

UNIVERSITY OF
NORTHERN COLORADO

BOARD OF TRUSTEES AGENDA ACTION ITEM

Meeting Date: June 11, 2021

Name of Item:	Board Policy Manual Amendment – Sections 1-1-307 and 2-3-801 (Post Tenure Review and Comprehensive Review)
----------------------	---

Responsible Staff Member: Satriana

Summary of Agenda Item: This item addresses amendments to Sections 1-1-307 and 2-3-801 of the Board Policy Manual regarding Post Tenure Review and Comprehensive Review. The amendments include triennial review (in addition to annual and biennial review in the current policies) and also provides explicitly that the failure of an faculty person who is under post tenure or comprehensive review to submit a dossier as required in the review process will result in an overall rating of unsatisfactory.

Recommended Action by BOT:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval	<input type="checkbox"/> No Action Needed
----------------------------	--	---

Change to Board Policy Manual:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval	<input type="checkbox"/> No Action Needed
--------------------------------	--	---

If yes, Section: 1-1-307 and 2-3-801

Administrative Recommendation (Motion): Approve



Signature of Vice President

6/3/2021

Date

Signature of President

Date

Attachment to Senate Action #1213

Approved by the Faculty Senate

April 5, 2021

Revisions to 3-3-801(2)

Clean copy version below to replace existing policy.

3-3-801(2) Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review. Procedures for annual/biennial/triennial review are for the purpose of performance evaluation and to determine eligibility for merit pay consideration.

(a) **Criteria.** Evaluation criteria are developed by each program area and approved as described in Board Policy 2-3-801(3)(a).

(b) **Procedures.** Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review procedures are described in the Board Policy Manual Title 1, Article 1, Part 3 Faculty Evaluation, and Title 2, Article 3, Part 8 Faculty Evaluation. All years of employment are subject to annual/biennial/triennial review. No review period may be included in more than one annual/biennial/triennial review.

(c) **Evaluation Period.** The calendar year is used as the review period for all annual/biennial/triennial reviews notwithstanding that the faculty member may not have worked the entirety of the calendar year.

(I) **Annual Review:** Faculty activities from January 1 through December 31 of a calendar year are the subject of an annual evaluation conducted during the period of January 1-May 31 of the following year.

(II) **Biennial Review:** Faculty activities from January 1 through December 31 of a consecutive two-year period are the subject of a biennial evaluation conducted during the period of January 1-May 31 of the following year.

(III) **Triennial Review:** Faculty activities from January 1 through December 31 of a consecutive three-year period are the subject of a triennial evaluation conducted during the period of January 1-May 31 of the following year.

(d) **Evaluation Areas.** Evaluation areas are based on the workload assigned by the chair/director/program coordinator. See Faculty Workload 2-3-401.

(e) **Evaluation Outcomes.** Faculty are evaluated in each applicable performance area and their contributions in each area may vary according to assigned workload. A faculty member's performance will be evaluated and scored on a five (5) point scale. See 2-3-801(4)(a)(XI). Each faculty member will receive an overall evaluation based on the scores in each of the areas. A numerical weighting system that incorporates the percentage of the total workload for each performance area as specified in the assigned faculty workload will be used to calculate a weighted average using the evaluation scale in Board Policy 2-3- 801(4)(a)(XII).

(f) **Employment Status and Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review**

(I) **Adjunct Faculty.** Adjunct faculty are evaluated by the program area faculty in consultation with the department chair/school director/program coordinator. Each College will develop procedures for evaluating its adjunct faculty.

(II) **Contract-Renewable Faculty.** Contract-Renewable faculty must complete an annual/biennial review at least once every two years and may request an annual/biennial review in any year.

