

#### **IV.A.vi.d Impact on Merit Evaluation**

- The weighting vector used for merit evaluation is determined by the workload distribution specified in the DW agreement, adjusted by 10% for each additional course reduction or increase according to its purpose.
- Performance expectations in each category should be adjusted to reflect changes in effort. For example,
  - For an increase in research time, a higher level of productivity would be expected to achieve the same merit rating. However, the evaluation needs to take into account the time lag between when the research is performed and when the papers are accepted for publication. (This should be spelled out in the request for the DW-R).
  - For increases to the teaching load, a larger number of classes would be expected, but the standards of performance for classroom teaching do not change.
  - For an increase in service workload, a proportionally larger amount of service contributions is expected.

### **IV.B Research Faculty**

Research faculty are faculty members whose primary duties are in research. Research faculty will have comparable ranks to tenured/tenure track faculty: Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Assistant Professor. All holders of a research faculty appointment must have an earned Ph.D. in a discipline commensurate with employment in a department of mathematical sciences. A research faculty appointment is an “at will” appointment with a time/effort distribution of at least 40% research and may also include teaching and service responsibilities. Research faculty are non-rostered faculty and are not eligible for tenure.

Research faculty generally are not voting members of the department. However, in some cases, research faculty may become special voting members of the department through the procedure specified in Section I.C.i of the Bylaws.

In so far as it is possible, the normal departmental procedures and structures shall be used for Research faculty. Differences, due to the nature of this type of appointment, shall be explicitly stated in this personnel policy. Research faculty may not participate in any activities related to hiring, evaluation, promotion, or dismissal of tenured/tenure track faculty. The procedures outlined below are in addition to any policies for Research faculty specified by the College, Campus, and University.

#### **IV.B.i Initial Appointment**

##### **IV.B.i.a Procedures for Initial Appointment for Research Faculty**

Appointments at the rank of Research Assistant Professor can be made upon the recommendation of the Department Chair in accordance with appropriate college and university policies for initial appointment of research faculty.

Appointments at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor require a vote of the tenured, tenure-track and voting research faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above. Appointments at the rank of Research Professor require an additional vote of the Professors and voting Research Professors. A candidate should submit an application packet consisting

of, at a minimum, the following: curriculum vitae, statement of research philosophy, and letters of recommendation. For the rank Research Associate Professor, there must be three letters, including at least one of which is from outside of the department. For the rank of Research Professor, five letters are required, at least two of which are from outside the department. These letters will be solicited by the Department Chair after consultation with the department faculty and the candidate. The application packet will be reviewed by the tenured, tenure-track and voting Research faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above, who will vote on a written recommendation to the Chair for appointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor. For appointment at the rank of Research Professor, a separate vote of the Professors and voting Research Professors will be taken.

After reviewing the application packet and the faculty recommendation(s), the Chair will make a separate, written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to Associate Dean for Research and Creative Activities, who makes a recommendation to the Dean and appropriate college and university level policies for initial appointment will be followed thereafter.

#### **IV.B.i.b Criteria for Initial Appointment to the Research Faculty**

Appointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor requires a Ph.D. in the Mathematical Sciences. Appointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor requires in addition a demonstrated record of research excellence, which meets or exceeds the research criteria required for promotion of a tenure-track faculty member to the rank of Associate Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Professor requires an outstanding record of research achievement, which meets or exceeds the research criteria required for promotion of tenured faculty to the rank of Professor.

#### **IV.B.ii Re-appointment of Research Faculty**

##### **IV.B.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment of Research Faculty**

Contracts for research faculty are not automatically renewed. If funding is available to extend the contract, a reappointment review will be conducted prior to reappointing a research faculty member. The research faculty member seeking reappointment will submit a dossier to the Chair. This dossier shall include, at minimum, all materials required for initial appointment with the exception of letters of recommendation. The dossier shall also include a copy of the most recent employment contract, a professional plan, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of research activities, and, if applicable, summaries of teaching and service activities.

For reappointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor, the chair will review the dossier and make a written recommendation, which will be forwarded to the Dean's office. Appropriate college and university level policies for reappointment will be followed thereafter.

For reappointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor, the chair will appoint a review committee consisting of at least three departmental members chosen from the tenured, tenure-track and voting research faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above. At least half of the membership of this committee should be tenured or tenure-track faculty. For reappointment at the rank of Research Professor, all members of this committee must hold either the rank of Professor or the rank of Research Professor. The candidate's dossier will be reviewed by the committee, and a written recommendation will be made to the TT faculty and voting research faculty of appropriate rank, who will then vote on a written recommendation to the Chair. In the case of reappointment at the rank of Research Professor, only faculty at the rank of Professor or Research Professor will review and vote on the recommendation. After reviewing the application

packet and the faculty recommendation, the Chair will make their own written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research and Creative Activities, who makes a recommendation to the Dean and appropriate college and university level policies for reappointment will be followed thereafter.

#### **IV.B.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment to the Research Faculty**

In order to be reappointed at the rank of Research Assistant Professor, a research faculty member must, at minimum, earn a rating of “meeting expectations” in each previous annual performance evaluation. For reappointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor, the candidate should demonstrate a record of continued excellence in research.

#### **IV.B.iii Promotion of Research Faculty**

##### **IV.B.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion of Research Faculty**

To be eligible for promotion to Research Associate Professor, a candidate must have spent at least three years (not necessarily consecutive) at the rank of Research Assistant Professor. Additionally, the candidate should have undergone at least one successful reappointment review prior to applying for promotion. To be eligible for promotion to Research Professor, a candidate must hold the rank of Research Associate Professor.

A candidate seeking promotion must inform the Chair of this intent by the end of the spring semester preceding the semester of evaluation and will thereafter follow the timeline specified by CLAS policies. The Chair will solicit external letters following the procedures specified for promotion of tenure-track faculty. (See Section IV.A.i.d.6). The Chair will appoint one to three subcommittees (depending on the workload distribution of the candidate) to evaluate the candidate’s record in research, teaching and/or service. Each subcommittee consists of three tenured, tenure-track or voting research faculty of the appropriate rank (Associate Professor or Professor for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor for promotion to Professor).

The candidate shall submit a dossier to the Chair that includes, at minimum, all materials required for initial appointment (including three letters of recommendation) along with a copy of the most recent employment contract, a professional plan, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of research accomplishments, and if applicable, a summary of teaching activities (including course evaluations) and service activities.

This dossier will be evaluated by the promotion subcommittee(s), which will present a written recommendation(s) to the faculty. The faculty of appropriate rank will vote on the written recommendation(s), and will also vote on a recommendation for or against promotion. After reviewing the dossier and the faculty recommendations, the Chair will make a separate, written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research and Creative Activities, who makes a recommendation to the Dean, and appropriate college and university level policies for promotion of research faculty will be followed thereafter.

##### **IV.B.iii.b Criteria for Promotion of Research Faculty**

**IV.B.iii.b.1 Promotion to Research Associate Professor** To be promoted to the rank of Research Associate Professor, an individual must demonstrate a record of research excellence that meets or exceeds the research criteria required for promotion of tenure-track faculty to the rank of Associate Professor. Additionally, Research Faculty with teaching and service responsibilities

must also have a meritorious record in these areas, taken in proportion to their workload distribution.

**IV.B.iii.b.2 Promotion to Research Professor** To be promoted to the rank of Research Professor, a Research Associate Professor must have a) a record that, taken as a whole in relation to the workload distribution of the individual, is judged to be excellent; b) an outstanding record of research achievement, which meets or exceeds the criteria for research excellence defined in the Department's criteria for promotion of tenured faculty to the rank of Professor (see Section IV.A.i.c).

#### **IV.B.iv Annual Evaluations and Expectations**

Expectations for research faculty vary and should be specified in their employment contract. This is particularly true of research expectations. For example, a research faculty member hired to work on a grant will have expectations specifically associated with the grant, which will not necessarily involve publishing their work. In contrast, research professors and research associate professors will usually be expected to disseminate their research in reputable peer-reviewed venues. Research faculty members who have time allocated to teaching must comply with the expectations described in Section IV.E.i for classroom teaching; Research faculty with service responsibilities will be expected to competently and collegially perform these duties.

