Department of Health Sciences
Annual Performance Review Process
December 7, 2021

Consistent with Regent laws and policies (CU APS 5008), the performance of faculty members will be evaluated and rated annually. The performance evaluation provides the basis for individual performance ratings and merit and other pay adjustments. The performance rating is the overall summary rating of the individual's performance and constitutes the public record of rating, in accordance with the Colorado Open Records Act.

This document is intended to assist you with creating your portfolio for annual performance evaluation (aka: merit review). Performance reviews are completed once a year, based on the academic year for all regular faculty members (>0.5FTE), including instructor, research, and clinical faculty (IRCF); tenure-track faculty (TTF); and tenured faculty (TF). Submission of documents shall be conducted via Watermark in the Fall for the academic year prior.

You should refer to the JBE Annual Performance Review Policy for further information about the college processes that are not specified below. You may also review CU APS 5008 for more information on faculty performance evaluation. Your documents will be uploaded to Watermark with review access given to those responsible for reviewing your materials.

HSCI Performance Review Processes
1. Each faculty member in the department will undergo a self-evaluation that includes performance portfolio materials as specified below.
    a. The faculty member will submit a self-evaluation rating for each area assigned to their workload as specified in their contract or current faculty responsibility statements for the year under review.
    b. These ratings will be blinded from the department committee and department chair review levels.
    c. These ratings will be used in the college level determination of the final performance score by the Dean.
2. Each faculty member in the department will undergo a peer level of review of the submitted performance portfolio.
    a. The department level review will be conducted by a committee of peers representing the faculty member's category resulting in two committees (TF/TTF and an IRC committee)
        i. Each committee will consist of 2 or more faculty members.
        ii. The TF/TTF committee will review the TF and TTF
        iii. The IRCF committee will review IRCF.
    b. In the instances where a committee member is the one under review, the remaining committee members will conduct the review.
    c. The committee members will use the Department performance criteria to review the portfolio materials submitted by the faculty member.

d. The committee will collaboratively rate the faculty member according to their assigned workload as demonstrated by their contract or FRS when appropriate, for the year under review.

e. The committee will collaboratively provide comments supporting their ratings of the faculty member.

f. These ratings will be blinded to the department chair review.

g. These ratings will be used in the college level determination of the final performance score by the Dean.

3. The Department Chair will conduct their review of each faculty member.

a. The department chair review will rate the faculty member according to their assigned workload (FRS when appropriate) for the year under review using the Department performance criteria.

b. The Department Chair will provide comments to support their ratings of the faculty member.

c. The ratings will be used in the college level determination of the final performance score by the Dean.

4. The faculty member will receive the documentation from each level of review upon completion of the review in accordance with college-level processes.

Performance Portfolio Materials from the academic year under review to be electronically uploaded to Watermark (or Watermark will automatically populate from the faculty's Activities page in Watermark)

o Faculty Responsibility Statement(s) (FRS), if applicable
o HSCI Department Self-evaluation narrative
o Faculty Activity Report created through Watermark
o 5-year Faculty Professional plan(s) (UCCS format) (required for TF)
o CV (UCCS Format)
o FCQ summary sheets (including qualitative and quantitative data)

Evaluation Scale

Faculty members are rated against performance criteria in each category as listed on their workload with a rating of 1-5 using decimals 0.25, 0.50 and 0.75 for each category. Consideration of the Faculty Activity Report and materials and other portfolio materials and items specified in the narrative shall be used for rating each workload area.

Notes:

- Faculty will complete a self-rating score for each category of evaluation. The descriptors listed below are provided as example activities to help guide the numerical ratings.
- Faculty should explain in the accompanying narrative how they believe they met the set of performance criteria outlined for each category.
- The entire self-evaluation is restricted to 1 page (front and back) for Teaching, 1 page (front and back) for Research and 1 page (front and back)for Service/Leadership.
- Faculty may upload additional documents as they deem appropriate to support their Annual Performance Review to the Watermark platform. Examples of additional

documents may include, but not limited to, documents that were used to evaluate teaching (formative or summative methods of evaluation), completed forms/letters used to demonstrate peer evaluation of teaching, documents used to demonstrate evaluation of clinical practice performance, copies or notifications of scholarship/research/grants that have been disseminated.

- 5-year professional plans are used by tenured faculty only.

The descriptors below are provided as examples to help guide numerical ratings. The descriptors are not intended to be all inclusive or serve as a checklist or required items. Faculty are to assign the evaluation point(s) in each category based on the best-aligned, overall set of descriptors. Faculty should explain in the accompanying narrative how they believe they met the set of performance criteria outlined for each category.

Teaching

1.0	**Fails to Meet Expectations**	• No willingness to teach or adapt courses based upon departmental need or feedback provided. • Consistently cancels classes, and/or fails to show up for class. • Consistently fails to utilize the entire scheduled class period. OR • Does not turn in any performance review materials. *A TTF or TF faculty receiving this rating must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement as specified in CU APS 5008*
2.0	**Below Expectations**	• 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 courses up-to-date. • 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. *A TTF or TF faculty receiving this rating must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement as specified in CU APS 5008*
3.0	**Meeting Expectations**	• Utilizes 3 methods of teaching effectiveness and addresses the feedback provided by the methods, including FCQ's wherever possible. • Generally positive peer observations. • Course learning objectives and goals meet the needs and requirements for the course, students, and curriculum. • Demonstrates current knowledge of teaching practices/methods or materials generally adequate for learning. • Utilizes current, relevant evidence based information and material in the classroom and in practice.

