 – 2.9

Fails to Meet Expectations = 1.0 – 1.9

**The Leadership, Research, and Foundations IRC faculty annual review criteria will be reviewed and approved by the IRC faculty every three years, at a minimum. Criteria will be approved by a simple majority.**

**Evaluation Process**

All faculty will document and report their yearly activities on or before the deadlines communicated by the College of Education Dean’s Office. Unless otherwise directed, all faculty will provide an update to their scholarly activities listed in Faculty Success, a current curriculum vitae, and a self-evaluation form with self-ratings in the categories of (1) teaching and (2) leadership and service. Faculty who fail to provide such evidence, except those on official leave, will be rated as “below expectations.” Failure to provide annual review materials will be viewed as neglect of duty and will be the basis for disciplinary action (see CU Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 5008 - Faculty Performance Evaluation). Faculty who do not submit annual review materials or who are rated below a 3.0 in any workload area must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) with the department chair. The signed PIA will include specific goals, timelines, and benchmarks that will be used to measure progress. The PIA will be established for at least one year but will be reviewed mid-year. If the PIA goals are met in the subsequent annual review process, the PIA concludes. If the goals are not met, an extensive review process is initiated (see APS 5008).

Annual review materials (Faculty Success updates, current CV, and self-evaluation form with self-ratings) will initially be submitted to the chair for review. In the self-evaluation, faculty must make the case for their self-ratings using the departmental annual review criteria and by documenting their work for the academic year in the workload areas. Ratings must reflect contractual workloads appropriately. Faculty may rate their work as falling between ratings when they have accomplished several of the markers for a given workload area. As part of this process, the chair will meet with each faculty member one-on-one to discuss their annual review materials, their accomplishments from the past year to ensure they are accurately captured, share ideas and feedback for professional growth, and alert faculty to low performance. Also, goals for the upcoming academic year will be reviewed and discussed. The chair will consult with the dean after the one-on-one meetings have concluded.

After the meeting with the chair, there will be a peer review of all annual review materials submitted. A departmental peer review committee will be formed with three department faculty members. A diversity of faculty representation in the peer review committee is encouraged, with the recommended makeup being one pre-tenure faculty member, one tenured faculty member, and one IRC faculty member. If the department has insufficient faculty across these ranks, a faculty member in another department in the college who meets the needed rank will be included as a member of the committee. The committee makeup will be agreed upon in a department meeting in the spring prior to the review. The committee should be re-formed every two years. When a committee member is being reviewed, they will recuse themselves. The chair will serve as an ex-officio member of the committee. The committee deliberations, evaluations, and recommendations are confidential, but the recommended ratings by workload area and overall, as well as a brief summary of the rationale for the ratings and recommendations for improvement and growth, will be shared in writing with the faculty member and chair. Each faculty member’s case is reviewed and judged holistically on its individual merits and circumstances and by the departmental annual review criteria (rather than in relation to other faculty members). Finally, the annual review materials will be submitted by the chair to the College of Education Dean for further evaluation and official workload ratings.

**Other Considerations for the Annual Review Ratings and Recommendations**

* **Departmental climate:** Department members are expected to contribute to a departmental climate of civility, respect, and inclusion.
* **Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI):** The department especially values evidence of and attention to the embodiment of principles of DEI in all areas of evaluated workload.
* **Long-term achievements:** Although the annual review is based on the preceding academic year, consideration may be given to longer-term achievements and contributions to account for ongoing activities that extend across multiple years (Regent Policy 11B).
* **Double-counting:** A single achievement may not count in more than one evaluated category.
* **Sabbatical:** Faculty on sabbatical can be reviewed based on the work they proposed and completed during that time period. If the annual evaluation occurs while a faculty member is on sabbatical, they can choose to complete the annual review as scheduled or take the average of the previous two years.
* **Extenuating circumstances:** The annual review criteria is designed to provide guidance related to process; however, we acknowledge that a reasonable amount of flexibility should be included to account for significant disruptions and/or major life events that may directly impact a faculty member’s contributions. For example, a faculty member may cite FMLA (if a faculty member cites FMLA, HR needs to be consulted), or other extenuating circumstances to account for gaps during a review period. When such a disruption or event occurs, the faculty member and chair will work together to determine appropriate accommodations. Some options include:
	+ For the annual review, include a multiple-year average.
	+ For the annual review, reflect a differential weighted proportion of workload that reflects a flexible work arrangement, such as a reduction of FTE or workload swaps between semesters.
	+ Scholarship activities, such as conferences, that had to be canceled or postponed can be considered with the same weight as if they had occurred as originally planned.
* **Grievances and disputes:** Faculty who want to grieve or dispute the results of their annual review ratings or the annual review process must follow the College of Education Annual Review Grievance Policy and Process.
* Any policies and processes **not** directly addressed in this document will default to the appropriate UCCS policy, CU Regent Laws and Policies, or CU Administrative Policy Statements. Below is a list of policies and links that are relevant to the annual performance evaluation:
	+ CU Regent Policy 5.C.4(B)

