Outstanding Teacher Award
Reviewer Instructions and Rubric Overview

Updated 2023

Overview: Recognizing Excellence in Teaching by Full-Time or Part-Time IRC Faculty Members

Committee Chair: Chair of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Teaching
Committee Reviewers: Members of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Teaching

Eligibility Criteria Met?

1. Be a full- or part-time IRC faculty member.
2. Have taught at least five semesters at UCCS.
3. Have not previously received this award.

Application Complete?

1. A letter of nomination that briefly describes the nominee's teaching excellence.
2. A narrative (double-spaced, 1000-word maximum) describing the nominee's teaching philosophy, written by the nominee.
3. The nominee's curriculum vitae.
4. A maximum of five letters of recommendation. (These can be solicited from students, faculty, or administrators, and should demonstrate a knowledge of the nominee's qualifications for the award.)
5. Faculty Course Questionnaire results (both quantitative and qualitative) for all courses taught during the last five semesters.

If yes to all these items, continue to score:

Instructions to Reviewers: Getting Oriented*

Thank you for taking the time to review the nominations for this award. Your work in evaluating the submissions and selecting colleagues for recognition is important and familiar work for faculty. You may be less familiar with the research on peer reviewing, which has shown there are some common pitfalls in the process that lead to unintentional bias in the outcomes. Briefly, those pitfalls have to do with taking procedural shortcuts in peer review that lead reviewers to rely on intellectual shortcuts (*e.g.*, biases) in our thinking.

Keep in mind: biases may appear in the very materials that you are asked to review as part of the nomination package. From the content of the letters to the types of metrics used to determine excellence there are several ways that bias may unintentionally get baked in. To overcome this, give yourself enough time to review. Research consistently shows that biases are most likely to occur when we are rushed. After you read the nominations consider going back over all the packets and reflect on the group as a whole. Just like grading papers, sometimes our criteria can shift as we see what is submitted. Make sure you go back and ask yourself if you were too hard on or too easy on nominees.

Nomination Scoring

We are modeling the NIH reviewer system in which we will use a 9-point rating scale (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor) in whole numbers (no decimals) to determine the **Four Criterion Strengths** and **Overall Teaching Impact** scores for all applications. Scores of 1 or 9 should be used less frequently than the other scores. 5 is for a good medium-impact application and considered an average score.

Overall Teaching Impact or Criterion Strength	Score	Descriptor
High	1	Exceptional
	2	Outstanding
	3	Excellent
Medium	4	Very Good
	5	Good
	6	Satisfactory
Low	7	Fair
	8	Marginal
	9	Poor

You will score an application as presented in its entirety and may not modify your scores based on personal knowledge of the nominee. **Please notify the Chair of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Teaching of any possible conflicts of interest *prior* to your review.**

Consider the **Four Criterion Strengths**:
- Quality of the letters of support
- Quality of the teaching philosophy narrative
- Quality of FCQ scores
- Quality of student comments on FCQs

Holistic Impression: You should give equal weight to the above criteria in assessing the comprehensive strength of the nomination package to derive an overall holistic score of the nominee.

You will also be asked to provide a very brief (~50-word) summary in support of your overall score.

Your scoring will take place online, via the Qualtrics Review Portal.

You will input the nominee's name in your review and repeat the reviewer form for each nominee.

Final Selection: The scores are summed across reviewers for all nominees. The lowest score is selected as the winner. In the event of a numerical tie, the reviewer summary comments will be considered by the Chair of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Teaching, who will make the final selection in consultation with the review committee.

* Modified from UMass ADVANCE template for peer review.