

**EQUITY-MINDED
CAMPUS AWARD
CRITERIA RUBRIC**

**ADVANCE
PROJECT
CREST**

Changing **R**esearch **E**xperiences **S**tructures
and (in)**T**olerance through the Adaptation
of Promising Equity Practices

Equity-Minded Campus Award Criteria Rubric

The ADVANCE Project CREST Team is dedicated to ensuring faculty evaluations for campus awards for research, teaching, service, and seed grants are completed in a fair and equitable manner so that all the vital work our faculty do for our university, our students, and our disciplines is celebrated accordingly. Campus awards are a chance for honoring faculty achievements through their career. The review guidelines and criteria for these awards should be transparent, equitable, and flexible to ensure faculty are evaluated fairly. This rubric is a tool for reviewing your unit's award criteria and (if available) reviewer instructions with an eye toward ensuring the equitable treatment of all our faculty.

This rubric was adapted from the Audit Resources for Equity-Minded Reform of Faculty Evaluation Policies published by the American Council on Education (ACE) in 2022. ACE's audit resource is intended to be used in conjunction with the comprehensive discussion of research, examples, and solutions offered in another ACE report: Equity-Minded Reform of Faculty Evaluation: A Call to Action from Drs. KerryAnn O'Meara and Lindsey Templeton.

We hope this rubric is a useful resource to units as they consider revising award and seed grant criteria that are comprehensive and equitable in their evaluation of faculty.

Sincerely,

The Project CREST Team

Jessi L. Smith, Sylvia Mendez, Heather Song, Elizabeth Daniels, Emily Skop, Jeffery Montez de Oca, Kelly McNear, and Jennifer Poe

Suggested citation: Song, H., Poe, J., Smith, J. L., Mendez, S., Skop, E., & Daniels, E. A. (2022). UCCS Equity-Minded Campus Award Criteria Rubric. *University of Colorado Colorado Springs*.

Equity-Minded Faculty Award Coding Rubric

Guiding Principles of Equity and Inclusivity

Scoring (0 - Absent, 1 - Addressed but room for improvement, 2 - Fully addressed)

For All Types of Awards and Seed Grants (Teaching, Research, Service)

1 Transparency

- 1.1 Salient information related to faculty evaluation is intentionally shared, accessible, and accurate.
- 1.2 The review criteria are broad and embrace the interests and talents of faculty from multiple social groups and backgrounds.

2 Clarity

- 2.1 Information is provided in a way that is easily understood.
- 2.2 There is ambiguity that could invite bias, guessing, and misinterpretation.
- 2.3 The award/seed grant evaluation criteria are outdated.

3 Accountability

- 3.1 The review process is explained in a clear manner and are there responsible actors and steps identified.

4 Consistency

- 4.1 Essential parts of the award evaluation process are standardized and applied consistently so that when the same kind of activity is evaluated or procedure enacted, faculty can expect similar treatment.
- 4.2 There are informal processes or practices that reward certain types of activities that may give one group of potential awardees an advantage?

5 Context

- 5.1 The award criteria take into account new contexts and novel forms of excellence.

6 Credit

- 6.1 Award criteria policies specifically recognize mission-critical work (e.g., mentoring, institutional service, DEI).
- 6.2 Policies provide a way to take into account past performance when it is important to do so.

7 Flexibility

- 7.1 Award evaluation policies are flexible enough to adapt to the new, different, and changing set of contexts shaping faculty careers and work.

8 Pandemic Impacts

- 8.1 The award evaluation takes into account the long-term impacts of the pandemic, and its corresponding restrictions and disruptions on faculty work.
- 8.5 The award evaluation considers how caregiving demands amplified considerably during the pandemic both personally and professionally in terms of emotional labor and meeting student and staff and colleague needs.

9 Holistic assessment

- 9.1 There is a holistic assessment of teaching/research/service (or is there an overreliance on FCQs/h-indices/committees?).

10 Appointment type/rank

- 10.1 Policies include what it means to meet and/or exceed teaching/research/service criteria relevant to different appointment types and ranks.