The performance of research faculty members will be evaluated annually in relation to the expectations specified in their employment contracts. Research faculty members who are paid entirely out of a research grant will be evaluated by the principal investigator of the grant. Research faculty members who are paid all or in part by departmental funds will be evaluated by the TT-MEC following the procedure outlined in Section IV.A.ii, adjusted appropriately for differing expectations and workload distribution. In particular, the teaching evaluation will be based primarily on classroom teaching performance, which is evaluated according to the policy described in Section IV.E (Evaluation of Classroom Teaching Effectiveness), using the following numerical scale: Exceptional (4.5 - 5.0), Highly Effective (3.5-4.25), Effective (2.5-3.25), Deficient (1.5-2.25), Problematic (0-1.25).

#### **IV.C Clinical Teaching Track Faculty**

The Clinical Teaching Track (C/T) is intended for non-tenure track faculty who participate in a broad range of teaching, service and scholarly activities. C/T appointees will have comparable ranks to tenured faculty (i.e., Assistant, Associate and Full Professor), except that in referring to them in official documents, the designation C/T will be placed after the academic rank (e.g., Assistant Professor C/T).

A C/T appointment is an "at will" appointment for a three-year term which is not a tenure track appointment. All holders of a C/T appointment must have obtained a Ph.D. in a discipline commensurate with employment in a department of mathematical sciences. The typical appointment has a time/effort distribution of 80% Teaching, 10% Research/Scholarship, and 10% Service. Deviations from this apportionment must be approved by the Dean of CLAS.

In so far as it is possible, the normal departmental procedures and structures shall be used for C/T Faculty. Differences, due to the nature of this type of appointment, shall be explicitly stated in this personnel policy. C/T faculty may not participate in any activities related to evaluation, promotion, or dismissal of tenured/tenure track faculty. The procedures outlined below are in

addition to any policies for C/T faculty specified by the College, Campus, and University. Initial Appointment

#### **IV.C.i Procedures for Initial Appointment to the C/T**

The Executive Committee of the department shall determine whether or not to request from the Dean an appointment to the C/T track. Candidates for a C/T track appointment can be internal (instructors or senior instructors in the department) or external (new hires). Internal candidates must, as a first step, request such a consideration by the Executive Committee.

A candidate should submit an application packet consisting of, at a minimum, the following items: curriculum vitae, statement of teaching philosophy, student evaluations, evidence of continued scholarship, and letters of recommendation. For the ranks of Assistant and Associate Professor C/T, there must be three letters, including at least one from outside of the department. For the rank of Professor C/T, five letters are required, two from outside the department. These letters will be solicited by the Department Chair after consultation with the department faculty and the candidate.

The application packet will be reviewed by the voting members of the department who will then vote on a written recommendation to the Chair, which includes a proposal as to the level of the appointment (Assistant Professor C/T, Associate Professor C/T, or Professor C/T). After reviewing the application packet and the faculty recommendation, the Chair will make a separate, written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to the DAC-C/T, and appropriate college and university level policies for initial appointment will be followed thereafter.

##### **IV.C.i.a Criteria for Initial Appointment to the C/T**

As the clinical teaching track is oriented toward teaching, applicants to the C/T should demonstrate, at a minimum, meritorious teaching with the potential for excellence in line with the criteria outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.1 Applicants should also demonstrate the ability to carry out consistent and effective service, in line with the criteria outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.2, and demonstrate potential for professional development through scholarly activity as discussed in Section IV.C.iv.b.3 For appointments at the rank of Associate Professor C/T or Full Professor C/T, the applicant should satisfy the criteria specified for promotion to the appropriate rank specified in Section IV.C.iii

#### **IV.C.ii Re-appointment within the C/T**

##### **IV.C.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment within the C/T**

Contracts for C/T faculty are limited to three years and are not automatically renewed. Unless otherwise stipulated by the College, the reappointment review will be conducted in the spring semester prior to the last year of the contract. At the beginning of this semester, a C/T faculty member seeking reappointment will submit a dossier to the Chair. This dossier shall include, at minimum, all materials required for initial appointment with the exception of letters of recommendation. The dossier shall also include a copy of the most recent employment contract, a professional plan, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of teaching activities, including teaching evaluations, and summaries of scholarly and service activities.

Upon receipt of a candidate's dossier, the Chair will appoint a review committee consisting of at least three voting members of the department. The candidate's dossier will be reviewed by the committee, and a written recommendation will be made to the department faculty, who will

then vote on a written recommendation to the Chair. After reviewing the application packet and the faculty recommendation, the Chair will make their own written recommendation. All of these materials will be forwarded to the DAC-C/T, and appropriate college and university level policies for reappointment will be followed thereafter.