- (III) Tenure-Track Faculty. Tenure-track faculty must complete an annual review in years 1, 2, 3 (in conjunction with pre-tenure review), 4 and 5 (and year 6, if applicable). In year 3, pre-tenure review materials must be organized so that an annual review can also be completed. If, in the pre-tenure review, the faculty member receives “exceeds expectations” or higher in either instruction or professional activity, and “meets expectations” or higher in the other areas, they may complete a biennial review covering years 4 and 5, instead of completing annual reviews for years 4 and 5.
- (IV) Tenured Associate Professors. Tenured Associate Professors must complete, at a minimum, a biennial review once every two years, and they may request an annual review in any year. When the annual/biennial review coincides with a comprehensive review, materials must be organized so that an annual/biennial review can also be completed.
- (V) Tenured Full Professors. Tenured Full Professors must complete, at a minimum, a triennial review once every three years. They may request an annual/biennial review in any year. When the annual/biennial/triennial review coincides with a comprehensive review, materials must be organized so that an annual/biennial/triennial review can also be completed.
- (VI) Tenured faculty may opt out of an annual review for the 2020 review period or opt out of a biennial review for the 2019-2020 review period. Faculty who do so shall either complete an annual review for the 2021 review period or a biennial review for the 2021-2022 review period. A tenured faculty member who opts out of an annual/biennial review under this subsection (VI) does not modify the timing of their next comprehensive review, which comprehensive review will include an evaluation of activities that occurred during the opt-out years.
-

Additional UR policy section in need of update. Additions highlighted.

3-3-301(4) Department Chair Evaluation. Evaluation of those in the position of chair shall follow the standard University evaluation process (see Board Policy Manual, 1-1-307 and 2-3-Part 8 and University Regulations 3-3-Part 8). The portion of a chair’s workload devoted to chair duties shall be evaluated as “Chair Responsibilities” as a separate subcategory under service, which will be averaged into the overall service score as a weighted average according to workload. Although the dean does not assign scores in the annual/biennial/triennial evaluation process, the dean will assign scores in evaluating the “chair responsibility” section of the service. This evaluation will be averaged with the department faculty’s evaluation of the chair’s workload in his/her capacity as chair. If there is a disagreement as to the level of evaluation (as defined in 3-3-801(f)) between the department faculty’s evaluation of the chair, in his/her capacity as chair, and the dean’s evaluation, the results of each evaluation will be sent to the Chief Academic Officer as an information item. If the department faculty’s or dean’s evaluation of the chair’s performance as chair is at the level of “unsatisfactory” or “needs improvement”, the dean shall convene a meeting with the department faculty to discuss the evaluation.

Additional UR policy section in need of update. Additions highlighted.

3-3-701(1) Faculty Compensation Procedures.

- (a) The University is committed to a faculty salary distribution process which meets the following objectives, subject to available resources:
- (I) To increase and maintain salaries to a competitive level for both recruitment and retention of faculty at all ranks.

- (II) To provide compensation increases for all faculty who at least receive an overall annual/biennial/triennial evaluation of “meets expectations” or above.
 - (III) Faculty who receive less than a “meets expectations” in their overall annual/biennial/triennial evaluation shall not receive an annual salary increase. For each year that a faculty member receives an overall annual/biennial/triennial evaluation of less than “Meets Expectations,” one year in rank (or two years in the case of biennial evaluation, or three years in the case of triennial evaluation) shall be deducted from the total number of years in rank used to calculate parity.
- (b) Further, the University is committed to the determination of an individual faculty member’s salary in accordance with the following principles:
- (I) Continuing full-time faculty will not have their salaries reduced as a result of modifications to the University compensation policy.
 - (II) Continuing full-time faculty will receive no less than their current academic year salaries, excluding administrative and extra duty stipends. (Note: For faculty in the University Libraries, the academic year salary is the fiscal year salary.)
- (c) The following guidelines will determine the distribution of any salary increase monies available each fiscal year:
- (I) The salary increase monies available for distribution (salary and benefits) will be determined through the annual budget setting process.
 - (II) The faculty salary increase for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer shall be \$2,000. The faculty salary increase for promotion from instructor to assistant professor shall be \$2,000. The faculty salary increase for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor shall be \$3,000. The faculty salary increase for promotion from associate professor to full professor shall be \$5,000. If the resulting salary after the promotional increase for any rank is below the minimum parity threshold established by the CAO in the salary distribution process, the salary will be increased to the minimum parity threshold.
 - (III) The CAO will provide annually, before the end of each fall semester, to the Salary Equity Committee a compensation distribution report for the previous year which includes, but is not limited to, distribution of the parity pool and merit monies.
 - (IV) Each year the Salary Equity Committee shall recommend to the Senate a salary distribution model.
- (d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b), above, the President may implement temporary salary reductions for the 2020-2021 academic year. Substantially similar percentage reductions shall be implemented for administrative/professional exempt staff. The reduction shall be based on a formula applicable to all faculty and administrative/professional exempt staff.

