# GSLL SALARY PROCEDURES

Updated March 2022

1. The Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC) is elected every fall semester.
2. Standard and differentiated faculty workloads to be used in the salary calculation will be reviewed each year by the department Chair prior to the beginning of the salary process. A faculty member must be notified of any change in percent of obligation.
3. The department chair will send faculty the “Instructions to Faculty for Submitting Peer Evaluation Materials” [see Addendum #2] at least four weeks prior to the deadline for submitting Peer Evaluation materials. The Peer Evaluation Committee will propose point assignments for each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and service. Point assignments must fall within the parameters of the department’s point chart (attached). Before the end of the spring semester the PEC completes its evaluation process. Faculty members will have a week to review their evaluations and to file grievances or notice of numerical discrepancies with the Department Chair. When faculty members receive their evaluation for review, they may notify the merit committee chair that they do not wish to receive a salary increase. The faculty member thereby renounces that year’s salary increase, and cannot ask for the current year’s salary increase to be added in a later cycle. The PEC holds a meeting in order to rule on grievances.
4. Chair will give PEC at least 48 hours to look at a proposed salary spreadsheet before it is approved.
5. The department’s annual salary allocation will be divided into two pools. Twenty-five percent (25%) will be designated for rewarding career merit, addressing salary inequity, for the department share of the retention cases and for providing raises at promotions for Teaching Professors. Seventy-five percent (75%) will be used for annual merit raises and will be awarded on a percentage basis where merit points will translate into dollar value in accordance with a base salary of each faculty member.

1. The department uses a two-stage salary increase calculation: a dollars-per-point calculation (spreadsheet formula) followed by a manual percent adjustment for compression. A range of the spread (wide vs. narrow) will be decided annually by the Peer Evaluation Committee and will be determined by such factors as: the size of an average departmental raise; and a total point range between the lowest and highest scores. When the difference between the lowest and the highest scores is bigger, the range of spread should be wider. In this sliding scale the minimum (narrow) spread can be determined by the formula: 1 point of difference= .5% of spread. The maximum (wide) spread can be determined by the formula: 1 point of difference=2.5% of spread.
2. Records of continuing point credit for publications will be maintained by the PEC Chair, distributed to the PEC members and faculty with continuing points and placed on file with the department at the conclusion of PEC deliberations.
3. The department chair will forward the point assignment, along with the spreadsheet listing point assignments for all department faculty, to Arts and Sciences.
4. In addition to the merit evaluation, the PEC, in consultation with faculty members’ mentors, will prepare an “Advice and Comments” form for assistant professors and Teaching Professors with specific advice about their progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or reappointment.
5. Misrepresentation of one’s work to the PEC may result in points not credited for that work. Further investigation and sanctions are the purview of the department chair.

SALARY INCREASE CALCULATION

A subtract funds needed for special merit (2x) adjustment from the total dept. salary increase allocation.

B enter point assignments and run spreadsheet (dollars per point calculation). The point assignment in each area (teaching, research, service) will be an average of the current and previous year’s scores. When a faculty member is on leave for one semester, the point assignment will be the average of the previous year and the semester of the current year during which the faculty member had a normal workload. When a faculty member is on leave for a full year, the average score from the previous two years will be used to determine the point assignment for the leave year. A faculty member who has been on leave may receive additional points for teaching and service, under two conditions only: if the faculty member was the principal advisor for a Ph.D. or M.A. student who defended during the leave period, or if the faculty member performed extraordinary service such as being on a PUEC or holding a leadership position in a national or international organization; and if the faculty member did not receive points for these activities in the previous two years.

C subtract an additional amount from the salary pot, sufficient to carry out the following adjustment for compression: percentages of salary increases (shown on the spreadsheet) will be adjusted manually so that point assignments and percent of increase are brought closer together for the purpose of avoiding compression.

D the final dollar amounts of salary increases will be approved by the PEC chair and the chair of GSLL.

