

College of Business
Faculty Annual Evaluation Policy
As Approved on September 11, 2015 – Effective January 1, 2016
As revised July 21, 2016
As revised April 6, 2017
Revised February 15, 2019
Revised May 17, 2019
Revised March 8, 2021
Revised JUN 18, 2022

This policy clarifies the application of regent, system, and university standards and processes to the College of Business's Annual Performance Planning and Review and addresses annual faculty evaluation criteria. Faculty are evaluated in the areas of intellectual contribution and professional development, teaching, and service; the three components of the annual workload. A rating of exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations is assigned to each area. After evaluating each area, an Overall Rating of outstanding, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations, or fails to meet expectations is assigned based on the faculty member's workload and rating of each three components. NOTE: According to regent rules, annual merit evaluations are not necessarily indicators of successful Promotion and Tenure applications.

This document is developed for Tenured,/Tenure-track (TTT), and Instructional, Research, and Clinical (IRC) faculty and does not address policies or practices for at will lecturers. The policy is intended to fall within the rules of the regents, the CU system, and the university.

APS 1009 (revised) Section III: *"A. The voting faculty of each primary unit shall determine the goals and components for evaluating teaching in the unit. Primary unit components shall take into account any requirements from the campus or school/college. Individual faculty members shall be evaluated based on components selected from the list approved by the primary unit."*

"Consistent with regent laws and policies, the performance of faculty members will be evaluated and rated annually. The annual performance evaluation provides the basis for individual annual merit increases. Annual merit increases and other factors are used in setting final compensation. The annual performance rating is the overall summary rating of the individual's annual performance and constitutes the public record of rating, in accordance with the Colorado Open Records Act." ([APS 5008 Performance Rating for Faculty Part I](#))

"Annual performance evaluations for all faculty members shall be conducted by each campus, using a peer evaluation process. Consistent with the faculty member's duties, their contribution to teaching, scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and, where applicable, other activities specific to their unit (e.g., clinical activity, librarianship), shall be evaluated based on written performance standards developed by the faculty of the academic unit (primary unit annual evaluation criteria) and any additional written expectations agreed to by the faculty member and the unit." ([Regent Policy 5.C.4](#))

The policy also closely follows the guidelines and definitions relevant to AACSB and any faculty member who fails to meet appropriate AACSB faculty qualifications for the year will receive an overall annual evaluation of "Fails to Meet Expectations" regardless of any other activity.

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation Process

The Annual Evaluation Process consists of three levels of review: Department Chair, COB Peer Evaluation Committee and approval by the Dean. The Overall Performance Rating will be determined based on the faculty member's workload and the corresponding rating of each three

components (research, teaching, and service).

Refer to the Pilot Policy for Peer Evaluation of overall annual performance.

1. Department Chairs will nominate award winners for intellectual contributions, teaching, service, and outstanding faculty member. The Executive Committee will decide the award winners in intellectual contributions, teaching, and service. Tenured and tenure-track faculty will vote for the outstanding faculty award winner from among the nominees of the Department Chairs as affirmed by the Executive Committee. Any ties will be resolved by the Executive Committee. (See College of Business Awards Policy for a detailed description of the COB awards and processes.)
2. When faculty take a sabbatical or leave of absence their annual evaluation of teaching and service will be based on the portion of the year for which they are present. Because evaluation of research uses a three-year window no adjustments for sabbatical or leave of absence are necessary.
3. Any annual merit raise will be set by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee.
4. A faculty member may be considered for a specific development plan if he/she receives a rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” in any of the three categories in any year.
5. Faculty Responsibility Statements, or professional plans, may be modified during the planning process to reflect feedback from the Dean’s office and changes in service assignments required for the next academic year.

B. Annual Evaluation of Intellectual Contribution and Professional Development

All tenured/tenure-track faculty must maintain Scholarly Academic qualifications unless they have a separate workload agreement with the Dean. All instructional, research, and clinical faculty must, at a minimum, maintain Instructional Practitioner qualifications. Consistent with the AACSB International standards and College of Business Faculty Qualifications and Sufficiency Policy, the following annual evaluation criteria apply.

