

FACULTY EVALUATION
IN THE COLLEGE OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES
AUGUST 1, 2004

FACULTY EVALUATION IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

August 1, 2004

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Faculty Evaluation Criteria: College of Arts and Sciences | 2 |
| University of Northern Colorado Faculty Evaluation Procedures..... | 3 |
| A&S Principles and Procedures Re: Annual Review | 8 |
| Arts and Sciences College Criteria | 10 |
| University of Northern Colorado Promotion and Tenure Guidelines..... | 11 |
| Promotion and Tenure Evaluations - Dean's Level - Arts and Sciences..... | 16 |
| Review of Teaching | 17 |
| Faculty Scholarship at the University of Northern Colorado | 18 |
| Arts and Sciences Performance Profiles | 22 |
| Evaluating Department Chairs/Division Directors | 24 |
| Additional College Criteria for Department Chair Responsibilities..... | 25 |
| Appendix A - College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Evaluation Deadlines..... | 26 |
| Appendix B - Evaluation Forms | 28 |
| Appendix C – Comprehensive Review Process and Criteria | 32 |

Faculty Evaluation Criteria: College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty evaluation, both annual and comprehensive, in the College of Arts and Sciences will conform to the Board of Trustees current policy, *University of Northern Colorado Faculty Evaluation Procedures* (11/13/98) and to *the Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures* (12/8/97).

For comprehensive faculty evaluation, the college comprehensive review procedures and criteria approved at the November 6, 2003, Council of Chairs meeting and subsequently by Interim Provost Huang will be used for faculty hired in Fall 2004 and after, for faculty promoted to Associate Professor or Professor in Spring 2004 and after, and for faculty holding the rank of Professor who complete post-tenure review in Spring 2004 and after. All remaining faculty have the option of using old or new guidelines and criteria until calendar year 2006. Assuming these new guidelines/criteria are not modified by actions of faculty and administrative leaders in the new Colleges of Natural and Health Sciences and Humanities and Social Sciences before 2006, then these guidelines go into effect in calendar year 2006 for all comprehensive reviews.

For annual faculty evaluation: See A& S Principles and Procedures Re: Annual Review.

Beginning with the annual evaluation for the 1998 calendar year, the department chair, in consultation with the faculty of the department, and the dean will provide, as part of annual faculty evaluation, a statement of progress towards promotion and/or tenure for all tenure track/tenured faculty who are not tenured at the rank of professor.

The document, *Promotion and Tenure Evaluations, Dean's Level, Arts and Sciences* (Revised 1/18/94), will define the procedures and criteria used by the dean to make recommendations on promotion and tenure.

Revised 9/1/2004

**Board Approved Constitutions and Procedures: Article 3 Faculty
Part 8 Faculty Evaluation.**

8 Faculty Evaluation.

2-3-801 Procedures for Evaluation of Performance. All faculty members (see also 2-3-201, Faculty: Definition and Contracts) being reviewed for reappointment, promotion, tenure, appointment to the graduate faculty, and all tenured faculty undergoing post-tenure review shall be evaluated in accordance with the procedures specified in this section 2-3-801, Faculty Evaluation and 1-1-307, Faculty Evaluation, and 3-3801, Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures.

2-3-801(1) Definitions. Definitions are provided to give guidance and should be substantially adhered to in the processes that follow:

(a) Dossier: Portfolio of information relative to performance and accomplishments during the comprehensive evaluation period, which shall include the updated vita; appropriate documentation; a representative sample of student evaluations, from each year, as determined by the department, covering the range of teaching assignments; and other materials as determined by the department/program area. Student evaluations chosen as a representative sample will include all responses submitted by students for each course selected by the department.

(b) Colleges: Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education, Health and Human Sciences, University Libraries, and Performing and Visual Arts.

(c) Departments: For the purposes of this document, departments shall include schools, divisions, departments, programs, centers, and their equivalents.

(d) Department Chair: Department chair is the designee responsible for administrative departmental duties as defined by the college.

(e) Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC): A committee responsible for resolving planning differences, observing teaching, receiving evaluation materials and making them available for faculty review, calling evaluation meetings of the departmental faculty, and producing a report with rationale for recommendations regarding the evaluatee based upon the vote of the eligible faculty. The department chair shall not be a member of this committee. The chair of the DEC shall be a tenured faculty member unless the composition of the department precludes it. The evaluatee may not rule in his/her own case. The DEC shall consist of either the entire tenured and tenure-track faculty excluding the chair or, if the department faculty chooses, a subcommittee of the departmental faculty. In the latter case, the subcommittee must consist of at least three members of the faculty. Members on the DEC shall be determined by a faculty vote. Tenure-track faculty, if they choose, may participate and vote in the DEC. Term faculty may, but will not be required to, participate on the DEC.

Voting: All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty will participate in review and evaluation of members of the department, but only tenured faculty must participate in voting. Tenured faculty in the department who are on full-time administrative assignment may not vote. Nor shall term faculty vote.

Evaluation Conference Committee (ECC): A conflict resolution committee, convened by the dean, consisting of the dean, department chair, and Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC). The ECC re-examines

evaluation materials, responses, and any new information when there is disagreement among the recommendations of the department, the chair, and the dean regarding overall comprehensive evaluation, promotion, tenure, remediation, and disciplinary action. It is the responsibility of the DEC members to represent the views of the faculty. If it is the chair who is the evaluatee, a member of the tenured faculty shall be elected to fulfill the chair's function and will produce an independent evaluation of the chair and cast a vote.

(h) Comprehensive Review is used for faculty who are under consideration for tenure, promotion, or graduate faculty status, or for those who are due for post-tenure review.

(i) Faculty

(I) Tenured faculty will undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review on a four-year cycle.

(II) Chairs will be evaluated for their non-administrative duties annually if untenured and on a four-year cycle if tenured.

(III) A faculty member must receive a comprehensive evaluation in any year upon his/her request.

(j) Comprehensive Review Categories:

(I) Promotion review, when requested by the evaluatee, shall include:

(II) degree of progress toward promotion.

(III) action recommended.

(k) Tenure-track review will address one or more of the following:

(I) Degree of progress toward tenure.

(II) Deficiencies requiring improvement and a development plan.

(III) Whether requirements for the position as listed in the position description or as modified through the departmental planning process have been met.

(IV) Whether tenure is recommended (final tenure review).

(l) Post-tenure review shall address one or more of the following (see also 1-1-307 et seq., Faculty Evaluation; and 3-3-801 et seq., Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures):

(I) Achievement of planning goals.

(II) Progress toward promotion, if appropriate.

(III) Deficiencies requiring improvement and a remediation plan, if needed.

(IV) Recommendation and rationale.

(m) Graduate Faculty Status Review. Faculty will be reviewed on a cycle established by the Graduate dean to coincide with post-tenure review or every four years for non-tenured faculty. [See also the Graduate Faculty Guidelines and 2-3-107(3), The Graduate Council.]

2-3-801(2) General Processes.

- (a) 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, the colleges/ schools, and the departments; 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 teaching, research, and service.
- (I) Each evaluatee will prepare a dossier [see also 2-3-801(1)(a)] covering performance and accomplishments over the comprehensive evaluation period.
 - (II) The faculty will conduct its evaluation and forward its findings to the chair. The chair and the Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC) will forward their evaluations and findings to the dean. Upon receipt of the recommendations of the DEC and the chair, the dean will make an independent evaluation with rationale that is shared with the departmental faculty, the chair, and the evaluatee.
 - (III) In case of disagreement with the voting departmental faculty or the chair, the Evaluation Conference Committee (ECC) shall be convened by the dean.
 - (IV) After attempts have been made to reach consensus, the dean, the chair of the DEC, and the department chair (or representative of the faculty elected to fulfill the role of the chair in case the department chair is the evaluatee) will forward their individual recommendations and rationale to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). If disagreement remains, the ECC will provide a statement of reasons why agreement could not be reached which will be forwarded to the CAO.
 - (V) The CAO, after insuring that procedures have been followed, shall make a recommendation to the President of the University.
 - (VI) In cases of post-tenure review, graduate faculty status, and tenure track review, the President of the University will make the final decision. In cases of promotion, or the granting of tenure, the President will forward his/her recommendations to the BOT, which will make the final decision.
 - (VII) The Graduate Faculty Status review will follow procedures defined by the bylaws of the Graduate Council, as approved by the President.

In no case will the procedures for annual evaluation go into effect until the next evaluation cycle.

- (b) Annual Review provides a mechanism for regular feedback to all faculty members as to their performance, for determining merit pay, and for assessing progress toward tenure and promotion. This review will occur each year during the Spring Semester.

