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**I. Introduction**

This policy provides requirements for the evaluation of faculty teaching, the results of which may be used for annual merit performance evaluation, tenure and promotion, and mentoring of the faculty member, and professional development. Requirements for the annual evaluation of teaching are addressed in Regent Policy 5.C – Faculty Appointments and Regent Policy 5.D – Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion:

- Regent Policy 5.C.4.(B) – Other Terms and Conditions of Faculty Appointments, which addresses the requirement of multiple measures of teaching evaluation for the annual evaluation of teaching
- Regent Policy 5.D.2 (B) - Standards for Tenure, which addresses the requirement of multiple measures of teaching evaluation for tenure purposes

**II. Policy Statement**

A. The teaching of all faculty members, other than lecturers, teaching regular courses (excluding independent study, thesis, dissertation credits, and similar individual student courses) shall be have their overall teaching evaluated annually using multiple means, including normed student feedback on each regular course, addressing behaviors and practices of which students have direct knowledge, using an instrument that mitigates known attempts to mitigate potential bias in student evaluations of teaching. See section IV of this APS for information on faculty teaching and course evaluation.

B. All personnel actions for tenured or tenure-track faculty shall be based, in part, on the evaluation of teaching. Faculty members shall be evaluated annually to inform decisions regarding merit-based salary adjustments and evaluated in a summative manner for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion.

---

1 At the Anschutz Medical Campus, faculty evaluation processes may vary from those described here. A peer evaluation process shall be used where appropriate, and normed student feedback shall be considered in the evaluation process whenever possible.
1. Annual evaluations of teaching are conducted as described in section II.A. shall include data from the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ) or a similar, campus-approved mechanism (see section IV of this APS) and may include other measures of teaching effectiveness.

1.2. Summative evaluations require more in-depth assessment and evaluation and shall also employ multiple measures of teaching effectiveness. A minimum of three assessment components shall be used, one of which must be data from the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ) or a similar, campus-approved mechanism. These components shall be addressed in primary unit criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

C. All personnel actions for instructional, research, and clinical faculty with teaching responsibilities shall be based, in part, on the evaluations of teaching.

1. Annual evaluations of teaching are conducted as described in section II.A.

2. Summative evaluations require more in-depth assessment and evaluation and shall also employ multiple measures of teaching effectiveness. A minimum of three assessment components shall be used, one of which must be data from the FCQ or a similar, campus-approved mechanism. These components shall be addressed in primary unit criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion.

a.—In accordance with Regent Policy 5.D—Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion, a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.

C. For instructional, research, and clinical track faculty with teaching responsibilities:

1. The evaluation of teaching shall include data from the FCQ or similar campus-approved mechanism. Other means of evaluation may be required by the campus or primary unit.

D. Lecturers shall, at a minimum, participate in Faculty Course Questionnaires, which should be reviewed by the unit head. The use of multiple means of teaching evaluation is encouraged.

D.E. Professional development to improve teaching shall be informed by the results of teaching evaluation as defined in this policy.

E.F. In conducting annual performance evaluations, primary units can consider performance over multiple years to account for activities that may not yield measurable meaningful results in a single year. Units are encouraged to use this flexibility to give appropriate consideration to pedagogical innovation, recognizing that positive impact may not be immediately evident.

III. PRIMARY UNIT PROCEDURES FOR TEACHING EVALUATION

A. The voting faculty of each primary unit shall determine the goals and components for evaluating annual evaluations of teaching in the unit. Primary unit components shall take into account any requirements from the campus or school/college. Individual faculty members shall be evaluated based on components selected from the list approved by the primary unit. Appendix A includes a non-exhaustive list of components that a unit might consider.

1. The primary unit evaluation goals and components shall be available to each faculty member.

2. The evaluation components selected for each faculty member for both annual and summative evaluations shall be appropriate to their teaching responsibilities of the faculty member.

3. Faculty members shall be advised of any elimination/revision of existing approved components, or addition of new approved components, no later than April 1 for application in the next academic year.

4. The primary unit shall gather the materials needed to evaluate an individual faculty member. The faculty member shall cooperate with this process and failure to do so may be regarded as neglect of duty.
4.5. Components of

B. The evaluation components for both annual teaching evaluations review and reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be reviewed when any primary unit criteria are reviewed and approved by the dean and provost.

B. Summative components of teaching evaluations for tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be developed as part of the primary unit evaluation criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

C. Summative evaluation components for IRC faculty are determined by the primary unit following a process similar to section III.A.

C-D. The provost/executive vice chancellor shall facilitate effective and efficient implementation of this policy with the deans and the chairs of the primary units.

IV. FACULTY TEACHING AND COURSE EVALUATION

A faculty member’s teaching shall be evaluated using multiple measures, including normed student feedback (such as FCQs or similar, campus-approved mechanisms), with actions to mitigate potential bias that evaluates the effectiveness of the course and the faculty member’s teaching of that course, or part of the course. The normalization process shall be defined by each primary unit. This information supports the faculty evaluation process and faculty rewards system.

A. FCQs or similar campus-approved mechanisms are used to provide a student-based evaluation of the course and the faculty member.

1. Each campus shall have a process for determining common questions for the campus instrument in evaluating courses and individual faculty on the campus.

The campus process for determining common questions for the campus instrument shall include faculty and students representing each school or college. When possible, these faculty and student representatives shall be members of the school or college from the appropriate shared governance body.