Annual intellectual contribution evaluation for tenured and tenure track faculty: Scholarly Academic (SA)

	Peer Reviewed Journal (PRJ) publications over past 5 years (from the COB journal list)¹	+	Other Intellectual Contributions over past 3 years	+	Research-related Service over past 3 years
Exceeds Expectations	One tier 2 and one tier 3, or one tier 1		Any 2 high impact activities ² from SA faculty qualifications table		
Meets Expectations	2 tier 3		Any 3 activities ² from SA faculty qualifications table		
Below Expectations	Less than 2 tier 3 or No PRJ		Any 3 activities ² from SA faculty qualifications table		

Table set for 40% IC workload. Each 10% addition (reduction) to research workload would require one additional (less) tier 3 publication during the three-year period.

¹ For faculty hired immediately upon completion of their PhD, the completed dissertation counts as a Tier 2 + Tier 3 PRJ. Additional requirements will be waived for the first two years.

² Three activities not identified as high impact activities equals one high impact activity.

Annual Professional Development evaluation for instructional, research, and clinical track faculty:

Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), or Instructional Practitioner (IP)

	Minimum Professional Development activities from either SA or PA faculty qualification table over past five years
Exceeds Expectations	2 qualifying activities from a combination of two different categories
Meets Expectations	1 qualifying activity
Below Expectations	No qualifying activity but still IP

For convenience, the Scholarly Academic and Practice Academic activities tables are shown below. Journal Tiers and Book Quadrants are in the Journal List and Book Publication Policies.

Scholarly Academic Qualification Activities	
Category: JOURNAL ARTICLES	
*Peer Reviewed Article	Journal on COB Journal List
Category: BOOKS, BOOK CHAPTERS AND CASES	
*Books & Book Chapters	Quad 1
Books & Book Chapters	Quad 2 & 3
Published Case	Case not in peer-reviewed (e.g. online, textbooks)
Published Instructor Material	Instructor Manual/Test Bank
Published Software	Software
Category: OTHER INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTION	
*Proceedings (full paper) Refereed and Published	International/National
*Presentation – Refereed	International/National
*Keynote or Major Invited Conference Speaker	International/National
*Submission of Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) grant proposal	
Proceedings (full paper) Refereed and Published	Regional/Local
*Research Note, Commentary, Column	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 1 or 2
*Other publication	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 1 or 2
Other publication	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 3 or non-refereed
Presentation – Refereed	Regional/Local

Scholarly Academic Qualification Activities	
Presentation – Not Refereed	International/National
Presentation – Not Refereed	Regional/Local
Symposium	International/National
Guest/member on Conference Panel	International/National
Category: RESEARCH RELATED SERVICE	
*Editor	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 1 or tier 2
*Associate Editor	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 1 or tier 2
*Guest Editor	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 1 or tier 2
*Book Editor	Quad 1
*Board Member/Officer: Academic/Research Association	International/National
*Academic Conference	Chair of Program Committee/Track International/National
*Research Notes	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 1 or tier 2
*Editorial	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 1 or tier 2
Editor	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 3
Associate Editor	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 3
Guest Editor	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 3
Book Review Editor	Peer-reviewed Journal
Editorial Review Board Member	Peer-reviewed Journal
Reviewer: Article/Manuscript	Peer-reviewed Journal, Conference or Association
Reviewer: Book/Textbook/Grant	Peer-reviewed
Book Editor	Quad 2 or 3
Board Member/Officer: Academic/Research Association	Regional/Local
Academic Conference	Chair of Program Committee/Track Regional/Local
Academic Conference	Program Committee/Track Member
Academic Conference	Moderator/Facilitator/Discussant
Doctoral Consortium or Similar Panel	Presenter or panelist
External Review	Promotion and Tenure
Visiting Scholar	Research appointment
Media “hit”	Related to research activities
Grant submission or administration	External to CU system
Research Notes	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 3
Editorial	Peer-reviewed Journal tier 3
Dissertation Committee member	
Invited Research presentation at other research institutions	