Each department will develop its own procedures for annual evaluation, subject to the approval of the appropriate dean. Each department's procedures must include a mechanism to resolve differences between departmental and dean's evaluations in cases where the dean chooses to evaluate all faculty [see also (II) below]. If the department and dean cannot reach agreement on evaluation procedures, the following procedures will be used:

(I) The department will form a DEC, which will conduct its evaluation and forward its finding to the chair, who will make an independent evaluation. The chair and the DEC will forward their evaluations and findings to the dean. Upon receipt of the recommendations from the DEC and the chair, the dean will make an independent evaluation with rationale that is shared with the participating department faculty, the chair, and the evaluatee. [NB: Under this circumstance, the dean will evaluate all members of the department, but will not be required to evaluate all members of the college.

(II) The department will conduct its evaluation in accordance with its approved annual evaluation procedures and forward its findings to the dean. The dean may, at his or her discretion, independently evaluate all or none of the faculty in the college. In case the dean chooses to evaluate faculty in his/her college, s/he will forward his/her findings, with rationale, to the department faculty, the chair, and the evaluatee, in case a dean chooses not to conduct an independent evaluation, s/he must still do so in the case of any faculty member who chooses to appeal his/her evaluation from the department.

(III) In the case of tenure track faculty and tenured faculty at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor, the department's annual evaluation will note, in addition to rankings in the three performance areas, the evaluatee's progress toward a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. In all such cases, the department chair and the dean shall comment on the evaluatee's progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

(IV) If the dean conducts an independent evaluation, and if the dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the department, after unsuccessful attempts have been made to resolve those disagreements, then the dean and the department will forward their individual evaluations and rationale to the CAO, who will make the final decision.

2-3-801(3) Evaluation Areas. Unless otherwise specified in an evaluatees job description, s/he will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service. However, the faculty member need not contribute to each area equally in every evaluation period. Expectations and evaluations should be in accordance with the evaluatees background, goals, experience, and current professional status, as well as the expectations of the department and the characteristics of the discipline. The evaluation process must take into consideration any agreements between the chair and the faculty member concerning the emphasis to be placed on each area. These procedures will be employed only in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service in the evaluation of the chair. Leadership and management for the evaluation of the chairs will be considered under the area of service.

2-3-801(4) Possible Consequences to Tenure Status. A faculty member who receives an unacceptable comprehensive post-tenure review evaluation will be given a period of two years to achieve an acceptable evaluation. Failure to do so will constitute grounds for disciplinary action, including the initiation of dismissal proceedings as specified in 2-3-1101, Disciplinary Action of Tenured Faculty.

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, as

otherwise authorized under the terms and provisions of this procedure, unless or except when used to administer the affairs of the University, or to comply with the law.

A&S PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES RE: ANNUAL REVIEW

1. The following principles and procedures apply to annual reviews beginning with those for calendar year 1999.
2. Departments/Units will develop annual review procedures and criteria for annual review which will be reviewed and approved by the dean.
3. The following parameters will apply to the development of departmental procedures and criteria:
 - a. Adopted procedures/criteria should reflect consensus or the views of a significant majority of the department. The vote, if taken, should be forwarded with the procedures/criteria. If the document is one that reflects department consensus rather than a formal vote, it should be noted.
 - b. The chair must have a voting role in the annual review process.
 - c. The department may choose to include participants in the process who are not faculty. They will be non-voting.
 - d. There will be five levels of review, as characterized in the BOT faculty evaluation policy.
 - e. Departments must develop criteria/indicators, etc., that distinguish between the levels of evaluation.
 - f. Departments may define their weighting of criteria on either a 15 hour equated load basis or on a departmental mission basis. If the equated load basis is chosen, the weighting for a “typical” appointment would be 60% teaching, 20% professional activity, and 20% service. If a mission definition is adopted: teaching for a “typical” appointment must be weighted no less than 40% and no more than 60%; professional activity must be weighted no less than 20% and no more than 40%; and service must be weighted no less than 10% and no more than 30%. Differential workloads would be negotiated by the chair and accepted by the dean prior to the start of a new evaluation period.
4. In all cases, the Board approved policy applies to the development of departmental procedures and criteria.
5. The dean of Arts and Sciences will not participate in assigning ratings (i.e., a level of annual review) unless the department does not have approved criteria and procedures or unless involved at the level of appeal. The dean will review the application of all procedures and criteria by departments and may return the departmental annual reviews (as a whole) to departments for reconsideration if they are not in accord with approved procedures and criteria. If, after reconsideration by the department, the dean and the department are unable

to agree on the application of approved procedures and criteria, the provost will be the final appeal.

6. Procedures/criteria for the 2005 calendar year, the initial cycle, must be received by Dean's office by October 27, 2004, and must be approved no later than December 10, 2004. Otherwise, the former process, as outlined in the Board-approved policy, will apply for calendar year 1999.
7. Any change in procedures and criteria must be submitted to the dean and approved prior to start of a new evaluation cycle. If procedures/criteria are not approved for calendar year 1999, they must be approved prior to the start of a new cycle or the former process, as outlined in the Board-approved policy, will continue to apply.

Adopted by Council of Chairs, 3/25/99

Arts and Sciences College Criteria

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| V. Excellent | See IV. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS / V. EXCELLENT Performance Standards below. A IV or V is assigned depending on the degree to which performance standards are exceeded. |
| IV. Exceeds Expectations | |
| III. Meets Expectations | See III. MEETS EXPECTATIONS Performance Standards below. |
| II. Needs Improvement | A rating of I or II is based on performance that falls below the performance standards identified as III. MEETS EXPECTATIONS (below). A I or II is assigned depending on the degree to which performance standards are not met. |
| I. Unsatisfactory | |

III. MEETS EXPECTATIONS

Performance Standards

1. Instruction:

- (a) Demonstrates a capacity for stimulating students to think critically and to perform at a level commensurate with their potential.
- (b) Demonstrates an understanding of course design and a knowledge of teaching and learning principles.
- (c) Demonstrates currency, depth, and breadth of knowledge in the subject fields.
- (d) Demonstrates creativity, and resourcefulness in the preparation and presentation of course content.
- (e) Demonstrably creates a climate/environment conducive to student learning.
- (f) Develops and implements new/revised courses, curriculum or programs, which may include courses taught through the UNC Continuing Education Division during the academic year and/or the summer.
- (g) Demonstrates effective supervision of student practice, internships, and field studies.
- (h) Demonstrates effective direction of or participation in student (graduate or undergraduate) research, performances, or creative endeavors.
- (i) Demonstrates effective participation in student competency examinations, certification/licensing procedures.

2. Professional Activity:

- (a) Documented scholarly research (submitted manuscripts or research reports or documented work in progress) which demonstrably contribute to or have the potential of contributing to, the advancement/assimilation of knowledge in the discipline.
- (b) Creative efforts (concerts, recitals, performances, exhibits, recordings, films, and other professional activities) which contribute to the advancement/assimilation of knowledge in the discipline.
- (c) Documented professional contributions to, or consultancies with organizations and societies basic to the advancement/assimilation of knowledge in the discipline.
- (d) Documented sponsored program activity leading to or having the potential of producing external grant/contracts to support research, scholarly activity, or creative endeavors.
- (e) Documented participation in continuing education activities (workshops, seminars, field, conferences, etc.) which enhance professional credentials and scholarly competence.

3. Service:

- (a) Documented contributions to service efforts within the department, school/college or University which significantly impact the quality and vitality of the academic programs of the institution.
- (b) Documented contributions to service efforts which significantly impact the quality/vitality of the community or society.
- (c) Documented contributions to service efforts which demonstrably impact the quality, vitality and role of the profession or discipline at the state, regional, or national levels.
- (d) Creative efforts (concerts, recitals, performances, exhibits, recordings, films, displays, readings, etc.) which contribute in a significant way to the cultural life of the institution and community.
- (e) Provides adequate guidance and direction to students regarding course content and program requirements.

IV. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS / V. EXCELLENT

Performance Standards

1. Instruction:

- (a) Demonstrates consistently the ability to inspire students to achieve their greatest potential and has the capacity for instilling in them a true dedication to learning.
- (b) Serves as a formal and informal role model for achieving teaching excellence.
- (c) Contributes demonstrably to the knowledge base relevant to achieving effective, quality instruction.
- (d) Directs or takes major responsibility for curriculum developments having a demonstrably significant impact on the academic program.
- (e) Directs or takes major responsibility for developing new academic degree programs.
- (f) Develops new instructional strategies/approaches having demonstrably significant impact on the University or program-wide instruction. This may include courses taught through the UNC Continuing Education Division during the academic year and/or the summer.
- (g) Creates exceptional or innovative opportunities for student placement and demonstrates creative supervision of practice, internships, and field studies.
- (h) Directs student research, performances, and creative endeavors of demonstrably high quality.

2. Professional Activity:

- (a) Original scholarly research activities or consulting, the product of which makes a significant, well recognized contribution to the discipline.
- (b) Creative efforts (concerts, recitals, performances, exhibits, recordings, films, and other professional activities) which contribute to the discipline as acknowledged by critical reviews from reputable sources outside the immediate university community.
- (c) Professional contributions to learned societies/organizations which make a significant, well recognized contribution to the discipline or field.
- (d) Successful development or implementation of externally sponsored (grants/contracts) projects of a scope which make a significant, well recognized contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline or the quality and vitality of University programs.
- (e) Leadership roles in continuing education and peer professions which demonstrate exceptional competence.

