UNIVERSITY OF COLOARDO COLORADO SPRINGS HELEN AND ARTHUR E. JOHNSON BETH-EL COLLEGE OF NURSING AND HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS Department of Nursing

Introduction

The purpose of the annual performance review is to provide the opportunity for self, peer, and supervisor evaluation of a faculty member's performance which can inform the development of future goals and objectives. Also, this annual performance review forms the basis for any annual merit salary allocations and other rewards/recognitions. The annual performance review process is separate from the review process for appointment, reappointment, and/or promotion. The following list includes the system and college policies that related to annual performance review.

CU Policy: APS#5008, *Faculty Performance Evaluation*. January 1, 2021. https://www.cu.edu/sites/default/files/5008.pdf

Johnson Beth-El Policy: Faculty Annual Performance Review Policy, Columbia Drive (All-College Documents), Approved 05/01/2020.

UCCS Annual Performance Review Resources and Timelines: https://hr.uccs.edu/supervisors/performance-management

Policy Statement

- 1. Faculty (\geq 0.50 FTE) will complete an annual performance review using activities of the performance year under review.
- 2. Faculty will upload all the following required documents to the Watermark platform as per the deadline established by the college.
 - a. **Annual Activity Report** for the performance year under review generated in Watermark.
 - b. **Annual Self-Evaluation** includes a self-rating and narrative statement addressing each category of evaluation as outlined in their current contract/FRS. Faculty will complete the rank-specific annual evaluation form used by the college. The approximate length of the narrative statement on the Annual Self Evaluation is 2-4 pages. A succinct narrative statement and bullet statements, (used in combination with a narrative), are preferred to demonstrate self-reflection in the annual self-evaluation.
 - c. **5-Year Professional Plan** will be submitted only by post-tenured faculty under review. The year under review should be reflected in the five-year span of the professional plan. Faculty should review the plan each year and make any revisions/updates as deemed necessary.
 - d. **FRS** (Faculty Responsibility Statement) for the performance year under review, if different from the original faculty contract.

- e. Syllabi for all courses taught in the performance year that is under review.
- f. **FCQ**'s (Faculty Course Questionnaires) for all courses taught in the performance year under review. The FCQ documents should include both the quantitative and qualitative data.
- 3. Faculty may upload **Additional Documents** as they deem appropriate to support their Annual Self Evaluation to the Watermark platform and as per the due date established by the college. This section of additional documents in the faculty portfolio is optional, but it is highly recommended that faculty provide supporting documents. Additional documents in this section may include, but are not limited to, documents that were used to evaluate teaching (examples of any additional formative or summative methods of evaluation), completed forms used to demonstrate peer evaluation of teaching, completed forms used to demonstrate evaluation of clinical practice performance, and/or copies of/or notifications of scholarship/research that has been disseminated.
- 4. Faculty will complete a self-rating score for each category of evaluation in their Annual Self Evaluation document. The descriptors listed in the columns of Table 1. are provided as examples of descriptors/activities to help guide the numerical ratings. Achievement of any one activity in a rating column can serve as a basis for the assigned rating. The descriptors are not intended to be all inclusive or serve as a checklist of required items. Faculty may include other descriptors/activities in their self-evaluation narrative that support their self-rating score. Faculty are to assign the rating score in each category based on the best-alignment to their completed activities for the year under review (to the nearest 0.1). Faculty should explain in the accompanying narrative how they believe they met the activity descriptor for the assigned rating score.
- 5. Reviews will be completed at four levels: Following the self-evaluation, reviews will be completed at three additional levels: Department Peer Review Committee, Department Chair, and Dean. At the Department Peer and Department Chair levels, the reviewer or review committee will provide a rating score and summary statement of the faculty member based on their review of the faculty member's performance for the previous year. This review is based on the descriptors in Table 1, the faculty member's self-evaluation narrative, and documentation included in the Watermark portfolio. Reviewers are to assign the rating score in each category relative to the faculty member's workload (teaching, research/scholarship, service, and/or practice). The descriptors are not intended to be all inclusive or serve as a checklist of required items.
- 6. Members of the Peer Review Committee and the Department Chair will be blinded to the faculty member's numerical self-rating on the Annual Self Evaluation.

Table 1. Examples of Descriptors/Activities for Rating Score

				T	T
	Outstanding	Exceeding	Meeting	Below	Fails to Meet
	5.0	expectations	expectations	expectations	Expectations
		4.99-4.0	3.99-3.0	2.99-2.0	1.9-0.0
TEACHING	Assumes leadership role for curriculum development within the program, department, or campus. Publishes on the scholarship of teaching pedagogy. Invited speaker on teaching practices at professional meeting. Recognized for innovative course development, implementation and/or evaluation. Receives a teaching award. Feedback on summative or formative teaching evaluations consistently excel. Leadership role as lead faculty that resulted in substantive outcomes in the delivery of a course. Provides mentorship to students through	Utilizes more than 3 methods of teaching evaluation and addresses the feedback provided by the methods, including FCQs, wherever reasonable. Bases course design and implementation on innovative, new teaching methods; educational principles; theory; and research. Participates in professional development opportunities related to teaching. Demonstrates evidence of new curriculum development. Participates in a research project related to teaching pedagogies. Serves as a preceptor to graduate students completing an educational practicum.	Utilizes 3 methods of teaching evaluation and addresses the feedback provided by the methods, including FCQs, wherever reasonable. Class materials are current. Course learning objectives meet curricular needs and requirements; courses are adapted where necessary to meet accreditation and/or professional curriculum requirements. Utilizes current, relevant, evidence-based information in the classroom and in practice of teaching. Courses/ curriculum is coherently organized, thoughtfully presented and promotes critical thinking.	Uses fewer than 3 methods of teaching evaluation and/or does not address the feedback provided by the methods, including FCQs, wherever reasonable. Does not keep course materials current. Demonstrates little willingness to teach or adapt courses based on departmental need, documented problems with teaching, generally a negative impact. Unreasonably cancels classes and/or fails to show up for classes. Frequently does not utilize the entire scheduled class period.	No willingness to teach or adapt courses based upon departmental need or feedback provided. Consistently cancels classes, and/or fails to show up for classes. Consistently fails to utilize the entire scheduled class period. Or Does not submit any annual review materials.

