

# **Economics Department Annual Merit Review Policy**

## **TT and IRC Faculty**

### **Approved by Department 03/17/2022**

Performance evaluations for all faculty members of the Department of Economics will be conducted annually. Consistent with the faculty member's duties, their contribution to teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service will be evaluated based on these written performance standards which were developed by the faculty of the Department of Economics. In annual merit evaluations, the assigned workload of a faculty member will be considered.

To assist in the annual performance evaluation process, a faculty member, except when on leave, must provide written evidence of their performance, using the appropriate format for reporting scholarly and other activities, as prescribed by the campus, college, and the Department. As part of this yearly documentation, a faculty member will also provide a current CV, a self-evaluation, and self-ratings of performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The Economics Department Chair also rates each faculty member in teaching, research, and service, and then submits that rating to the Dean of College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), for further evaluation at the college level. The Chair will meet with each faculty member to discuss the yearly evaluation as part of a collaborative process in support of faculty development. The faculty member has the right to append a response to the annual performance rating determined by the department chair. Faculty members who fail to provide such written evidence will be evaluated as "below expectations." If the faculty member disagrees with the performance rating received at the college level, a grievance may be submitted to the CLAS Salary Grievance Committee, and the process for such a grievance can be found in CLAS Policies & Procedures Manual.

The annual performance evaluation provides the basis for individual performance ratings which serves as the basis for annual merit and other pay adjustments. The performance rating is the overall summary rating of the individual's performance which utilizes the following five to one (5-1) point summary rating: "Outstanding" (5), "Exceeding Expectations" (4), "Meeting Expectations" (3), "Below Expectations" (2), and "Fails to Meet Expectations" (1).

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members who receive a rating of "below expectations" or "fails to meet expectations" as the result of their annual performance evaluation must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Plan (PIA). The guidelines for these activities are found in Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 508 Faculty Performance Evaluation. A faculty member who disagrees with the annual performance rating may request a peer review of their annual performance record. Subsequently, a faculty member who believes the primary unit's evaluation is incorrect may appeal the rating through the established grievance procedures in CLAS. These procedures can be found in CLAS Policies & Procedures Manual.

Here is a list of university rules and policies which are relevant to the annual faculty performance evaluation.

[Regent Policy 5.C.4\(B\)](#)

[APS 1009 Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation](#)

[APS 5008 Faculty Performance Evaluation](#)

[APS 1006 Differentiated Annual Workloads for Faculty](#)

[CLAS Policies & Procedures Manual](#)

### **Annual Performance Standards**

Consistent with the faculty member's duties, the faculty member's annual contribution to teaching, scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and, where applicable, other activities specific to the unit, shall be evaluated based on the following criteria. The department recognizes that different faculty ranks may have different expectations and those can be taken into account.

#### **Teaching**

To be considered "Meeting Expectations" for teaching, faculty are expected to achieve a score of at least 3.0 using the criteria below. In addition, as a minimum, faculty should provide a clear and comprehensive syllabus for each class, adequately prepare for and teach scheduled courses, communicate with students clearly and provide feedback in a manner that is timely and respectful, maintain regular office hours (in-person or virtual), evaluate students in a timely manner, allow chair observation of in-person classes if requested, and provide the chair access to course content (for example, access to LMS course shell, reading lists, etc.) if requested for both online classes and in-person courses.

To be considered "Exceeding Expectations" for teaching faculty are expected to achieve a score of at least 4.0 using the criteria below. To be considered "Outstanding" for teaching faculty are expected to achieve a score of at least 5.0 using the criteria below.

The annual teaching merit review shall be composed of the following three criteria, as detailed below: 1) Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ); 2) Other Contributions to Teaching; 3) Teaching Portfolio.

#### **1) FCQ:**

The faculty member shall use, for each course, an index which will be the average of the mean scores of questions 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 of the system-level FCQ. This index will be averaged with the scores obtained in the following two questions for each course:

- Q1) How likely are you to recommend this instructor to another student?
- Q2) How likely are you to recommend this course to another student?