3. Service:

- (a) Directs or takes major responsibility for internal planning, development and governance activities which demonstrably enhance the quality, vitality, or mission of the University.
- (b) Exhibits a major leadership role with respect to service efforts having a significant impact on the quality or vitality of the community or society.
- (c) Exhibits a major leadership role with respect to the quality, vitality and role of the profession or discipline at the state, regional, or national levels.
- (d) Creative efforts (concerts, recitals, performances, exhibits, recordings, films, displays, readings, etc.) which contribute in a significant way to the cultural life outside the institution and community.
- (e) Consistently exceeds unit expectations/requirements with respect to advising students.

Table II Examples of Standards that may be used to determine satisfactory and excellent performance for faculty (84-85 Document)

Board Approved Constitutions and Procedures: Article 3 Faculty

Part 9 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

2-3-901 Promotion Guidelines. Promotion at the University provides a mechanism for the recognition of personal contributions of faculty members to the mission of the institution and its reputation as well as a professional contribution of the advancement of the state of the art and the society at large. While judgment of potential contributions must necessarily be based on past performance, it is expected that persons achieving a given rank will continue to take initiatives which are valued by the institution.

Although the administration of promotion policies at the University must be equitable, it must not be perceived as implying identical standards for types of contributions by each individual faculty member. The promotion policy must facilitate the recognition of diverse potentials which harmonize individual competence and initiative with institutional needs and values. The promotion policy attends to both qualitative and quantitative contributions, with greater emphasis on the former.

Although historically promotion policies have been primarily related to degree status and length of service, it is well recognized that these dimensions do not guarantee qualitative productivity for the institution, the profession, or society at large.

Further, it is well recognized that learning and growth occur in other than formalized learning environments.

Specific academic or professional qualifications and performance guidelines shall be established at the school/college level. These must be written in consultation with the academic departments of the respective school/college and shall be approved by the appropriate Dean and Vice President.

2-3-901(1) Academic and Professional Qualifications. The University must be committed to academic excellence, requiring faculty members to meet high academic and professional qualifications. Minimum eligibility requirements for promotion to the ranks of associate professor and professor require any one of the following:

- (a) Possession of an appropriate earned doctorate.
- (b) Academic degrees and/or professional certification considered terminal in specific disciplines.
- (c) In exceptional cases, clearly demonstrated capacity for sustained and significant contribution to the goals of the University.

Eligibility for promotion from instructor to assistant professor shall be contingent upon documented evidence of substantial progress toward meeting the above qualifications.

2-3-901(2) Performance Guidelines. The following are areas of contribution or initiative which are deemed valuable and attend to fulfilling the explicit or implicit mission of the institution. These identified areas do not establish criteria for judgment, but identify areas for which specific guidelines must be developed at the school/college level to facilitate decisions regarding promotion in individual cases. It is not intended that faculty members would or could show initiative in all identified areas or that each would necessarily be appropriate in given schools or colleges.

Major consideration will be given to fulfillment of contractual duties and performance in those duties commensurate with the rank aspired to (i.e., teaching, advising, librarianship, etc.). Consideration will be given to performance and accomplishment in the areas which follow:

(a) Area I - Excellence in Teaching, Librarianship, etc.

It is assumed that the use of this category would require as much extra effort and produce sufficient results as to be recognized "as productivity above and beyond the basic contractual duties of the aspired rank."

(b) Area II - Professional Growth and Activities.

Scholarly activities, i.e., research, knowledge dissemination, advancement of the state of the art, writing, etc.

(II) Professional involvement/active participation, i.e., leadership officership, service on task forces, commissions, etc.

(III) Presentations at professional organizations, learned societies, exhibitions, recitals, etc.

(IV) Continued formal education, professional development, seminars, workshops, professional internships, etc.

(c) Area III - Professional Service and Institutional Leadership.

(I) Professional Service - Internal.

(A) Contribution to committees.

(B) Program development.

(C) Curricular and instructional innovations.

(D) Development of training facilities or placement opportunities for graduates. (E)

Resource development.

(II) Professional Service - External.

(A) Position-relevant professional consultation or service. (B)

Position-relevant government consultation or service. (C) Position-

relevant community service.

(III) Institutional Leadership.

(A) Increasing levels of leadership, responsibility and initiative.

2-3-901(3) Time Guidelines. Instructors are eligible for promotion to the assistant professor rank as soon as they have met the requirements necessary for appointment to that rank. Assistant professors are first eligible

for promotion to the associate professor rank during their fifth year in rank. Associate professors are first eligible for promotion to the full professor rank during their fifth year in rank.

2-3-901(4) Promotion Criteria. Promotion Criteria shall be developed in consultation with academic departments by the appropriate college and approved by the appropriate academic dean and the CAO prior to consideration of any individual for promotion. Promotion criteria must be written within the confines of the University's promotion policy to insure that criteria for promotion are generally comparable throughout the University, yet accommodate differences within the academic disciplines.

Department chairs will discuss relevant promotion criteria with each faculty member in her or his department periodically so as to insure that each member is cognizant of departmental and college performance expectations and his or her fulfillment of them.

2-3-901(5) Eligibility. Eligibility for consideration for promotion shall be based upon academic years in which the individual is contracted with the University to a full-time position. Up to three years credit (out of the five-year probationary period) toward both promotion and tenure may be negotiated by newly hired faculty who have been tenured, or who have held tenure-track appointments at another institution of higher education, or who possess a record of outstanding achievement in the area in which they are being hired. Under exceptional circumstances, faculty may become eligible for early consideration for promotion and/or tenure. Time in which the individual is on leave for academic purposes, with or without pay, shall be counted as if the individual had not been on leave. It shall be the responsibility of the individual who is eligible for consideration to initiate the review through a formal request to the appropriate department chair.

2-3-901(6) Consideration. At the time of the formal request for consideration for promotion it shall be the responsibility of the candidate to document satisfactory fulfillment of the appropriate areas of consideration for promotion as defined within the approved college criteria for promotion.

2-3-901(7) Review. Professional ethics require that decisions regarding promotion be made on the basis of criteria deemed important and approved by the college, the dean, and the CAO rather than qualities and/or preferences not contained therein. It is also important that professionals judging fellow professionals accept the responsibility to review appropriate and applicable supporting material to insure that decisions are fair and based upon the approved criteria. Departmental review of each candidate shall be made by faculty members eligible under 2-3-801(1)(f) Voting, excluding the individual being considered for promotion. (See also 1-1-307, Faculty Evaluation, 2-3-801, et seq., Faculty Evaluations and 3-3-801, et seq., Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures.)

Promotion and tenure become effective upon BOT approval.

2-3-902 Tenure.

2-3-902(1) Purpose. The purpose of tenure is to create an environment in which the concept of academic freedom is protected. The decision to grant or not grant tenure is influenced by the desirability of maintaining a continuing collegial and professional relationship between the candidate and his or her peer professionals. While a department cannot remain viable under conditions of sharp disharmony, neither can it achieve vitality in the absence of a diversity of interests, opinions, and personalities; a balance of these considerations must, therefore, be sought. Members of educational institutions -concerned as they are with lively exchanges of ideas, and with students who themselves are varied in terms of interests and personalities -- should be particularly receptive to such differences, and particularly mindful of accepting them when making decisions about tenure. These areas necessitate that professionals must accept their responsibilities to other professionals, to students, to the University, and to the community at large.

2-3-902(2) Eligibility. Eligibility shall be calculated on full academic years in which the individual was contracted to a full-time, tenure-track position. Time which the individual has spent on leave or as a visiting faculty member shall not be calculated as applicable toward eligibility for tenure. Tenure is in a person's program area and does not apply to any administrative position or chairship.

2-3-902(3) Tenure Guidelines. Tenure-track faculty become eligible for tenure consideration in their fifth year at UNC but must receive tenure consideration in their sixth year. If tenure is denied in the fifth year, faculty may reapply in their sixth year. If tenure is not granted before the end of the sixth year, the seventh will be the terminal year.

- (a) Promotion and tenure become effective upon BOT approval.
- (b) In unusual circumstances, immediate tenure may be granted to faculty being hired from outside the University as associate and full professors.
- (c) Up to three years credit (out of the five-year probationary period) toward both promotion and tenure, may be negotiated by newly hired faculty who have been tenured, or who have held tenure-track appointments at another institution of higher education, or who possess a record of outstanding achievement in the area in which they are being hired.
- (d) Under exceptional circumstances, faculty may become eligible for early consideration for promotion and/or tenure.
- (e) Applications for promotion to the rank of associate professor by tenure-track faculty must always be accompanied by an application for tenure, so that the two decisions may be considered at the same time. In these cases, tenure and promotion to the associate rank must be granted at the same time.