*High impact

Practice Academic Qualification Activities	
Category: PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE	
Academic	Dean or Associate Dean in the College of Business (Full-time)
Academic	AACSB Initial/Continuous Improvement Review Team
Academic	AACSB Accreditation Mentor/Volunteer
Non-academic*	Current Practical Experience
Non-academic*	Responsibilities/Ownership in outside business
Non-academic*	Significant Consulting

Non-academic*	Semester long Faculty Internship
Non-academic*	Achieve Professional Licensure
Non-academic*	Meeting Annual Continuing Professional Education requirement for professional licensure
Category: SCHOLARSHIP	
Peer-reviewed Article	Professional Trade Journal that is not on the COB journal list
Non-Peer-reviewed Article	Professional Trade Journal
Publication	Article in business journal or magazine
Publication	Editorial in business journal or magazine
Publication	Business editorial in newspaper
Presentation	Practitioner conference
Category: SERVICE	
Professional	Expert Witness Testimony
Non-academic*	Board of Directors: for-profit organization
Non-academic*	Board Member/Advisor: not-for-profit organization
Non-academic*	Officer: International/National Practitioner Association
Non-academic*	Officer: Regional/Local Practitioner Association
Non-academic*	Industry Committee/Task Force/Working Group
Non-academic*	Professional Event Speaker
Non-academic*	Review Grant Applications for grants outside CU system
Non-academic*	Attend Professional Seminar/Workshop
Non-academic*	Media hit
Category: PRACTITIONER EDUCATION	
Non-academic*	Develop Executive Education course
Non-academic*	Teach Executive Education course
Non-academic*	Develop Continuing Professional Education course
Non-academic*	Teach Continuing Professional Education course

*Must be related to area of teaching

C. Annual Evaluation of Teaching

A long-time tradition of our College of Business has been to place a strong emphasis on teaching excellence. We hire for a commitment to teaching excellence, provide development opportunities for improving teaching skills, and take pride in the reputation we have for having committed, student-centered professors. It is our desire to create ways of evaluating teaching that encourage constant improvement, the willingness to try new ideas, and the flexibility to consider unusual circumstances without having to create allowances for the many factors that can influence FCQs. We are also committed to using the three CU System and AACSB standards of student evaluations, peer-evaluation, and self-evaluation in ways that are helpful and motivating. We welcome new ideas on how we can best achieve our desire to emphasize and value teaching excellence while fulfilling the requirements for evaluating teaching.

In accordance with the CU System policy and AACSB standards, three measures will be used for the annual evaluation of teaching. The rating for each measure ranges from below expectations, meet expectations, to exceed expectations. The final teaching evaluation is determined based on the individual

rating of the three measures. Below are the evaluation criteria.

1. **Developmental (formative) Peer-evaluations:** Peer evaluation of Teaching is to foster the culture of peer pedagogical learning and encourage continuous improvement. Through peer evaluation, a faculty member can improve teaching based on feedback from either a subject matter expert perspective or instructional design perspective, or both. Meanwhile, reviewing a peer's course can provide fresh ideas and insights that stimulate innovative updates and improvements in a reviewer's own courses.

Three options are available for peer-evaluation of teaching. A faculty member may select one of the three options listed below for their peer-evaluation. Each faculty member is required to undergo a teaching peer evaluation at least once every three years to meet expectation.

Option 1: Internal teaching peer review (Inside the COB): Rubrics from FRC; Documentation: Rubric + Response to peer review/improvement plan

Option 2: External teaching peer review (Outside the COB): Rubrics from FRC; Documentation: Rubric + Response to peer review/improvement plan

Option 3: Other peer reviews by a faculty teaching peer review committee or other course reviews conducted by educational organizations upon prior approval of COB peer review committee.

To be eligible for a peer evaluation of exceeds expectations, faculty member needs to fulfill one of the following over a three-year period:

- A faculty member conducts a peer evaluation for another faculty member at least once every three years (Use provided rubrics/walk through video, providing constructive feedback, help to develop improvement plan)
- A faculty member provides mentorship for another faculty member to help with teaching improvements (need rubric, details).
- Serve on the faculty teaching peer review committee.
- Involved in teaching development activities (need details; e.g. lead, present, organize etc.)
- The following factors are also considered: successful development and teaching of a new course, exceptional new curricula / program or course improvement, evidence of student engagement and active learning, rigor of the course, innovation in teaching, and other similar factors.