POINT ASSIGNMENTS

### A. Teaching

The point assignment and peer evaluation wording for teaching will be determined by

averaging the score from all five components of the merit teaching evaluation rubric (based on all courses in a given year). When an instructor teaches a recitation section of a large course, the recitation grade may slightly raise or lower the lecture grade, but is not weighted equally with the latter in the calculation. Note guidelines above (Salary Increase Calculation section B) for assigning points when faculty member was on leave.

### Conversion of rubric points to PEC points

Average score from the merit teaching evaluation rubric, based on an evaluation of all courses taught as part of regular academic year course load. See Addendum #1 for a more detailed breakdown of converting points.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric points | PEC points | Peer Evaluation wording (Corresponding wording for College if different) |
| 5 | 72-90 | Outstanding  |
| 4 | 54-71 | Exceeding expectations |
| 3 | 36-53  | Meeting expectations |
| 2 | 18-35  | Below expectations  |
| 1 | 0-17  | Unsatisfactory/fails to meet expectations |

High-enrollment courses receive additional PEC points, up to a maximum of 12 additional points per faculty member per year.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ENROLLMENT FOR CONTENT CLASSES: | POINTS FOR CONTENT COURSES: | ENROLLMENTFOR LANGUAGECLASSES: | POINTS FOR LANGUAGE COURSES: |
| 20-29 | 1 | 18-22 | 1 |
| 30-39 | 2 | 23-29 | 2 |
| 40-59 | 3 | 30+ | 3 |
| 60-79 | 4 |  |  |
| 80+ | 5 |  |  |

The same high-enrollment course taught in the same semester receives extra credit only once.

(3) Additional points are assigned for the teaching activities listed below. Points are awarded upon completion of theses and exams. Committee may award points for failed exams or unfinished theses at its discretion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Independent study  | 2 points  |
| Internship direction | .5 per student |
| Directing honors & MA thesis | 2 points per student |
| Regular meeting with PhD candidate after completion of coursework | 1 point per semester per student |
| Defense of a PhD dissertation | 4 points per student  |
| Membership on a PhD, MA, honors thesis committee | .5 points (max. 5 points per year) |
| Directing a graduate exam committee | 1 point |
| Membership on a graduate exam committee | .5 points (max. 5 points per year) |
| Advisor for non-thesis option exam | up to 1 point |
| .25 per student for Russian MA proficiency exam  |  |
| Curriculum development (approved and implemented new course proposal, major revisions of an existing course; documentation should be supplied):  | up to 5 points per year |
| Campus-wide/national teaching awards | up to 4 points per year |
| For Teaching Professors only: professional development (including methodological/technological workshops with documentation, presentations, and publications) | usually up to 5 points per year, with possibility of up to 15 for exceptional cases (such as the publication of a book) |
| For Teaching Professors only: Other teaching activities, such as administering external exams, community teaching, and teaching pedagogical workshops | usually up to 5 points per year, with possibility of up to 15 for exceptional cases |
| For Teaching Professors only: Teaching three or more different courses in one semester | 1 point per semester |

The language of the peer evaluation is based on the average rubric rating and supplementary points added for other teaching activities. However, the supplementary points may not raise the language of the evaluation by more than one category.

Points for teaching in excess of the maximum of 90 are banked for Teaching Professors.

### B. Research

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Book in a refereed venue | Depending on the size of a book and the quality of a publisher:78-90 points in each year 30,000 – 50,000 words (one year), 50,000 – 70,000 words (two years), 70,000 – 100,000 words (three years) corresponds to about 200 to 300 pages100,000 – 130,000 words (four years)130,000 and above (up to five years) |
| One published refereed article | 66 points for 12,000 words60 points for 10,000 words54 points for 8,000 words48 points for 6,000 words42 points for 4,000 words36 points for 2,000 words |
| Edited primary texts/curatorial work | 1-77 points continuing credit up to 3 years depending on the size of a book/ exhibition and the quality of a publisher/venue(s) |
| Edited book of scholarly articles  | 45-77 points  |
| Co-edited book of scholarly articles  | 20-38 points |
| Edited special issue of a journal | 25-55 points |
| Edited cluster of articles in a journal | 10-25 points  |
| Co-authored refereed article | 26-32 points |
| Non-refereed book chapter, paper, article, review article | 1-32 points |
| Book or film review | Depending on quality of venue, length of book under review, length of review, and whether review was invited:1-8 points |
| Invited external lecture | Up to 15 points, depending on the length and venue |
| Reprint of article or book chapter | Up to 10 points, depending on the venue |

The Peer Evaluation Committee will evaluate notes, numerous or unusually short or long articles, major scholarly translations, book prizes, major external grants and prizes, editing work on reprints and translations,.