2-3-902(4) Administrators With Tenure. Tenure shall not be lost by appointment to an administrative position and may be granted to administrative officers in their respective teaching disciplines or program area. Upon termination of the non-teaching position, a faculty member with tenure may return to the previous professional assignment or one of equal status in accordance 3-4-102, Contract/Appointment Status.

2-3-902(5) Voting. In all cases, tenure shall be granted only upon approval of a plurality of the faculty voting in the academic department/unit in which the faculty member will hold tenure. In the case of a negative department vote on tenure, an appeal may be made to the Tenure Appeals Committee (Committee) as outlined in 2-3-902(6). The Committee will hear appeals only in those cases in which the faculty member alleges that the department's negative vote on tenure was arbitrary, capricious, or the result of prejudice.

2-3-902(6) Tenure Appeals Committee. In the case of a department voting against tenure, the faculty member may appeal to the Tenure Appeals Committee (Committee) which is herein established. The committee shall consist of two faculty representatives from each college, and one from the University libraries. Each college representative shall be a member of the faculty and shall serve for a term of two years. Elections shall be held annually so that one member of each college is elected each year. At the initial elections, one position in each college shall be designated as a one-year term. Elections will be conducted by the Faculty Senate and will be held during the spring semester. Terms of office will begin with the next academic year. The Committee shall select its own chair, and establish its own bylaws.

Appeals must be filed within ten working days (excluding winter and spring breaks) of notification of the

department vote. The Committee will hear appeals only in those cases in which the faculty member alleges that the department' s negative vote on tenure was arbitrary, capricious, or the result of prejudice. The Committee shall conclude its deliberations no fewer than ten working days before the date on which recommendations on tenure are due in Academic Affairs. If by a majority vote the Committee finds reasonable grounds for the allegations that the department' s decision was arbitrary, capricious or the result of prejudice, its decision, with rationale and a vote count, will be forwarded to the appropriate officer. If however, the Committee does not find reasonable grounds to support the candidate' s allegations, tenure will be denied in that department and the appellant will be notified.

PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATIONS
DEAN'S LEVEL
ARTS AND SCIENCES
(Updated 9/7/2004)

Appendix C (page 32) is the Comprehensive Review Process and Criteria (approved November 6, 2003) as described on page two of this Handbook for designated faculty. Other faculty may choose to use the guidelines below through 2005 subject to changes or revisions approved by faculty and administrative leaders in the new colleges.

Procedures: The Deans review all application materials submitted by departments including: candidate vita, dossier, statement (if any), department faculty vote/evaluation, department chair evaluation/recommendation.

In some instances the Deans seek additional information to gain a complete understanding of the application. This may include: interviews with the candidate or the department chair; telephone interviews with department chairs external to UNC (Department chairs of the CCHE peer group institutions in the department appropriate to the specific applicant); telephone interviews with journal editors; or information available in the Michener Library. When information from this process is thought to be important it is presented and discussed in the Dean's evaluation memo.

Criteria: The operational criteria are as follows:

Tenure—rating of Exceeds Expectations(IV) or better in at least one performance area and rating of Meets Expectations (III) in the other two.

Promotion to Assistant Professor:

At least ABD in an appropriate discipline and rating of Meets Expectations (III) or better in all three performance areas from a promotable instructor position (note, some instructor positions are not promotable due to budgetary considerations and/or nature of job duties.)

The minimum requirement for promotion to Associate and Professor is any one of the following: a) earned doctorate in the discipline, b) other terminal degree specified for the department, c) an exceptional case, and, in addition, the following:

Promotion to Associate Professor:

With the Doctorate: Rating of Exceeds Expectations (IV) or better in at least one performance area and rating of Meets Expectations (III) or better in the other two.

Without the Doctorate: Rating of Exceeds Expectations (IV) or better in at least two performance areas and rating of Meets Expectations (III) or better in the other one.

Promotion to Professor:

With the Doctorate: Rating of Exceeds Expectations (IV) or better in at least two performance areas and rating of Meets Expectations (III) or better in the other one.

Without the Doctorate: Rating of Exceeds Expectations (IV) or better in all three performance areas.

Dean's Recommendation: The memo from the Dean summarizes personnel data for the candidate and communicates the Dean's level recommendation relative to the proposed action. No attempt is made to restate candidate accomplishments or outcomes that are already described in the application. However, an attempt is made to highlight accomplishments and evaluation of them as necessary to justify Dean's level performance ratings and to

suggest areas for improvement (if applicable). All Dean's level evaluations and recommendations are made using College Criteria (Table II of the 1984-85 university evaluation document) as a guide.

REVIEW OF TEACHING

The following is a list of possibilities for fuller review of teaching in the College of Arts and Sciences:

Statement of teaching philosophy

Copies of course syllabi

Narrative descriptions of course syllabi

Copies of exams

Copies of graded exams

Copies of graded papers

New courses

New programs

Student evaluations (no numbers or numbers de-emphasized)

Analyses of student evaluations

Professor description of class "personality," ability, performance

Letters from students

Student awards

Student research presented

Other evidence of effects on students

Video of teaching

Peer review of teaching

Chair review of teaching (dean mandates)

FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

I. Introduction

Scholarly accomplishments come in many forms and are an essential component of graduate education. Contemporary, stimulating and relevant graduate education requires a faculty which is actively engaged in advancing one or more aspects of their discipline. That UNC has such faculty was noted in the recent NCA visit and report.

Many [faculty] are very active scholars, publishing their work in major journals in their academic fields and in professional journals reaching practitioners in their areas. Conference presentations are widely evident.... Many university faculty are considered primary workers in the vineyard of scholarship (p. 18).

In addition to recognizing that many faculty are active as scholars, the NCA report acknowledges the importance of teaching and points out the need for university support for faculty scholarship.

The university has a core of faculty who are committed to research, but not at the expense of other academic activities, and a serious core of persons who engage in activities to support a research environment. On the other hand, it appears that the university must do more to enhance the potential inherent in the faculty and its goal of becoming a mature Doctoral I institution (pp. 19-20).

As is true on other university campuses and with the public at large, there is some debate at UNC about what is meant by scholarship. This was made evident by faculty feedback from focus groups during the Fall, 1995 Graduate Faculty retreat.

This paper presents the position of the Graduate Faculty of the University of Northern Colorado on the nature and expectations of scholarship among the professoriate. It is intended to be a guide to current and new faculty as well as to communicate to external audiences the meaning, value and role of scholarship for UNC's Graduate Faculty. Further, it advances recommendations for encouraging, enhancing and supporting scholarship at UNC.

II. The Concept of Scholar-Teacher

The University of Northern Colorado, as a doctoral university, places high priorities on both teaching and scholarship. In contrast to comprehensive four year colleges or major research universities, it is not acceptable for UNC's Graduate Faculty to be either teachers or scholars. They must be both. Consequently, the Graduate Faculty endorses the concept of *scholar-teacher* to show their commitment to the integration of inquiry and the application of knowledge to teaching. This belief presents a particular challenge to UNC's Graduate Faculty. They must find ways to integrate their scholarship and teaching. In so doing, they act as role models for their students and continually renew what they teach.

As scholar-teachers, UNC faculty bring their research into the classroom because their scholarship is directly related to what they teach. Others pursue discipline based scholarship that is ancillary to the subjects they teach. However, their teaching benefits because they keep abreast of the discipline and integrate newly acquired knowledge into their teaching. Finally, some Graduate Faculty have become scholarly about their teaching; that is, they research their teaching techniques and strategies.

When blended together, scholarship and teaching allow students to participate in learning opportunities that would be missing without this integration. Although scholar-teachers may express their scholarship in different forms, all endeavor to use their scholarly activity to improve the quality of their teaching and to enhance active student learning and advance their professions through dissemination of their findings.

III. Characteristics of UNC's Graduate Faculty Scholarship

A university is comprised of many different disciplines that are guided by different goals, values and expectations. As a part of the university community, the Graduate Faculty value and encourage academic diversity and expect scholarship to be expressed in a variety of ways. Therefore, the Graduate Faculty endorses a broad and inclusive definition of scholarship that includes activities recognized by the respective discipline as scholarly. This position breaks from the narrow definition in which scholarship is defined as basic research only. This broader definition includes traditional forms of scholarship such as research and inquiry found in the sciences as well as more discipline-specific activities such as advancing practitioner techniques essential to clinical programs and creative and informed performance found in the arts.

