University of Colorado Colorado Springs

Considerations when Creating/Revising UCCS Annual Review Documents for Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty

Revise Fall 2021

Objective: In response to Regent Policy Changes, each unit should create/revise annual review criteria documents for both TTF and IRC faculty. The goal of this document is to assist with the aligning of TTF annual reviews with regent law while ensuring proactive and inclusive engagement of faculty in the development of the required documents. By the end of this experience, your unit should have two documents:

1. Criteria document focused on the requirements expected of the faculty.
2. Procedures of how merit review is conducted (committee membership, timing, etc.) should be in a separate document so that they can be changed without going through the entire merit criteria change process.

Relevant Regent policy and CU Administrative Policy Statements:

- Regent policy now specifies that departments must have separate criteria for RPT processes and for annual merit review.
- **Regent Policy 5.C.2(E):** "The process leading to the award of tenure is an evaluation of a faculty member's cumulative performance and is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual performance evaluation."
- **Regent Policy 5.C.4(C)(1):** "Faculty governance leadership and service shall be considered in the annual merit evaluation as in other evaluation processes."
- **Regent Policy 5.C.4(B):** "Annual performance evaluations for all faculty members shall be conducted by each campus, using a peer evaluation process. Consistent with the faculty member's duties, their contribution to teaching, scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and, where applicable, other activities specific to their unit (e.g., clinical activity, librarianship), shall be evaluated based on written performance standards developed by the faculty of the academic unit (primary unit annual evaluation criteria) and any additional written expectations agreed to by the faculty member and the unit. Teaching evaluations shall use multiple measures, including normed student feedback (e.g. Faculty Course Questionnaires), as further explained in the corresponding Administrative Policy Statement. In annual merit evaluations, the assigned workload of a faculty member shall be considered.
- **APS 1009 (revised) Section II:** "A. The teaching of all faculty members shall be evaluated using normed student feedback on behaviors and practices of which students

have direct knowledge using an instrument that mitigates known bias in student evaluations of teaching. See Section IV of this APS.   B. All personnel actions for tenured or tenure-track faculty shall be based, in part, on the evaluation of teaching. Faculty members shall be evaluated annually to inform decisions regarding merit-based salary adjustments and evaluated in a summative manner for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion.   B.1. Annual evaluations shall include data from the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ) or a similar, campus-approved mechanism (see Section IV of this APS) and may include other measures of teaching effectiveness."

  o   (Note that Regent Policy 5.C.4(B) requires the use of multiple measures and so appears to be inconsistent with the APS.)

"E. In conducting annual performance evaluations, primary units can consider performance over multiple years to account for activities that may not yield measurable results in a single year. Units are encouraged to use this flexibility to give appropriate consideration to pedagogical innovation, recognizing that positive impact may not be immediately evident. "

- **APS 1009 (revised) Section III:** " A. The voting faculty of each primary unit shall determine the goals and components for evaluating teaching in the unit. Primary unit components shall take into account any requirements from the campus or school/college. Individual faculty members shall be evaluated based on components selected from the list approved by the primary unit. Appendix A includes is a non-exhaustive list of components that a unit might consider.

  1. The primary unit evaluation goals and components shall be available to each faculty member.

  2. The evaluation components selected for each faculty member for both annual and summative evaluations shall be appropriate to their teaching responsibilities.

  3. Faculty members shall be advised of any elimination/revision of existing components, or addition of new components, no later than April 1 for application in the next academic year.

  4. The primary unit shall gather the materials needed to evaluate an individual faculty member. The faculty member shall cooperate with this process and failure to do so may be regarded as neglect of duty.

  B. The evaluation components for both annual review and reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be reviewed when primary unit criteria are reviewed and approved by the dean and provost.

  C. The provost shall facilitate effective and efficient implementation of this policy with the deans and the chairs of the primary units.

- **APS 5008 (revised):** "II.A. Faculty members will be evaluated and receive a performance rating on an annual basis. Individual performance evaluations and ratings provide the basis for annual merit and other pay adjustments, although additional information may also be used in the annual salary setting process. As stated in Regent Policy 5.C.4, a peer evaluation process shall be used at all campuses, with some exceptions at the Anschutz Medical Campus. A faculty member's performance shall be evaluated based upon performance standards developed by each academic unit and according to any written expectations agreed to between the faculty member and the unit."   "II.E. Performance ratings for annual merit or salary adjustment consideration shall be submitted to the Dean in accordance with individual campus-defined submission dates."   "II.F. The justification for the performance rating may consist of a numerical, narrative, or other evaluative processes, at the discretion of the campus. Existing evaluation processes, including the Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA), may be used to arrive at the annual performance rating. A description of the evaluation process and the criteria to be used must be available, in writing, to each faculty member."
- **Regent Policy 11.B.1(B)(1)(A):** "Merit shall be the prevailing factor in all recommended salary increases. Determinations of merit shall be made by a collegial and consultative process within the primary unit using clearly articulated standards of merit and employing existing primary unit (defined in the glossary) guidelines, including peer review."