The PEC will adjust by consensus judgment the point assignment for significance and quality of publications for all faculty members. For co-edited and co-authored works, credit is assigned according to the scale above, unless the faculty member can provide documentation of disproportionate contribution to the publication.

The preceding point assignments for co-operative publication assume only two authors.

In cases where the contribution of one author is more than 50%, the faculty member may petition the PEC for additional credit and must provide proof of the percent of contribution. Credit for multiple authorship (more than two contributors) will be decided on a case-by-case basis by the PEC.

An article subsequently published as a chapter of a book will be awarded normal point credit in the year of publication, but some credit, as determined by the PEC on a case-by-case basis, will be subtracted from the total number of points awarded the book in the year of publication.

Credit points for refereed publications in excess of the maximum of 90 for any year are banked.

**Peer Evaluation wording:**

One article published over the past three years = meets expectations

Two articles over the past three years in refereed venues = exceeds expectations

Book (refereed venue) = outstanding (during all credited years)

In a case when a faculty member deserves “meets” but his or her points in research are lower than the level of “meets,” the case is handled according to rank. An assistant professor’s research points are raised to the bottom of the “meets” category (39), while the research points of an associate or higher are not raised.

Points Corresponding wording for the College

72-90 Outstanding

54-71 Exceeding expectations

36-53 Meeting expectations

18-35 Below expectations

0-17 Unsatisfactory/fails to meet expectations

### C. Service

Service is evaluated on the basis of the service activities that each faculty member lists in the FRPA. Note guidelines above (Salary Increase Calculation section B) for assigning points when faculty member was on leave.

The PEC, by consensus judgment, is able to adjust the point assignment for significance and quality of service for all faculty members, including departmental administrative officers.

Expectations for assistant professors are lower than those for tenured professors and full-time Teaching Professors.

Faculty members in administrative positions (especially those with stipends and/or course releases) do not receive additional points for the normal service duties associated with their positions.

Points are assigned in higher ranges when faculty do additional service beyond their standard assigned administrative duties, for example, significant additional service on college, campus, or system committees, or significant additional professional service at the regional, national or international level.

ADDENDUM #1:

Converting from Teaching Rubric to Teaching Points

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rubric points | PEC points |
| 5.00 | 81 |
| 4.95 | 80 |
| 4.90 | 79 |
| 4.85 | 78 |
| 4.80 | 77 |
| 4.75 | 76 |
| 4.70 | 75 |
| 4.65 | 74 |
| 4.60 | 73 |
| 4.55 | 72 |
| 4.50 | 71 |
| 4.45 | 70 |
| 4.40 | 69 |
| 4.35 | 68 |
| 4.30 | 67 |
| 4.25 | 66 |
| 4.20 | 65 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rubric points | PEC points |
| 4.15 | 64 |
| 4.10 | 63 |
| 4.05 | 62 |
| 4.00 | 61 |
| 3.95 | 60 |
| 3.90 | 59 |
| 3.85 | 58 |
| 3.80 | 57 |
| 3.75 | 56 |
| 3.70 | 55 |
| 3.65 | 54 |
| 3.60 | 53 |
| 3.55 | 52 |
| 3.50 | 51 |
| 3.45 | 50 |
| 3.40 | 49 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rubric points | PEC points |
| 3.35 | 48 |
| 3.30 | 47 |
| 3.25 | 46 |
| 3.20 | 45 |
| 3.15 | 44 |
| 3.10 | 43 |
| 3.05 | 42 |
| 3.00 | 41 |
| 2.95 | 40 |
| 2.90 | 39 |
| 2.85 | 38 |
| 2.80 | 37 |
| 2.75 | 36 |
| 2.70 | 35 |
| 2.65 | 34 |
| 2.60 | 33 |

**ADDENDUM #2: Instructions to Faculty Members**

**Deadlines**

Please note that deadlines are **hard deadlines**. The Peer Evaluation Committee works on a very tight schedule. It is imperative that faculty members submit all materials on time. Faculty members who do not follow guidelines / deadlines risk not having their points credited for that calendar year, and forfeiting merit raises.

Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA): due Jan 29th(before campus deadline)

Additional materials: due February 5th

**General Process**

Karen will create a Sharepoint folder for each faculty member’s peer evaluation materials, and share this folder with you.  Please add all of your materials to this folder by the deadline.  Karen will “unshare” the folder with you after the deadline, and you will no longer have access to add materials.  Please upload all of your peer evaluation materials into the appropriate folder: Teaching, Service, and Research (if applicable).  If you have a book or something that can’t be submitted electronically, please submit to Karen by the deadline. **\*\*For 2020 evaluations conducted in 2021: contact Beverly and Karen and we will figure out a solution.\*\***

All folders will be deleted after the merit process.  Please keep your own electronic copies of items submitted.

**Notes on Completing and Submitting your FRPA**

Complete and submit your FRPA by going to MyCUInfo, then reporting. Then submit your FRPA as a PDFto the “GSLL Packet” folder in your merit folder.  Do not delete other files in this packet (which should include your three most recent FRPAs and your two most recent performance ratings).

**For 2020 evaluations conducted in 2021:** You have the opportunity (optional) to use your FRPA to describe the ways in which the pandemic has impacted your work.

**Teaching**

For graduate or honors advising, please list *only* those students who completed a thesis or exam during the year evaluated. Indicate the date of the exam or defense. You should also include PhD advisees who are no longer taking courses; indicate frequency of meetings. Indicate whether you were a chair or committee member. If you conducted MA Russian proficiency exams, indicate how many.

**Research**

For each submitted research item, translate title in parentheses after the original title.

**Service**

List each service duty as a separate item.

If you are involved in a major service duty that may be unfamiliar to the committee, you may want to include a brief description of the work involved (there is a comment space in the FRPA for this, or you can just include it in a separate document with your service materials).

There is a section for submitting professional development work that you have done in this section; this will be relevant to your teaching as well.

**Instructions to Faculty for Submitting Additional Peer Evaluation Materials**

**Teaching**

Submit a syllabus as well as major assignments (exams and essay prompts) that demonstrate alignment of learning goals and teaching practices for ONE course.

Submit self-reflection (see attached Salary Procedures addenda).

Submit your FCQs. Go to <https://colorado.campuslabs.com/faculty> , and for each individual course, click on the “Print Reports” button, then print to a PDF.**\*\*Note for 2020 evaluations that will be completed in 2021: FCQs for spring 2020 are optional.\*\***

You may choose to submit up to 20 pages of **additional** material per year, such as peer observations, lesson plans, and/or your feedback on student assignments. If your self-reflection focuses on a specific course or assignment, you may want to include relevant materials. If you discuss changes in your course(s), you may want to include syllabi and assignments from previous years.

All materials should be a single Word document or PDF or included in a single folder titled with the course number and title. If student assignments are included in your materials, make sure all identifying information has been removed.

**Research**

Please submit copies of all publications published during the previous calendar year as PDFs. Copies of works in progress may be submitted if they attest to your ongoing research.

**Cover Sheet**

State the title, a translation into English, and an actual word count (not an estimate) of each publication.

If there is overlap with previously published work, faculty must address this on the cover sheet (indicate approximate number of words overlapped and with which publication).

If an article was peer reviewed or invited, you may submit copies of correspondence with editors and reader’s reviews.

You are encouraged to submit information about the editorial policy of a press or journal in which your work appeared if the venue is not well known or not listed in the MLA Dictionary of Periodicals. Submit copies of acceptance/rejection letters for grants written.

For books, please submit details that describe the peer review and revision process. Consider including a letter from the editor or a link to a website that describes this process.

