

# Department of Philosophy

## Merit Review Criteria for Instructors

### Spring 2022

This document delineates the UCCS Philosophy Department's guidelines and criteria for the Annual Merit Performance Evaluations of its faculty, as required by the Laws of Regents (Article 5.C.4(B)) and the system wide University administrative policy statement, "Annual Merit Adjustments for Faculty." 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. The annual merit performance rating is an important, but not sole, item of information that may be used, consistent with the Laws of Regents and University Policy, in the annual salary setting process or in comprehensive faculty evaluations. Further information regarding CU policies on merit performance ratings, salary and compensations can be found in Laws of Regents (Article 11.A), Regent Policies (Sections 11-B. & 11-F.2) and the "Compensation and Leave" Section of the CU Faculty Handbook.

It is the job of each faculty member at any level of Instructor to rank themselves annually. This departmental guideline will inform annual evaluations of all Instructors. Following submission of self-evaluations, it is the job of the Chair to evaluate all faculty annually. The following document is intended to guide faculty as they prepare their self-evaluations and to guide the Chair as they assess the work of the faculty in their department. It is the job of the Chair to meet with faculty to discuss their assessments, and to alert faculty in a timely manner to low performance with potential to affect that faculty's RPT process. Egregious cases will require a meeting between the Chair and the faculty member, a plan of remedial action agreed upon and signed by both the faculty member and the Chair, and a follow-up meeting midway through the following year. Faculty may assess themselves as falling between rankings when they have accomplished several of the markers for a given ranking. It is the job of the individual faculty member to make the case for the self-assessed ranking. A standard workload for Instructors is 95% Teaching/5% Service. Faculty with negotiated "differentiated workload" agreements will be evaluated using the appropriate weighting system of the agreement.

## Teaching:

### Summary of Numerical Scoring: (Insert Score Here)

The following criteria represent the key "best practices" that demonstrate successful teaching and pedagogy. Each rank of evaluation requires the Instructor to meet a minimum standard for commendation. **(Please highlight the practices demonstrated).**

- Student evaluations as expressed through the Faculty Course Questionnaire, in addition to letters and emails written to the Instructor during the semester. Questions 7-12 should be prioritized over questions 1-6.
- Recognition of excellence in teaching (awards, etc.)
- Development and dissemination of an innovative high-impact teaching practice

- Development of a new departmental or interdisciplinary program or minor
- Participation in interdisciplinary work that incorporates teaching and involves students
- Integration of students into research opportunities
- Providing adequate guidance to students pertaining to course material
- Teaching additional (overload) courses to meet curricular demands
- Peer-evaluation from a colleague (within or outside the department)
- Creation of new course
- Supervision of independent study, teaching assistantship, senior thesis, or internship
- Participation in pedagogical workshop
- Substantive course improvements/updates
- Substantive improvements to expertise on relevant subject matter
- Demonstration of successful teaching in-person or online
- Expanding or adjusting course material to support the curricular needs of the department, college, and university
- Creation of new course
- Attendance and/or participations in scholarly conferences

## ***Numerical Scoring***

### 5 (Outstanding)

To receive an assessment of Outstanding, faculty must clearly demonstrate *at least* **three** of the best practices listed above

### 4 (Exceeding Expectations)

To receive an assessment of Exceeding Expectations, faculty must clearly demonstrate **two** of the key practices.

### 3 (Meeting Expectations)

At minimum, faculty are expected to adequately prepare and teach scheduled courses and to evaluate students in a timely manner and meet **one** of the best practices listed above

Please score yourself in increments no smaller than tenths (that is, “4.1”, not “4.12”).

***Narrative Self-Evaluation of Teaching. (For each identified key practice, provide a statement of description):***

**(List Select Criteria Here)**

(Insert Explanation Here)

# Service

## Summary of Numerical Scoring: (Insert Score Here)

The following criteria represent the key “best practices” that demonstrate academic service. Each rank of evaluation requires the instructor to meet a minimum standard for commendation. **(Please highlight the practices demonstrated).**

- Directing a center; creating and/or leading a minor; or creating and/or managing a certificate
- Active performance of duties or service, including work on committees, within the department.
- Student mentoring that extends beyond the academy into personal and professional development.
- Guest lecturing across the university or at other institutions
- Giving public lectures/serving on a panel
- Running and/or advising a student club
- Supporting events hosted by department, college, or campus
- Active contributions to shared governance
- Review of peer manuscripts, serving as reviewer on a peer-review journal, or reviewing conference proposals
- Providing letters of recommendation for students and/or faculty
- Faculty mentoring
- Offering feedback/support for pedagogical growth and/or scholarship for colleague(s) both within and outside of the department
- Reviewing peers’ teaching
- Support for students, faculty, staff, or traditions from marginalized and underrepresented communities within higher education
- Active participation on committees or other service opportunities beyond the department, whether at the College, University, or System level, within the discipline, or as an academic within the community
- Conferences
- Active participation in national and/or international scholarly organizations

## *Numerical Scoring*

### 5 (Outstanding)

To receive an assessment of Outstanding, faculty must clearly demonstrate *at least* **three** of the best practices.

### 4 (Exceeding Expectations)

To receive an assessment of Exceeding Expectations, faculty must clearly demonstrate **two** of the key practices.

### 3 (Meeting Expectations)

At minimum, all faculty are expected to participate in departmental meetings and to complete letters of recommendation for students when appropriate as well as demonstrate **one** of the best practices listed above.

Please score yourself in increments no smaller than tenths (that is, “4.1”, not “4.12”).

**Narrative Self-Evaluation of Service (For each identified key practice, provide a statement of description):**

§ **(List Select Criteria Here)**

(Insert **Self-Evaluation Narrative** Here)