This model of scholarship is particularly well suited to doctoral universities like UNC because it broadens the definition of scholarship and encourages research on teaching. The four types of scholarly activity proposed by Boyer (1990)¹ are included in this model; the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching. Each is seen as valuable and important at UNC and should be promoted by the University through its policies and practices. Although each type of scholarship is embraced by the Graduate Faculty, it is not believed that each faculty member has to engage in all four types. Instead, faculty must choose those that best match their skills and meet the discipline requirements of their program. Each type is defined briefly:

- **Scholarship of discovery.** This form of scholarship is exemplified by the pursuit and generation of new knowledge. "It is most often referred to as basic research and entails disciplined, investigative efforts" (p. 17).
- **Scholarship of integration.** When practicing the scholarship of integration, scholars synthesize information from a variety of contexts to give it meaning in a broader perspective. For example, a historian who creates a policy position by integrating knowledge from past historical events with scientific discovery is practicing the scholarship of integration. According to Boyer, those involved in integration ask, "What do the findings mean? Is it possible to interpret what's been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?" (p. 19).
- **Scholarship of application.** This type of scholarship uses knowledge to solve "consequential problems" (p. 21). Scholars focus on ways to use knowledge to improve practice or improve the quality of life. Examples include medicines to cure illness, unique teaching strategies for the learning disabled, financial forecasting based upon economic theory, and informed artistic performance.
- **Scholarship of teaching.** Boyer points out, "The work of the professor becomes consequential only as it is understood by others" (p. 23). This view holds that teaching should not be routine transmittal of knowledge but, at its best, it should transform and extend knowledge. The best teachers not only know the content but they continually learn through active inquiry, develop methods to challenge their students, develop new insights into the discipline and encourage their students to do the same. In short, the scholarship of teaching is disseminated to peers for critical review and thus advances the discipline of teaching.

Although the Graduate Faculty recognizes and values disciplined based differences, it believes that all faculty scholars *must express their work publicly in forms recognized by the discipline so that it can be reviewed by peers*. Public expression and critique makes the scholar accountable and provides role models for graduate students.

¹ The book is titled, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Dr. Ernest L. Boyer, recently deceased, was President of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

V. Characteristics and Values of Scholar-Teachers

The Graduate Faculty define the following as central characteristics as well as expected values of the Scholar-Teacher at UNC.

Characteristics

- A. **Exceptionally Knowledgeable:** Command a thorough awareness of the most current knowledge and practices within their respective disciplines.
- B. **Critically Inquisitive:** Challenge current knowledge and contribute new discoveries, perspectives and innovations.
- C. **Open to Critical Review:** Submit their scholarship for peer review from other scholars.
- D. **Responsibly Informative:** Disseminate, exhibit or perform their work to national and international audiences in formats appropriate to faculty members' disciplines.
- E. **Collegial:** Encourage, guide and consult with new faculty and colleagues in order to help advance their scholarly and educational endeavors.
- F. **Educationally Engaging:** Involve graduate and undergraduate students in scholarly activities.

Values

- A. Be open to different kinds of scholarship within and between disciplines.
- B. Openly express the value and crucial importance of faculty and student scholarly activities.
- C. Consider faculty scholarship as a basic responsibility of faculty members at UNC.
- D. Value active teaching and mentoring as well as scholarly activities. Be committed to offering the highest level of instruction and guidance.
- E. Demonstrate a commitment to strengthening graduate programs in which they hold faculty positions through scholarship.
- F. Be responsible to maintain high standards for graduate student scholarship.

VI. Recommendations for Action by the University Administration

It is the position of the Graduate Faculty that the University should recognize, support, and celebrate scholarship in its many forms. Furthermore, the University should promote intellectual vitality of its faculty to ensure the highest quality and most contemporary educational opportunities for its graduate and undergraduate students. To meet these ends, the Graduate Faculty advance the following recommendations:

- A. The University, through policies, procedures and budgetary allocations, must properly recognize and support individual and collaborative scholarship in its many forms. Additionally, a system of incentives, recognition and rewards that is supportive of scholarship in its many forms should be implemented. (see position paper on institutional support)

- B. Faculty evaluations, including tenure and promotion, should be based on an equitable and mutually agreeable set of scholarship expectations designed to encourage excellence while recognizing appropriate variations among disciplines.
- C. Faculty assignments and responsibilities must recognize the importance of balance in scholarship and other professional expectations among faculty as well as departments and colleges. An acceptable workload policy and implementation procedures should be developed to guide faculty assignments, academic programming and to enhance scholarship. (see position paper on faculty workload)
- D. University administrators and the Board of Trustees must maintain a position of public advocacy on behalf of graduate programs and the related value and necessity of faculty and student scholarly activities.
- E. The administration must implement programs that enhance the intellectual environment of the University and promote scholarly exchanges among Graduate Faculty and students as well as facilitating interactions with well-known scholars of national and international renown.

ARTS AND SCIENCES PERFORMANCE PROFILES *
Updated 1/19/98

Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in Instruction, Meets Expectations in Professional Activity, Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in Service

Received recognition for past accomplishments in instruction, professional activity, and service through the granting of tenure. Is in the Department of _____ and came to UNC in 1983. Among many contributions at UNC are excellent teaching recognized by awards such as “Favorite Professor” and “1988 Honors Thesis Advisor of the Year.” Research in the area of pain assessment and management have resulted in numerous presentations both to professional organizations and community groups as well as several articles. Has contributed much to the University through service as a faculty senator. Helped found UNC’s Chapter of Gold Key, named one of the “Best New Chapters” at the Gold Key National Convention.

Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in Instruction, Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in Professional Activity, and Meets Expectations in Service

Received recognition for past accomplishments in instruction, professional activity, and service through promotion to full professor. Is in the Department of _____ and came to UNC in 1983. Among many accomplishments are excellence in teaching, recognized by Mortar Board in 1985 and 1988. Is one of only two persons in the State of Colorado certified as a tester for the Oral Proficiency Interview by the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language, the most demanding and precise of all oral evaluation instruments currently in use. Is nationally known for work on Latin American Baroque Literature and Contemporary Hispanic feminist criticism. Has been honored as UNC’s Distinguished Scholar in 1989 and as College Scholar for Arts and Sciences in 1986 and 1989. In the last five years has published four book chapters, seven articles, and four book reviews. Continues to publish research and will soon complete a book. Has made 23 presentations at national and international meetings since last promotion. Along with all research activities, has served on the Graduate Council and a variety of other committees.

Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in All three Areas

A member of the _____ Department since 1982, has been recognized with promotion to full professor. Is a rigorous and demanding teacher who has incorporated activities such as video skits and original research into classroom. Has established and maintained the internship program for family studies majors, making it a capstone research experience. Has 11 juried publications and 20 conference presentations to credit since promotion to Associate Professor, and these present both discipline content and teaching strategies in chosen specialties of family violence, sex roles, and teaching techniques. Directs the family studies emphasis of the Sociology major, doing primary advising of more than 50 majors. Has served on a variety of departmental, college, and University committees, including the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Sexual Assault Task Force, and the Women’s Studies Committee.

* Note: Performance profiles were developed using the former 3-level system. The Exceeds Expectations/Excellent level is used to recognize that presently there are two levels where formerly Outstanding was used.

Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in All three Areas

Has been recognized with promotion to Associate Professor. Has been on the _____ department faculty since 1988 and has demonstrated versatility in teaching students ranging from lower to upper level undergraduates as well as graduates. Has been very involved in developing the department's Ph.D. program in educational mathematics as well as their new Advanced Placement Calculus Institute. Professional activities have resulted in numerous and substantial publications and invited presentations in the area of nonstandard analysis/logic. Is active on various department, college, and University committees, including the Faculty Senate's Academic Policies Committee, which has chaired.

Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in All three Areas

Has been recognized for achievements with promotion to full professor. A member of the Department since 1983, is known for outstanding instruction. Has been chosen for the Mortar Board Favorite Professor Award four times since 1985. Has emphasized writing across the curriculum, student involvement in research, and development of the internship program. Is credited with identifying agencies and creating opportunities for placement of sociology students. Averaging more than one publication per year since arrival at UNC, has been recognized as a College Scholar and nominee for the Distinguished Scholar Award. Publications have appeared in a variety of journals. Has served on a variety of department committees, the College curriculum committee, and taken leadership positions in both the American Correctional Association and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.

Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in All three Areas

Has been recognized with promotion to full professor. A member of the _____ Faculty since 1968, is an outstanding instructor known both for being well-prepared and well-organized. Has made significant contributions in keeping technical courses in geography current with new technologies, most significantly the development and introduction of a computer mapping course. Has co-produced two sets of published media materials during the last two years which have received wide use and praise by teachers nationwide. As a result, was appointed as the materials co-editor for the National Council of Geographic Education. Has also produced a variety of other publications and presentations, and has secured grant support for most recent research. Is active in a variety of committees, including the Professional Education Council, and University Promotion and Tenure Committee and was Chair of the ___ department and provided key leadership during the early 80s when the University underwent significant reorganization.

Exceeds Expectations/Excellent in All three Areas

A member of the Psychology faculty since 1986, has been recognized with promotion to Associate Professor and the granting of tenure. Is one of our very best examples of what a teacher should be. While is demanding of students and expects their very best in classes, is also consistently described as their "favorite" professor by those students. Frequently involves students in research projects and finds time to publish many of the works they are involved in. Has published 14 articles and numerous papers in the areas of Aids reactions, employee turnover, and psychometrics. Did an outstanding job as chair of our Achievement Awards Committee and has served willingly and well on many other department, college and University committees.

