

**Department of Teaching and Learning (TLRN)**  
**Annual Performance Evaluation Criteria for Tenure Track Faculty**

Approved by TLRN Tenure Track Faculty on 1/26/2024

Approved by the Dean on 02/02/2024

Approved by the Provost on 02/09/2024

**1. Overview:** Consistent with the University of Colorado Regent Law and UCCS Campus Policy, all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department with a full-time equivalent appointment  $\geq 0.5$  will be evaluated each academic year using the review criteria outlined in this document. All regular faculty shall be evaluated annually on the merit of their performance in the categories of: (1) teaching, (2) scholarly/creative work, and (3) leadership and service (Regent Law 5) unless otherwise specified in a differentiated workload agreement.

**2. Purpose:** The purpose of the annual performance review is threefold:

- A. **Performance Evaluation:** The primary purpose of the annual performance review is to assess each individual faculty member's performance in their respective workload categories. At the most basic level, the performance evaluation helps to determine whether the faculty member is meeting the minimum expectations set forth by the department. Similarly, the annual performance evaluation process is used to identify faculty members who may require additional support OR identify faculty members who are exceeding minimum expectations. Individual annual performance evaluations and ratings provide the basis for annual merit increases, although additional factors may be used in setting final compensation ([CU System Policy 5008](#)).
- B. **Feedback and Improvement:** In addition to ratings that can be used for annual merit increases, performance reviews provide a structured opportunity for faculty members to receive constructive feedback regarding their strengths and areas for improvement. Constructive feedback received from the annual performance evaluation can be used to help faculty members enhance the quality of their teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service activities. More specifically, the feedback and evaluation may support faculty members at different points of their academic careers including:
- **Pre-tenured faculty:** The feedback and assessment provided during the annual review process can help guide pre-tenured faculty members in building a strong foundation for their tenure dossier. (*note:* The Department of Teaching and Learning has made a concerted effort to align the annual performance review criteria to the *College of Education Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure* (RPT) document; however, the annual performance review and RPT documents are **separate and distinct processes**. As such, annual performance ratings shall not form the sole basis for earning tenure and promotion ([CU System Policy 5008](#)).
  - **Tenured faculty:** The feedback and assessment provided during the annual performance review can help guide tenured faculty members in updating their professional plan and preparing for post-tenure review (required every 5 years).

C. **Goal Setting:** The annual performance review process provides faculty members with an opportunity to outline their goals for the upcoming reporting period. Intentional goal setting allows faculty members to align their efforts with departmental objectives and/or personal career ambitions. Setting clear goals also helps faculty members to measure their progress and can help set them up for future career success.

**3. Performance Ratings and Definitions:** Individual faculty will be assigned numerical ratings (from 1-5) using the numerical scores outlined in the table below.

<b>Rating</b>	<b>UCCS Campus Definition</b>
5 - Outstanding	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
4 - Exceeding Expectations	Always achieves performance expectations and frequently exceeds them. Demonstrates performance of a very high level of quality in all areas of responsibility.
3 - Meeting Expectations	Consistently fulfills performance expectations and periodically may exceed them. Work is of high quality in all significant areas of responsibility.
2 - Below Expectations	Frequently fails to meet expectations and improvement is needed in these areas.
1 - Fails to Meet Expectations	Consistently fails to meet expectations and improvement is needed in most aspects of position.

Final annual performance ratings are assigned as a **whole number integer** (calculated as a weighted average across all categories evaluated for workload) and will be rounded accordingly based on the following ranges.