**Service**

Submit documentation for

* letters of recommendation, if you have written more than 20 letters (due to privacy considerations, a list of names will suffice)
* copies of acceptance/rejection letters for grants written in service to an organization
* invitations for invited lectures
* Additional materials, such as letters of acknowledgment, thanks, or invitation, may also be submitted.

**ADDENDUM #3 CLASSROOM TEACHING MERIT EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR GSLL**

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS:

Submit a syllabus as well as major assignments (exams and essay prompts) that demonstrate alignment of learning goals and teaching practices for ONE course.

Submit self-reflection (see Addendum #4).

Submit your FCQs. Go to <https://colorado.campuslabs.com/faculty> , and for each individual course, click on the “Print Reports” button, then print to a PDF.

You may choose to submit up to 20 pages of **additional** material per year, such as lesson plans and your feedback on student assignments. If your self-reflection focuses on a specific course or assignment, you may want to include relevant materials. If you discuss changes in your course(s), you may want to include syllabi and assignments from previous years.

All materials should be a single Word document or PDF or included in a single folder titled with the course number and title. If student assignments are included in your materials, make sure all identifying information has been removed.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PEC COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

There are two versions of the rubric included in this document. The first (A) is a complete rubric based on five components of effective teaching (from the [TQF rubric](https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/TQF_Assessment_Rubric_Draft)) and includes a list of what materials to look at for evaluating each component and explanations for how to score. The second rubric (B) is a simpler form, intended more as a quick reference for what materials to look at for each component once you’ve become familiar with the process described in the first rubric.1

For each of the seven components, you should assign a score of 1 to 5 where 1 = significantly below expectations (unsatisfactory), 2 = below expectations, 3 = meets expectations, 4 = above expectations, and 5 = significantly above expectations. Your score for each component should take all available data sources into consideration; however, if there are discrepancies between data sources, consider the weight (e.g., relative importance) of each data source, as indicated in the rubrics.

For peer observation protocols, there are two versions: one for Content Courses (denoted with (C) in the rubrics) and one for Language Courses (denoted with an (L) in the rubrics; protocol items that do not specify C or L are common to both protocols. For FCQs, S = standard questions and CP = core TQF pilot questions.

Note that FCQs for crosslisted courses will have forms for each unit in which the course is listed. Students enrolled in the crosslisted number receive the special questions for that unit.