		• Demonstrates that standard course practices are carried out to include applied learning and student engagement. • Demonstrates a course climate supporting respect and inclusion, motivation, and engagement. • Participates in departmental teaching-related committees and/or college-level.
4.0	**Exceeding Expectations**	• Utilizes more than 3 methods of teaching effectiveness and addresses the feedback provided by the methods, including FCQ's wherever possible. • Above average student learning outcomes; course is appropriately challenging, and high levels of student learning are achieved. • Participation in training in teaching effectiveness and new education-related technology. • Demonstrates evidence of continuous improvement in teaching and learning. • Very positive peer observations. • Demonstrates evidence of new curriculum development. • Mentoring students outside of the classroom. • Course materials are well-planned, integrated, and reflect commitment to meaningful assignments. • Student reports of instructor accessibility and interaction skills are strong and consistently positive. • Work collaboratively with other faculty to intentionally implement interprofessional assignments and learning opportunities for students from different disciplines to work and learn together.
5.0	**Outstanding**	• Adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and three methods of evaluation. • Reflection on teaching is informed by multiple sources of feedback (e.g., students, faculty peers, literature on teaching and learning, program development opportunities.) • Publishes on the scholarship of teaching pedagogy. • Invited speaker on teaching practices at professional meetings. • Provides extensive mentorship of faculty in teaching. • Demonstrates exceptional mentorship of students. • Assumes leadership role for curriculum development with the program, department or campus. • Receives a teaching award. • Very positive peer observations that are external to the College. • Professional awards related to the education process or other outstanding accomplishments in instruction.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Works

1.0	Fails to Meet Expectations	Does not participate in research, scholarship, creative works or grant/contract writing. *A TTF or TF faculty receiving this rating must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement as specified in CU APS 5008*
2.0	Below Expectations	Demonstrates little evidence of progress in the stages of on-going research project(s) during the time of review. *A TTF or TF faculty receiving this rating must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement as specified in CU APS 5008*
3.0	Meeting Expectations	- Demonstrates appropriate evidence of progress in the stages of on-going research project(s) during the time under review. - Evidence of contributions and leadership in collaborative research efforts/projects. - Submits peer-reviewed presentation(s), paper(s), or other scholarly activity. - Submits or obtains funding from internal grant/contract proposal(s). - Presents at regional, national, or international professional meeting/conference.
4.0	Exceeding Expectations	- Demonstrates significant progression along a consistent line of research as principal investigator. - Accepted/published peer-reviewed manuscript or other significant scholarly activity, including peer reviewed manuscripts that demonstrate interprofessional collaborations with faculty from different professions. - Accepted/published first-authored, peer-reviewed manuscript. - Submits external or multiple grant/contract proposals. - Obtains/maintains funding from internal grant/contracts.
5.0	Outstanding	- Demonstrates major advancement in research as a principal investigator. - Obtains/maintains funding from external grants and/or contracts. - Invited speaker at professional meeting(s)/conference(s). - Multiple accepted or published peer-reviewed manuscripts. - Receives a research award.

Service/Leadership

1.0	Fails to Meet Expectations	• Does not attend or actively participate in committees or work groups at any level. **OR** • Does not turn in any performance review materials. *A TTF or TF faculty receiving this rating must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement as specified in CU APS 5008*
2.0	Below Expectations	• Attends but does not actively participate in any departmental and/or college meetings, committees or work groups. *A TTF or TF faculty receiving this rating must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement as specified in CU APS 5008*
3.0	Meeting Expectations	• Regularly attends and actively participates in department and/or college meetings, committees or work groups as needed. • Participates in leadership in the department for routine department activities (i.e., performance reviews, RPT reviews). • Mentors students unrelated to teaching or research. • Attends commencement events.
4.0	Exceeding Expectations	• Participation in department, college and/-or university committees in excess of service load documented on an FRS. • Actively participates in professional or community organizations, 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. • Participates in the planning, implementation, or evaluation -of interprofessional education events and/or opportunities at the department, college or university level.
5.0	Outstanding	• Chairs several departments, college and/or university committee workgroups. • Actively participates in CU 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. • Receives a service/leadership award.

Clinical Practice (if included in contract/FRS)

1.0	Fails to Meet Expectations	• Does not engage in clinical practice. **OR** • Does not turn in any performance review materials. *A TTF or TF faculty receiving this rating must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement as specified in CU APS 5008*
2.0	Below Expectation	• Does not maintain competency in clinical practice. *A TTF or TF faculty receiving this rating must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement as specified in CU APS 5008*
3.0	Meeting Expectations	• Completes all expectations/responsibilities of clinical practice. • Stays current with emerging trends and guidelines in clinical practice through continuing education and retention of licensure and/or certification relevant to the clinical practice. • Demonstrates appropriate clinical competence in the clinical setting. • Incorporates evidence-based practice in the clinical setting.
4.0	Exceeding Expectations	• Serves as preceptor in clinical education programs. • Participates in continuing education curriculum development and program delivery. • Actively engaged in clinic/organizational operations and policy. • Serves as practice consultant. • Exceeds the continuing education requirement for certification. • Demonstrates influence in healthcare advancements at the local/state level. • Demonstrates influence in interprofessional education and/or interprofessional collaboration in healthcare at the college, university, community, or state level.
5.0	Outstanding	• Assumes a leadership role in the development of new clinical practice outcomes. • Demonstrates influence in healthcare advancements at the regional or national level. • Recognized as a leader in implementing emerging trends & guidelines in clinical practice. • Leads development and implementation of preceptorship opportunities for clinical education programs. • Engages in clinical research associated with their clinical practice (in the absence of research workload distribution).

- Approved by the Health Sciences Faculty, 12/07/2021
- Approved by Dean Kevin Laudner, 01/27/2022