#### **IV.C.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment within the C/T**

In order to be reappointed at any rank within the C/T, an applicant must display a continued commitment to excellence in teaching, resulting in at least meritorious teaching on a consistent basis. An applicant should also demonstrate continued evidence of potential for overall excellence in teaching determined in relation to the criteria outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.1 Additionally, an applicant should demonstrate a record of consistent and effective service and scholarship that meets the expectations outlined in both Sections IV.C.iv.b.2 and IV.C.iv.b.3, and which, taken as a whole, is meritorious overall.

#### **IV.C.iii Promotion within the C/T**

##### **IV.C.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion within the C/T**

1. The promotion procedure for C/T faculty differs from the analogous procedure for TT faculty only to the extent that there are two, instead of three, subcommittees of three faculty members apiece. One subcommittee evaluates teaching and the other evaluates service and research/creative or scholarly activities.
2. To be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor C/T, a candidate should have spent at least three years (not necessarily consecutive) at the rank of Assistant Professor C/T. Additionally, the candidate should have undergone at least one successful reappointment review prior to applying for promotion. A candidate seeking promotion must inform the Chair of this intent by the deadline specified by CLAS policies and no later than two weeks following the start of an academic year to be promoted for the following academic year. The candidate shall submit a dossier that includes, at minimum, all materials required for initial appointment (including three letters of recommendation) and also a copy of the most recent employment contract, a professional plan, annual performance evaluation reports, a summary of teaching activities, teaching evaluations, a summary of scholarly activities and a summary of service activities.
3. To be eligible for promotion to Full Professor C/T, a candidate should have spent at least five years (not necessarily consecutive) at the rank of Associate Professor C/T. A candidate seeking promotion to Full Professor C/T must inform the Chair of this intent by the deadline specified by CLAS policies and no later than the start of the summer semester prior to the academic year in which the promotion will be considered. The candidate shall submit a dossier that includes, at minimum, all materials required for promotion to Associate Professor C/T. Two additional letters will be solicited by the department Chair after consultation with the department faculty and the candidate.

##### **IV.C.iii.b Criteria for Promotion within the C/T**

**IV.C.iii.b.1 Promotion to Associate Professor C/T** To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor C/T, an individual must demonstrate overall excellence in teaching determined in relation

to the criteria outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.1 Additionally, the candidate should demonstrate a record of significant contributions in both service and scholarship, which meets the expectations outlined in both Sections IV.C.iv.b.2 and IV.C.iv.b.3, and which, taken as a whole, is meritorious overall.

**IV.C.iii.b.2 Promotion to Full Professor C/T** To be promoted to Full Professor C/T a candidate must demonstrate excellence in teaching, including a record of outstanding contributions. The candidate should also demonstrate a record of meritorious contributions in service and scholarship, determined in relation to the expectations laid out in Section IV.C.iv.b The candidate's record, taken as a whole, should be excellent.

#### **IV.C.iv Evaluation of Clinical Track Faculty**

##### **IV.C.iv.a General Procedure**

1. C/T Faculty members will be evaluated annually by the Non-Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee (NTT-MEC) based on the expectations outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.
2. The committee will evaluate each C/T faculty member according to the guidelines in Section IV.C.iv.c to determine a numerical rating in each of the three areas: teaching; research and scholarship; and leadership and service. A weighted average of these three numerical ratings determines an overall numerical rating, with the weights determined by the faculty member's workload distribution.
3. The committee will provide to the chair of the department the numerical ratings as well as written evaluations in each of the three areas, with a copy to the faculty member. The numerical ratings in the 3 categories should be justified by the written evaluations, consistently between different faculty members.
4. The NTT-MEC is encouraged to establish an informal appeals process in which faculty members may ask the committee to reconsider their evaluations. This process should be completed prior to forwarding the numerical ratings and written evaluations to the chair.
5. The department chair assigns a final (categorical) performance rating (Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, etc.) for each faculty member. Typically, the final rating is determined from the numerical rating according to the following intervals: Outstanding: (4.5-5.0); Exceeding Expectations: (3.5-4.49); Meeting Expectations: (2.5-3.49), Below Expectations: (1.5-2.49), Failure to Meet Expectations (0.0-1.49). However, the chair may raise or lower this rating by providing a written justification.
6. The evaluation will be based on faculty files as specified in Section IV.A.ii.d. The complete set of documents will be made available to the faculty member under evaluation who will be given an opportunity to respond prior to being evaluated. The committee's comments should fairly reflect the evidence.
7. The evaluation will be based primarily on the previous calendar year, but will also be taken in the context of the three prior years.
8. Faculty members may appeal their evaluations following the procedure described in Section IV.A.ii.g