<b>Final Performance Rating</b>	<b>Weighted Average Range</b>
5 - Outstanding	4.50 - 5.00
4 - Exceeding Expectations	4.00 - 4.49
3 - Meeting Expectations	3.00 - 3.99
2 - Below Expectations	2.00 - 2.99
1 - Fails to Meet Expectations	< 2.00

#### 4. Other Important Context and Considerations

- A. **Faculty as individuals:** The performance of each faculty member 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. Each faculty member's final rating shall reflect the workload percentages outlined in their letter of offer or official differentiated workload agreements signed by the department chair and dean.
- B. **Departmental climate:** Faculty are expected to contribute to our departmental climate of civility, respect, and inclusion. This should be demonstrated through active participation in department meetings and College of Education functions, professional communication with colleagues (through email or otherwise) and supporting student success.
- C. **Extenuating circumstances:** This annual performance evaluation document is designed to provide guidance related to the 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 Family Medical Leave (FML), a sabbatical, or other extenuating circumstances to account for gaps during a review period. When such a disruption or event occurs, the faculty member and department chair will work together to determine appropriate accommodations. Some options include:
  - For the annual review to reflect a differential weighted proportion of workload that reflects a flexible work arrangement, such as a reduction of FTE or workload swaps between semesters.
- D. **Alignment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion:** As part of this review, the Department of Teaching and Learning especially values evidence of attention to the embodiment of principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in the areas of evaluated performance.
- E. **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.
- F. **Departmental review:** Approved annual performance criteria will be reviewed and approved by the department a minimum of **every three years**. Criteria will be approved by a simple majority of the tenured/tenure track faculty. More frequent reviews of this document may occur, if requested by the faculty within the department and/or there are significant changes to campus or CU Regent policy that warrant an interim review. Any substantive changes to an approved departmental annual review document will require an official department vote (with a majority).
- G. **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).

H. **Double-counting:** A single achievement may not count in more than one evaluated category.

I. **Related Policy Information:** Any processes not directly addressed in this document will default to the appropriate UCCS policy, CU Regent Laws and Policies (if applicable) or CU Administrative Policy Statements (APS). Below is a list of policies and links which 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 evaluation ratings, deadlines, and forms are included on the UCCS HR website: <https://hr.uccs.edu/supervisors/performance-management>

**5. Annual Evaluation Documentation:** All faculty will submit their annual performance evaluation documentation on or before the deadline(s) communicated by the College of Education Dean's Office.

All faculty members are **required** to submit the following documents:

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Self-evaluation form:</b> (using the template provided by the department) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Examples of completed self-evaluation forms shall be available to faculty upon request</li></ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Faculty report of professional activities (FRPA)</b> currently through Watermark Faculty Success
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Updated CV</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Faculty members are encouraged to use the recommended <a href="#">UCCS CV template</a></li></ul>

Faculty members can **optionally** submit additional evidence beyond the three required documents above. Typically, additional items are used to provide evidence of how and why a faculty member has earned a rating of exceeding expectations (4) or outstanding (5).

**6. Annual Evaluation Submission Process:** Upon submitting the required documents listed above, the following steps occur.

- A. **Step 1 (Department Chair):** The faculty member initially submits the required annual review materials listed above and schedules a one-on-one meeting with the department chair. Through this process, the faculty member justifies their self-evaluation ratings by documenting their work for the reporting period in each workload category. The department chair will initially confirm each faculty member is meeting expectations (based on the departmental rubrics provided below) and then discuss appropriate ratings higher or lower than a 3. The chair will also discuss goals for the upcoming reporting period and support faculty in actualizing their goals (e.g., providing recommendations for professional development or other opportunities for growth).
- B. **Step 2 (Peer review process):** After the one-on-one meeting with the department chair, there will be a peer review of all annual review materials submitted. A departmental peer review committee will include at **least three** department faculty members. A diversity of faculty representation in the peer review committee is encouraged, with the recommended makeup being one pre-tenured faculty member, one tenured faculty member, and one instructional, research, and clinical (IRC) faculty member.

The peer review committee 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 department chair will serve as an ex-officio member. The peer review committee deliberations, evaluations, and recommendations are confidential, except that peer review recommendations are shared with the faculty member and the chair.

Peer reviewers will consider departmental annual review criteria and will **provide recommended ratings** to the department chair, as well as written feedback for faculty. They will indicate the recommended faculty member rating for each workload category, as well as overall. A brief written summary describing the rationale and results of the peer review will be communicated to the faculty member and chair.

- C. **Step 3 (Dean):** After the meeting with the department chair and going through the peer review process, the annual evaluation materials will be submitted to the College of Education Dean for further evaluation and final approval.