<https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

* + APS 1006 - Differentiated Annual Workloads for Faculty

<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1006>

* + APS 1009 - Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation

<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009>

* + APS 5008 - Faculty Performance Evaluation

<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5008>

* Additional information regarding the annual review ratings, deadlines, and forms are included on the UCCS HR website: <https://hr.uccs.edu/supervisors/performance-management>

**Criteria**

The following criteria are used for annual review purposes. All IRC faculty will be evaluated on the categories of teaching (80%) and leadership and service (20%) unless otherwise documented in a faculty member’s letter of offer or official differentiated workload agreement signed by the chair and dean. Since annual review is separate and distinctfrom the IRC Promotion criteria and process, the department’s annual review criteria include a broad set of activities to measure performance and contributions that are not necessarily captured in the IRC Promotion criteria. The activities listed are not exhaustive, all-inclusive, nor a list of requirements. There is no expectation that these are the only activities that faculty might engage in or that all these activities must be performed. The department recognizes the activities can and will likely change over time. If a faculty member has an activity that does not appear to fit into a pre-articulated category or one that may belong in more than one category (e.g., leading a workshop being either teaching or service), they may discuss where it might be placed with the chair. In all cases, it is recommended that the faculty seek the advice of mentors and the chair when deciding on which activities to participate in and what evidence to submit in their annual review materials.

The ratings of **Meeting Expectations**, **Exceeding Expectations**, and **Outstanding** each have a list of activities below. Meeting expectations is the baseline rating, which is the minimum of expected activities required of all IRC faculty in the department.

**Teaching**

The department recognizes both classroom teaching and individualized teaching activities, such as research training and/or mentoring, academic and career advising, portfolio review, and dissertation advising. In the assessment of teaching effectiveness and accomplishments, the department requires the use of multiple means of documenting teaching activities inside and outside of the classroom–including FCQs, peer reviews of teaching, other forms of student feedback, etc.–as well as activities demonstrating impact beyond the classroom.

**Possible Teaching Evidence to Include:** Courses taught, including semester, section and enrollment (required); Individual course FCQ scores and summaries (required per CU Regent policy); results of personal evaluations conducted; student/alumni solicited and unsolicited letters, emails, and feedback; results and responses to peer review teaching evaluations; dissertation committee work; portfolio reviews; number of advisees by program; assessment or accreditation work; specialized training or professional development; and awards or other distinctions and recognitions.

**Meeting Expectations (3.0):** To be considered Meeting Expectations for teaching, faculty are expected to adequately prepare for and teach their required teaching load; provide a clear and comprehensive syllabus; utilize Canvas for their courses; communicate with students clearly and provide feedback/grades in a timely, respectful, and professional manner; maintain regular office hours; advise undergraduate and graduate students (as appropriate); serve on dissertation committees (as appropriate); review student portfolios (as appropriate); and write letters of recommendation for students (as appropriate). **To be considered “Exceeding Expectations” or “Outstanding” for teaching, faculty must engage in additional activities listed below.**

**Exceeding Expectations (4.0):** To receive a rating of Exceeding Expectations in teaching, faculty must be deemed Meeting Expectations as outlined above and clearly demonstrate evidence for at least three of the activities below. **A case for outstanding can be made if at least five of the following activities are achieved.** Faculty can count the same teaching activity a maximum of two times in a single year.

**Exceeding Expectations Activities and Documentation**

* Creation of a new course or extensive revision of an existing course (including developing an existing course in a different instructional mode)
* Teaching a new course, an overload course, a writing intensive course, a GPS course, or another course outside the department (compensated or not)
* Above college FCQ average on items 7-11
* Evidence that demonstrates students succeed in courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or careers
* Soliciting, including, and responding to a peer review evaluation of teaching
* Guest lecturing in a class in or outside the department, including in the community, in P-12 schools, or at other higher education institutions
* Intentional and broad incorporation of DEI teaching practices
* Incorporation of high-impact practices, innovative practices, and/or risk-taking in teaching
* Providing effective role modeling in teaching (e.g., providing peer teaching support, providing teaching reviews, working with teaching assistants, opening one’s classroom for observation of teaching techniques, providing pedagogical materials such as syllabi class activities, and evaluation materials to peers)
* Development of workshops for student growth, programmatic support, professional development, etc.
* Organizing, presenting, or participating in teaching professional development activities (e.g., workshop on inclusive teaching practices)
* Serving as a dissertation chair or methodologist on a completed dissertation (each completed dissertation may be counted separately, up to two per year)
* Service on dissertation, honors, or thesis committees outside the department, including outside UCCS
* Student supervision in professional experience activities, internships, and/or independent studies and/or individualized research supervision (e.g., disciplinary conferences, Undergraduate Research Academy, graduate assistantships)
* Evaluation of student performance in departmental and/or Compass Curriculum examinations and assessments
* Role-modeling and mentorship of students and alumni, especially from underrepresented groups, in teaching, as well as evidence of the quality of the mentorship (e.g., unsolicited letters, evaluations)
* Use of mentoring philosophy statement and/or mentor-mentee agreements
* External teaching enhancement/development grant proposal submitted or funded as PI/co-PI, senior personnel, or evaluator
* Internal CU/UCCS teaching enhancement/development grant proposal submitted or funded
* Teaching improvement activities (e.g., seeking mentorship; demonstrating the use of student or peer feedback to modify courses; evaluating classroom processes or student learning)
* Recognition for meeting established criteria for course excellence (e.g., quality matters, accessibility)
* Developing and/or incorporating open educational resources (OER) into a course
* Publishing a commentary in popular media about teaching pedagogy (e.g., *Inside Higher Ed*)
* Engaging in public teaching work, including, but not limited to, hits and positive commentary on social media, blogs, and instructional videos
* Invitations to participate in documentaries, podcasts, newspaper and radio interviews, and other media formats
* Participating in re-authorization and accreditation activities

