


<p>SCHOOL POLICY</p>  <p>University of Colorado Colorado Springs</p> <p>School of Public Affairs</p>	<p>POLICY NUMBER 200-02</p> <p>SUBJECT: Annual Faculty Evaluations</p> <p>APPROVED: November 30, 2021</p>
--	---

Consistent with APS 5008 Performance Rating for Faculty Part I, the performance of faculty members will be evaluated annually. The holistic performance evaluation provides the basis for individual performance ratings, merit, and other pay adjustments. The performance rating is the overall summary rating of the individual's performance and constitutes the public record of rating, in accordance with the Colorado Open Records Act.

The purpose of this policy is to specify the criteria and process for the evaluation of tenured, tenure-track, and instructors in the School of Public Affairs.

1. Process

- a. Faculty complete and turn in the Report of Scholarly, Professional and University Activities via the University's process (Watermark Faculty Success) by the first of February. All submissions are first reviewed by program directors and then by the dean. The goal will be to complete annual evaluations with feedback to faculty by March 1.
- b. Faculty members will be evaluated on intellectual contributions/professional development, teaching, and service. The first level of evaluation will be conducted via a peer-review process. Tenured and tenure-track faculty constitute a peer group and instructors constitute a separate peer group. Review groups are also divided by discipline. Program directors will make recommendations to the dean after reviewing peer evaluations, and the dean will record the final evaluation. Evaluations will be recorded on the annual Performance Evaluation Summary. A copy of each faculty member's summary form is maintained by the dean's office and forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' office as required by university policy.
- c. Faculty on sabbatical or leave will elect to either complete the reporting process, or use the previous year's recorded evaluation by informing the dean of their preference. Otherwise, those who do not submit the Report of

Scholarly, Professional and University Activities will be ineligible for merit raises.

- d. Annual merit raises (as available) will be set by the dean in consultation with program directors.
- e. Faculty members may be considered for a development plan if they receive a rating below “Meeting Expectations” in any of the three categories in any year.

2. Salary Setting and Appeals

- a. Campus leadership provides the salary pool for school faculty raises. The Dean will apportion the salary pool monies on a percentage based on faculty salaries. Program directors will generate raise recommendations for faculty using three-year averages (or other averages as mandated by campus administration). Program directors will provide their salary raise recommendations to the Dean who will then make a final determination of raises and submit to Provost and campus Human Resources office as required. The dean will separately make salary raise recommendations for faculty members evaluated by him/her using criteria similar to school faculty using the apportioned raise pool monies.
- b. Faculty can initiate an appeal of salary decisions on the basis of a failure to follow the procedures as specified in this policy. The campus-level appeal can be initiated by submission of a memorandum to the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Note that the campus-level review will be limited to a procedural review and will not address the merits of the decision as to whether the faculty member met the criteria for intellectual contributions/professional development, teaching, and service.

2. Criteria for Evaluation.

- a. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to maintain scholarship and research, teaching, service, and outreach. While the percentages might vary based on negotiated workload agreements, tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to make contributions in all areas consistent with criteria specified in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies. The typical distribution for tenured and tenure track faculty is 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. Instructor, Research, and Clinical (IRC) track faculty are expected to make contributions focusing on teaching, service, and outreach. The typical workload for instructors is 80% teaching and 20% service. Alternate workloads exist and the annual evaluation process will reflect those unique distributions.
- b. Annual Evaluation of Scholarship and Research. It can be difficult to make objective decisions about the quality of scholarly contributions in the academic disciplines that constitute the School of Public Affairs. What disciplines value in

terms of research and scholarship often vary. To some degree the difference between meeting and exceeding expectations is subjective, relative to a mean based on professional norms and relative comparison. All faculty members are expected to be productive, making contributions to the university and their fields of expertise. At appendix A is a list of activities associated for each evaluated areas a means of establishing a means of distinguishing varying levels of contribution.

- c. Annual Evaluation of Teaching. All faculty members are expected to teach well. Students in all sections of courses will complete the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ). Student evaluations are important, but not the only source of information regarding teaching quality. Peer evaluations may be used to obtain feedback and suggestions for improving teaching practice. Course material and syllabus reviews are other sources of feedback that can be useful. The Faculty Resource Center can provide a formal peer evaluation. Each faculty member will complete a self-evaluation in Faculty Success. The self-evaluation should address the following questions:

1. Compared to the previous evaluation year, my teaching practice has changed in the following ways:
2. Compared to the previous evaluation year, my research and scholarship activities have changed in the following ways:
3. Compared to the previous evaluation year, my service activities have changed in the following ways:
4. What are your greatest teaching accomplishments this year? Examples of teaching accomplishments include independent studies, faculty advisor service, student group leadership, provision of high-volume/specialized courses, and search committee work.
5. What are your greatest research and scholarship accomplishments this year? Examples of research and scholarship accomplishments include journal articles, funding proposals, and presentations.
6. What are your greatest service accomplishments this year? Examples of service accomplishments include capstone/thesis, practicum/internship supervision, assessment, special department service, subcommittee work, community engagement, cultivation of university volunteers, partnerships, and speakers.