2. Schools/colleges, primary units, and individual faculty members shall have the option of adding additional questions to the campus instrument, but any additions are subject to approval by the faculty of the primary unit and the dean.

A.3. Each student in a course/course section shall have the opportunity to participate in a faculty teaching and course evaluation (commonly referred to as the FCQ), or a similar, campus-approved mechanism that evaluates the effectiveness of the course and the faculty member’s teaching of that course or part of the course.

B.4. The purposes of implementation and information distribution associated with faculty and course evaluations shall be funded by the chancellor: the evaluation are: (1) to provide a student-based evaluation of the course and the faculty member, and (2) to support the faculty evaluation process and faculty rewards system. In addition, faculty are encouraged to develop and use diagnostic (formative) evaluation tools during the course to assist in mid-course pedagogical corrections for the purpose of improving instruction and student learning.

5. Faculty teaching and course evaluation numerical summary data shall be available to the public. Other data collected with FCQs are available to select individuals specified by each campus.

C. Each campus shall have a process for determining common elements for evaluating courses and individual faculty on the campus. Schools/colleges, primary units, and individual faculty members shall have the option of adding additional components, but any additions are subject to dean and provost approval.

B. Other measures of evaluating teaching are used to provide additional insights into faculty members’ teaching effectiveness and evidence of their teaching practices. Additional means to be included as multiple measures of evaluation shall be selected from those approved by the primary unit, using a process approved by the primary unit as described in section III of this APS.

2 The process for administering and reporting faculty and course evaluations may differ on the Anschutz Medical Campus. Details will be made available in the dean’s offices.
C. Faculty are encouraged to develop and use diagnostic (formative) evaluation tools during the course to assist in mid-course pedagogical corrections for the purpose of improving instruction and student learning.

V. INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION OTHER THAN FACULTY TEACHING AND COURSE EVALUATION

Institutional evaluations other than FCQs and multiple means approved by the primary unit are subject to the following:

A. These evaluations shall measure the effectiveness of institutional affordances in supporting instruction and student learning.

B. They shall not be used for the purposes of evaluating the teaching of a faculty member.

C. Instructors of record shall be informed about any other course evaluation tool prior to its administration and shall receive the results of the evaluation tool.

1. The campus process for determining common elements shall include faculty and students representing each school or college. When possible, these faculty and student representatives should be members of the school or college shared governance body.

D. The implementation and information distribution associated with faculty course evaluations shall be funded by the chancellor.

E. Faculty and course evaluation summary data shall be available to the campus community.

V.VI. DEFINITIONS

Classroom instruction (online or face-to-face, undergraduate or graduate) and laboratory instruction is considered teaching and is subject to faculty teaching and course evaluation. In addition, individual instruction, working with students in clinical or studio settings, and directing the work of honors students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows can be considered in any teaching evaluation, but are not subject to faculty course evaluations.

For the definition of Primary Unit, refer to the glossary of Regent Policy 11.B.

VII. RELATED POLICIES

A. Regent Laws and Policies
   1. Regent Policy 5.C.4.(B) – Other Terms and Conditions of Faculty Appointments
   2. Regent Policy 5.D.2 (B) – Standards for Tenure

B. Administrative Policy Statements
   1. APS 1022 - Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review
   2. APS 5008 - Faculty Performance Evaluation
   3. APS 5053 Multi-Year Contracts for Instructional, Research and Clinical Faculty with Teaching Responsibilities or Librarian Appointments

VIII. HISTORY

- Last Reviewed: July 1, 2020.
APPENDIX A

Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation

As provided in section III.A, the voting faculty of each primary unit shall determine the goals and components for evaluating teaching in the unit. This appendix lists some example components suggested by the Faculty Council Education, Policy and University Standards Committee that might be used in the evaluation of teaching. Except for the campus-approved student evaluation (e.g., FCQs), primary units are responsible for developing their own criteria, which need not contain any item from this list.

- Student evaluations
  - Student evaluations as reported on Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQ's) or a similar, campus-approved mechanism (required)
  - Student mid-term evaluations (including steps taken in response to feedback)
  - Student focus groups, interviews, or surveys
- Instructional materials
- Course syllabi and examinations
- Curriculum development efforts
- Course improvement efforts
  - Evidence of continuous improvement in teaching and learning
  - Department and curricular work, including participation in curriculum revision and departmental efforts on teaching
- Professional development and innovations relating to teaching
  - Participation in training in teaching effectiveness and new education-related technology
  - Evidence of effective utilization of contemporary teaching modalities, e.g., enhanced student learning
  - Engagement in peer assessment processes
- Professional awards related to the education process
- Receipt of grants for teaching and education improvements
- Alumni surveys or opinions on teaching
- Philosophy and self-assessment of teaching
- Oversight of independent studies, e.g., honors theses, preliminary exams, dissertations
- Advising and mentoring, e.g., graduate of students (as primary advisor or committee member)
- Video recordings of teaching
- Documentation of efforts to create inclusive and equitable educational experiences for students
- Scholarly research and presentation or publication on teaching and learning
  - Mentoring students beyond the immediate instructional setting, e.g., supervision of doctoral or medical students, presenting teaching seminars to graduate students
  - Mentoring faculty members in their educational enterprises
  - Authoring or co-authoring textbooks adopted by other higher education institutions