1 These rubrics were developed in partnership with the Teaching Quality Framework Initiative (<https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/>) with sponsorship by the National Science Foundation (DUE-1725959) - any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component of effective classroom teaching** | **Meets expectations (3)** | **Above expectations (4) (Meets, PLUS)** | **Signif. above expectations (5) (Above, PLUS)** | **Your Score (1-5)** |
| **Goals and Content***What are students expected to learn from the courses taught? Are course goals appropriately challenging, considering level of course? Is content appropriately challenging for the course level?*Data sources to review:Self-reflection statement, peer observation protocols, FCQs, syllabi/course materialsRelative weight of sources:Self-reflection, peer observation and review of syllabi/course materials should be weighted high and FCQs should be weighted low | For at least one course, the syllabus includes some course goals, or if absent from syllabi, the self-reflection articulates course goalsStandard, intellectually sound course materials and content (based on syllabi and any submitted course materials)Generally positive peer observations for A3) Learning Goals and A6) Prior KnowledgeFCQ item CP5 (helpful materials) is greater than 2.5If FCQs and/or peer observations are mid/low, self-reflection addresses this | For at least one course, the syllabus includes well-articulated and appropriately challenging course goalsRange/depth of course materials and content is appropriate for the course level (based on syllabi and any submitted course materials)Very positive peer observations for A3) Learning Goals and A6) Prior KnowledgeFCQ item CP5 (helpful materials) is greater than 3.3 | Course materials or self-reflection reveal a attempt to develop clear and appropriately challenging course goalsContent and materials are challenging and thoughtful, and content connects to developments in the field and/or current issues (based on syllabi and any submitted course materials)Excellent peer observations for A3) Learning goals and A6) Prior KnowledgeFCQ item CP5 (helpful materials) is greater than 4.2 |  |
| **Teaching Practices***What assignments, assessments, and activities are used? Are they aligned with course goals? Are methods appropriate for course level and class size? Was the course well-organized? Are there opportunities for students to practice skills and receive feedback throughout the semester?*Data sources to review:Self-reflection statement, peer observation protocols, FCQs, syllabi/course materialsRelative weight of sources:All data sources should be weighted equally | For at least one course, assignments, assessments, and activities are linked to the course goals (based on syllabus, course handouts, and/or self-reflection)FCQs and peer observations show that students have some opportunities to practice skills embedded in course goals and receive feedbackGenerally positive peer observations for A1) Organized and Clear, A2) Tools and Resources, A4) Participation, A5) Active Learning, and A8) Critical Thinking (C)/Corrective Feedback (L), and if applicable C1) Strengths/expertiseAverage of FCQ items CP7 (opportunities for discussion) and CP8 (helpful feedback on work) is greater than 2.5If FCQs and/or peer observations are mid/low, self-reflection addresses this | For at least one course, the syllabus, course handouts, and/or self-reflection clearly connect assignments, assessments, and activities to course goalsFCQs and peer observations show that assignments give students the opportunity to receive regular feedback on their mastery of skills/conceptsVery positive peer observations for A1) Organized and Clear, A2) Tools and Resources, A4) Participation, A5) Active Learning, and A8) Critical Thinking (C)/Corrective Feedback (L), and if applicable C1) Strengths/expertiseAverage of FCQ items CP7 (opportunities for discussion), and CP8 (helpful feedback on work) is greater than 3.3 | Syllabi, course handouts and/or self-reflection reveal well organizedclasses well aligned goals, materials, and assignmentsFCQs and peer observations show that students have frequent opportunities to receive feedback on important skills/conceptsExcellent peer observations for A1) Organized and Clear, A2) Tools and Resources, A4) Participation, A5) Active Learning, and A8) Critical Thinking (C)/Corrective Feedback (L), ), and if applicable C1) Strengths/expertiseAverage of FCQ items CP7 (opportunities for discussion), and CP8 (helpful feedback on work) is greater than 4.2 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component of effective classroom teaching** | **Meets expectations (3)** | **Above expectations (4) (Meets, PLUS)** | **Signif. above expectations (5) (Above, PLUS)** | **Your Score (1-5)** |
| **Presentation and Student Interaction***Are teaching methods implemented effectively? Is the classroom climate respectful? Do the teaching methods encourage engagement?*Data sources to review:Self-reflection statement, peer observation protocols, FCQsRelative weight of sources:FCQs should be mid-weighted, peer observations should be weighted highest, and self-reflection and syllabi/course materials should be weighted lowest | Some evidence that classroom climate is respectful, cooperative, and encourages student engagementStudents report good instructor interaction skillsInstructor occasionally gathers student feedbackGenerally positive peer observations for A4) Participation and if applicable, A7) Engagement (L)Average of FCQ items S4 (how much learned), S6 (encourages interest), S7 (instructor availability), S8 (respect for students), and CP3 (respectful environment) is greater than 2.5Generally positive qualitative FCQ commentsIf FCQs and/or peer observations are mid/low, self-reflection addresses this | Evidence that classroom climate is respectful, cooperative, and encourages student engagementStudents report good instructor interaction skillsInstructor gathers student feedback and seeks to incorporate changes appropriate to students’ needs and learning outcomesVery positive peer observations for A4) Participation and if applicable, A7) Engagement (L)Average of FCQ items S4 (how much learned), S6 (encourages interest), S7 (instructor availability), S8 (respect for students), and CP3 (respectful environment) is greater than 3.5Mostly positive qualitative FCQ comments | Strong evidence that classroom climate is respectful, cooperative, and encourages student engagementStudents report excellent instructor interaction skillsInstructor gathers student feedback and implements changes in the short and/or long termExcellent peer observations for A4) Participation and if applicable, A7) Engagement (L)Average of FCQ items S4 (how much learned), S6 (encourages interest), S7 (instructor availability), S8 (respect for students), and CP3 (respectful environment) is greater than 4.2Consistently positive qualitative FCQ comments |  |
| **Student outcomes***What evidence shows student learning and achievement of course goals? Do assessments effectively measure student learning?*Data sources to include:Self-reflection statement, peer observation, FCQs, Classroom interviews, syllabi/course materialsRelative weight of sources:Self-reflection should be weighted highest, FCQs and classroom interviews should be mid weight, and peer observations and syllabi/course materials should be mid weighted | Standard attention to student achievementFor at least one course, the syllabus (or other course materials) indicates some standards for evaluating student understandingClear standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding; occasional attempts to improve student outcomesGenerally positive peer observations for A4) Participation and if applicable A8) Corrective feedback (L)Average of FCQ items S4 (how much learned), CP4 (invested in student success), and CP8 (helpful feedback on work) is greater than 2.5 | Clear efforts to support learning in all studentsFor at least one course, the syllabus (or other course materials) clearly articulates standards for evaluating student understandingEvidence-based standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding; works to improve student outcomesVery positive peer observations for A4) Participation and if applicable A8) Corrective feedback (L)Average of FCQ items S4 (how much learned), CP4 (invested in student success), and CP8 (helpful feedback on work) is greater than 3.5 | Exceptional efforts to support learning in all studentsFor at least one course, the syllabus (or other course materials) clearly articulate well thoughtout/evidence-based standards for evaluating student understandingEvidence-based standards for evaluating the quality of student understanding; consistently works to improve student outcomesExcellent peer observations for A4) Participation and if applicable A8) Corrective feedback (L)Average of FCQ items S4 (how much learned), CP4 (invested in student success), and CP8 (helpful feedback |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component of effective classroom teaching** | **Meets expectations (3)** | **Above expectations (4) (Meets, PLUS)** | **Signif. above expectations (5) (Above, PLUS)** | **Your Score (1-5)** |
| **Student outcomes, continued***What evidence shows student learning and achievement of course goals? Do assessments effectively measure student learning?*Data sources to include:Self-reflection statement, peer observation, FCQs, Classroom interviews, syllabi/course materialsRelative weight of sources:Self-reflection should be weighted highest, FCQs and classroom interviews should be mid weight, and peer observations and syllabi/course materials should be mid weighted | Classroom interview Q2 (if available) score is greater than or equal to 4.2Self-reflection statement indicates some attention paid to understanding student learningIf FCQs, classroom interviews, and/or peer observations are mid/low, self reflection addresses this | Classroom interview Q2 (if available) score is greater than or equal to 7Self-reflection indicates regular efforts to improve student outcomes based on data | on work) is greater than 4.2Classroom interview Q2 (if available) score is greater than or equal to 9Self-reflection indicates consistent efforts to improve student outcomes based on multiple sources of data |  |
| **Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service/ Scholarship***How has the faculty member’s teaching changed? To what extent has the teacher reflected on and improved their teaching?*Data sources to include:Self-reflection statement, syllabi/course materials, FRPARelative weight of sources:Self-reflection and syllabi/course materials should be weighted highest and FRPA should be mid-weight | Self-reflection statement includes some indication that teaching has been informed by reflectionReflection on teaching is informed only by FCQsFRPA professional development (PD) activities includes at least 1 pedagogical PD activity | Self-reflection indicates regular adjustment of teaching based on prior teaching and feedbackReflection on teaching informed by student feedback beyond FCQs and/or by teaching development training or scholarshipThese adjustments are reflected in changes to syllabi/course materials over timeReflection is informed by more than FCQsFRPA professional development (PD) activities includes 2 or more pedagogical PD activities | Self-reflection is informed by multiple sources of dataContinuously adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedbackFRPA professional development (PD) activities includes 3 or more pedagogical PD activities |  |
|  |  |  | Enter the average score across allcomponents |  |