Since FCQ answers have a different range than the existing individual performance rating, the average FCQ score  $[(\text{Index} + \text{Q1} + \text{Q2})/3]$  shall be transformed to the appropriate annual individual performance rating range. After the FCQ course score has been adjusted to the annual merit evaluation scale, it may be adjusted according to the following course characteristics:

- Required major courses (1010, 1050, 2020, 2810, 3010, 3020 and 4990): add 0.15 to course FCQ score;
- Heavy course load (FCQ question 5 score greater than departmental average): add 0.15 to course FCQ score;
  - If this is the first time you taught the course: add 0.25 to course FCQ score;
  - If enrollment is greater than 70 students per section: add 0.25 to course FCQ score;
  - If the course is taught online or remote asynchronously: add 0.25 to course FCQ score.

All FCQ course scores shall be averaged for a faculty FCQ score.

Since FCQ answers range from 1-7, the average FCQ score  $[(\text{Index} + \text{Q1} + \text{Q2})/3]$  shall be transformed to a 1-5 scale in accordance with the existing annual merit evaluation range.

## **2) Other Contributions to Teaching:**

The faculty member may demonstrate evidence of teaching contributions through additional means and complement their FCQ score. An extensive list of common accomplishments that meet the department's criteria are shown below.

- Completion of teaching enhancement course [e.g., Faculty Resource Center (FRC) programs]: add 0.10 per completed enhancement course to faculty FCQ score.
- Attendance or participation at teaching conference: add 0.10 per event to faculty FCQ score.
- Receipt of teaching grant: add 0.10 per grant to faculty FCQ score.
- Supervision of student internship or independent study: add 0.10 per 3 credit hours to faculty FCQ score.
- Teaching recognition:
  - o CLAS or UCCS Teaching Award: add 0.5 per award to faculty FCQ score.
  - o Nomination to a teaching award (no self-nominations): add 0.1 per nomination to faculty FCQ score.
  - o Other teaching awards and nominations shall be included and explained in "Other."

- Significant course revision such as modality change, new course development: add 0.10 per course to faculty FCQ score.
- Other (Explain): The faculty member may include other contributions here [e.g. publishing of Open Educational Resources (OER), attendance at student-support events such as Veteran training, Ethics roundtable, Teaching DEI initiatives teaching Economics for the Center for Economic Education or for the community]. Contributions that may be used for Service or Research may not be double counted in Teaching.

### **3) Teaching Portfolio:**

The faculty member should submit a teaching portfolio containing supporting evidence of their contributions to teaching. Faculty are expected to provide a brief summarizing document including:

- Course information: the faculty member should inform the reader about their course load, approximate enrollment, teaching modalities and specific courses taught in the year under review.
- Serving Students: the faculty member should inform the reader about how their teaching has served UCCS students and the Economics department that year.
- Reflection: the faculty member should inform the reader on the evolution of teaching accomplished during the review year, which should include a reflection on the goals established independently or with the department chair the year prior to this review.
- Forecasting: the faculty member should inform the reader on new goals and objectives the faculty member hopes to accomplish in the following year. These goals and objectives shall be discussed with the department chair and shall be used for reflection in the following year's teaching statement.

Portfolio materials include, but are not limited to, peer evaluations, course materials, evidence of course material preparation, assessment activities, social media engagement related to teaching and evidence of use of innovative teaching technologies.

### **Research**

The annual research and scholarship (research henceforth) merit review shall be composed of the following two criteria: 1) a Research Rating; 2) a Research Statement.

#### **1) Research Rating:**

The faculty member should report their research rating as their assessment of research for the relevant period of review.

For faculty under a differentiated workload during the review period, more (fewer) points will be required for the associated rating depending on if their research workload is larger (smaller). The faculty member should calculate their adjusted point total by multiplying the number of points earned by forty then dividing that number by their differentiated workload. For example, a faculty member on a 30 percent research

workload who earned 15 points in a year would have a final adjusted point total equal to  $15 \times (40/30) = 20$  points on a 40% workload contract equivalent. Their final rating would be a 5 (see table below).

The table below provides the point conversion:

<b>Faculty on a 40% research contract</b>	<b>Research Rating</b>
18	5
15	4.75
12	4.5
9	4.25
6	4
3	3.75
2	3.5
1	3
0	1

The following list of eligible research activities is comprehensive but not exhaustive. Faculty members must justify point allocation for all activities associated with a range of possible points. Faculty members who participated in research activities not listed should explain this/these contribution/s in “Other (Explain).”

