

**Motion 1:** The Faculty Representative Assembly Executive Committee moves that the Representative Assembly adopt the following resolution based on the work of the Faculty Assembly Teaching Task Force:

“Whereas the UCCS Faculty Assembly Teaching Task Force administered a survey in November 2021 to allow faculty input into current issues involving annual teaching evaluations and merit, and reappointment and promotion of IRC faculty, and tenure of tenure-track faculty; and

Whereas the teaching task force presented these finding to the faculty assembly in December 2021; and

Whereas the Respondents included 40.34% IRC, 26.90% tenure track, and 32.76% tenured faculty. There were 117 IRC faculty, 78 tenure track, and 95 tenured faculty who responded for a total of 290 faculty in these categories;

Be it therefore resolved that the UCCS Faculty Representative Assembly supports the following recommendations brought forth by the faculty:

1. Every primary unit should have clear written annual merit review criteria:
  - a. Include at least three measures for teaching evaluation. It should be clear that FCQs will not count for more than 1/3 of the teaching evaluation for faculty that are the instructor of record.
  - b. Be as clear as possible how the multiple measures of teaching are used to reach a single rating for teaching.
  - c. Be as clear as possible how the ratings for teaching, research and service are combined to reach an overall rating for merit.
  - d. It should be clear to faculty how the merit ratings affect annual salary in the college. Expectations and guidance should be provided for how any self-rating is to be constructed with respect to development of merit rating numbers
  - e. Expectations and guidance should be provided for how the chair or program director will arrive at a rating
2. There needs to be a clear process for translating the ratings for each area of evaluation (teaching, research and service) into the overall rating for annual merit (outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, below expectations, and fails to meet expectations)
3. In departments or units where it is feasible, faculty should receive written feedback (preferably accompanied by a conversation) from department chairs or program directors
4. To the extent possible, T/TTF should serve as peer reviewers for T/TTF and IRC faculty should serve as peer reviewers for IRC faculty
5. RPT criteria for teaching, and IRC promotion should also include multiple measures of effectiveness and it should be clear to the faculty what measures are appropriate; how FCQs fit into those measures; and to what degree they are used in committee recommendations and conclusions.”