	Outstanding 5.0	Exceeding expectations 4.99-4.0	Meeting expectations 3.99-3.0	Below expectations 2.99-2.0	Fails to Meet Expectations 1.9-0.0
	the direction of student learning activities (e.g., theses, scholarly projects). Provides mentorship to new faculty through serving as a course lead or as a result of a leadership position in the department that works closely with faculty for dedicated role development.	Leadership role as lead faculty that facilitated change or provided significant mentorship of clinical faculty in the delivery of a course. First year of obtaining additional certification in content specialty. Completes ongoing requirements to maintain specialty certification.	Facilitates learners' self- reflection and personal goal setting. Provides leadership to clinical faculty in the planning and evaluation of student learning activities.		
RESEARCH/ SCHOLARSHIP/ CREATIVE WORKS (if included in contract/FRS)	Demonstrates major advancement in research as a principal investigator. Awarded internal/external grant/contract proposals. Obtains/maintains funding from external grants and/or contracts. Invited speaker at professional meetings/ conferences on program of research. Multiple accepted or published peer-	Demonstrates significant progression along a program of research as a principal investigator. Presents at professional meeting/ conference. Accepted/ published peer reviewed manuscript or other significant scholarly activity. Submits internal/ external grant/contract proposals.	Demonstrates some advancement along a program of research as a principal investigator. Evidence of involvement in current research project(s). Submitted peer reviewed presentation(s), paper(s), or other scholarly activity.	Demonstrates little advancement along a program of research as a principal investigator.	Does not participate in research, scholarship, creative works or grant/contract writing. Or Does not submit any annual review materials.

	Outstanding	Exceeding expectations	Meeting expectations	Below expectations	Fails to Meet Expectations
	5.0	4.99-4.0	3.99-3.0	2.99-2.0	1.9-0.0
	reviewed manuscripts.	Obtains/maintains funding from			
	Receives a research award.	internal grant/contracts.			
	Editor of book/journal for the year of publication in your content specialty.				
	Authors a book chapter/textbook.				
	Provides mentorship to students or faculty through scholarship activities that result in direct collaboration and/or supervision on a research project (e.g., faculty mentor for the undergraduate research academy, research assistants, or serving as a co- principal investigator with a new faculty member).				
SERVICE/ LEADERSHIP	Chairs department, college, and/or university committees or workgroups. Actively participates in CU	Holds an elected or appointed leadership position for the department. Actively participates in community	Regularly attends and actively participates in department and/or college meetings, committees, or work groups.	Attends but does not actively participate in any departmental and/or college meetings, committees, or work groups.	Does not attend or actively participate in committees or work groups at any level.

	Outstanding 5.0	Exceeding expectations 4.99-4.0	Meeting expectations 3.99-3.0	Below expectations 2.99-2.0	Fails to Meet Expectations 1.9-0.0
	System committees or work groups. Holds an elected or appointed leadership position for the college or campus. Actively participates in professional organizations, committees, and work groups at state, regional, or national level. Receives a service/leadership award. Actively involved in a professional organization to provide mentorship and leadership development for the organization's	committees and work groups (related to professional area of expertise). Serves as a reviewer for journal manuscripts. Participates in the planning of special events for the department, college, or university. Serves as an external reviewer for faculty promotions, awards, doctoral projects. Serves on a university level committee/ workgroup. Exceeds the expected service	Attends commencement events.		Does not submit any annual review materials.
	members.	commitment as outlined in workload.			
CLINICAL PRACTICE (if included in contract/FRS)	Actively engages in clinic/ organization operations by initiating change. Recognized as a leader in implementing emerging trends	Actively engages in clinic/ organizational operations and policy. Serves as preceptor in clinical education programs.	Maintains competency in clinical practice. Stays current with emerging trends and guidelines in clinical practice. Includes a peer evaluation of practice.	Does not maintain competency in clinical practice. Does not include a peer evaluation.	Does not engage in clinical practice. Or Does not submit any annual review materials.

Outstanding 5.0	Exceeding expectations 4.99-4.0	Meeting expectations 3.99-3.0	Below expectations 2.99-2.0	Fails to Meet Expectations 1.9-0.0
& guidelines in clinical practice. Leads development and implementation of preceptorship opportunities at clinic/ organization.	Serves as a practice consultant. Exceeds the continuing education requirement for certification.	Participates in professional development activities that align with practice. Maintains practice certification.		