**7. Criteria:** Faculty evaluations for annual performance review are **criterion referenced** (i.e., individual faculty member's performance is rated against the criteria and **not** other faculty). All tenured and tenure track faculty shall be evaluated on the categories of teaching (40%), scholarly/creative works (40%), and leadership and service (20%) unless otherwise documented in an official differentiated workload agreement signed by the department chair and dean. The activities listed below 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., a publication with a student being either teaching or research), 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 (3)**, **Exceeding Expectations (4)**, and **Outstanding (5)** each have a list of activities below for each category. Meeting expectations is the baseline rating, which is the minimum of expected activities required of all T/TT faculty in the department.

- **Not meeting minimums:** Faculty members who receive an annual performance rating of below expectations (2) or fails to meet expectations (1) as the result of their annual performance evaluation must participate in developing and implementing a **Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA)**. The department chair will work collaboratively with the faculty member to design an appropriate PIA. The PIA must outline the specific steps, strategies, and resources taken to address the identified weaknesses.

**8. Teaching:** This section provides guidance and expectations for the teaching domain. The department recognizes both scheduled teaching and individualized teaching activities – for example, individualized student mentoring, general advising, portfolio review, and supervision. In the assessment of teaching effectiveness and accomplishment, **the department uses multiple means of documenting teaching activities in and outside of the classroom**, including faculty course questionnaires (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.

**Teaching - Meeting Expectations (3.0):** To receive a rating of meeting expectations for teaching, faculty are expected to meet the following:

- Adequately preparing for and teaching all scheduled courses (including supervision).
- In general, mean FCQ scores of **4.5** or greater are expected across all courses
  - (Note: faculty should omit items # 5 [course workload] and #6 [personal interest before enrolled] when calculating their mean FCQ scores. Co-taught courses or courses where the faculty member is not serving as the instructor of record will be taken into consideration
- Providing students with clear and comprehensive course syllabi aligned to the department template
- Utilizing a Canvas shell for all courses
- Scheduling and maintaining regular synchronous office hours (note: this is normally 4 hours per week during the fall/spring academic semesters)

- Evaluating student performance on course assignments and providing feedback in a timely manner
- Advising undergraduate and/or graduate students as appropriate (typically, this is a caseload of 10 or more individual students per year)

**Teaching - Exceeding Expectations Activities and Documentation:** 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.

- Above College FCQ averages on items #7-11
- Creation of a new course or extensive revisions of an existing course (including developing an existing course in a different instructional mode)
- Alignment of degree requirements and/or updates to licensure pathways
- Developing PK-12 field experiences and identifying mentor teacher opportunities
- Submitting a course for Compass Curriculum approval
- Teaching a new course, an overload course, a writing intensive course, a GPS course, or another course outside the department (compensated or not)
- Student supervision (beyond workload) that may include professional experience activities, internships, and/or individualized supervision (on-site or virtual)
- Organizing or presenting workshops addressing best practices for inclusive teaching pedagogy (on campus or with local school district partners)
- Development of workshops for student growth, programmatic support, professional development, etc.
- Innovative use of teaching technologies and/or assistive technologies
- Engaging in teaching improvement activities outside of a PIA (e.g., seeking mentorship; demonstrating use of ongoing assessment including student mid-term feedback or peer feedback)
- Evidence of taking risks in teaching activities. This may include, but is not limited to, integration of materials in courses which deal with controversial or sensitive topics, using alternative pedagogies
- Substantial teaching contribution to other departments, programs, or institutions, in addition to Teaching and Learning (i.e., working with other academic units on or local school district to develop new programs, curricula, or pedagogical approaches)
- Providing or receiving peer evaluation of teaching
- Documentation/inclusion of topics or teaching methods that take into consideration issues related to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and/or Universal Design for Learning
- Teaching outside of the classroom through supervision of students' thesis (masters) or other master's research projects as the primary mentor
- Individual mentoring of students, especially from underrepresented groups
- Receiving a teaching enhancement or teaching development grant as PI/Co-PI, senior personnel, or evaluator
- Conducting independent studies with students
- Substantial advising beyond average workload in the department or program
- Participating in re-authorization and accreditation activities

