

Center for Asian Studies

Guidelines for instructor merit review, reappointment and promotion

The Center for Asian Studies is committed to cultivating and supporting excellence in teaching in the Asian Studies curriculum. Instructor evaluation and reappointment lies at the heart of this commitment. The College of Arts & Sciences [policy on evaluating teaching](#) indicates a commitment to “evaluating teaching quality by three dimensions: scholarly, inclusive, and goal-oriented. To make the evaluation of these dimensions explicit, routine, and equitable, departments should identify a scholarly framework suitable to disciplinary context, communicate expectations, and use evidence from multiple voices, including but not limited to students, peers, and the self. In so doing, the college demonstrates commitment to supporting faculty as teachers and as professionals who continually seek to improve their craft” (See also [“A&S Policy on Teaching Quality and Associated Evaluation”](#)).

Scholarly, Inclusive, and Goal-Oriented Teaching

In response to the campus Quality Teaching Initiative (QTI) and the above policy, CAS has developed the following guidelines to cultivate and encourage quality teaching among its faculty. These guidelines cover key elements of quality teaching as well as the role of quality teaching evaluation in CAS faculty reappointment, and promotion processes. Multiple measures of teaching are collected and compiled annually in a faculty member’s teaching dossier for reappointment and promotion review. Reappointment and promotion review uses the criteria of excellence, meritorious, and less-than-meritorious for teaching evaluation. While the annual merit review process takes into account multiple measures of teaching quality, it uses a different set of criteria, as noted below, based on teaching as well as activities documented in the annual Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA).

Inclusive Teaching

Inclusive teaching at CU Boulder is designed with an eye toward the wide range of ways in which our students and educators teach and learn. In part, inclusivity means supporting diverse approaches to learning using a variety of teaching practices. Inclusivity also involves sensitivity to and support of diversity of students and faculty from across the range of social, economic, and demographic factors. Frequently, this sensitivity is geared toward initiatives in the classroom but also involves mentorship of students and support of their efforts to achieve their professional and personal goals (from A&S Policies).

Basic Criteria:

- Creating a supportive environment that gives each student equal access to learning is a course goal (*Goal Oriented*)
- Active consideration and planning for how diverse learners will engage with activities and content
- Methods and practices are informed by a knowledge of the student population (*Scholarly*)
- Inclusive pedagogy strategies are used. (*Scholarly*)
 - Classroom climate is consistently respectful, cooperative, and inclusive.

Professional/Advanced Criteria:

- Has prepared, and worked to improve, activities to help students overcome common challenges, noting the diverse learners in class (*Scholarly*)
- Students perceive the instructor strongly values diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Very knowledgeable about inclusive teaching pedagogies and methods to support diverse learners and enacts in the classroom (*Scholarly*)

Goal-Oriented Teaching

Hallmarks of quality teaching at CU Boulder include teaching that is: (1) guided by clearly articulated learning goals; (2) based on a curriculum designed to prepare, enact, and achieve those goals; and (3) evaluated and responsive to various forms of feedback, including evidence of impacts on learning. Additional elements of goal-oriented teaching may include engaging in efforts to make visible the achievement of specific learning outcomes, as well as to improve and adapt to the needs of diverse learners (from [A&S Policies](#)).

Basic Criteria:

- Learning goals are explicit, clearly articulated, and regularly communicated to students
- Course materials/content are aligned with course goals.
- Clear, evidence-based approach for evaluating student achievement (*Scholarly*)
- Students are regularly given feedback on their mastery of important skills and concepts.
- Consistently works to improve student outcomes and support learning for all students (*Inclusive*)

Professional/Advanced Criteria:

- Course learning goals clearly connect to curricular, programmatic, and departmental goals.
- Course goals include advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in the field (*Inclusive*)
- Assignments are graded using clear and thorough rubrics.
- Students define some of the class activities/goals (*Inclusive*)
- Quality of student learning supports success in other contexts. (e.g., subsequent courses or non-classroom venues)

Scholarly Teaching

Scholarship on teaching and learning and domain-specific studies of education provide clear pictures of effective, evidence-based and often innovative approaches for our CU Boulder educators to draw from and contribute to. These high impact practices may include (and are not limited to): engaging students in classroom settings; challenging them appropriately; providing structured research experiences; experiential learning opportunities; bringing appropriate faculty research or creative work into our classrooms; developing technology-based and innovative teaching methods; individualized mentoring; and nurturing a sense of identity, belonging, and reflection among our students. Scholarly approaches to teaching at CU-Boulder that encourage our own continued development as educators and may seek to make our practices and impacts visible through dissemination and peer review (from [A&S Policies](#)).

Basic Criteria:

- Selects teaching resources, materials, activities, and/or methods that are shown to enable learning (e.g., evidence-based)
- Regularly solicits student feedback, uses this information to improve teaching, and communicates this back to students (*Goal-oriented*)
- Regularly adjusts teaching based on prior teaching and feedback from a variety of sources
- Provides a variety of ways for students to succeed and/or demonstrate their learning on assessments, with particular attention to being inclusive and equitable (*Inclusive*)

Professional/Advanced Criteria:

- Employs systematic collection of classroom data to iterate on and improve teaching (*Goal-oriented*)
- Uses research-validated tools for measuring student understanding (e.g., pre/post-tests)

Criteria for Teaching Excellence, Meritorious Teaching, and Less than Meritorious Teaching

- Excellence in teaching includes positive peer reviews, record of self-evaluations and FCQs at or above the historical range for the unit (or that show improvement over time), demonstration of innovative teaching techniques and efforts to address Quality Teaching elements (as above), evidence of other effort to improve pedagogical methods, recognition of teaching beyond the classroom.
- Meritorious Teaching: FCQs within an acceptable historical range for the unit, peer reviews that are, on average, positive.
- Less than Meritorious Teaching: Negative peer reviews, and FCQs that are consistently below the historical range for the department. Failure to submit a timely annual FRPA.

