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 (0.6x4) +(0.2x3) + (0.2x1) = 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 their 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, they communicate 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 they believe 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 their 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, they 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 they believe to be relevant to the evaluation of their 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 (0.6x4) +(0.2x3) + (0.2x1) = 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 evaluate 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 their 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 their 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.

Policy History

2-3-801 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE.
Subsection 2-3-801(1)(3)(4)(b)(c) Faculty Evaluation amended (Jun 2021)
Section 2-3-801(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) Faculty Evaluation amended (Jul 2016)
Subsection 2-3-801(1)(h) Definitions amended (Nov 2011)
Subsection 2-3-801(3)(b) General Processes amended (Nov 2011)
Subsection 2-3-801(3)(b)(iv) General Processes amended (Nov 2011)
Subsection 2-3-801(4) Evaluation Areas amended (Nov 2011)
Section 2-3-901 Promotion Guidelines unnumbered paragraph five and six amended (Nov 2011)
Subsection 2-3-901(1)(b)(c) Academic and Professional Qualifications amended (Nov 2011)
Subsection 2-3-901(2) Performance Guidelines unnumbered paragraph one amended (Nov 2011)
Subsection 2-3-901(3) Time Guidelines deleted and replaced (Nov 2011)
Subsection 2-3-901(4) Promotion Criteria deleted and replaced (Nov 2011)
Subsection 2-3-801(1) Definitions: (c)(d), (e), (f), (g) (h), and (i) amended (Dec 2010)
Subsection 2-3-801(2)(b)(III) Tenure Track Review amended (Dec 2010)

Subsection 2-3-801(3) General Processes (a) amended (Dec 2010)
Subsection 2-3-801(3) (a) Comprehensive Review (II), (III), and (IV) amended (Dec 2010)
Subsection 2-3-801(3) (b) Annual Review (I), (II), (III), (IV), and (V) amended (Dec 2010)
Subsection 2-3-801(4) Evaluation Areas amended (Dec 2010)