

Department of Mathematics

College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
University of Colorado
Colorado Springs

Annual Review Criteria and Procedures

Tenure Track and IRC

March 2021

1 Introduction

This chapter delineates the UCCS Department of Mathematics guidelines and criteria for the annual merit performance evaluations of its faculty, as required by Regent Policy 5.C.4(B) and the CU Administrative Policy Statement 5008. A performance evaluation is a comprehensive process that begins with the identification of job responsibilities and agreement on goals and objectives, and which concludes with an assessment of performance. A performance rating is a summary derived from the evaluation process. Further information regarding CU policies on merit performance ratings, salary, and compensation can be found in the Regent Laws Article 11.A, Regent Policy 11.B, and the CU Faculty Handbook (Compensation and Leave Section).

2 Basic Procedure

(1) The chair of the department will evaluate the performance of each faculty member based on the faculty member's activity during the previous year. Evaluations will be completed according to the criteria specified in this document, consistently with the contractual obligations of each faculty member.

(2) In general, the chair will evaluate each faculty member based on the normal workload allocations described in 3.3.1. Specifically, for tenure-track faculty the normal workload allocation is 40% teaching, 40% scholarly/creative work, and 20% leadership and service; while for instructors it is 95% teaching and 5% leadership and service. However, in applying these weights, the chair should exercise some flexibility, to adequately account for the overall contributions of an individual faculty member in a given calendar year. Exceptions to the above guidelines are to be made only in the following situations.

(i) Faculty who hold previously negotiated differentiated workload allocations will be evaluated using the appropriate weighting system of the agreement (see Chapter 3 of the department's bylaws).

(ii) Faculty who hold additional administrative appointments should negotiate with the chair and other involved individuals (e.g., dean, provost), at the time the administrative appointment begins, how annual merit evaluations will be conducted. This includes faculty who might serve in campus administrative positions, as well as faculty who serve as department chair for some, but not all, of the annual merit review period under consideration.

(iii) Faculty who hold less-than-full-time appointments will be evaluated according to the terms of their appointments, and should negotiate with the chair in advance how their annual merit evaluations will be conducted.

(3) The chair will fill out the relevant evaluation form provided by the college for each faculty member under evaluation.

(4) The chair's evaluation will be based on documents for the year under review, including, but not limited to, the following.

(i) Annual Faculty Activity Report, as required by UCCS.

(ii) Faculty Self-Evaluation Form, provided by the college.

(iii) Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ) summaries.

(iv) Annual Workload Form (for instructors only).

(v) Any supporting documents¹ which help to clarify or explain the information given in the Annual Faculty Activity Report. These may include indications of significant time spent in various service activities and impact on student learning, such as teaching innovations or information gleaned from FCQs. For tenure-track faculty, these may also include information about research work which otherwise goes unrecorded, such as efforts in projects which are in various stages of development, the strength of a specific journal, or importance of a specific conference invitation.

(5) If the chair uses in the evaluation process documents not supplied by the faculty member, then the chair must indicate this, together with an appropriate rationale, and provide copies of said documents to the faculty member.

(6) The chair will provide a copy of the written evaluation well in advance of submitting it to the dean, for the following reason. The chair may meet with a faculty member to discuss their performance and evaluation. This meeting may be requested by either the chair or the faculty member. After the meeting, the chair will inform the faculty member of any changes made to the evaluation, in a timely manner, before submitting it to the dean.

3 Situations of Part Time Residence

These are situations in which a faculty member is not in full-time residence for the entirety of the year under review.

3.1 One Semester of Residence

These are situations in which a faculty member is in full-time residence for only one semester of the year under review. This includes, for example, faculty who are on sabbatical or leave for one of the semesters under review, and also includes new faculty in their first year in the department. In these situations it is incumbent on the faculty member to arrange in advance how the faculty member will be evaluated. Typically the faculty member's annual evaluation will be based on performance during the in-residence semester, extrapolated to the entire year. In addition, faculty can supplement this assessment process by submitting any germane work completed during the absence.

3.2 No Full Semester of Residence

If a faculty member is on sabbatical for the entire calendar year, then he or she will be evaluated on the work completed during the assignment. If the faculty member is on a non-sabbatical assignment of duty elsewhere, or on leave, then he or she should negotiate in advance with the chair and the dean how the annual merit evaluation will be conducted.

¹Faculty are encouraged to consult the attachments to the department's Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure criteria document for specific examples.

4 Merit Rating Guidelines

Each faculty member will receive a comprehensive evaluation rating, according to the CU system-wide policy, of “outstanding”, “exceeding expectations”, “meeting expectations”, or “below expectations”. The comprehensive rating will be determined by a weighted average of merit ratings in each of three areas: teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, for tenure-track faculty; and each of two areas: teaching, and leadership and service, for instructors. Each merit rating is intended to indicate a range of performance. The chair may elect to assign a numerical scale for each of the ratings. However, the chair should, to the greatest extent possible, make an effort to be uniform and systematic about how each faculty member’s performance is evaluated, in order to ensure a fair evaluation process. Exceptions may be made in unusual circumstances, or those beyond a faculty member’s control.