- Evaluation of student performance in departmental and/or Compass Curriculum examinations and assessments
- Evidence that demonstrates students succeed in courses and/or in the pursuit of graduate education and/or careers
- Guest lecturing in a class in or outside the department, including in the community, in P-12 schools, or at other higher education institutions
- Serving as a dissertation chair or methodologist on a completed dissertation (each completed dissertation may be counted separately, up to two per year)
- 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)
- Use of mentoring philosophy statement and/or mentor-mentee faculty agreements, including mentoring university supervisors
- Recognition for meeting established criteria for course excellence (e.g., quality matters, accessibility, FRC teaching badge, etc.)
- Developing and/or incorporating open educational resources (OER) into a course
- 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)
- Unsolicited letters from current and former students documenting the impact of teaching and mentoring
- Teaching activities in a community setting to lay audiences including schools
- Providing a reflective teaching statement or teaching philosophy

**Teaching - Outstanding Activities and Documentation:** 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.

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

**9. Scholarly/Creative Work:** This section provides guidance and expectations for the scholarly/creative work domain. The department recognizes that research and scholarly/creative work can take many forms. Thus, we have designed our annual criteria to reflect these differences. Regardless of research methodology, our department values scholarship that focuses on fundamental discovery, integrates existing knowledge, and translates research to practice (including practitioner-focused research). We also recognize the scholarly study of teaching and learning as a form of research.



In the general assessment of research and scholarly work, the department places greater weight on items which have undergone some form of peer review. Non-peer reviewed work will also be considered as part of the faculty member's record but in general, will be weighted less than peer reviewed work. Our department encourages collaborative research, including with students. We strongly caution against publishing and presenting in predatory outlets. Please consult with the Kraemer Family Library or senior faculty for a list of potential predatory journals and publishers or for additional guidance on this matter. Our department encourages collaborative research, including with students/alumni and peers, thus single-authored and co-authored work are counted equally, and author order is immaterial.

**Possible Research/Scholarly Work Evidence to Include:** Cite all work published or in press, and note the number of items under review and in progress (required); cite all work presented or accepted, and note the number of items under review and in progress (required); cite all active grants, contracts, or other sponsored program research, and note the number of items under review and in progress (required); specialized training or professional development; and awards or other distinctions and recognitions.

**Scholarly/Creative Work - Meeting Expectations (3.0):** To receive a rating of Meeting Expectations in scholarly/creative work, faculty are expected to maintain an active program of research and to make steady progress in generating publications and other means for disseminating their ongoing scholarly work. Generally, faculty are expected to generate at least one peer reviewed publication **or** submit at least one external funding proposal per year. Peer reviewed publications under review, accepted, **or** in press satisfy the minimum expectation of maintaining an active program of research as do external proposals under review **or** funded. **To be considered "Exceeding Expectations" or "Outstanding" for Scholarly/Creative Work, faculty must engage in additional activities listed below.**

**Scholarly/Creative Work - Exceeding Expectations (4.0):** To receive a rating of Exceeding Expectations in research/scholarly work, 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 research activity a maximum of two times in a single year.

- Peer-reviewed journal article or book chapter
- Invited journal article or book chapter authored or edited scholarly book, monograph, or textbook (including revisions)
- Non-peer reviewed journal article, book chapter, book, monograph, textbook, or technical report
- Invited commentary (e.g., book foreword, editorial, book review, legal testimony)
- Commentary (e.g., encyclopedia entry, book review, journal article review, case study, blog, op-ed, newsletter, popular press publication, documentary)
- Refereed paper, roundtable, or poster presented at local, regional, state, national, and international professional conferences
- Invited paper, roundtable, or poster presented at local, regional, state, national, and international professional conferences
- Non-refereed paper, roundtable, or poster presented at local, regional, state, national, and

