

UCCS Women's and Ethnic Studies Criteria for Annual Reviews

First Draft submitted Dec 1, 2021

First Revision submitted March 18, 2023

Second Revision submitted April 19, 2024

Final Draft Approved December 3, 2025

It is the job of each faculty member ranked at any level of Instructor or Professor to evaluate themselves annually. Following submission of self-evaluations, it is the job of the Program Director 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 program.

It is the job of the Chair to meet with faculty to discuss their assessments **yearly**, and to alert faculty in a timely manner to low performance and to share ideas and feedback for professional growth. Anything below a 3 in any category will require a meeting between the director and the faculty member, a plan of remedial action agreed upon and signed by both the faculty member and the director, and a follow-up meeting midway through the following year.

As part of this review, the WEST Program especially values evidence of attention to and embodiment of principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in all three areas of evaluated performance. We acknowledge that this evaluation process, co-created by the faculty member and the Chair, should include some reasonable flexibility to account for significant disruptions and/or major life transitions that impact a faculty member's contributions.

Process for resolving disputes about annual review ratings: Should a challenge or dispute arise about any aspect of the annual review process; the first step is for the faculty member to meet/discuss their concerns with the Chair. If the dispute is not satisfactorily resolved after meeting with the Chair, the next step is for the faculty member to follow-up with the LAS Dean.

Faculty may assess themselves as falling between rankings when they have accomplished several of the indicators for a given ranking (e.g., 4.4 out of 5). It is the job of the individual faculty member to make the case for the self-assessed ranking. For each area (teaching, research, and service) there are two ways to receive an assessment of Outstanding. First, faculty can receive an assessment of Outstanding by clearly demonstrating any one of the measures in the Outstanding Indicators list. Second, faculty may also be judged as Outstanding if they demonstrate at least six different indicators of success from the corresponding Exceeding Expectations list.

Some of the criteria from one area could overlap with another area and the faculty member can choose which area to apply that component (but can only apply it in one area).

Overall Components for Meeting Expectations

- At minimum, faculty are expected to exhibit collegiality and respect
- Faculty are expected to submit their annual self-evaluation

Teaching

Meeting Expectations (3.0)

To be considered “Meeting Expectations” for teaching, faculty are expected to provide a clear and comprehensive syllabus, adequately prepare for, and teach scheduled courses, review and/or update course content in relation to the field, communicate with students clearly and provide feedback in a manner that is respectful, advise undergraduate students, maintain regular office hours and/or be available for virtual meetings with students, and evaluate students in a timely manner. Contribute to the teaching in the major through teaching at least one core course (Intro, Theory, Capstone-flagged) a year.

4 (Exceeding Expectations)

To receive an assessment of Exceeding Expectations for teaching (starting at 4.0), faculty must clearly demonstrate the criteria for “Meeting Expectations” in teaching as well as any two of the following measures. For each different additional measure listed below, faculty may add 0.20 to their scores. If there are enough indicators (at least 5 more), a case may be made for an assessment of Outstanding.

Exceeding Expectations Indicators

- E1 Incorporation of high-impact teaching practices, including engaged, student-centered teaching methods, (such as service-learning projects), innovative technology, and creating community in the classroom
- E2 Development and teaching of a new course
- E3 An extensive revision of an existing course or complete change in teaching modality (e.g., in person to online asynchronous)
- E4 Teaching outside of the classroom: e.g., one of the following, supervision of multiple independent study, internship, or directed research or serving on honors thesis master’s thesis, doctoral thesis,
- E5 Contributing to goals of the department— e.g. teaching more than one core/required course, capstone flagged course per year, summer courses, adding waitlisted students to a course (going above the cap),
- E6 A strong peer-review of teaching letter
- E7 Significant mentorship of students (this justification can be quantitative or qualitative and can include mentorship of students outside of UCCS)
- E8 Participation in professional development on teaching--e.g., curriculum transformation workshops)
- E9 Accomplishments in pedagogy of teaching and learning
- E10 Integration of students into research opportunities
- E11 Strong FCQs (average for all courses between 6.0-6.49 for questions 1, 4, 8, 10)
- E12 Guest/invitational lectures across campus or in the community
- E13 Teaching activities that include principles of DEI which involve increased risk factor in the teaching venture, recognizing controversial, difficult/challenging topics, etc.

