EQUITY-MINDED ANNUAL

REVIEW 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 Annual Review Criteria Rubric

The ADVANCE Project CREST Team believes faculty evaluations must be completed fairly and equitably to ensure the vital work faculty performs for our university, our students, and our disciplines are given proper credit. While annual reviews are an opportunity to celebrate faculty achievements, identify areas to strengthen, and plan for a successful year to come, they can be riddled with hasty judgments, ambiguity, indifference, and distrust, which can affect faculty productivity, job satisfaction, and advancement. Thus, the guidelines and criteria for annual review must be transparent, context-rich, and comprehensive to account for all the ways faculty engage in teaching, research and creative works, and service and leadership. Equally, attention must be afforded to the ways in which faculty work most valued in the academy is often gendered and racialized.

In an effort to promote equity-minded practice in UCCS annual review documents, a rubric inspired by the *Equity-Minded Reform of Faculty Evaluation Policies Audit Resource* published by the American Council of Education (ACE) in 2022 was created. ACE's *Audit Resource* is intended for use in conjunction with another ACE report, *Translating Equity-Minded Principles into Faculty Evaluation Reform* (O'Meara et al., 2022). The rubric titled, *The Project CREST Annual Review Coding Rubric for Equity* (Table 1), is a tool for reviewing unit-level annual merit review criteria and process documents with an eye toward ensuring the equitable treatment of all our faculty and all that they bring to the table. The rubric attends to areas of transparency; accountability; context; holistic assessment; and considerations of teaching, research and creative works, grant activity, and service and leadership in the annual review guidelines and criteria.

We hope this rubric is a useful resource to units as they create and revise annual merit review 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: Smith, J. L., Mendez, S., Poe, J., Skop, E., Song, H., & Daniels, E. A. (2022). *Equity-Minded Annual Review Criteria Rubric*. University of Colorado Colorado Springs.

Table 1 – *The Project CREST Annual Review Coding Rubric for Equity*

Annual Review Coding Rubric for Equity
Scoring: 0 = Absent   1 = Addressed but Room for Improvement   2 = Fully Addressed

---

1: Transparency
1.1 The criteria are easily understood (i.e., no ambiguity could invite bias or misinterpretation).
1.2 The criteria are well-organized such that what meets expectations, exceeds expectations, and is outstanding is clear.

2: Accountability
2.1 The criteria identify an appeal process.

3: Context
3.1 The criteria provide ways to bring relevant life contexts into the review (e.g., significant transitions/ disruptions).
3.2 The criteria provide ways to bring relevant work contexts into the review (e.g., differentiated workloads, sabbatical leave of absence).
3.3 The criteria account for expected professional and collegial behavior.
3.4 The criteria consider faculty rank to determine meeting expectations, etc., in teaching/research/service.
3.5 The criteria include processes for faculty to explain the significance of their work.

4: Holistic Assessment
4.1 The criteria are welcoming and open to multiple ways of conducting and engaging in teaching/research/ service.
4.2 The criteria promote a holistic assessment of teaching/research/service, rather than an overreliance on numeric metrics (e.g., FCQs, impact factor of journals, amount of grant dollars).
4.3 The criteria consider the ways in which faculty work contributes to the overall mission and goals of the unit/college/university across teaching/research/service.
4.4 The criteria recognize the different demands of a faculty member's type of teaching/research/service (e.g., interdisciplinary, collaborative, international, community-based).
4.5 The criteria value and recognize diversity, equity, and inclusion work within teaching/research/service.
4.6 The criteria acknowledge an achievement award is optional, but not necessary, to receive a rating of outstanding in teaching/research/service.
4.7 The criteria include an explicit statement about using the annual review process to map out future goals.

5: Teaching Considerations
5.1 The criteria account for faculty engaged in different modes of instruction (e.g., in-person, online, hybrid).
5.2 The criteria recognize innovation in teaching (e.g., development of new courses, use of high-impact practices).
5.3 The criteria account for the availability of a teaching assistant, class size, class level, and the number of new preps in a given year.
5.4 The criteria indicate the evaluation of teaching includes a peer-review process, and the process is articulated.
5.5 The criteria recognize faculty engaged in student advising/mentoring informally and formally (e.g., lab supervision, independent study, thesis/dissertation membership).
5.6 The criteria seek student input to evaluate advising/mentoring quality.
5.7 The criteria consider writing student reference/recommendation letters as a valuable teaching activity.

6: Research and Creative Works Considerations

6.1 The criteria provide a broad definition of research and creative works.

6.2 The criteria recognize a broad set of research and creative works products over specific types.

6.3 The criteria recognize faculty who publish on pedagogy-related topics as scholarship.

6.4 With the expansion of pay-to-publish outlets and predatory journals, the criteria clearly state peer-reviewed publications are expected.

6.5 The criteria recognize alternative products and venues for dissemination of scholarship (e.g., podcasts, blogs, social media, webinars).

6.6 The criteria recognize the value of varied publication outlets, venues, and presses to reach a broad audience.

6.7 The criteria define authorship expectations (e.g., author order, number of co-authors, publishing with an advisor).

6.8 The criteria explicitly value collaborative work with fellow faculty.

6.9 The criteria explicitly value collaborative work with undergraduate and/or graduate students.

7: Grant Activity Considerations

7.1 The criteria recognize grant submissions along with grant awards.

7.2 The criteria recognize PI, Co-PI, evaluator, and consultant roles.

7.3 The criteria recognize the time and effort of administering, carrying out, and closing out grants.

7.4 The criteria specify the type of funding that is valued (e.g., external vs. internal, award amount, research vs. teaching vs. workforce development).

8: Service and Leadership Considerations

8.1 The criteria articulate the value of campus service, define it, and delineate what is considered an appropriate amount.

8.2: The criteria articulate the value of disciplinary service, define it, and delineate what is considered an appropriate amount.

8.3 The criteria value high service levels to the unit/college/university.

8.4 The criteria value leadership over membership in service roles.

8.5 The criteria value efforts related to mentoring faculty within and outside the university.

8.6 The criteria account for compensated service work.