international professional conferences

- Expert and technical consultation on research projects (compensated or not)
- Contribution to DEI scholarship (e.g., conducting research in underserved communities, such as Title I schools and rural schools, research focused on broadening participation)
- Evidence of cultural, societal, or disciplinary impact of research
- External research grant proposal submitted as PI/co-PI, senior personnel, or evaluator
- Internal CU/UCCS research grant proposal submitted as PI/co-PI, senior personnel, or evaluator
- Organizing, presenting, or participating in research or methodological professional development activities (e.g., statistical methods workshop, grant-writing bootcamp)
- Organizing, presenting, or participating in research-oriented career development activities
- Role-modeling and mentorship of students and alumni, especially from underrepresented groups, in research, as well as evidence of the quality of the mentorship (e.g., unsolicited letters, evaluations)
- Internal UCCS/CU grant proposal funded (e.g., UCCS campus or CU System proposal)
- Editorial activities for professional journals (e.g., editor, guest editor of special edition, associate editor)
- Reviewing manuscripts for journals, conferences, grant proposals, books, or book chapters.
- Participation in career development activities (e.g., workshops, conference, summer schools, seeking and using a research mentor)
- Participation in grant-funding training workshops
- Un-sponsored research activities such as data collection activities, development of survey measures

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

#### **Scholarly/Creative Work - Outstanding Activities and Documentation**

- Publication of three peer reviewed journal articles and/or book chapters
- Publication of a peer reviewed book (in the year it is published and the subsequent year to honor the time and commitment to such an endeavor)
- Completion and public dissemination of a community-based research project
- Public recognition of excellence in research (an award, invited lecturer/keynote on research expertise nationally or internationally)
- Being awarded an external research grant of at least \$25,000 as PI/co-PI, senior personnel, or evaluator

### **10. Leadership and Service**

This section provides guidance and expectations for the leadership and service domain. All faculty members are expected to engage in leadership and service activities as appropriate by position, years of service, and rank. Because leadership and service can take many forms, a

discussion with the chair and/or mentors may be helpful in determining what constitutes “appropriate” leadership service in the department. In addition, faculty members are expected to contribute to the departmental climate of civility, respect, and inclusion. This should be demonstrated through active participation in department meetings and College of Education functions, professional communication with colleagues (through email or otherwise) and supporting student success.

**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. Faculty can count the same leadership and service activity a maximum of two times in a single year.

**Leadership and Service** – The ratings will be assigned based on the table below:

	<b>Meeting Expectations (3)</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (4)</b>	<b>Outstanding (5)</b>
Pre-tenured faculty	At least <b>two</b> activities from the meeting or exceeding expectations list	At least <b>three</b> activities from the meeting or exceeding expectations list	At least <b>one</b> activity from the outstanding list  OR  At least <b>four</b> activities from the meeting or exceeding expectations list
Tenured faculty	At least <b>three</b> activities from the meeting or exceeding expectations list	At least <b>four</b> activities from the meeting or exceeding expectations list	At least <b>two</b> activities from the outstanding list  OR  At least <b>five</b> activities from the meeting or exceeding expectations list

**Leadership and Service – Meeting or Exceeding Expectations Activities and Documentation**

- Service on department-level committees as a member
- Service on college-level committees as a member
- Service on campus or system level committees as a member
- Contribution to diversity, such as involvement in DEI departmental, college, or campus committees or Task Forces
- Service to local school district and/or educational partners
- Formal mentoring of peers and colleagues (e.g., COE mentoring committee)
- Developing/delivering professional development or workshops for the community
- Attending UCCS commencement ceremonies

- Attending program/College of Education (COE) completion ceremonies
- Attending other major department/COE functions: e.g., Alumni & Friends, COE Partnership Breakfast, etc.
- Review of tenure/promotion cases from the department, other departments on campus,
- Informal mentoring of peers and colleagues
- Participation in professional activities (e.g., officer, committee member, organizing conferences or workshops, site visits, in-service training)
- Writing letters of support or recommendation for students
- Writing letters of recommendation or support for colleagues
- Nominating students or colleagues for Fellowships, Awards, etc.
- Providing a media interview
- External consultation
- Establishing community partnerships (e.g., internship for students)
- Participation in career development activities (e.g., workshops, conference, summer schools, seeking and using a research mentor)

### **Leadership and Service – 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 and/or CU committee
- Participation in UCCS faculty governance as chair or in significant leadership position
- 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.)