Part 8 Faculty Evaluation. [See Also Title 3, Article 3, Part 3, 3-3-303(5) Performance Evaluation.]

Comprehensive Review provides a regular, systematic evaluation of performance to encourage professional development and renewal; to encourage individual excellence and achievement; to encourage activities that contribute to the mission and goals of the University, and one's college, department, school, or free standing program; and to help those who are not achieving at satisfactory levels to do so. The evaluation process should encourage excellence in both traditional and innovative approaches to instruction, research, scholarship, and creative works.

The substantive evaluation of a faculty member's performance is necessarily restricted to those with the disciplinary or, as appropriate, multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise needed to make the required judgments. The authority of the program area faculty and the chair/director/coordinator in this area carries with it significant responsibilities. These include the responsibility to make fair and honest judgments based on agreed upon criteria and to provide feedback regarding progress towards tenure and/or promotion when appropriate.

Graduate Faculty Status Review. Faculty will be reviewed on a cycle established by the graduate dean and is separate from Comprehensive Review.

2-3-801 Comprehensive Review

Comprehensive review is a single process which is used for a variety of purposes. A faculty member must receive a comprehensive review in any year upon request. In addition, the results of comprehensive review are the sole basis for decisions concerning pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. Every comprehensive review of a tenured faculty member, for whatever purpose, is at the same time a post-tenure review.

The requirement that review decisions (such as tenure and promotion) be based only on the results of comprehensive review in the areas of faculty endeavor (teaching, professional activity and service) precludes the use of collegiality as a separate dimension in making such decisions. The term collegiality has, historically, meant different things to different people. Sometimes, it indicates a legitimate concern for cooperativeness and team work. Sometimes, however, it has been used to foster an unhealthy uniformity of opinion that is a threat to academic freedom. The University of Northern Colorado adheres to the position of the American Association of University Professors: <http://www.aaup.org> "On Collegiality As A Criterion for Faculty Evaluation" (November 1999). Collegiality should not be used as a separate category in reaching evaluative decisions. Where legitimate, it should be incorporated into the criteria for instruction, professional activity, and service.

2-3-801(1) Definitions.

- (a) Comprehensive Review Period: The relevant years for the purposes of pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review, or if not for any of these purposes, from the previous comprehensive review. [See also 2-3-901(1) Time Guidelines.] See 2-3-801(2).
- (b) Dossier: Portfolio of information relative to performance during the comprehensive evaluation period, which shall include a narrative of accomplishments during the review period, an updated vita in approved university format; appropriate documentation; all student evaluations, from each year, covering all teaching assignments, all of the pre-tenure review and annual/biennial/triennial evaluations submitted by program area faculty, the chair/director/program area coordinator, and the dean for the period under review and other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate.
- (c) Professional activity: Activities pertaining to research, scholarship and creative works.
- (d) School: An administrative subdivision of a college which may consist of one or more program areas. A school may be multidisciplinary, in which case it comprises more than one program area, or single disciplinary, in which case it comprises a single program area.

- (e) Program Area: For the purposes of this policy, “program area” shall mean a discipline-based unit which may be multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or unidisciplinary and may consist of several emphasis areas or graduate and undergraduate degrees.
- (f) Department: A department is an administrative subdivision of a college, which shall be considered to consist of one program area.
- (g) Free standing program: An administrative unit of a college that is neither a department nor housed within a school. The coordinator of such a program will fulfill the duties assigned to department chairs/school directors in the evaluation process.
- (h) Program Area Faculty: For the purposes of this policy, “Program Area Faculty” shall mean the faculty of a program area within a school. In the case of a single discipline school, the faculty of the school is the program area faculty. In the case of a multidisciplinary school, the faculty of each program area within the school is the program area faculty. The faculty of a department are also a program area faculty.
- (i) Program Coordinators: For the purposes of this policy, program coordinators refer to the coordinator of a free standing program where there is no chair or director.
- (j) Department Faculty: All of the faculty in a department will be considered to be members of a single discipline based unit or program area.
- (k) Multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary activities: Teaching or professional activities that draw from or are at the intersection of more than one discipline.
- (l) Evaluation level: There are five levels of evaluation: Excellent (= V), Exceeds Expectations (= IV), Meets Expectations (= III), Needs Improvement (= II), and Unsatisfactory (= I). The evaluation level is determined by the following evaluation scale in (m) below:
- (m) Evaluation Scale (Round to the nearest 10th)
 - V. 4.6 - 5.0 Excellent
 - IV. 3.6 - 4.5 Exceeds Expectations
 - III. 2.6 - 3.5 Meets Expectations
 - II. 1.6 - 2.5 Needs Improvement
 - I. 1.0 - 1.5 Unsatisfactory
- (n) Overall Evaluation: The average, weighted in accordance with workload, of evaluation levels in all performance areas. This is used for post-tenure review and annual/biennial/triennial review, although not for promotion or tenure review. For example, a faculty with a workload of 0.6 instruction, 0.2 professional activity, and 0.2 service, who received a score of 4 for instruction, 3 for professional activity and a score of 1 for service would have an overall score of $3.2 (0.6 \times 4) + (0.2 \times 3) + (0.2 \times 1) = 3.2$ which falls in the range of III Meets Expectations.
- (o) Performance Areas: There are three performance areas: teaching, professional activity, and service.