2. **Self-evaluation:** The second component of the teaching evaluation is a developmental statement regarding past and planned teaching improvements and their alignment with value created for UCCS students and the College of Business. To meet expectation, each faculty member will submit a short statement in Watermark in which they address the following 2 components:

1. Course information: the faculty member should inform the reviewer about their course load, approximate enrollment, teaching modalities and specific courses taught in the year under review.
2. Teaching improvements: the faculty member should inform the reviewer about how improvements to their teaching served UCCS students and the College of Business that year. Faculty member should reflect on how these improvements help to achieve the teaching improvement goal set by the previous year. When possible, faculty should explicitly connect these improvements to AACSB accreditation standards. Examples might include:
 - Adjustments made to curricula to ensure that knowledge and skills in these curricula remain aligned with the changing needs of post-graduate employers and students' development of lifelong learning mindsets. (AACSB Standard 4)

- The use of new technologies or the adoption of new instructional modalities to enhance students' technological competencies (AACSB Standard 4) and to improve the faculty's teaching effectiveness and impact. (AACSB Standard 7)
- Efforts undertaken to empower learner success among the many different student demographics represented at UCCS and within the College of Business. (AACSB Standard 6)

To achieve an exceed expectation rating, a faculty member provides the following teaching development plan stated in point 3.

3. Forecasted improvements: the faculty member should inform the reader on new goals and objectives the faculty member hopes to accomplish in the following year and their alignment with value created for UCCS students and the College of Business.

In addition to documenting past and planned changes regarding these topics faculty should use their self-evaluation to comment specifically on additional issues that might have negatively affected student evaluations (FCQs) in the corresponding academic year and if and how they can mitigate these issues in the future. Examples might include:

- The enforcement of instances of academic dishonesty and steps taken to lessen future instances (e.g., additional content in syllabi or class, redesigning assignments or exams to reduce opportunities for plagiarism or cheating, etc.).
- Lessons learned following a significant teaching innovation (e.g., adopting a new textbook, developing a new class, adopting a new teaching modality, etc.) and plans to use student feedback to improve upon initial innovations.
- Address comments that students provided in their FCQs.

Failure to submit a self-evaluation statement (point 1 and 2) will result in below expectations rating.

3. **Student evaluations:** Students in all sections of all courses will complete the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ). From the FCQs an average score will be computed which constitutes the student evaluation.
 - The following formulas shall be used in calculating FCQ scores for each course. The higher of the two scores will be used to evaluate teaching.
 - Course questions (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4) average
 - Instructor questions (Q7, Q8, Q9, Q10, Q11) average
 - Course FCQ = (course question average + instructor question average) / 2
 - The average of all classes taught by the faculty member shall be the faculty member's Overall FCQ.
 - In calculating the Overall FCQ of a class may be excluded for reasonable cause in the judgment of the Executive Committee.
 - An FCQ score equal to or greater than 5.8 is rated exceed expectations. An FCQ score equal to or greater than 4.8 is rated meet expectations. An FCQ score lower than 4.8 is rated below expectations.

Overall Teaching Evaluation

Faculty can earn a rating of up to Exceeds Expectations for the three measures for teaching evaluation: peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and FCQs.

Teaching	Peer Evaluation (3yrs)	Self Evaluation	FCQ (7pt Scale)
	Below Expectations	Below Expectations	Below Expectations (<4.8)
	Meet Expectations	Meet Expectations	Meet Expectations (>=4.8)
	Exceed Expectations	Exceed Expectations	Exceed Expectations(>=5.8)

The evaluation of the three measures shall result in a rating based on the following table.

	Final Teaching Evaluation (Peer, Self, FCQ)
Exceeds Expectations (E)	<u>2 out of 3 Exceed</u>
Meets Expectations (M)	M, M, M
Below Expectations (B)	All others

In extenuating circumstances, the faculty may make a case for adjustment to their FCQ rating. A Department Chair may adjust a faculty member's Annual Teaching Evaluation rating upward or downward one rating level to take into consideration factors that bear on a faculty member's teaching responsibilities and performance. Any adjustment, however, must be evaluated by the COB peer review committee in consultation with Dean before it is reflected in an individual's evaluation.