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Points</b>
Article in progress:	
• Work on draft	1
• Submission to peer-reviewed journal	2
• Revise and Resubmit Status at peer-reviewed journal	3-5
Article publication at peer-reviewed journal	6-15
Book in progress:	
• Proposal submitted to academic press	2
• Book under contract with academic press	3-5
• Work on book under contract with academic press	6-8
Book publication at academic press	15-20
Book editor (published at academic press)	8-10
Book chapter	5-10

Grant proposal (non-funded)	2
Funded grant	2-6
Receipt of research award	6-10
Research seminar given	2
Conference presentation	2-4
Conference discussant	1
Other (explain): _____	-

Examples of other scholarly accomplishments include, but are not limited to, publishing of editorial pieces in academic journals and other media, Contribution to DEI scholarship, publishing of non-peer reviewed or center reports, publishing of economic educational materials and participation in research seminars, workshops, colloquia and other events. Accomplishments that may be used for Service or Teaching may not be double counted in Research.

## **2) Research Statement:**

The faculty member should submit a short statement containing the following information about their research:

- Introduction: Statements on faculty goals and contributions to scholarship overall;
- Trajectory: a summary of the faculty member's 3 to 5 year research plans;
- Reflection: a summary of the faculty member's research development in the period under review;
- Forecasting: the faculty member should inform the reader on new goals and objectives the faculty member hopes to accomplish in the following year. These goals and objectives shall be discussed with the department chair in the review process and shall be used for reflection in the following year's research statement.

## **Service**

To be considered "Meeting Expectations" for service, all faculty are expected to participate in departmental meetings. In addition Department members are expected to behave in a professional and collegial manner and are also expected to contribute to our departmental climate of civility, respect, and inclusion.

To be considered "Exceeding Expectations" or "Outstanding" merit review shall be composed of the following criteria, as detailed below. We provide two separate point scales for faculty under 20% and 5% workloads to account for commonplace tenure-track/tenured and Instructional, Research and Clinical (IRC) faculty expectations.

For faculty under a differentiated workload during the review period, more (fewer) points will be required for the associated rating depending on if their workload is larger (smaller). The faculty member should calculate their adjusted point total by multiplying the number of points earned by twenty then dividing that number by their differentiated workload. For example, a faculty member on a 30 percent service workload who earned 15 points in a year would have a final adjusted point total equal to  $15 \times (20/30) = 10$  points on a 20% workload contract equivalent. Their final rating would be a 4 (see table below).

The table below provides the point conversions necessary for the service review for faculty on a 20% or 5% service contract.

Faculty on a 20% service contract	Faculty on a 5% service contract	Service Rating
18	6	5
15	5	4.75
12	4	4.5
9	3	4
6	2	3.5
3	1	3
0	0	1

The following list of eligible service activities is comprehensive but not exhaustive. Faculty members who participated in service activities, including DEI-related service, not listed should explain this/these contribution/s in "Other (Explain)." Contributions that may be used for Teaching or Research may not be double counted in Service.

### 1) Department:

Activity	Points
Department service (meetings and routine duties)	1
Department meeting secretary	1
Service on department or center committees	1
Service at open house or major/minor fair	0.5 per event
Service on primary unit committees (plus 1 point if committee chair)	2
Service on Assurance of Student Learning program (plus 2 if coordinator)	5
Service as center director	8
Service as department program supervisor	2
Service as departmental major advisor	4
Service as department chair	60

Interim department chair	15
Other (explain): _____	-

## 2) College, University or CU-System

Activity	Points
Service on minor college or campus committees (plus 2 points if committee chair)	2
Service on major college or campus committees (plus 4 points if committee chair)	4-7
Other (explain): _____	-

## 3) Profession:

Activity	Points
Review of articles/manuscripts (add 0.5 per additional round)	1 per article
Public presentation (explain)	1
Chair at a session in a professional meeting	1
President of a professional organization	10-15
Officer in a professional organization	1-4
Editor in Chief of a journal	15-20
Member of Editorial Board of a journal	1-4
Professional consulting	1-4
Service on a committee external to the university	1-4
Service to a professional association	1-4
Service on a MA, MS, PhD, or similar committee	2
Other (explain): _____	-

## 4) Community

Activity	Points
Public Presentation (explain)	1
Service on a committee external to the university	1-4
Other (explain): _____	-