2-3-801(2) Types of Comprehensive Review.

Comprehensive Review is used for faculty who are under consideration for promotion, pre-tenure review, tenure, or post-tenure review. A tenured faculty member will undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review at least once in every six academic years. A faculty member must receive a comprehensive evaluation in any year upon his or her request. [See also 1-1-307 et seq., Faculty Evaluation and University Regulations 3-3-801 et. seq., Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures.] The following considerations apply to comprehensive reviews for specific purposes:

- (a) Promotion Review. Promotion review, when requested by the evaluatee, shall include:
- (I) degree of progress toward promotion.
 - (II) action recommended (to promote or not).
- (b) Pre-tenure Review. Tenure-track faculty members will undergo a pre-tenure review in their third year of a tenure-track appointment (see University Regulations 3-3-801 et seq. implementation of faculty evaluation procedures for details, including exceptions to the third year rule). Pre-tenure review shall note degree of progress toward tenure/promotion and what further achievements are expected for tenure/promotion and will include scores and reasons based on the program area's approved criteria.
- (c) Tenure Review. Tenure review will address one or more of the following:
- (I) degree of progress toward tenure.
 - (II) deficiencies in meeting the evaluation criteria.
 - (III) the outcome of the evaluation, which determines whether tenure is recommended.
- (d) Post-Tenure Review. Post-tenure review shall address one or more of the following:
- (I) Progress toward promotion, if appropriate.
 - (II) Deficiencies requiring improvement and a remediation plan, if needed.
 - (III) The outcome of the evaluation, which determines whether satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

2-3-801(3) Comprehensive Review Procedures

(a) Preliminaries.

The Program Area faculty develops criteria within the framework of the University's mission that reflect the nature of teaching, professional activity, and service as valued within the discipline for each evaluation level. Each unit should develop criteria for the following purposes: pre-tenure review, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion. The criteria developed for each may differ from each other. However, since a positive tenure decision must be accompanied by a positive decision on promotion to associate professor, the criteria for these two purposes must be the same. The criteria must be approved by the program faculty, the chair/director/program coordinator, the dean of the relevant college, and the Chief Academic Officer. No criteria will be adopted unless acceptable to the program area faculty, the chair/director/program coordinator, the dean, and the Chief Academic Officer. As part of Program Review, each program area will review and submit for approval their evaluation criteria according to the process described above. Program areas with approved criteria in place prior to spring 2016 need not resubmit those criteria for approval until the next Program Review.

(b) Process.

At each step of the review, the evaluatee will be informed in writing which will be transmitted via campus mail and university email, of the decision made. The evaluatee will be given the opportunity to respond to that review, with the option of providing additions and/or clarifications to their dossier. This additional information allows for the reconsideration of the decision made and provides additional information to the next step in the process. At each level of review, and prior to the next, the evaluatee and prior reviewers have one opportunity to respond.

- (I) The evaluatee prepares a dossier covering accomplishments over the evaluation period. Failure to submit a dossier for review shall result in an overall evaluation rating of unsatisfactory.