College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for the Evaluation of Department Chairs

The responsibilities of department chairs should be evaluated using the performance standards for Service: Chairing, (adopted February 12, 1998).

1. The process of evaluating the department chair should include opportunity for student input.
2. The process of evaluating the department chair should provide opportunity for input from a current colleague chair.
3. The department chair's responsibilities are evaluated under the category of service, as one component of that category. The evaluation for chairing responsibilities should be proportionally combined with the evaluation for non-chairing service responsibilities.

For example: If the weighting for serving as chair is .2 and the weighting for service is .2, the overall service weighting is .4 and should equally reflect each area.

4. The evaluation for chair responsibilities is reported on the annual review and comprehensive review forms as Service. The weight and rating of the chair is incorporated into the total Service score, and also it is reported as a subscore.

For example: Here is how the evaluation of a chair who has .4 for service, .2 of which is in chairing, would be reported. This hypothetical chair received a 4, Exceeds Expectations, for chairing and a 3, for the other portion of service; hence, the overall service rating would be 3.5

Weighting Factors

Service
.4 (chair: .2)

Annual Performance Evaluation

Service
3.5 (chair: 4)

5. In accord with University regulations, the dean will annually evaluate chairs on the performance of their chair responsibilities, informed by the Department's evaluation of the chair's responsibilities as reported under service. The dean will not evaluate the chair on other responsibilities (teaching, professional activity, and service) that have been delegated to the department through its development of approved criteria and procedures. The dean will report the results of the evaluation to the chair and to the department/program.
6. Merit pay awards for chairs will be part of the department's merit funds and distributed in accord with the A&S Principles and Procedures Re Merit Distribution and the approved merit plan of the department.

Adopted 10-12-00

Additional College Criteria for Department Chair Responsibilities

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| V. Excellent | See IV. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS / V. EXCELLENT Performance Standards below. A IV or V is assigned depending on the degree to which performance standards are exceeded. |
| IV. Exceeds Expectations | |
| III. Meets Expectations | See III. MEETS EXPECTATIONS Performance Standards below. |
| II. Needs Improvement | A rating of I or II is based on performance that falls below the performance standards identified as III. MEETS EXPECTATIONS (below). A I or II is assigned depending on the degree to which performance standards are not met. |
| I. Unsatisfactory | |

III. MEETS EXPECTATIONS

3. (Addendum) Service: Chairing

- (f) Facilitates the instruction, professional achievement and public service by the faculty.
- (g) Demonstrates commitment to affirmative action/equal opportunity through recruitment and other personnel actions.
- (h) Recognizes faculty, staff and student achievement.
- (i) Facilitates decision making through unit governance procedures.
- (j) Demonstrates responsiveness to the concerns of faculty, students and the community and represents those concerns appropriately.
- (k) Establishes, through consultation with faculty and others, goals, objectives and priorities congruent with school/college and University mission and goals.
- (l) Monitors the quality of courses and programs on and off campus.
- (m) Directs and monitors the departmental recruitment of faculty and students.
- (n) Allocates resources (budget, FTE, staff, facilities, equipment, etc.) equitably and effectively.
- (o) Submits accurate and timely budget and personnel information as required.
- (p) Facilitates the awarding of assistantships and scholarships.
- (q) Assigns faculty, facilities, courses, etc., in accordance with University policies and procedures.
- (r) Conducts personnel evaluations (including PACE, promotion and tenure, etc.).
- (s) Provides accurate and timely information to faculty, dean, and others as required.

IV. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS / V. EXCELLENT

3. (Addendum) Service: Chairing

- (f) Facilitates the development of new programs congruent with University mission and goals.
- (g) Effectively promotes programs outside the University.
- (h) Demonstrably facilitates the professional growth of the faculty members.
- (i) Significantly increases the numbers of students in the program.
- (j) Demonstrably increases the effectiveness of faculty and staff.
- (k) Leads the unit to recognition (e.g., accreditation by outside agencies).
- (l) Meets affirmative action/student recruitment goals.
- (m) Achieves or facilitates the obtaining of additional resources.
- (n) Involves students effectively in governance.
- (o) Achieves exceptional productivity through use of resources.
- (p) Establishes model management techniques.
- (q) Introduces cost saving techniques.
- (r) Provides management that facilitates the academic functions of the faculty.

Adopted 2/12/98

APPENDIX A
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY EVALUATION DEADLINES

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
2005/2006 FACULTY EVALUATION DEADLINES

Reappointment of tenure-track faculty in their first year of service for the 2005-2006 Academic Year:

DUE: A&S Dean's Office - January 14, 2005
Academic Affairs - February 8, 2005

Reappointment of tenure-track faculty in their second year of service for the 2005-2006 Academic Year:

DUE: A&S Dean's Office - November 12, 2004
Academic Affairs - December 1, 2004

Reappointment of tenure-track faculty in their second, third, fourth or fifth year of service for the 2005-2006 Academic Year:

DUE: A&S Dean's Office - March 1, 2005
Academic Affairs - April 15, 2005

Reappointment of term faculty/exempt administrators in any year of service for the 2005-2006 Academic Year:

DUE: A&S Dean's Office - March 11, 2005
Academic Affairs - April 1, 2005

Comprehensive Reviews (including applications for promotion and/or tenure, and graduate faculty status; and post tenure review for calendar years 2001-2004):

DUE: A&S Dean's office - January 28, 2005
Academic Affairs - March 18, 2005

Annual Evaluations for Calendar Year 2004:

DUE: A&S Dean's office - March 1, 2005
Academic Affairs - April 14, 2005

Original 9/7/2004

Updated 10/29/2004 updates are in red

APPENDIX B

FORMS

Annual Evaluation Form

Comprehensive Review Form

Interactive forms are available on the A&S website:

http://asweb.unco.edu/Forms/faculty_evaluation/annual_evaluation.doc

and

http://asweb.unco.edu/Forms/faculty_evaluation/comprehensive_review.doc

ANNUAL EVALUATION
For Calendar Year _____

PART I: Evaluatee Information

Name _____

College _____ School/Department _____ Rank _____

Date 1st Hired at UNC _____ Contract Status (check one) Tenured _____ Tenure Track _____ Term _____

Member of the graduate faculty? Yes ___ No ___ Doctoral research endorsement? Yes ___ No ___ Date of last appointment _____

Graduate program responsibilities? (check all that apply) Teaching ___ Advising ___ Supervision of research MA ___ Doc ___

PART II: Annual Performance Evaluation

Weighting Factors

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Instruction | Professional Activity | Service |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |

Performance Evaluation

(5=Excellent, 4= Exceeds Expectations, 3= Meets Expectations, 2= Needs Improvement, 1=Unsatisfactory)

| | Instruction | Professional Activity | Service | Overall Evaluation |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|--------------------|
| Department Faculty | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Chair | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Dean | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Vice President | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

| | |
|----------------------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ |
| DEC Chair | Date |
| _____ | _____ |
| Department Chair | Date |
| _____ | _____ |
| Dean | Date |
| _____ | _____ |
| Vice President | Date |
| _____ | _____ |
| President (if appropriate) | Date |

| Overall Evaluation Scale | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|----------------------|
| 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 |

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

For Calendar Years _____ through _____

Purpose of Review (check all that apply) Promotion ___; Tenure ___; Post Tenure Review ___; Personal Request ___.

PART I: Evaluatee Information

Name _____

College _____ School/Department _____

Rank _____ Date of Last Promotion _____ Date Tenured at UNC _____

Complete next 2 items if applying for tenure and/or promotion. Date hired at UNC in a tenure track position _____

Prior service credit toward tenure and/or promotion? Yes ___ No ___ (If yes, attach your first contract agreement.)

Member of the graduate faculty? Yes ___ No ___ Doctoral research endorsement? Yes ___ No ___ Date last appointed _____

Graduate program responsibilities? (Check all that apply) Teaching ___ Advising ___ Supervision of research MA ___ Doc ___

PART II: Annual Performance Evaluation

Weighting Factors

| | | | |
|------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|
| | Instruction | Professional Activity | Service |
| Year _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Annual Performance Evaluation

(5=Excellent, 4= Exceeds Expectations, 3= Meets Expectations, 2= Needs Improvement, 1=Unsatisfactory)

| | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| | | | | Overall Evaluation |
| Department Faculty | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Chair | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Dean | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Vice President | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

PART III: Comprehensive Evaluation

Weighting Factors (Average for Comprehensive Review Period)

| | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------|
| | Instruction | Professional Activity | Service |
| | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Comprehensive Performance Evaluation

| | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| | | | | Overall Evaluation |
| Department Faculty | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Chair | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Dean | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Vice President | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Part IV: Post Tenure Review Decision

| | Satisfactory | Needs Improvement | Unsatisfactory |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Department Faculty | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Chair | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Dean | _____ | _____ | _____ |

ECC (if required) Indicate satisfactory, needs improvement, unsatisfactory.

