

Department of Philosophy

Merit Review Criteria for TT Faculty

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 summation 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. In addition, this document accords with Regent's policy #5008: <https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5008>.

It is the job of each TT faculty member to rank themselves annually. Much of the value of the annual self-evaluations lies in its ability to motivate faculty to continue to improve teaching and for faculty to think about goals. Following the 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. In addition, this document aims to guide the Chair as they assess the work of the faculty in the 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 that has the potential to affect that faculty's RPT process. Anything below a 3 in any category 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. Stated outside circumstances that may have impacted faculty performance will be considered in the Chair's evaluation.

Faculty may assess themselves as falling between rankings when they have accomplished several, but not all, of the markers for a given ranking. A part of the self-evaluation must include the faculty members' incorporation of professionalism, civility, and respect into the classroom, department, and the people within one's own academic association(s). It is the job of the individual faculty member to make the case for the self-assessed ranking. A standard workload for TT faculty members is 40% Teaching / 40% Research / 20% Service. Faculty with negotiated "differentiated workload" agreements will be evaluated using the appropriate weighting system of the agreement.

Teaching

Criteria for the Teaching Metric

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.

- Competitive Faculty Course Questionnaire scores across the department, college, and campus
 - “Competitive” means that scores were at or above the department, college, or campus mean.
 - Questions 7-11 will be weighted more heavily than questions 1-6.
- Peer evaluations from a colleague within or outside of the department/college/university
- Development of a new departmental or interdisciplinary program
- Public recognition of excellence in teaching (awards, etc.)
- Development and public dissemination of an innovative high-impact teaching practice
- Preparation of course material, including revisions to the syllabus
- Student development/encouragement (centers of excellence, library knowledge, learning disability recognition, encouragement of students)
- Participation in interdisciplinary work that incorporates students
- Integration of students into research opportunities
- Significant mentorship of students
 - Aiding of a student’s progress within a course
 - Mentoring a student through the major
 - Serving as a second reader for a Senior Thesis
 - Guiding interested students into graduate work
 - Considering working with students towards co-collaborated papers/books
- Teaching additional (overload) courses to meet curricular demands
- Teaching “on-ramp” introductory courses that can lure potential majors.
- Creation of a new course
- Extensive revision of an existing course
- Supervision of an independent study, teaching/research assistantship, thesis, or internship
- Student advising
- Participation in pedagogical workshop
- Expanding or adjusting course material to support the curricular needs and goals of the department or academic programs outside the department
- Expanding or adjusting course material to account for new research
- Teaching contribution at any institution other than at UCCS

Numerical Scoring

5 (Outstanding)

To receive an assessment of Outstanding, faculty must clearly demonstrate at least **three** of the best practices (with FCQ analysis as a required criterion, per Regent Law).

4 (Exceeding Expectations)

To receive an assessment of Exceeding Expectations, faculty must clearly demonstrate at least **two** of the best 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 fulfill at least **one** of the best practices.

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

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

- (Insert Criteria Here)
- (Insert Explanation Here)

Research

Summary of Numerical Scoring: (Insert Score Here)

5 (Outstanding)

To receive an assessment of Outstanding, faculty must clearly demonstrate any of the following measures, all of which must be peer reviewed:

- Successful publication of:
 - A book, either a monograph or edited volume
 - At least two articles in a peer-reviewed, reputable journal
 - At least two book chapters towards an edited volume.

Other scholarly efforts that can contribute to one’s research:

- Presentation at academic conferences
- A book review
- A review of one’s own book/article
- Successful landing of a major grant or contract proposal

Faculty may also be judged as outstanding if they demonstrate multiple examples of the following markers denoting research or scholarly work that exceeds expectations.

4 (Exceeding Expectations)

To receive an assessment of Exceeding Expectations, faculty must clearly demonstrate any of the following measures:

- Successful publication of a book
- Successful publication of an article or book chapter

- Documented progress on a book manuscript (monograph or edited volume) as evidenced by a contract with a journal or publisher
- Presentation at a conference

Narrative Self-Evaluation of Research. (For each identified best practice, provide a statement of description):

- (Insert Criteria Here)
- (Insert Explanation Here)

Service

Summary of Numerical Scoring: (Insert Score Here)

The following activities represent what our department sees as the most impactful actions that contribute to our service to the department, college, and campus. Each rank of evaluation requires the instructor to meet a minimum standard for commendation.

Chairing a department

- Directing a center
- Being a member of a System, University, or College committee
- Creating and sustaining a certificate/minor
- Active participation in student mentoring that encourages further academic, personal, and professional goals.
- Member of college or campus committees
Appearing in any form of media that promotes the university/ department (print, video, internet, etc.)
- Guest lecturing for other faculty, departments, universities, or the public
- Establishing a series (or on-off) of events that showcases the department
- Reviewing of manuscripts or journal essays
- Active participation in faculty mentoring
- Supporting students, faculty, or staff that come from marginalized and underrepresented communities within higher education
- Serving on committees that serve national/international scholarly organizations.
- Hosting conferences/scholars that serve the needs of the department
- 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
- Public outreach to the wider community in the form of public talks, hosting public events, etc.

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 at least **two** of the best 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 and fulfill at least **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 best practice, provide a statement of description):

- (Insert Criteria Here)
- (Insert Explanation Here)