- (II) The tenured and tenure track faculty members in the program area, excluding the evaluatee and the chair/director/coordinator, review(s) the dossier and whatever other relevant material can reasonably be gathered and assign(s) a score in each of the performance areas relevant to the workload of the evaluatee. Contract-renewable faculty may participate in the discussion and share relevant information, but may only participate in the assignment of scores regarding contract-renewable faculty members. If the unit has fewer than 3 tenure/tenure-track faculty members, aside from the evaluatee and chair, then the evaluating faculty must include extra members as required to bring the number to 3. To accomplish this, a list of names of faculty members from the University of Northern Colorado who have related expertise must be submitted by the evaluatee, to consist of twice the number of people required. The faculty, including the chair, will select from that list to bring the total number to 3. For interdisciplinary programs (e.g., ENST, LOM) which have faculty advisory boards, the advisory board must choose from among its members, at least 3 faculty members to serve as the program area faculty for evaluation purposes.
- (III) The scores of the program area faculty may be determined either by using mean, median, mode scores or by a vote of the participating individual faculty members. In either case, the process must result in a single score for each of the performance areas. In addition, the program area faculty explains, in writing, its reasons, in terms of the approved program area criteria, for its scores. Each program area will decide the mechanisms whereby the rationale is determined and the scores are tabulated.

(A) Tenure Applications

If the program area faculty's evaluation results in a positive recommendation for tenure [see 2-3-902(5)] its evaluation (scores and reasons) will be forwarded to the department chair/school director/program coordinator and will be shared with the evaluatee.

If the program area faculty's evaluation does not result in a positive recommendation for tenure, the evaluatee and the chair/director/program area coordinator will be notified in writing and tenure will be denied unless the evaluatee appeals to the Tenure Appeal Committee (2-3-902(7)). The sole basis for such appeals is that the program area faculty's evaluation was not consistent with the program area's approved criteria and procedures which resulted in a negative recommendation for tenure. Once the tenure appeal process is complete, the Tenure Appeal Committee will forward its findings, in writing, and the documentation it has received, to the chair/director/program area coordinator and shared with the evaluatee. If the Tenure Appeals Committee finds that the program area faculty's evaluation was not consistent with the program area's approved criteria the evaluation process will proceed to step IV below. If the committee finds that the program area faculty's evaluation was consistent with the program area's approved criteria and procedures, tenure will be denied.

(B) Pre-Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review, and other comprehensive reviews.

The program area faculty's evaluation (scores and reasons addressing criteria) will be forwarded to the department chair/ school director/program coordinator in writing, and will be shared with the evaluatee.

- (IV) The department chair/school director/program coordinator will assign a score in each of the performance areas relevant to the workload of the evaluatee. The chair/director/coordinator's evaluation (scores plus reasons addressing criteria) will be shared with the program area faculty and with and the evaluatee. The faculty will have the opportunity to respond to the chair/school director/program coordinator. Both the program area faculty's evaluation (scores plus reasons) and the chair/directors/program coordinator's evaluation (scores plus reasons) will be forwarded, in writing, to the college dean.
- (V) The dean reviews the evaluations of the program area faculty and the chair/director/coordinator to verify that the scores assigned, and the reasons given, are consistent with the approved program area criteria and procedures. The dean may include confidential personnel information about the evaluatee if it has bearing on the evaluatee's teaching, professional activity or service. Unless the university's general counsel or the director of human resources deems that the information is to remain confidential, this information must be shared with the faculty and chair/director/program coordinator and included in the evaluation process.

If the dean finds that the evaluation is not consistent with approved program area criteria or process, he or she communicates that finding, in writing, with reasons, to the program area faculty, the chair/director/coordinator and the evaluatee. In case of such disagreement, the dean will indicate what scores he/she believes were warranted by the program area's criteria. The faculty and chair/director/coordinator will have the opportunity to respond to the dean. The dean forwards his or her findings, along with those of the faculty and chair/director/coordinator, together with all responses to the Chief Academic Officer. In addition, the dean will include the Tenure Appeals Committee findings only if the Tenure Appeals Committee has decided that the program area faculty's evaluation was not in accord with the program area's evaluation criteria or process.

- (VI) The Chief Academic Officer reviews the evaluations of the program area faculty, the chair/director/coordinator, along with the dean's findings on the consistency of the evaluations with the approved program area criteria and process, and in the cases considered by the Tenure Appeals Committee, its findings. The CAO may include confidential personnel information about the evaluatee if it has bearing on the evaluatee's teaching, professional activity or service. Unless the university's general counsel or the director of human resources deems that the information is to remain confidential, this information must be shared with the faculty and chair/director/program coordinator and included in the evaluation process.