DEC _____ Chair _____ Dean _____

Vice President's Recommendation

Performance plan required? _____

President's Decision

Part V: Voting Record for Promotion

| | # Faculty Eligible to Vote | # Voting | # For | # Against | # Abstain |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Faculty | # Tenured | # Tenured | | | |
| | # Tenure Track | # Tenure Track | | | |
| Chair | | | | | |
| Dean | | | | | |
| ECC (if required) | Indicate Vote (Yes or No)* | | DEC _____ | Chair _____ | Dean _____ |
| Vice President | | | | | |
| President | | | | | |

Part VI: Voting Record for Tenure

| | # Faculty Eligible to Vote | # Voting | # For | # Against | # Abstain |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Faculty | # Tenured | # Tenured | | | |
| | # Tenure Track | # Tenure Track | | | |
| Chair | | | | | |
| Dean | | | | | |
| ECC (if required) | Indicate Vote (Yes or No)* | | DEC _____ | Chair _____ | Dean _____ |
| Vice President | | | | | |
| President | | | | | |

DEC Chair Date

Department Chair Date

Dean Date

Vice President Date

President Date

| Overall Evaluation Scale | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|----------------------|
| 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 |

APPENDIX C

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW
PROCESS AND CRITERIA

**Comprehensive Review Process and Criteria
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Northern Colorado**

These guidelines are to be used by faculty as per instructions on page 2 of this Handbook/Guide

Section 1. Comprehensive Review Guidelines for the College of Arts and Sciences

1. Faculty evaluation in the College of Arts and Sciences will conform to the Board of Trustees current policy.
2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to review the document entitled "Faculty Evaluation in the College of Arts and Sciences" (http://asweb.unco.edu/faculty_evaluation.htm) in its entirety and review any questions or concerns with the department chair as soon as possible.
3. Comprehensive review includes evaluation in the three areas of instruction, professional activity, and service. Since instruction and professional activity are fundamental to the role of a teacher-scholar, promotion and tenure must include substantive evidence of accomplishments in these areas. Since faculty members are also engaged in service and have a portion of their workload assigned to service responsibilities, their contributions to service must also be evaluated.
4. Department chairs are strongly encouraged to meet at least once annually with faculty on the path to promotion and/or tenure to discuss the results of annual reviews and assess the candidate's progress toward realizing a successful comprehensive review.
5. In some cases faculty members may be engaged in activities that have direct application to two or even three areas of their appointment (i.e., Instruction, Professional Activity, and Service). Among the activities that might fall into more than one area are the following: consulting; supervision of graduate research; serving on editorial boards; grants, depending on their nature e.g., whether they are pedagogical or content research). It is incumbent upon the candidate to select and defend the selected area(s). For example, a single project may involve publication of original data (Professional Activity), leading workshops for teachers related to that project (Instruction), and serving on a regional, national, or international board that coordinates research efforts within that particular project (Service). In such cases, though, the faculty member must justify in detail why a particular activity should be allotted to more than one area.
6. Departments are strongly encouraged to prepare comprehensive review guidelines and/or departmental criteria which include expectations for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. The guidelines and/or departmental criteria for comprehensive review should reflect the nature of instruction, professional activity, and service valued by the discipline and be consistent with the college guidelines and criteria. The dean must review and approve departmental guidelines and criteria. Once approved, the departmental guidelines and criteria will be used by the department, the chair, and the dean in all comprehensive reviews. The college guidelines and criteria will be applicable to all departments which do not have approved criteria in place.

Section 2. Dean's Comprehensive Review Evaluations and Recommendations in the College of Arts and Sciences

Process:

The Dean of Arts and Sciences reviews all application materials submitted by departments, including candidate vita, dossier and statement, department faculty vote/evaluation, department chair evaluation/recommendation. Dossiers are to be submitted in a loose-leaf notebook, no larger than two inches. (Books, monographs, compact discs, and similar artifacts, as well as sets of student evaluations may be submitted separately.) The department may choose to review a larger compilation of materials than that submitted to the Office of the Dean.

In some instances the Dean may request additional information from the candidate, through interview or request for additional documentation, to gain a more complete understanding of the application. In addition, the dean may seek information from other sources, which may include, but are not limited to, interviews with the department chair, telephone interviews with department chairs from appropriate peer group institutions or department-selected reviewers external to UNC, telephone interviews with journal editors, or information available in the Michener Library or available through the internet. When information from this process is significant to the recommendation, it will be presented and discussed in the Dean's evaluation memo.

Basis for the Recommendation:

For promotion to Associate and Professor, an earned doctorate in the discipline or other terminal degree specified by the department is required in addition to the following:

Tenure: Level IV or V rating for instruction or professional activity and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other two areas. Assistant professors may only be granted tenure if promoted to associate professor at the same time.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Level IV or V rating for instruction or professional activity and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other two areas.

Promotion to Professor: Level IV or V rating for instruction and professional activity and a Level III, IV, or V rating for service.

Post-tenure Review: A faculty member is evaluated on assigned workload over the four-year period. A satisfactory performance results from a Level III, IV, or V overall rating, which must include a Level III, IV, or V rating in instruction.

Content of the Recommendation:

The memo from the Dean summarizes personnel data for the candidate and communicates the Dean's recommendation relative to the proposed action. The dean's recommendation need not restate candidate accomplishments or outcomes that are already described in the application. However, the dean's recommendation should highlight accomplishments and evaluate performance as necessary to justify the performance ratings and to suggest areas for improvement (if applicable). All Dean's level evaluations and recommendations are made using approved department criteria or college criteria if department criteria have not been approved.

Section 3. Comprehensive Review Criteria/Performance Standards in the College of Arts and Sciences

The following lists in each of the three areas are descriptions of activities that, if documented appropriately, minimally qualify a candidate for specific ratings. Each listed activity alone does not necessarily merit the indicated rating, but could contribute to that rating. Multiple occurrences of positive achievements in one category could merit a higher rating.

INSTRUCTION

Effective instruction is demonstrated by the intellectual development of students. Characteristics of effective instruction include professional dedication to student learning and outcomes. Faculty members engage students meaningfully in learning by using appropriate pedagogies and methodologies for their disciplines, including active and dynamic teaching strategies. Effective instruction motivates students to learn while providing them with the opportunity to acquire their own knowledge. Effective teachers carefully monitor and frequently assess student learning, providing feedback to students and adapting their instruction as appropriate to improve student learning. Students are able to demonstrate learning outcomes in their courses and in applying their learning in research, internships, practica, or other learning situations. Effective teaching is enhanced by faculty expertise, classroom innovation, multiple opportunities for student success, and participation in assessment of student learning outcomes.

Because measuring such development is often difficult, it is important to use a variety of performance indicators in the evaluation of teaching. For example, the measurement of course and program learning outcomes (the results of course-embedded assessment) may constitute one (though not the only) tool for evaluating an instructor's performance. It should also be recognized that, while student evaluation of instruction is an important measurement tool and must be included in the dossier for a comprehensive review, results of student evaluation of instruction should not constitute the only such evidence of instructional performance. Observation of instruction (peer review) by department chairs and/or faculty should be a component of the comprehensive evaluation.

Examples of possible performance indicators follow some of the performance standards in parentheses. Performance standards include, but are not limited to, the following indicators.

- I. Unsatisfactory**
- or**
- II. Needs improvement**

A rating I or II is assigned depending on the degree to which the following performance indicators apply.

- A. Uses teaching methods that fail to impart basic content and/or develop basic critical thinking skills (syllabi, assignments, student evaluations, peer review).
- B. Demonstrates little understanding of course design or does not consistently articulate or uphold course expectations and expected outcomes (syllabi, assignments, peer review, exams).
- C. Fails to develop or maintain basic depth and breadth of knowledge in the subject fields (syllabi, peer review).
- D. Demonstrates ongoing and consistent inadequacy in the preparation and presentation of course content (student evaluations, peer review, video of teaching).
- E. Demonstrably creates a climate/environment hostile to student learning (e.g., through documented denigration or sexual harassment; student evaluations, letters from students, video of teaching).
- F. Exhibits documented ongoing unwillingness or inability to implement new and revised courses and/or curriculum.
- G. Receives substantiated complaints concerning supervision of student activities such as student practices, internships, and field studies.

- H. Does not participate in student competency exams, student outcomes assessment activities, or student research, performances, and creative endeavors.
- I. Is consistently late in returning homework, exams, papers, and other student work and/or is consistently late in submitting grades.

III. Meets Expectations

- A. Uses teaching methods that impart basic content and/or develop basic critical thinking skills (syllabi, assignments, student evaluations, peer review).
- B. Demonstrates student learning through effective participation in student competency examinations, student achievement in research or applied activities, or other student outcome assessment activities.
- C. Demonstrates an understanding of course design and clearly articulates course expectations and expected outcomes (syllabi, assignments, peer review).
- D. Demonstrates basic depth and currency of knowledge in the subject fields.
- E. Demonstrates resourcefulness in the preparation and delivery of course content.
- F. Demonstrably creates a climate/environment conducive to student learning.
- G. Develops and implements new and revised courses and curriculum that meets programmatic needs.

