**CURRENT FCQ PORTION OF MERIT FORM**

**FCQ-based Teaching Points**. These are awarded using an average Instructor Rating computed from all your courses over the previous six semesters, whether taught within or outside of the History department, as compared with the average for all faculty on the Boulder campus. Those figures are provided by the FCQ Office upon request, with the resulting points calculated by the Chair, so you do not need to do anything about them on this form. The description below is for your information only.

**4 points** = Average FCQ Instructor Ratings are 1⁄2 standard deviation or more below the mean score for all faculty on the Boulder campus.

**5 points** = Good teaching. Average FCQ Instructor Ratings are within 1⁄2 standard deviation above or below the campus mean score.

**6 points** = Excellent teaching. Average FCQ Instructor Ratings are 1⁄2 standard deviation or more above the campus mean score.\*

If you have reason to think that your FCQ’s **consistently underrate** your teaching performance, please explain why. The Executive Committee will consider adding points to your score based upon such factors as an unusual number of very large classes, difficulty in obtaining qualified graders in your field, or consistent student biases that have moved you into a lower numeric category.

*\* Note: before last year’s stop-gap revision to the point levels, for years these were 3 - 5 - 7.*

**PROPOSED REVISED STRUCTURE**

1. Engagement (rolling 3-year average)
	* Response rate above XX% = 1 pts
	* Response rate above XX% = 2 pts
2. Professionalism (rolling 3-year average)
	* Average scores at/above/within range of average mean of permanent faculty\* on Boulder campus = 2 pts
		+ Based on some set of questions…
3. Accomplishment (can receive one or the other, not both)
	1. Improvement of scores = 2 pts
		* Based on a set of questions compared to own previous scores
	2. Consistency of high scores = 2 pts
		* Based on a same set of questions, pegged at a specific number
		* Differentiated by course level: 1000-2999/3000-7999

[Retain] If you have reason to think that your FCQ’s **consistently underrate** your teaching performance [*or affect your response rate*], please explain why. The Executive Committee will consider adding points to your score based upon such factors as an unusual number of very large classes, difficulty in obtaining qualified graders in your field, or consistent student biases [*or other factors, such as new introduction of new pedagogies/technologies*] that have moved you into a lower numeric category.

\* Permanent Faculty includes Tenured, Tenure-Track, Instructors and Senior instructors, and not Adjuncts, Lecturers, GPTIs, or TAs.

**PROPOSED REVISED QUESTION SET AND RATING LEVELS:**

Most scholarship on Student Evaluations recommends moving away from the “omnibus” questions (Traditional #s 5 & 9) as they are the most susceptible to bias and provide the least specific feedback. We currently use only #9 (“instructor overall”).

In terms of ratings, the study of both traditional and pilot questions here at CU suggests that a tenth of a point is not a significant figure to use for meaningful differentiation. The recommendation is for more on the order of at least a half a point, perhaps a full point, provide a more trustworthy scale.

1. Engagement (rolling 3-year average)
	1. Response rate above 65% = 1 pts
	2. Response rate above 70% = 2 pts
		* Campus avg = 63%; HIST avg 62% (Fall 2017-Sum 2019)
2. Professionalism (rolling 3-year average)
	* + Average scores at/above/within range of average mean of permanent faculty on Boulder campus = 2 pts
		+ Proposed Questions: Traditional #’s 6,7,8
3. Accomplishment (can receive one or the other, not both)
	1. Improvement of net average score $\geq $ .5 pts over 3 years’ previous = 2 pts
		* Proposed questions: Pilot #’s 3,4,5,9,10
		* The above (net average) is the default, but individual faculty can also claim this by making a case for the same net numerical improvement in multiple instances of a single course, (i.e. a 1000-level course).
	2. Consistency of scores $\geq $ 5\* within the 3 year window = 2 pts
		* Proposed questions: Pilot #’s 3,4,5,9,10
		* \*We plan to differentiate this by course level. Where 5 seems about right for upper div courses (3000-7999), a lower number may be appropriate for the lower div level (1000-2999). This will require some further study.

**Resources**

* Note: We plan to compile a set of recommendations about how to increase rate and quality of responses. We’ll start by consulting the TQF and BFA guides here.
	+ The TQF central team has compiled a set of useful FCQ references, resources, and recommendations to consult in answering these questions: <https://bit.ly/2YnN8HO>
	+ The May 2018 BFA Resolution and Guide to FCQ Best Practices is here: <https://bit.ly/33VC85H>
* You can also read some preliminary takeaways from the study of the traditional and pilot FCQ questions here: <https://bit.ly/34ZDKfZ>