The Chief Academic Officer determines whether or not the evaluations are consistent with the approved criteria and procedures. If the Chief Academic Officer disagrees with the scores assigned by the faculty and/or chair/director/coordinator, he or she must determine what scores were warranted by the program area's criteria. In the case of applications for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, the Chief Academic Officer, consistent with the program area's criteria, makes the final decision as to what action will be recommended to the President and Board of Trustees.

(c) Responsibilities of Participants in the Comprehensive Evaluation Process.

- (I) Evaluatee. Each evaluatee will prepare a dossier covering performance and accomplishments over the comprehensive evaluation period. If years of credit for teaching, professional activity, and/or service at a prior institution have been agreed upon at the time of hire, the activities that occurred during those years will be included in the first comprehensive review dossier. It is the

responsibility of the evaluatee to gather and submit evidence to be used as the basis of evaluation. Since the evaluatee is essentially “making a case”, it is also the right of the evaluatee to include whatever evidence he or she believes to be relevant to the evaluation of his or her performance.

- (II) Faculty, Chair/School Director/Program Coordinator. The substantive evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, professional activity and service, consistent with the program area criteria, and evaluation procedures, is the responsibility of the faculty and the chair/school director/program coordinator in the program area.
- (III) Dean. The responsibility of the dean is to assure that the scores assigned and the reasons given by program area faculty and the chair/school director/program coordinator are consistent with approved program area criteria and procedures.
- (IV) Chief Academic Officer. The responsibility of the Chief Academic Officer is to assure that the evaluation levels assigned and the reasons given by program area faculty and the chair/ director and dean are consistent with approved program area criteria and procedures. In particular, it is the responsibility of the Chief Academic Officer to resolve disagreement between the program area faculty and chair and the dean on this matter in cases involving application for tenure, promotion or post-tenure review.

2-3-801(4) Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review.

Annual/Biennial/Triennial review provides a mechanism for regular feedback to all faculty members holding academic rank as to their performance and determining merit pay. Satisfactory annual/biennial/triennial reviews do not guarantee or determine a successful comprehensive review. A faculty member may request annual/biennial/triennial review in any year.

(a) Definitions

- (I) Dossier: Portfolio of information relative to performance which shall include a narrative of accomplishments during the review period, an updated vita in approved university format; appropriate documentation; all student evaluations covering all teaching assignments, and other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate.
- (II) Professional activity: Activities pertaining to research, scholarship and creative works.
- (III) School: An administrative subdivision of a college which may consist of one or more program areas. A school may be multidisciplinary, in which case it comprises more than one program area, or single disciplinary, in which case it comprises a single program area.
- (IV) Program Area: For the purposes of this policy, “program area” shall mean a discipline-based unit which may be multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or unidisciplinary and may consist of several emphasis areas or graduate and undergraduate degrees.
- (V) Department: A department is an administrative subdivision of a college, which shall be considered to consist of one program area.
- (VI) Free standing program: An administrative unit of a college that is neither a department nor housed within a school. The coordinator of such a program will fulfill the duties assigned to department chairs/school directors in the evaluation process.

- (VII) Program Area Faculty: For the purposes of this policy, “Program Area Faculty” shall mean the faculty of a program area within a school. In the case of a single discipline school, the faculty of the school is the program area faculty. In the case of a multidisciplinary school, the faculty of each program area within the school is the program area faculty. The faculty of a department are also a program area faculty.
- (VIII) Program Coordinators: For the purposes of this policy, program coordinators refer to the coordinator of a free standing program where there is no chair or director.
- (IX) Department Faculty: All of the faculty in a department will be considered to be members of a single discipline based unit or program area.
- (X) Multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary activities: Teaching or professional activities that draw from or are at the intersection of more than one discipline.
- (XI) Evaluation level: There are five levels of evaluation: Excellent (= V), Exceeds Expectations (= IV), Meets Expectations (= III), Needs Improvement (= II), and Unsatisfactory (= I). The evaluation level is determined by the following evaluation scale in (I) below:
- (XII) Evaluation Scale (Round to the nearest 10th)
 - V. 4.6 - 5.0 Excellent
 - IV. 3.6 - 4.5 Exceeds Expectations
 - III. 2.6 - 3.5 Meets Expectations
 - II. 1.6 - 2.5 Needs Improvement
 - I. 1.0 - 1.5 Unsatisfactory
- (XIII) Overall Evaluation: The average, weighted in accordance with workload, of evaluation levels in all performance areas. For example, a faculty with a workload of 0.6 instruction, 0.2 professional activity, and 0.2 service, who received a score of 4 for instruction, 3 for professional activity and a score of 1 for service would have an overall score of $3.2 (0.6 \times 4) + (0.2 \times 3) + (0.2 \times 1) = 3.2$ which falls in the range of III Meets Expectations.
- (XIV) Performance Areas: There are three performance areas: teaching, professional activity, and service.