The list of qualifying activities against each merit rating provided below is intended as a guideline for the chair to follow while assigning these ratings in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service. Only one qualifying activity in each rating category is sufficient to earn that specific rating. If a faculty member provides evidence of multiple qualifying activities in a given rating category, then the chair may at their discretion assign a higher merit rating. The list is by no means exhaustive. The chair may take into account other comparable qualifying activities in each category.

Teaching

Outstanding: documented very positive FCQ results; documented very positive comments regarding teaching effectiveness from students; documented very positive peer evaluations of teaching; other evidence of very strong positive impact on student learning; creation and successful implementation of a substantially new (to the department) course; receiving a significant teaching award; publication of a textbook or other teaching materials.

Exceeding expectations: documented positive FCQ results; documented positive comments regarding teaching effectiveness from students; documented positive peer evaluations of teaching; other evidence of significant positive impact on student learning; successful teaching of a new (to the faculty member) course; substantial revision of an existing course; participation in teaching conferences and workshops; giving an undergraduate independent study course; supervising a graduate thesis; voluntarily taking on extra teaching duties to help the department.

Meeting expectations: performance of standard teaching duties without substantial problems; evidence of positive impact on student learning.

Below expectations: lack of willingness to teach courses needed by the department; documented problems with teaching.

Scholarly/Creative Work

Outstanding: a publication in an extremely prestigious journal in the faculty member’s area of expertise; two or more publications in high-quality refereed journals in the faculty member’s area of expertise; funding of an external grant; receiving a significant research award.

Exceeding expectations: a publication in a high-quality refereed journal in the faculty member's area of expertise; two or more publications in refereed journals or conference proceedings; funding of an internal grant; positive reviews of an external grant proposal; delivering a major invited talk; successful completion of supervision of a graduate research thesis; other evidence of substantial research work.

Meeting expectations: a publication in a refereed journal or conference proceedings; a positive referee's report on a paper submitted to a high-quality journal; submission of a grant proposal; delivering talks at conferences and other universities; successful completion of supervision of an undergraduate research thesis; other activity intended to result in publications.

Below expectations: little or no research activity of any kind.

Leadership and Service (for Tenure-Track Faculty)

Outstanding: organization of a major conference; maintaining a leadership role in the department, college, university, or a professional society; membership on the editorial board of a high-quality journal; membership in several committees at different levels; receiving a significant service award.

Exceeding expectations: organizing a small conference or a session in a larger conference; refereeing or reviewing a significant number of papers or grant proposals; membership in at least two committees at different levels; substantial administration; notable community outreach; active mentoring of lecturers and student teachers; curricular development designed to improve departmental programs; activities that aid the graduate program but are different from normal graduate committee functions, such as contributing problems to and grading graduate examinations, serving as faculty advisors for graduate presentations or MSc papers; very active participation in departmental activities.

Meeting expectations: refereeing or reviewing papers or grant proposals; membership in committees; attendance and active participation in department meetings.

Below expectations: limited service and contributions.

Leadership and Service (for Instructors)

Outstanding: membership in a significant committee; substantial administration; active mentoring of lecturers and student teachers; curricular development designed to improve departmental programs; activities that aid the graduate program but are different from normal graduate committee functions, such as contributing problems to and grading graduate examinations, serving as faculty advisors for graduate presentations or MSc papers; receiving a significant service award.

Exceeding expectations: membership in a committee; mentoring of lecturers and student teachers; notable community outreach; active participation in departmental activities.

Meeting expectations: attendance and active participation in department meetings.

Below expectations: little or no service.

The final annual performance rating from the dean will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and is subject to disclosure under the Colorado Open Records Act. Faculty

members should note that according to the Regent Laws Article 11.A.1(F), consistently “outstanding” or “exceeding expectations” annual merit performance ratings, on their own, shall not be sufficient for tenure or promotion.

Q: Page 4: what items on the FCQ are included? Or does the faculty member get to select which items they want to average together?

A: We purposely left that vague. First, FCQs get changed from time to time, and so we didn't want to explicitly refer to the questions on the current iteration. Second, there is no universal consensus on which questions are the most important (ever since we got rid of "course overall" and "instructor overall" questions). So we decided to give the faculty members the option of making a case about their teaching on the basis of any and all parts of the FCQ.

Q: Is a PI on an external grant evaluated the same as a Co-PI?

Q: How is collaborative research evaluated?

A: Mathematics is different from the other sciences in that we don't tend to have labs or other hierarchical structures. So, when it comes to publications and grants, all contributors are generally considered equal, and are almost always listed in alphabetical order. The same goes for single-author vs. collaborative research--those tend to be valued equally. (Single-author research shows independence and initiative, while collaborative research is indicative of being valued by others and of an ability to work in groups.) For this reason we did not see the need to complicate the criteria trying to address the issue explicitly.

Q: How is research on mathematical teaching considered? As teaching? As research?

A: Publication of teaching materials, and revision of courses (including methodology), is recognized under teaching. But we consider educational research a different field (and interact with some of the experts in it from the education college).

Q: Page 4: the outstanding category includes the development of a new course. Might it also include the development of a new program?

A: This is recognized under service. It is also understood that the chair has flexibility in recognizing activities that straddle the boundaries of multiple categories of work.