**Outstanding (5.0):** To receive a rating of Outstanding in teaching, a faculty member must be deemed Meeting Expectations as outlined above and clearly demonstrate any **one** of the following activities.

**Outstanding Activities and Documentation**

* Public recognition of excellence in teaching (an award, invited lecturer/keynote on teaching pedagogy nationally or internationally, etc.)
* (Co-)development and public dissemination of an innovative high-impact teaching practice beyond the classroom
* Development of a new departmental or interdisciplinary program
* Exceptional FCQs (average for all courses above 6.5 on items 7-11)
* Leading re-authorization and accreditation activities in the year of a formal review

**Leadership and Service**

The department recognizes leadership and service to the department, college, university, community, discipline, and our profession. The department considers compensated and uncompensated service work equally.

**Possible Leadership and Service Work Evidence to Include:** List all service commitments and note leadership roles (required); Specify departmental leadership accomplishments (required); specialized training or professional development; and awards or other distinctions and recognitions.

**Meeting Expectations (3.0):** To be considered Meeting Expectations for leadership and service, faculty are expected to participate in departmental meetings and committees, college meetings and committees, commencement ceremonies, university committees, student admission/ applicant reviews, search committees, and disciplinary activities (e.g., conference/journal reviewer, professional association leadership). The totality of service and leadership engagement will be considered, without the expectation that any one specific activity is conducted each year. Appropriate service and leadership will consider rank and years in rank. For example, senior and principal instructors are expected to provide greater levels of institution-building leadership and service across the university than instructors. A discussion with the chair and mentors may be helpful in determining what constitutes “appropriate service” for any individual faculty member. **To be considered “Exceeding Expectations” or “Outstanding” for leadership and service, faculty must engage in additional activities listed below.**

**Exceeding Expectations (4.0):** To receive a rating of Exceeding Expectations in leadership and service, faculty must be deemed Meeting Expectations as outlined above and clearly demonstrate evidence for at least three of the activities below. **A case for outstanding can be made if at least five of the following activities are achieved.** Faculty can count the same leadership and service activity a maximum of two times in a single year.

**Exceeding Expectations Activities and Documentation**

* Chairing a department or college committee
* Serving on a search committee outside the department
* Holding a position in Faculty Assembly or a Faculty Assembly committee
* Contribution to diversity, such as involvement in DEI departmental, college, or campus committees or task forces
* Chairing and serving on department, college, and university promotion committees, as well as promotion cases for other institutions
* Serving as faculty sponsor/advisor for student clubs
* Nominating students or colleagues for fellowships, awards, etc.
* Writing letters of recommendation or support for colleagues
* Establishing community partnerships (e.g., internships for students)
* Contribution to public policy, such as developing legislation
* Organizing, presenting, or participating in service/leadership professional development activities
* Role-modeling and mentorship of students and alumni, especially from underrepresented groups, in leadership and service, as well as evidence of the quality of the mentorship (e.g., unsolicited letters, evaluations)
* Leading professional association activities (e.g., officer, committee member, organizing conferences or workshops, site visits, in-service training)
* Editorial activities for professional journals (e.g., editor, associate editor, guest editor of special edition)
* Reviewing journal or book manuscripts, as well as reviewing conference proposals and grant proposals
* Writing a popular press article or providing a media interview related to leadership and service
* External leadership/service grant proposal submitted or funded as PI/co-PI, senior personnel, or evaluator
* Internal CU/UCCS leadership/service grant proposal submitted or funded
* Leadership and service consulting services (compensated or not)

**Outstanding (5.0):** To receive a rating of Outstanding in service and leadership, a faculty member must be deemed Meeting Expectations as outlined above and clearly demonstrate any **one** of the following activities.

**Outstanding Activities and Documentation**

* Serving as Department Chair, Associate Chair, Program Coordinator, Cohort Liaison, and/or Center Director and fulfilling the position roles and responsibilities
* Chairing a UCCS or CU committee
* Holding a significant leadership role in a professional association (e.g., governing or executive board member)
* Service on community, state, regional, or federal-level boards and commissions
* Public recognition of excellence in service and leadership (an award, etc.)