E14 Publications/scholarship on teaching, including publishing a textbook (Faculty member can choose whether to attribute this activity under teaching or research/scholarship)

E15 Teaching collaboration regionally, nationally, and internationally

E16 New and different forms of dissemination and impact of teaching (e.g., participating in a major podcast; interviews with mainstream media; webinar development, recruiting and retaining underrepresented students).

5 (Outstanding)

FCQs are not required as an indicator of teaching success, but faculty can include them as part of their self-assessment. To receive an assessment of Outstanding in teaching, faculty must clearly demonstrate the criteria for “Meeting Expectations” in teaching as well as any **one** of the following “Outstanding indicators.” Faculty may also be judged as Outstanding if they demonstrate at least seven different indicators of success from the “Exceeding Expectations Indicators” above.

Outstanding indicators

O1 Public recognition of excellence in teaching (awards, etc.)

O2 (Co-)development and public dissemination of an innovative high-impact teaching practice

O3 Truly exceptional FCQs (average for all courses above 6.5 for questions 1, 4, 8, 10)

O4 Guest/invitational lectures/keynotes on teaching/pedagogy nationally or internationally

Research and scholarly work

3 (Meeting Expectations)

To be considered “Meeting Expectations” for research and scholarly work, faculty are expected to maintain an active program of research and scholarly/creative work and to make steady progress in generating publications and other means for dissemination of ongoing scholarly/creative work.

4 (Exceeding Expectations)

To receive an assessment of Exceeding Expectations for research and scholarly work (starting at 4.0), faculty must clearly demonstrate the criteria for “Meeting Expectations” for research and scholarly work, as well as any **one** of the following indicators. For each additional different indicator listed, faculty may add 0.20 to their score of 4.0. If there are enough indicators (six total), a case may be made for an assessment of Outstanding.

Exceeding Expectations Indicators

E1 Successful publication of a peer-reviewed book chapter, edited volume, poem, or professional report (Includes co-authorship in any position-first author, second author, etc.) *For this indicator, multiple publications can count more than once*

- E2 Successful publication of a non-peer reviewed/refereed article, book chapter, book, professional report, or creative works (Includes co-authorship in any position-first author, second author, etc.)
- E3 Documented progress on a manuscript
- E4 Development of an exhibit or artistic piece or performance
- E5 Presentation at a conference
- E6 Presentation at a public/community venue (if not counted under Service)
- E7 Submission of research product (article, abstract, poster, e.g.) for peer review NOTE: If a “product” is for peer review and it is published, the publication counts (E1 or E2) instead of the peer-review. A faculty member cannot double count these products in the same year.
- E8 Public outreach and scholarship (Examples: Op-eds, interviews)
- E9 Demonstration of innovation, risk-taking and collaboration in research and creative projects.
- E10 Recipient as PI or co-PI of externally or internally funded grant under \$10,000 (not double-counted if same year as submission (E11))
- E11 Submission of a grant or contract proposal under \$10,000 as PI or co-PI
- E12 Research/scholarship collaboration regionally, nationally, and internationally
- E13 Scholarship activities that include principles of DEI
- E14 Publications/Scholarship on teaching (Faculty member can choose whether to attribute this activity under teaching or research/scholarship)
- E15 Scholarship that leaves open the option for new and different forms of dissemination and impact (e.g., participating in a major podcast; interviews with mainstream media; webinar development, recruiting and retaining underrepresented students).

5 (Outstanding)

To receive an assessment of Outstanding in Research and Scholarly Work, faculty must clearly demonstrate the criteria for “Meeting Expectations” in research and scholarly work, as well as any **one** of the following “Outstanding indicators”. Faculty may also be judged as Outstanding if they demonstrate at least six indicators of success from the “Exceeding Expectations Indicators” list above.