**IV.C.iv.b Expectations for Clinical Track Faculty**

**IV.C.iv.b.1 Teaching** C/T faculty are expected to effectively teach their assigned classes (as defined in Section IV.E.i).

**IV.C.iv.b.2 Leadership and Service** Faculty appointed to the C/T are expected to carry out consistent and effective departmental service. Evidence of excellent or meritorious service could include active membership on a department committee, service on an internal or external search committee, outreach, and completion of other special assignments. Furthermore, attendance at department meetings is expected as it demonstrates a commitment to the department. In general, excellence in service is indicated by evidence that the service is of high quality, durability, effectiveness, and value.

**IV.C.iv.b.3 Research/Scholarship** For C/T faculty, scholarship is defined broadly and understood to be intellectual work that is visible, communicated externally and validated by peers. The level and type of scholarly expectation differs significantly from that expected of tenure-track faculty. There is no expectation for a major, focused program of original research (i.e., the scholarship of discovery) in the clinical ranks. Scholarship conducted by C/T faculty should support the teaching, service and/or research goals of the department. The appropriateness and importance of the type of scholarship C/T faculty may engage in will vary with the expectations of the position as outlined in the negotiated contract.

C/T faculty are expected to keep themselves professionally alive by consistently engaging in scholarly activity at a level commensurate with their workload. To be considered meritorious, this activity should result in meaningful scholarly output. Meritorious research or scholarship could be demonstrated by meaningful activity in any of the following: contributions to policy-making bodies such as the Colorado Council of Teachers of Mathematics or the Rocky Mountain Section of the Mathematical Association of America, or any Colorado based teaching councils; participating in the production of materials that are related to teaching or mathematics teacher education; offering high-quality professional development for school and university faculty; and presenting invited or contributed talks at professional conferences, including teacher conferences. Additionally, given the focus of the C/T, activities such as the development and dissemination of new and innovative courses, programs, or assessment tools may also be considered scholarly C/T faculty may also participate in more traditional research activities, including: obtaining external funding to support research and professional activities, including outreach; publishing research or expository articles in a variety of appropriate journals (pedagogical, outreach, etc.) and in conference proceedings; engaging in other scholarly and creative activities that are subject to peer review. The primary indicator of excellence regardless of the quantity of scholarly activity is evidence of the quality and impact of an applicant's scholarly output. In particular excellence in research or scholarship requires scholarly output that is communicated externally and validated by peers.

**IV.C.iv.c Merit Rating Guidelines for C/T Faculty**

The classroom teaching performance of all faculty will be evaluated according to the procedure described in Section IV.E.

**Teaching**



**4.5-5.0** Outstanding; Exceptional classroom teaching, or highly effective classroom teaching AND strong contributions to the teaching program of the department.

**3.5-4.25** Exceeding Expectations; Highly effective classroom teaching, or effective classroom teaching AND significant contributions to the teaching program of the department.

**2.5-3.25** Meeting Expectations; Effective classroom teaching.

**1.5-2.25** Below Expectations; Deficient classroom teaching.

**0.0-1.25** Failure to meet expectations; Problematic classroom teaching.

**Research/Scholarship** Given that a typical C/T appointment will have a 10% research/scholarship apportionment, it is suggested that the merit evaluation committee look more closely at a C/T faculty member's research and scholarly activity over a longer time period, not to exceed the three years.

**4.5-5.0** Outstanding; Highly productive research activity reflecting overall excellence as detailed in Section IV.C.iv.b.3. There should be an indication that the faculty member's work has been communicated externally and validated by peers within the three year review window.

It should be noted that, in line with Section IV.C.v.c., a high publication rate should not be considered necessary for an Outstanding rating in this category.

**3.5-4.25** Exceeding Expectations; Significant research and scholarship activity, in line with a meritorious record as detailed in Section IV.C.iv.b.3.