Specific examples of ‘excellence in teaching’ in Asian Studies might include, but are not limited to the following:

- developing new courses for or significantly revising existing courses in the Asian Studies curriculum as part of bringing pedagogical innovations and/or new research and/or new materials into the curriculum
- developing innovations in pedagogy around enhancing inclusivity in the curriculum
- evidence of excellent classroom pedagogical techniques or strong student engagement
- coordinating with cognate departments in Asian Studies to develop curricular offerings and/or course content that addresses unmet needs in their programs
- mentoring students to develop effective projects or papers for publication in the *Colorado Journal of Asian Studies*
- identifying and applying for funding (either internal to CU Boulder or external) for curricular enrichment
- efforts to increase the visibility of the Asian Studies major/minor on campus and/or efforts to increase the numbers of majors and minors in Asian Studies
- working with the Center to help oversee the Asia Internship Program
- actively engaging with the CAS Curriculum Committee to help manage and improve the Asian Studies major and minor

- engagement with other Asian Studies faculty across campus in the form of, for example, guest lectures in other classes, presentations in other departments, serving on graduate student committees, etc.

This list is not to suggest a set of activities *necessary* for ‘excellence in teaching’; in Asian Studies, but rather is meant to provide examples of what could be included as evidence of such teaching for the purposes of evaluation. The Center recognizes that specific appointments will involve their own specific expectations and it is always within the context of those expectations that reappointment evaluations will occur.

Process

Annual merit review

Instructors submit a Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) every year. This report is reviewed by the CAS Faculty Director who may consult with members of the CAS Executive Committee regarding the assignment of annual merit. The Faculty Director will provide a signed Annual Faculty Performance Rating Form (FPR) for the instructor’s review and signature. While feedback and comments on this form are optional, the Faculty Director is encouraged to provide these on the form and/or discuss the evaluation with the instructor.

Annual merit performance ratings

It is important to note that these annual performance ratings are not the same as the three teaching criteria (excellence, meritorious, less-than-meritorious) used for reappointment and promotion evaluation. Annual performance ratings are based on the full range of faculty activities averaged over the current *and previous* year (based on FRPA reporting).

5. Outstanding – Has fulfilled minimum teaching requirements for the position and performed exceptional additional teaching duties and activities; has participated in quality teaching activities and evaluations; has published and/or conducted research on pedagogical issues; has contributed additional service activities beyond what is expected not just to the unit but to the College, University and/or institutions beyond the university.
4. Exceeding Expectations – Has fulfilled minimum teaching requirements for the position and performed some additional teaching duties and activities beyond basic expectations; has participated in quality teaching activities and evaluations; has contributed additional service activities to the unit beyond basic expectations.
3. Meeting Expectations – Has fulfilled minimum teaching requirements for the position; has at least participated in annual instructional review for quality teaching
2. Below Expectations – Has taught less than the minimum teaching requirements for the position
1. Fails to Meet Expectations – Has taught less than the minimum teaching requirements for the position; has not submitted an annual FRPA; has been uncommunicative and/or absent for extended periods

Peer reviews of classroom teaching

The Faculty Director is responsible for arranging peer evaluations of instructors. Typically, though not necessarily, peers will be members of the Executive Committee. Each instructor should expect to have one peer evaluation per semester. It is suggested that the visitor first schedule a meeting with the instructor prior to the classroom visit in order to discuss the course overall, pedagogical goals, course aims, etc. It is also suggested that the evaluation be shared with the instructor and, if possible, discussed in a subsequent follow-up meeting as well.

Reappointment process

General College guidelines for the instructor reappointment process can be found [here](#). Instructors are typically appointed for 3 years and thus undergo a reappointment review every third year. This may vary, however, depending on an instructor's specific appointment contract. Instructors are encouraged to solicit one peer review of their classroom teaching each semester. Instructors up for reappointment should expect their reappointment dossier to be submitted in the Fall semester (typically November) of the final year of their appointment. Prior to this semester, the Faculty Director appoints an ad hoc Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) to be chaired by the Faculty Director and including at least two other voting members of the CAS Executive Committee. A timeline is established for the reappointment review process so that the dossier submission deadline can be met. The Faculty Director also meets with the instructor at this time to discuss the upcoming reappointment process.

Prior to submitting the dossier, the PUEC meets to discuss and vote on the reappointment. The instructor must receive an evaluation of 'highly effective' teaching in order to qualify for reappointment.

Reappointment dossiers will typically consist of the following

- A current CV
- A statement of teaching activities, goals, strategies, and future plans provided by the instructor; this statement should also make clear the activities that constitute 'highly effective' teaching
- 'Multiple Measures for Teaching Evaluation including:
 - Solicited letters from current and former students
 - Peer classroom visit reports
 - FCQs
 - Examples of course syllabi, assignments, projects, and other teaching materials
 - Evidence, if any, of pedagogical innovations and/or related activities (as noted in the guidelines above)
- A report by the PUEC describing the nature of the appointment, summarizing the multiple measures of teaching included in the dossier, explaining the committee's evaluation procedure, and conveying the committee's recommendation on reappointment to the Dean.

Standardized Class Sizes

Introductory classes (1000/2000 level): cap at 39

Advanced classes and (4000 level): cap at 19

Honors classes: cap at 17

Mid level (3000): cap at 30