D. Annual Evaluation of Service

While service generally constitutes only 10% of our workload, it is critical to our mission. In the evaluation of uncompensated service, service to the college, the campus, the CU system, and the business community is considered. SA qualified faculty are expected to provide service to the discipline and such service is considered part of the research/IC evaluation. Service to the profession by SA qualified faculty will be evaluated as service. PA, SP, and IP qualified faculty must be actively involved in the business community and, such service, is first considered part of the professional development evaluation. Service to the profession beyond PA, SP, or IP maintenance activities will be evaluated as service.

Service activities have various levels of commitment, engagement, and impact. Faculty and their Department Chair will identify annual service commitments on the FRS such that faculty will know that they are meeting their service requirements. Going beyond these initial service assignments by taking on additional ad hoc service and attending citizenship activities will allow faculty to earn a higher annual service evaluation. As a member of the College of Business community, faculty are generally expected to attend important activities as identified and communicated by the Executive Committee.

As part of the annual evaluation process each faculty member will report in Watermark the impact of their service contributions. The Executive Committee will evaluate these reports and assign a service evaluation rating of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations.

E. Overall Annual Evaluation

Annual evaluations of faculty are based on ratings in each of the workload areas – intellectual contributions (SA faculty) or professional development (PA, SP and IP faculty), teaching, and service. Ratings for each area will be assigned as Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Below Expectations. Ratings and the corresponding proportion of workload are taken into consideration to determine an overall evaluation score for each faculty member.

Final evaluation ratings will be assigned based on the following table assuming a standard workload.:

T/TT faculty

Teaching (50%)	Research (40%)	Service (10%)
Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
Meet	Meet	Meet
Below	Below	Below
Overall Annual Evaluation		
	Outstanding (5)	All exceed
	Exceeds Expectations(4)*	Exceed in either T/R, and at least meet the other 2 categories
	Meets Expectations(3)	All 3 meet or higher
	Below Expectations(2)	Either T or R below expectations
	Fails to Meet Expectations(1)	2 out of 3 below expectations

*Differential workload

Exceeds if 2 of the 3 categories that make up a **majority of your workload**. Faculty can make a case if they think this evaluation table does not fit their differential workload.

IRC faculty

Teaching (80%)	Professional/Scholarly (10%)	Service (10%)
exceed	exceed	exceed
meet	meet	meet
below	below	below
Overall		
	Outstanding (5)	All exceed
	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exceed in T, and at least meet the other 2 categories
	Meets Expectations (3)	All 3 meet or higher
	Below Expectations (2)	1 below expectations
	Fails to Meet Expectations (1)	2 out of 3 below expectations

*Differential workload

Exceeds if 2 of the 3 categories that make up **a majority of your workload**. Faculty can make a case if they think this evaluation table does not fit their differential workload.

E. Consequences of Not Maintaining AACSB Faculty Qualifications

Any faculty member who does not maintain their AACSB faculty qualifications (SA, PA, SP, or IP) in any given year automatically receives an overall annual evaluation rating of “Fails to Meet Expectations” in that year. A tenured or tenure-track faculty member failing to maintain faculty qualifications will have an alternate workload as described in the Work Load Policy. An IRC faculty member will be given one year to regain faculty qualifications. If such qualifications are not regained in the following year, the faculty member’s contract will not be renewed.

F. Faculty on Sabbatical or Leave of Absence

If a faculty member is on sabbatical or leave of absence when annual evaluations are being conducted (typically in February) and cannot attend an evaluation meeting in person, alternate arrangements can be made (e.g. evaluation by phone, Teams, Zoom, Skype, etc.).

G. Appeal Process

Members of the faculty who feel that their evaluations in teaching, intellectual contributions, and/or service do not adequately reflect their true performance may make appeal. Such appeals must be initiated in writing within 30 days of an individual’s formal performance review. The initial appeal should be conducted through the respective Department Chair to the Executive Committee. A subsequent appeal may then be made to the Dean.