**2.5-3.25** Meeting Expectations; Research and scholarly activity that, at a minimum, results in the faculty member remaining "professionally alive", as described in Section IV.C.iv.b.3.

**1.5-2.25** Below Expectations; Little or no research or scholarly activity.

**0.0-1.25** Failure to meet expectations; Evidence of deficiencies in professional integrity.

### **Service**

**4.5-5.0** Outstanding; Strong and effective contributions to the department, college, university or professional communities, reflecting overall excellence as outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.2. There should be an indication of leadership and/or evidence of the quality, durability and effectiveness of service performed.

**3.5-4.25** Exceeding Expectations; Meaningful contributions to the department, college, university or professional communities, reflecting an overall meritorious performance as outlined in Section IV.C.iv.b.2. There should be evidence of the quality, durability and effectiveness of service performed.

**2.5-3.25** Meeting Expectations; Solid, reliable service to the department.

**1.5-2.25** Below Expectations; Limited service and contributions.

**0.0-1.25** Failure to Meet Expectations; A record of disruptive or unprofessional behavior.

## **IV.D Instructors**

An appointment as Instructor or Senior Instructor is an “at will” appointment for a one year term, which is not a tenure track appointment. Instructors and Senior Instructors must have obtained a Masters degree in a discipline commensurate with employment in a department of mathematical sciences. Instructors typically have a time/effort apportionment of 80-100% teaching and 0-20% service. Instructors are not evaluated on Scholarly activity.

### **IV.D.i Initial Appointment**

#### **IV.D.i.a Procedures for Appointment**

Instructors are initially appointed by the Department chair, but do not become voting members of the department until they have been reappointed as per procedures in Section IV.D.ii

Initial appointment at the rank of senior instructor must be approved by a vote of the full faculty. In this case, full voting rights are conferred at initial appointment as outlined in Section I.C.iv

#### **IV.D.i.b Criteria for Initial Appointment**

At a minimum, instructors must have a Master’s degree in the mathematical sciences, or have a Master’s degree in some other discipline AND 18 credit hours of graduate-level course work in the mathematical sciences.

### **IV.D.ii Re-appointment**

#### **IV.D.ii.a Procedures for Reappointment**

Contracts for instructors are limited to one year and are not automatically renewed. Depending on the outcome of the annual merit evaluation, the department chair may recommend the instructor for reappointment. For initial reappointment, this recommendation must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty. For subsequent reappointments, no faculty vote is required. The recommendation for reappointment is forwarded to the Dean of CLAS. Reappointed instructors become voting members of the department as outlined in Section I.C.iv

#### **IV.D.ii.b Criteria for Reappointment**

Reappointment requires a satisfactory annual merit evaluation.

### **IV.D.iii Promotion to Senior Instructor**

#### **IV.D.iii.a Eligibility and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Instructor**

Instructors who have exceeded expectations in annual merit evaluations for two of the previous three years are eligible to apply for promotion to senior instructor. The instructor will submit a portfolio to the Chair consisting of the following materials: A summary of teaching activities, copies of FCQs from all courses taught at UC Denver, peer teaching evaluations, annual performance evaluation reports, and a summary of service activities. The chair will appoint a committee to evaluate the record of the instructor. This committee will prepare a written report of the evaluation that will be presented to the faculty. The faculty will vote on the recommendation, and a copy

of the report will be forwarded to the chair. The chair will forward this report to the Dean along with his/her own recommendation. Appropriate College and University procedures will be followed thereafter.

#### **IV.D.iii.b Criteria for Promotion**

Candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor must have a demonstrated record of excellent teaching and must also have a meritorious record of service.