GSLL merit teaching evaluation rubric B: Summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Corresponding items from:** |  |
| **Component of effective classroom teaching** | **Self-reflection** | **Peer Observation** | **FCQs** | **Syllabi and course materials** | **Your Score (1-5)** |
| **Goals, Content, and Alignment** *What are students expected to learn from the courses taught? Are course goals appropriately challenging,**considering level of course? Is content appropriately challenging for the course level?* | *High weight* | *High weight*A3) Learning Goals A6) Prior Knowledge | *Low weight*CP5 (helpful materials) | *High weight* |  |
| **Teaching Practices** *What assignments, assessments, and activities are used? Are they aligned with course goals? Are methods appropriate for course level and class size? Was the course well-organized? Are there opportunities for students to practice skills and receive feedback throughout the semester?* | *Equal weight* | *Equal weight*A1) Organized and Clear A2) Tools and Resources A4) ParticipationA5) Active LearningA8) Critical Thinking (C)A8) Corrective Feedback (L) C1) Strengths/expertise | *Equal weight*CP7 (opportunities for discussion)CP8 (helpful feedback on work) | *Equal weight* |  |
| **Presentation and Student Interaction** *Are teaching methods implemented effectively? Is the classroom climate respectful? Do the teaching methods encourage engagement?* | *Low weight* | *Mid weight*A4) Participation A7) Engagement (L) | *High weight*S4 (how much learned) S6 (encourages interest) S7 (instructor availability) S8 (respect for students) CP3 (respectful environ.) | *Low weight* |  |
| **Student outcomes***What evidence shows student learning and achievement of course goals? Do assessments effectively measure student learning?* | *High weight* | *Low/mid weight*A4) ParticipationA8) Corrective Feedback (L) | *Mid weight*)S4 (how much learned) CP4 (invested in student success)CP8 (helpful feedback on work) See also: Classroom Interview Q2 | *Low/Mid weight* |  |
| **Reflection, Development, & Teaching Service/ Scholarship***How has the faculty member’s teaching changed? To what extent has the teacher reflected on and improved their teaching?* | *High weight*(also review FRPA for pedagogical professional development activities, *mid weight*) | *NA* | *NA* | *High weight* |  |
|  |  |  | Enter the average score across all components: |  |