Factors that will be considered in evaluating whether a faculty member has earned a rating of Outstanding in teaching will include, but are not limited to, innovative course design, evidence of student engagement and active learning, course rigor, innovation in teaching, successful development of a new course, receipt of a teaching award, and earning Quality Matters certification for a course.

- d. Annual Evaluation of Service. The amount of workload dedicated to service varies by individual contract, but it typically constitutes 20% of faculty workload in the School of Public Affairs. It might be the smallest contribution in terms of

percentage of workload, but it is crucial to the good operation of an institution of higher education. Service to the school, campus, CU system and community are considered. Service activities have various levels of commitment, engagement, and impact. Faculty members are expected to do their fair share of committee work and attend important activities/events. Going beyond service assignments by taking on additional service roles and participating in campus events is a way of obtaining ratings of Exceeding Expectations and Outstanding.

- e. Overall Annual Evaluation. Annual evaluations of tenure-track and tenured faculty are based on a weighted average of ratings in each of the evaluated areas: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Annual evaluations of instructors are based on a weighted average of ratings in teaching and service. Ratings and points for each area will be assigned as Outstanding (5), Exceeding Expectations (4), Meeting Expectations (3) Below Expectations (2) and Fails to Meet Expectations (1). Ratings will be multiplied by the proportion of workload for each faculty member to arrive at an overall evaluation score.

IC % (IC Rating) + Teaching % (Teaching Rating) + Service % (Service Rating) = Overall Rating

For example, a typical tenured/tenure-track faculty member who has a workload of 40% scholarship and research, 40% teaching, and 20% service and earns ratings of Exceeding Expectations (4) in research, Outstanding (5) in teaching and Exceeding Expectations (4) in service would be calculated as follows:

$$.40(4) + .40(5) + .20(4) = 4.4$$

A faculty member who falls below expectations in any given area will receive an overall annual evaluation rating of Below Expectations or Fails to Meet Expectations.

Appendix A

Examples of Research, Teaching, & Scholarly Activity and Service Suitable for Evaluation Consideration

(Asterisks indicate high impact contributions)

Category: JOURNAL ARTICLES

*Peer Reviewed Articles

Category: INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

*Books & Book Chapters

Published Cases

Published Instructor Materials (Instructor manuals and test banks)

Program Reviews

(Conferences and Grants)

*Proceedings (full paper) Refereed and Published

*Presentations – Refereed International or National

*Keynote or Major Invited Conference Speaker

*Primary Investigator of Indirect Costs Recovery Grant

*Submission of Indirect Cost Recovery grant proposal

*Proceedings (full paper) Refereed and Published

*Presentation – Refereed

Presentation – Not Refereed

Symposium or Workshop

Guest/member on Conference Panel

Principal Investigator on Non-Indirect Cost Recovery Grant

Category: RESEARCH RELATED SERVICE

*Editor

*Associate Editor (Peer Reviewed)

*Editorial Board Member (Peer Reviewed)

Guest Editor

Book Editor

*Board Member/Officer: Academic/Research Association

*Academic Conference Chair/Committee Member

*Conference Panel Chair/Moderator/Facilitator/Discussant

Reviewer: Article/Manuscript (Peer-reviewed)

Reviewer: Book/Textbook/Grant

Reviewer: Article/Manuscript (Peer-reviewed)

Board Member/Officer: Academic/Research Association

Doctoral Consortium or Similar Panel

External Review

Visiting Scholar

Media Contribution (related to research)

Research Notes

Editorial Publication
Dissertation Committee Member
Invited Research presentation at other research institutions
Non-Peer-Reviewed Article

Category: SERVICE

Expert Witness Testimony
Board Member/Advisor: not-for-profit organization
*Officer: International/National Association
Officer: Regional/Local Practitioner Association
Task Force/Working Group
Professional Event Speaker
Review Grant Applications for grants outside CU system
Attend Professional Seminar/Workshop
Media Contribution
*Chair Search Committees
*Chair Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committees
*Chair Campus-Level Committees
*Lead Program Assessment Efforts
*Program Chair
School or Campus Committee membership
*Advisor for Student Organization
Second Reader on Capstone Projects or Thesis
Member of Search Committees

Category: Professional Development

Develop Executive Education course
Teach Executive Education course
Develop Continuing Professional Education course
Teach Continuing Professional Education course

Category: Teaching

Curriculum Development
Program Review
Assessment
Service Learning