#### **IV.D.iv Annual Evaluations**

##### **IV.D.iv.a Basic Procedure**

1. Instructors and Senior Instructors will be evaluated annually by the Non-Tenure Track Merit Evaluation Committee (NTT-MEC) based on the expectations outlined in Section IV.D.iv.b.
2. The committee will evaluate each faculty member according to the guidelines in Section IV.D.iv.c to determine a numerical rating in each of the two areas: teaching; and leadership and service. A weighted average of these numerical ratings determines an overall numerical rating, with the weights determined by the faculty member's workload distribution.
3. The committee will provide to the chair of the department the numerical ratings as well as written evaluations in each of the three areas, with a copy to the faculty member. The numerical ratings in the 3 categories should be justified by the written evaluations, consistently between different faculty members.
4. The NTT-MEC is encouraged to establish an informal appeals process in which faculty members may ask the committee to reconsider their evaluations. This process should be completed prior to forwarding the numerical ratings and written evaluations to the chair.
5. The department chair assigns a final (categorical) performance rating (Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, etc.) for each faculty member. Typically, the final rating is determined from the numerical rating according to the following intervals: Outstanding: (4.5-5.0); Exceeding Expectations: (3.5-4.49); Meeting Expectations: (2.5-3.49), Below Expectations: (1.5-2.49), Failure to Meet Expectations (0.0-1.49). However, the chair may raise or lower this rating by providing a written justification.
6. The evaluation will be based on faculty files as specified in Section IV.A.ii.d. The complete set of documents will be made available to the faculty member under evaluation who will be given an opportunity to respond prior to being evaluated. The committee's comments should fairly reflect the evidence.
7. The evaluation will be based primarily on the previous calendar year, but will also be taken in the context of the three prior years.
8. Faculty members may appeal their evaluations following the procedure described in Section IV.A.ii.g.

##### **IV.D.iv.b Expectations**

**IV.D.iv.b.1 Teaching** Instructors and Senior Instructors are expected to effectively teach their assigned classes (as defined in Section IV.E.i).

**IV.D.iv.b.2 Service** Instructors whose contracted workload distribution includes service are expected to carry out consistent and effective departmental service. Evidence of excellent or meritorious service could include active membership on a department committee; service on an internal or external search committee; outreach; and completion of other special assignments. Furthermore, attendance at department meetings is expected as it demonstrates a commitment to the department. In general, excellence in service is indicated by evidence that the service is of high quality, durability, effectiveness, and value.

#### **IV.D.iv.c Merit Rating Guidelines for Instructors and Senior Instructors**

##### **IV.D.iv.c.1 Teaching**

The classroom teaching performance of all faculty will be evaluated according to the procedure described in Section IV.E.

**4.5-5.0** Outstanding; Exceptional classroom teaching, or highly effective classroom teaching AND strong contributions to the teaching program of the department.

**3.5-4.25** Exceeding Expectations; Highly effective classroom teaching, or effective classroom teaching AND significant contributions to the teaching program of the department.

**2.5-3.25** Meeting Expectations; Effective classroom teaching.

**1.5-2.25** Below Expectations; Deficient classroom teaching.

**0.0-1.25** Failure to meet expectations; Problematic classroom teaching.

##### **IV.D.iv.c.2 Service**

**4.5-5.0** Outstanding: Strong and effective contributions to the department, college, university or professional communities, reflecting overall excellence as outlined in Section IV.D.iv.b. There should be an indication of leadership and/or evidence of the quality, durability and effectiveness of service performed.

**3.5-4.25** Exceeding Expectations: Meaningful contributions to the department, college, university or professional communities, reflecting an overall meritorious performance as outlined in Section IV.D.iv.b.2. There should be evidence of the quality, durability and effectiveness of service performed.

**2.5-3.25** Meeting Expectations: Solid, reliable service to the department.

**1.5-2.25** Below Expectations: Limited service and/or ineffective or insubstantial contributions.

**0.0-1.25** Failure to Meet Expectations: A record of disruptive or unprofessional behavior.

#### **IV.E Evaluation of Classroom Teaching Effectiveness**

Classroom teaching effectiveness refers to how well an instructor teaches his/her assigned courses (excluding readings courses, independent studies, thesis supervision, seminars, workshops, etc.). This section describes a uniform policy for evaluating the classroom teaching effectiveness of all rostered faculty of the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences. The evaluation of classroom teaching is one component of the overall teaching evaluation of each faculty member.

**IV.E.i Expectations**

While no specific teaching style is mandated, all faculty must comply with the following expectations for classroom teaching:

1. Be knowledgeable and proficient in the subject matter they are teaching.
2. Use class time effectively to facilitate student learning.
3. Give assignments that appropriately challenge students to enhance their learning.
4. Provide timely feedback to students.
5. Be available to answer student questions outside of class.
6. Be responsive to student questions and concerns.
7. Grade fairly and consistently with other courses of the same level.
8. Treat students with respect and understanding.
9. Comply with Department, College, and University teaching policies.