Outstanding indicators

- O1 Successful publication of a peer-reviewed article, book, collection of, or full-length creative work, novel, edited volume, or collection. (Includes co-authorship in any position-first author, second author, etc.)
- O2 Signing of book contract
- O3 Submission of a major grant or contract proposal as PI, co-PI, investigator, or co-investigator (>\$10,000)
- O4 Recipient of externally or internally funded grant proposal as PI, co-PI, investigator, or co-investigator (>\$10,000)
- O5 Opening of a public installation
- O6 New artistic or professional performance or exhibit
- O7 Successful completion of a community-based research project
- O8 Public recognition of excellence in research/scholarship/creative work (awards, honors, etc.)

Faculty may alternatively be judged as Outstanding if they demonstrate at least 6 examples of different “Exceeding Expectations” measures denoting research or scholarly work.

Service and Leadership

3 (Meeting Expectations)

At minimum, all faculty are expected to participate in departmental/program meetings and to complete letters of recommendation for students when appropriate. Anything beyond this, for an instructor or pre-initial reappointment review faculty member, would constitute outstanding service. To be considered “Meeting Expectations” for service, substantive service to the WEST program as appropriate by position and years in rank is required, regardless of other service activities. In addition, department members are expected to behave in a collegial manner and are also expected to contribute to our departmental/program climate of respect and inclusion. In general, more senior faculty are expected to provide greater levels of service and leadership in the department. At a minimum, all faculty are expected to participate in departmental/program meetings and job search activities.

4 (Exceeding Expectations)

To receive an assessment of Exceeding Expectations (starting at 4.0), faculty beyond the initial reappointment review must clearly demonstrate the criteria for “Meeting Expectations” in Service as well as any one of the following. Faculty who have undergone their initial reappointment review may be ranked between 4.0 and 5.0 by demonstrating multiple indicators of exceeding expectations (up to 0.2 for each different additional indicator). When these are sufficient (six total), a case may be made for an assessment of Outstanding.

Exceeding Expectations Indicators

E1 Active performance of exceptional duties within the program (e.g. chairing a committee inside program, serving on assessment committee, newsletter, attending more than one orientation events, etc.)

E2 Active participation on committees or other service opportunities **beyond WEST but within the University**

E3 A significant leadership role *in a section* of a professional association or organization (e.g., President, Vice President, Secretary/Treasurer, or their equivalent)

E4 Active participation or leadership role in service to the **community**

E5 Active contributions to shared governance

E6 Serving on 3 or fewer department/college/campus/system committees (or serving on more than 3 but not chairing/co-chairing any)

- E7 Guest lecturing for other faculty, departments, or public organizations-- faculty can choose which category
- E8 Review of book manuscript
- E9 Review of multiple journal articles and/or grant proposals
- E10 Active participation in faculty mentoring (including writing letters of support or external reviewer for tenure cases)
- E11 Paid service as external reviewer for a program
- E12 Development of a new departmental or interdisciplinary program
- E13 Directing a center or institute
- E14 Demonstrated commitment to/focus on DEI in leadership/service.
- E15 Volunteering or delivering lectures in the community
- E16 Chairing a committee outside the department
- E17 Providing (uncompensated) trainings/workshops on the campus or in the community
- E18 Serving as faculty advisor to a student organization
- E19 Attending faculty meetings and annual retreats in service to two departments (due to split appointment)
- E20 TBD

5 (Outstanding)

To receive an assessment of Outstanding in service and leadership, faculty beyond the initial reappointment review **must** clearly demonstrate the criteria for “Meeting Expectations” in service as well as **any one** of the following indicators:

Outstanding Indicators

- O1 Chairing a department (e.g. chairing the WEST Department)
- O2 IRC faculty in any director role
- O3 Serving on 4 or more department/college/campus/system committees (chairing at least one of those committees)
- O4 A significant leadership role in a professional association or community organization (e.g., President, Vice President, Secretary/Treasurer)

Faculty beyond the initial reappointment review may also be judged as Outstanding if they demonstrate multiple examples (six or more) of the above markers denoting service that exceeds expectations.

Following our criteria for promotion and tenure, tenure-track faculty in their first two years, and instructors at any level, will be assessed as Outstanding when they demonstrate any of the measures for Exceeding Expectations.