

Physics TT AMR feedback with responses from the Physics Department March 2022

Strengths:

- Inclusion of the option of multiple-year performance for long term projects
- Emphasis on multiple measure of teaching effectiveness
- Page 2: Statement on collaborative research and preference for peer review
- Page 2: Statement on the impacts of major life events
- Page 2: Statement on faculty rank factors (ie., early career having lower expectations for service).
- Page 4: Starting with meeting expectations and then adding to it for each subsequent level adds clarity and is easy to follow.
- Page 4: Great statement on “creating an engaging and inclusive” teaching environment to meet expectations
- Inclusion of professional development
- Page 7: statement on involvement with DEI in points for service/leadership
- Page 7: Statement on outside service value “to the extent that it contributes to effectiveness as a faculty member” (could potentially broaden it by saying to extent that contributes to the mission of UCCS)
- Appendix A is a helpful guide (but see suggestions below).
- Consideration of professionalism as a minimum component.

Suggestions to Consider:

In general, we appreciate, largely agree with and have implemented most of the suggestions. We recognize the need to maintain some flexibility within the evaluation process while still giving guidance. We do not feel that a check-box system is appropriate for encouraging the broad range of professional development and interests that our faculty exhibit. As such, there were several suggestions that we prefer not to implement. Our specific responses are provided below.

- Provide information in the introductory statement on
 - the value of annual reviews (e.g., to encourage/discourage behavior, to set goals for the future); a statement has been added in the opening paragraph
 - links to the APS requirement; links to all CU System and Regent policies have been added in the opening paragraph.
- Consider including the development of annual goals as a minimum component. Our faculty tend to work on projects that are longer than one year. We have not observed problems with faculty making good progress toward these long-term goals. The setting of short term (annual) goals does not seem to be a valuable inclusion for our faculty.
- Consider including the value of DEI-related activities in teaching and research. (broadening participation in physics, for example) We have added a DEI statement at the beginning of the section on Annual merit evaluation standards to emphasize the significance of DEI activities in all aspects of the annual review.

- Throughout: Consider using the more inclusive pronoun “they” instead of he/she or his/her or reword so pronoun use is not needed [Thanks for catching this. We have corrected it in the two places that it occurred.](#)
 - Page 4 d: this is the same metric for both exceeding and outstanding; there should be a distinction here. Consider that bonus activities are metrics of outstanding and integrate rather than into that rating. [We have now differentiated the metrics for these two levels.](#)
 - The numeric information “adds about .2 or .5 to a score” is confusing as there is no information on what total score is possible and how that maps onto meeting expectations. [We added clarification on the use and purpose of these bonus factors and their significance relative to a total score number.](#)
 - Page 4: What is “effective mentoring”? Consider retention and graduation rates as possible metrics and/or student assessments of mentoring. What is a “substantial” number of students? [We added a statement in the teaching section which discusses effective mentoring and how it can be measured. We also removed the word “substantial” and indicated a small range for the number of students.](#)
 - Page 4: Consider including “Winning a teaching award,” “professional development in teaching,” and “developing a new program” somewhere in lists either for Exceeding or Outstanding rather than as “bonus” points. [Winning a teaching award and developing a new program are not events that happen for a faculty member on an annual basis. They are more likely to happen rarely and so they make more sense as bonus points rather than as an annual expectation.](#)
- Page 5: Consider opening this section with standards for “meets expectations” as with the teaching section. This offers a nice baseline. [We have restructured each section \(T, R, S\) to begin with meets expectations and build on this.](#)
- Page 5: How are patents considered? They are in Appendix A but unclear how valued they are. [We have explicitly added this as another element \(e\) in the lists for all three levels of research and creative work criteria since we do value the receipt of a patent comparably to other criteria.](#)
 - Is a PI on an external grant evaluated the same as a Co-PI? - [We have added a statement under additional guidance in the research and creative works section that specifies that both co-authors and co-PIs are regarded the same as first authors and PI if they have the same level of effort.](#)
 - Page 5: Consider adding that attracting and retaining underrepresented students is a highly valued activity [We have included this in our DEI statement referenced above.](#)
 - Page 4-6: Consider adding a statement to each section (teaching, scholarship, leadership) 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). [We have added a statement in the Annual merit evaluation standards section which addresses this for all aspects of the review process.](#)
 - Page 6: under “Service & Leadership,” consider adding “college” service to your opening sentence (“The department recognizes service to the *college*, campus, community and to our profession.”) [We have added department and college to the list to clarify all three levels of campus activities.](#)
 - Page 7: How many service activities is “many”? How many is “several”? [We need to leave some flexibility here and not get into a system of checking off boxes. The number](#)

of activities needed depends on their quality and quantity which is specified earlier in the document. Not all things can be explicitly quantified.

- Is a publication with a student considered teaching? Research? Both? It appears in Appendix A under research but is suggested in the section under teaching. It can be considered an aspect of mentoring students as well as research. We have included it explicitly in our new statement on student mentoring in the teaching section to clarify the dual consideration.
- Consider adding a section on the rules for how someone can challenge their rating. We have added a statement at the end of the Introduction section which reminds faculty that disagreements should first be discussed with the chair and that decisions reached at the department level may be appealed to the dean.
- Appendix A Teaching Section first few items are not criteria but are instead evidence (peer review, FCQs). We relabeled the appendix to make it more clear that the lists are not explicit criteria but rather factors that can be considered and used in the annual evaluation process.
- Appendix B is kind of old (2008). There are a handful of things that no longer apply. Consider quoting sections from this document rather including the entire thing. We edited the original document to bring it up to date and to make it more specific to the teaching of physics. We feel that the edited version is appropriate to include to emphasize the important role of teaching and learning in our department.