

**EQUITY-MINDED ANNUAL
MERIT REVIEW CRITERIA
RUBRIC**

**ADVANCE
PROJECT
CREST**

**Changing Research Experiences Structures
and (in)Tolerance through the Adaptation
of Promising Equity Practices**

Equity-Minded Annual Merit Review Criteria Rubric

The ADVANCE Project CREST Team is dedicated to ensuring faculty evaluations 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 given credit. Annual merit reviews are a chance for celebrating faculty achievements, identifying areas to strengthen, and planning for a successful year to come. The guidelines and criteria for annual merit review should be transparent, equitable, and flexible to account for all the different ways our faculty demonstrate their knowledge and expertise. This rubric is a tool for reviewing your unit's 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.

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 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). UCCS Equity-Minded Annual Review Criteria Rubric. *University of Colorado Colorado Springs*.

Annual Review Coding Rubric

Guiding Principles of Equity and Inclusivity

<p>Scoring 0 – Absent 1 – Addressed but room for improvement 2 – Fully addressed</p>

1 Transparency and Clarity

- 1.1 Are the annual review criteria easily understood (i.e., there is no ambiguity that could invite bias or misinterpretation)?
- 1.2 Are the criteria well organized such that it is clear what meets expectations, exceeds expectations, and is outstanding?

2 Accountability

- 2.1 Do the criteria identify an appeal process?

3 Context

- 3.1 Do the criteria provide ways to bring relevant life contexts (e.g., significant transitions/disruptions) into the review?
- 3.2 Do the criteria provide ways to bring relevant work contexts (e.g., leave of absence, sabbatical, differentiated workloads) into the review?
- 3.3 Do the criteria account for expected professional and collegial behavior?
- 3.4 Do the criteria consider faculty rank in determining what it means to meet and/or exceed teaching/research/service categories?
- 3.5 Do the criteria include processes for faculty to explain the significance of their work?

4 Holistic and comprehensive assessment

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

5 Teaching considerations

- 5.1 Do the criteria outline clear expectations for faculty engaged in different modes of instruction such as in-person, online, and hybrid?
- 5.2 Do the criteria recognize innovation in teaching (e.g., development of new courses, use of innovative teaching methods)?

- 5.3 Do the criteria account for the availability of a teaching assistant, size of the class, class level, and the number of new preps in a given year?
- 5.4 Do the criteria recognize faculty engaged in student advising/mentorship informally and formally (e.g., lab supervision, independent study, thesis/dissertation membership)?
- 5.5 Do the criteria indicate the evaluation of teaching will also include a peer-review process and is the peer-review process articulated?
- 5.6 Do the criteria seek student input to evaluate mentoring/advising quality?
- 5.7 Do the criteria consider writing student reference and recommendation letters as a valued activity?

6 Research and creative works considerations

- 6.1 Do the criteria provide a broad definition of research and creative works?
- 6.2 Do the criteria recognize a broad set of research products over specific types?
- 6.3 Do the criteria recognize faculty who publish on pedagogy-related topics as research?
- 6.4 With the expansion of pay-to-publish outlets and predatory journals, do the criteria clearly state peer-reviewed publications are expected?
- 6.5 Do the criteria recognize alternative products and venues for dissemination of scholarship (e.g., podcasts, blogs, social media, webinars)?
- 6.6 Do the criteria recognize the value of varied publication outlets, venues, and presses to reach a broad audience?
- 6.7 Do the criteria define authorship expectations (e.g., author order, number of co-authors, publishing with a former advisor)?
- 6.8 Do the criteria explicitly value collaborative work with fellow faculty?
- 6.9 Do the criteria value collaborative work with undergraduate and/or graduate students?

7 Grant considerations

- 7.1 Do the criteria recognize grant submissions along with grant awards?
- 7.2 Do the criteria recognize PI, co-PI, evaluator, and consultant roles?
- 7.3 Do the criteria recognize the time and effort of administering, carrying out, and closing out grants?
- 7.4 Do the criteria clearly specify the type of funding that is valued (e.g., external vs. internal, award amount, research vs. teaching vs. workforce development)?

8 Service considerations

- 8.1 Do the criteria articulate the value of campus service, define it, and layout what is considered an appropriate amount of service?
- 8.2 Do the criteria articulate the value of disciplinary service, define it, and layout what is considered an appropriate amount of service?
- 8.3 Do the criteria value high levels of service to the department/college/university?
- 8.4 Do the criteria value leadership over membership in service roles?
- 8.5 Do the criteria value efforts related to mentoring faculty within and outside of UCCS?
- 8.6 Do the criteria recognize compensated service work?