General Resources:

- Current UCCS RPT criteria: https://www.uccs.edu/provost/faculty/tenure-documents
- UCCS Policy 200-001:   https://www.uccs.edu/vcaf/sites/vcaf/files/inline-files/200-001.pdf
- Regent Article V (new): https://www.cu.edu/doc/article-5-policy-5-finalpdf
- APS 1006 : Differentiated Work Loads for Faculty: https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1006
- APS 1009: Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation: https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009
- APS 5008 Performance Ratings for Faculty: https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5008

Questions and Issues to Consider in Annual Review Criteria Development

The following are all POSSIBLE topics to address as we bring our annul merit review policies into compliance with the changes in Regent Laws and Policies. The question prompts and issues on this list are not mandated but are important to consider.

Begin and end by asking questions such as:

1. Does our criteria sound like the same criteria used 25 years ago? How can we refresh it and grow it to meet the world of tomorrow?
2. Are annual review criteria welcoming and open to a variety of ways of knowing (knowledge construction)?
3. What type of research products are most valued and why? What is left out and how might we include it?
4. Are the scope and impact of service and teaching workloads understood in light of how much time these activities take away from research time?
5. Are the review criteria broad and embrace the interests and talents of faculty from multiple social groups and backgrounds?
6. Does one group benefit more than another because of informal processes or practices that reward certain types of activities in the department?
7. How can we avoid being subjective in the annual review process and be more transparent and objective (how can we set more concrete criteria)?
8. How did your own type of accomplishments factor into what you wanted to see in the annual review criteria?

Pandemic Impact Questions:

1. How does the annual review take into account the *long-term* impacts of the pandemic, and its corresponding restrictions and disruptions on faculty work?
2. How has the COVID pandemic affected the research pipeline in your discipline? Are there some groups of people more affected than others? Some types of subfields in your unit more than others?
3. Teaching transformed during the pandemic to remote formats. Did some faculty have considerably heavier loads in a remote format (e.g., large sections, intensive mentoring)? How is this considered in annual review?
4. Did service demands increase for some faculty members related to the pandemic (e.g., providing tech support to colleagues and students, serving on department or campus-wide pandemic mitigation committees)? Given these additional demands take time away from research and teaching, how is this considered in annual review?

5. Were faculty engaged in activities (e.g., extra student support/mentoring) driven by the pandemic that should be accounted for in review processes?
6. Caregiving demands amplified considerably during the pandemic both personally and professionally in terms of emotional labor and meeting student and staff and colleague needs. How is that work considered in the annual review process?

Ten Common Questions and Issues to Consider

1. Different instructional modes and workload
   a. Do our merit evaluation processes and policies appropriately protect faculty engaged in different modes of instruction such as in-class, on-line, and hybrid?
   b. Will your unit evaluate differently depending on the teaching load (for example, EAS had research/teaching/service of 50-30-20, 60-20-20 etc.)
   c. How does the availability of a teaching assistant, size of the class, type of class (graduate or undergraduate) or the number of new preps in a given year impact annual review?
   d. How does effective mentoring of graduate students, if applicable, factor into annual review? What does "effective" look like?
2. FCQ changes
   a. How should departments take into account the changes in the FCQ forms since faculty will have some FCQs in the older form and some in the new form?
   b. The faculty removed the overall instructor and course questions based on research that they tend to be biased. Should departments be allowed to put them back in?
   c. How much weight should be given to FCQ questions since we are supposed to be using "multiple measures"?
   d. Resources:
      i. Faculty Assembly Women's Committee study: https://www.uccs.edu/women/fcqs-bias-student-evaluation
      ii. Report of Faculty Assembly Teaching Evaluation Task Force (May 2019): https://www.uccs.edu/facassembly/fcq-revision
3. How are sabbaticals and other professional development activities taken into account in annual merit review?
4. How is grant activity recognized in annual merit review criteria?
   a. Is submission of grants recognized and valued?
   b. How does submission of grants differ from receiving a grant in recognition?
   c. How are PI, co-PI, evaluation, and consultant roles understood and valued for annual review?
   d. Administering, carrying out, and closing out a grant takes substantial time. How is that grant work recognized?
5. How is service and mentoring related to equity, diversity, and inclusion recognized?
6. Publications

    a.   With the expansion in pay-to-publish outlets, predatory journals, and other opportunities to publish work, how do we assess the quality and peer-review process of journals where faculty publish?

    b.   How are interdisciplinary outlets considered?

    c.   Different fields have different values for authorship placement. Senior author, first author, sole author etc. How is that considered in the annual review, especially when someone publishes in an interdisciplinary outlet?

7. New Modes of Dissemination

    a.   With the expansion of new technologies and platforms (pod casts, blogs, social media, webinars, remote conferences), how do we consider the impact, reach, and quality of new and emerging types of dissemination outlets?

8. Multi-unit hires

    a.   How do we handle annual merit review for faculty who have appointments in multiple primary units?

    b.   Should this be specified in policy? (Current practice is to write an MOU at the time of hire that spells out how to do the reviews.)

9. Administrative service

    a.   How is administrative service (chairs, program directors, …) included in annual merit review?

    b.   If the person is given a separate annual review for the administrative work, should that documentation be included in their faculty annual merit review?

10. Will your unit evaluate differently depending on pre-tenure or post-tenure status? How so?