(b) Preliminaries.

- (I) The program area develops criteria for annual/biennial/triennial review that reflect the nature of teaching, professional activity, and service as valued within the discipline for each evaluation level. Criteria for comprehensive review may be different from criteria for annual/biennial/triennial review.
- (II) Each program area will develop its own procedures for annual/biennial/triennial evaluation subject to the approval of the department chair/school director/program coordinator. Schools/departments/program areas may choose whether or not to stagger biennial/triennial evaluations. Each department’s/program area’s procedures must include a mechanism to

resolve any differences between department/program area faculty evaluations and that of the department chair/school director/program coordinator. [See also (III) below].

(A) If the program area and department chair/school director/program coordinator cannot reach agreement on evaluation procedures, the same procedures used in comprehensive evaluation will apply.

(c) Process.

- (I) The evaluatee shall prepare a dossier covering the accomplishments for the period under review. Failure to submit a dossier for review shall result in an overall evaluation rating of unsatisfactory.
- (II) The program area faculty will conduct their evaluation in accordance with their approved annual/biennial/triennial evaluation criteria and procedures and forward evaluation (scores and reasons), in writing, to the department chair/school director/program coordinator.
- (III) The department chair/school director/program coordinator will conduct his/her own independent evaluation, based upon the approved program area criteria, of the faculty member's performance.
- (IV) In the case of contract-renewable faculty in promotable ranks, the evaluatee may request that the program area faculty, the department chair/ school director/program coordinator, and the dean comment on the evaluatee's progress toward promotion.
- (V) Both of these evaluations will be forwarded to the dean. The dean will not assign scores except in the case of an evaluatee who appeals his or her evaluation scores from the program area faculty or department chair/school director/program coordinator.
- (VI) If, on appeal from the evaluatee, the dean conducts an independent evaluation, and if the dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the department/program area faculty and/or chair/school director/coordinator, after unsuccessful attempts have been made to resolve those disagreements, then the dean and the department/program area and chair/school director will forward their individual evaluations and rationale to the CAO, who will make the final decision.

2-3-801(5) Confidentiality and professional Ethics.

It is intended that all information reviewed, evaluation data collected, committee deliberations, decisions, and other work products generated during the course of evaluations conducted in accordance with this procedure shall be maintained as confidential, except as otherwise authorized under the terms and provisions of this procedure, or when used to administer the affairs of the University, or to comply with the law.

Additional BPM policy section in need of update. Additions highlighted.

1-1-307(3) Post-Tenure Review.

All faculty at the University are subject to annual/biennial/triennial review and comprehensive post-tenure review. Faculty review and evaluation at the University has long included a comprehensive, summative, multi-year requirement, as well as an annual/biennial/triennial review process. Both of these review procedures meet the guidelines developed by the Colorado Commission for Higher Education for post-tenure review. The review process at the University is based on a faculty peer review system within discipline or interdisciplinary areas.

Review will provide regular and systematic evaluation of performance of faculty in the areas of teaching, research, scholarship and creative works, and service. Assessment of faculty performance in these areas will review their established responsibilities as determined by workload assignment. Faculty will consult with their department chair/school director /program coordinators regarding their individual assignment areas. This will allow the adjustment of their activities as goals for individuals and the University change. Such consultation will provide for the encouragement of professional development and renewal, and individual excellence and achievement. Post-tenure review will encourage faculty to engage in activities that contribute to the mission and goals of the University, the colleges, departments, schools, and program areas. Review will ensure that faculty members are fulfilling their University responsibilities, and will assist faculty who are not achieving at satisfactory levels to do so. Evaluations must be consistent with principles of academic freedom, the tenure system, due process, and other protected rights.