**Addendum #4: MERIT Self-reflective teaching statement[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Reflect on your teaching during the past calendar year. The PEC will use your statement as part of the evaluation process. Your reflection should address one or more of the following guiding questions. You do not have to answer all of the questions.

Please limit your response to no more than 2 single spaced pages.

1) How did your courses go in the calendar year for which you are being evaluated? Please comment on achievement of course goals, level of student engagement, student learning outcomes, and anything else that seems important to you. You may want to address aspects of your teaching that proved to be particularly effective or ineffective. You may focus on one course or several courses.

2) Did you introduce changes in your classes or in your teaching during the calendar year for which you are being evaluated? If so, what changes did you introduce, and why? Did you find them effective? Explain why or why not.

* What adjustments did you make in response to prior course feedback (FCQs, peer observation, FTEP observation, surveys)?
* What steps have you taken to develop your knowledge about effective teaching practices, methods, or materials? You may wish to mention any FTEP, ASSETT, or COLTT sessions that you attended; discussions with colleagues; or any reading in pedagogical scholarship. How have these opportunities initiated reflection about your teaching and what concrete changes did they inspire?
* If you made other changes, describe them and explain your rationale.

3) What steps have you taken to evaluate student learning in a formative as well as summative fashion? (Formative assessments are low-stakes opportunities to monitor student learning and are typically not graded or only assigned points based on completion. Summative assessments are high-stakes measures used to evaluate student learning and are graded for correctness/quality [e.g., quizzes, exams, projects].)

4) Describe the teaching accomplishment(s) from the past year that you value the most.

5) If your syllabi do not contain learning goals or lack other components necessary to obtain high merit ratings based on the rubric, describe your course learning goals and how they relate to course assignments, activities, and assessments.

6) What teaching contributions, challenges, or concerns would you like to share?

1. Developed in partnership with the Teaching Quality Framework Initiative ( https://www.colorado.edu/teaching-quality-framework/ ) with sponsorship by the National Science Foundation. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)