IV. Exceeds Expectations

- A. Uses teaching methods in a way that develops advanced critical thinking skills and/or sophisticated content (syllabi, assignments, student evaluations, peer review).
- B. Demonstrates up-to-date, cutting-edge depth and breadth of knowledge in the subject fields.
- C. Demonstrates creativity and innovation (both technical and non-technical) in the preparation and delivery of course content (e.g., web page design, experiential learning, course-embedded assessment, service learning, peer review).
- D. Demonstrably creates a climate/environment conducive to student learning, both within and without the classroom (e.g., provides evidence of ongoing independent student learning and/or research).
- E. Encourages student research, and demonstrates effective supervision of student activities such as student practice, laboratories and research, internships, field studies, theses, and dissertations in addition to one's regular course load or as a primary teaching assignment.
- F. Participates in off-campus teaching assignments that require a significant extra time commitment.
- G. Provides effective leadership in establishing and/or maintaining instructional partnerships with other academic units.
- H. Receives and completes a competitive state or regional fellowship or residency from a relevant professional or educational organization.

V. Excellent

- A. Receives significant peer and student recognition for excellence in teaching (teaching awards, outstanding student evaluations, peer review).
- B. Demonstrates significant ability and recognition as a master teacher (e.g. provides leadership in teaching teachers, peer review).
- C. Directs or takes major responsibility for curriculum development (new or significantly revised minors or majors) having a major impact on the academic program (descriptions of new/revised courses and curriculum with analysis of their impact on program).
- D. Creates exceptional or innovative opportunities for student placement and demonstrates creative supervision of student activities such as student practices, internships, and field studies (description of activities, narratives from external participants or evaluators, etc.).
- E. Directs student research projects, theses, dissertations, performances or creative endeavors of demonstrably high quality (copies of student projects with appropriate evaluations and/or awards from faculty and peer groups).
- F. Provides major leadership in establishing and maintaining academic partnerships with other colleges or institutions.
- G. Receives and completes a significant competitive national or international fellowship or residency from a relevant professional or educational organization

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

Professional activity must include published research/scholarship which contributes to the knowledge base of the discipline and can take many forms including the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching. The different forms are not necessarily hierarchical in importance. Demonstration of one's professional activity is expected to be public and subject to peer review. Primary weight is given to peer-reviewed, research-based publication, complemented by successful grant applications and presentations. It is the responsibility of the department to document the authenticity of all citations included in the review period. In making judgments about scholarly products, it is recognized that both quality and quantity of contributions are to be considered.

Performance standards include, but are not limited to, the following indicators.

- I. Unsatisfactory**
or
- II. Needs Improvement**

A rating I or II is assigned depending on the degree to which the following performance indicators apply.

Activities that have not resulted in documented outcomes, such as refereed publications, books or monographs, other professional materials, or external grant proposals.

III. Meets Expectations

- A. Authors or co-authors and publishes discipline-related refereed scholarly and/or creative work appropriate to the author's area(s) of expertise.

- B. Serves as principal or co-principal investigator for unfunded grant proposals that receive positive reviews upon submission to external agencies.
- C. Authors or co-authors other published professional materials (e.g., study guide, instruction manual, software).
- D. Makes refereed scholarly presentations at professional conferences.
- E. Serves as peer reviewer for scholarly publications.
- F. Organizes scholarly panels or symposia for professional conferences.
- G. Documented completion of one or more chapters of a manuscript for a book or monograph in the review period.

IV. Exceeds Expectations

- A. Authors or co-authors and publishes a body of high quality, discipline-related refereed scholarly work and/or creative work appropriate to the author's area(s).
- B. Serves as principal investigator or co-principal investigator for a funded external grant.
- C. Serves as primary author of professional materials that are used widely and have an impact on the discipline.
- D. Makes refereed scholarly presentations which make a well-recognized contribution to the discipline at professional conferences.
- E. Serves as a member of the editorial board for a scholarly publication.
- F. Serves as the program chair or in a similar function for conferences.

V. Excellent

- A. Authors and publishes a significant body of high scholarly and/or creative work appropriate to the author's area of expertise that makes a significant contribution to the field.
- B. Serves as principal investigator for funded grants that make a major contribution to the discipline or have a significant impact on major programs.
- C. Is widely recognized for expertise in the field which results in such activities as keynote or other invited addresses for national organizations and/or such honors as significant awards or recognitions for scholarly activity or creative work
- D. Serves as editor of a major journal.

SERVICE

All faculty members are required to participate substantively in departmental, college, and/or university service. Timely, cooperative, and thorough completion of service assignments is essential to the proper functioning of the department, college, and university. Service to one's profession is also important in building and maintaining the profession and the reputation of the university. Community service representing an application of the faculty member's professional expertise also contributes to the profession and the reputation of the university. The outcomes of service can be documented in

numerous ways, including, but not limited to, products of one's work in service, peer or colleague review, external review, data showing impact of service, internal or external recognition for service.

Performance standards include, but are not limited to, the following indicators.

I. Unsatisfactory

or

II. Needs Improvement

A rating of I or II is assigned depending on the degree to which the following performance indicators apply. Ratings may be influenced by the workload assignment to service.

- A. Although a member of committees is not an active participant (e.g., fails to attend meetings or does not complete committee tasks in a timely manner).
- B. Gives minimal or poor advice to students.
- C. Assumes no service responsibilities or a very minimal share.

III. Meets Expectations

- A. Participates in documented service efforts within the department, college, or university that contribute to the quality and vitality of the academic programs of the institution.
- B. Uses disciplinary expertise to participate in documented service that contributes to the quality and vitality of the community or society.
- C. Participates in documented service efforts that contribute to the quality and vitality of the profession or discipline at the state, regional, national, or international level.
- D. Serves as a mentor to new faculty members.
- E. Participates in university governance through service on governance committees or related bodies.
- F. Provides appropriate guidance and direction to students regarding course content and program requirements.

IV. Exceeds Expectations

- A. Takes major responsibility for internal planning, development, and governance activities that demonstrably enhance the quality, vitality, or mission of the University.
- B. Takes major responsibility for recruiting new graduate or undergraduate students to the University.
- C. Plays an active role in University outreach efforts, off-campus initiatives, and partnerships.
- D. Participates in governance or consultation for professional organizations or the government.

- E. Uses disciplinary expertise to participate in documented service efforts that contribute in a significant way to cultural life outside the institution.
- F. Documented performance that consistently exceeds unit expectations for advising students.

V. Excellent

- A. Plays a major leadership role in service efforts having an exceptional impact on the quality or vitality of the community or society.
- B. Plays a major leadership role in developing the quality or vitality of the profession or discipline at the state, regional, national, or international level.
- C. Initiates and/or takes major responsibility for University outreach efforts, off-campus initiatives, and partnerships.
- D. Takes major responsibility for establishing and/or maintaining teaching or research facilities.
- E. Documents significant ability and recognition as a master adviser to students.
- F. Takes on a major responsibility in campus governance that has an exceptional impact on the quality, vitality, or mission of the University.

Approved, Council of Chairs and Program Directors, November 6, 2003

Approved, Allen Huang, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, April, 2004

College of Arts and Sciences

Comprehensive Review Process and Criteria

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| August-September, 2002 | Task Force convened. |
| January 31, 2003 | Task Force Report due to Dean (received early Jan.). |
| Week of January 20 th | Distribution of TF Report. |
| February 7-March 7, 2003 | Department discussions and College Forums. OPEN FORUMS FOR COLLEGE DISCUSSION: Thursday, Feb. 20, 3:30-4:30 p.m. Michener L54 Wednesday, Feb. 26, 8:00-9:00 a.m. Michener L54 Tuesday, Mar. 4, noon-1:00 p.m. Michener L54 |
| February 27-March 13, 2003 | Area Chairs' discussions. |
| March-August, 2003 | Development of Dean's proposal. |
| August 18-September 4, 2003 | Council of Chairs initial review and consideration of Dean's proposal. |
| September 9-October 15, 2003 | Circulation and discussion of Dean's proposal. |
| October 17, 2003 | Final draft circulated to faculty and Council of Chairs. |
| November 6, 2003 | Council of Chairs final review and consideration of Dean's proposal, with modifications as necessary. |
| November 24, 2003 | No later than this date, Dean submits final proposal to Provost and requests approval by December 10. |
| January, 2004 | New guidelines/criteria go into effect in calendar year 2004 for faculty hired in fall 2004 and after, for faculty promoted to associate professor or professor in spring 2004 and after, for faculty holding the rank of professor who complete post-tenure review in spring 2004 and after. All remaining faculty have the option of using old or new guidelines and criteria until calendar year 2006. |
| January, 2006 | New guidelines/criteria go into effect in calendar year 2006 for <u>all</u> comprehensive reviews. |
| Spring 2007 | All comprehensive reviews due in Spring 2007 and after are submitted under the new guidelines/criteria. |