**IV.E.ii Evaluation Criteria**

The following factors will be considered in evaluating classroom teaching effectiveness:

1. Student learning/achievement.
2. Planning and organization.
3. Classroom performance.
4. Efforts to improve teaching and/or efforts to maintain a previously demonstrated track record of effective teaching.
5. Student satisfaction.

**IV.E.iii General Procedure**

1. The evaluation will be based upon materials submitted by the faculty member as well as the following information and data maintained by the department:
  - (a) FCQs.
  - (b) Grade distributions and DFW rates.
  - (c) Student feedback (from all sources, including written comments on FCQs, exit interviews, and communications with the chair or associate chair).
  - (d) All peer evaluations (if any) of classroom performance performed by observers designated by the chair.
  - (e) Other data specified by the merit committee if applied uniformly to all faculty members. (For example, analysis of results on uniform finals, statistical analysis of student performance in subsequent courses, etc.).
2. The evaluation committee will rate the classroom teaching effectiveness of each faculty member according to the guidelines described in Section IV.E.v.

#### **IV.E.iv Faculty Files**

The faculty member should submit the following materials for evaluation:

- Syllabus for each course taught.
- Written account of how each course was conducted, including what material was actually covered (compared to what is listed in the syllabus), what help was provided to students (extra credit, curving of grades, etc.), what went well in each class, and what problems arose, and were they dealt with.

The faculty member may submit other materials developed in the normal course of teaching, which may assist the committee in evaluating teaching performance. These materials may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Description of strategies used to achieve learning objectives.
- Explanation of how student learning was assessed, and summary of the results of the assessments. Copies of final exams and summary of the raw scores (before any curve).
- Summaries of classroom observations.

#### **IV.E.v Guidelines for Rating Classroom Teaching Effectiveness**

Below, we list typical attributes of various ratings as a guide to determine which rating best describes the faculty member's classroom teaching effectiveness. It is not necessary to satisfy all of the attributes for a given rating; instead, the merit committee will determine the rating that best fits the faculty member's performance.

##### **Exceptional:**

- Evidence of very high levels of student learning.
  - Evidence of outstanding quality of course organization, content, tools used for student assessment, and teaching practices.
  - Evidence of outstanding commitment to improving student performance such as providing significant written feedback (e.g., on assignments, exams, or presentations).
  - Evidence of significant positive impact beyond the candidate's specific classes. (For example, adoption of course materials by other faculty).
  - High levels of student satisfaction relative to similar courses
- Highly Effective:
- Evidence of above average levels of student learning.
  - Evidence of high quality in lectures, course organization, content, tools used for student assessment, and teaching practices.
  - Above average levels of student satisfaction relative to similar courses.

**Effective:**

- Compliance with all departmental expectations for classroom performance, as described in Section IV.E.i.
- Reasonable levels of student learning and student satisfaction relative to similar courses.

**Deficient:**

- Deficiencies in meeting some of the expectations for classroom performance. For example,
  - Evidence of deficiencies in student learning.
  - Documented problems in conducting the course; for example, failure to provide timely feedback to students, insufficient office hours, inconsistent grading, etc.
  - Evidence of significant student dissatisfaction.
- AND evidence of efforts to improve on deficiencies.

**Problematic:**

- Deficiencies in classroom teaching coupled with unwillingness or inability to address these deficiencies.
- Or, major deficiencies in meeting expectations for classroom performance. For example
  - Documented problems with respect to treatment of students.
  - Large numbers of student complaints that provide evidence of specific problems.
  - Evidence of significant problems with respect to student learning.
  - Severe student dropout rates in relation to other courses of the same level.

## Article V

# Amendments

These bylaws may be amended by a 2/3 written vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members followed by approval by the Dean of CLAS and by the Provost/Chancellor. Faculty members on sabbatical or on leave will not be counted unless they opt to cast a vote. The vote cannot be taken until one week after debate has ended on the proposed amendments.

## Disclaimers

These Bylaws are not intended to and do not create any contractual obligations.

To the extent that these Bylaws are inconsistent with CLAS Bylaws, Regent law, policy, or administrative policy statements, or University of Colorado Denver policies, the CLAS Bylaws, Regent law, policy, and administrative policy statements and University of Colorado Denver policies prevail.

Nothing in these Bylaws abrogates the right of any constituency or other duly organized body within the Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences to organize and meet.