Subject: Biennial Review: Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures 3-3-801 (Amend S.A. 1078)

Reference to Senate Minutes dated: September 15, 2014

Senate Action:

MOTION: The Faculty Welfare Committee recommends approval of the additional highlighted revisions (in red) to Senate Action 1078 (Section 3-3-801) of the University Regulations to clarify procedures for biennial reviews.

VOTE: The motion passed with a hand vote of 22-1, 1 abstention.

Response requested:

______ approval for placement in University Catalog

______ approval for placement in University Regulations

______ recommendation to Board for placement in Board Policy Manual

______ none (sent as information item)

______ other action requested/comments:

__________________________________________  _____________________________
Faculty Senate Chair  Date

Administrative review of Senate action (unnecessary for information items):

______ reviewed by VPAA/Provost. Check ______ if comments attached

______ reviewed by General Counsel. Check ______ if comments attached

Presidential action:

______ approve;  ____ reject;  ____ return to Senate for discussion/modification (comments attached)

__________________________________________  _____________________________
President/Designated Administrative Officer  Date

Date of Board approval (if applicable): _____________________________

PLEASE RETURN SIGNED ORIGINAL AND ATTACHMENT TO THE FACULTY SENATE OFFICE, BOX 75.
MOTION: The Faculty Welfare Committee recommends approval of the additional highlighted revisions (in red) to Senate Action 1078 (Section 3-3-801) of the University Regulations to clarify procedures for biennial reviews.

*original amendments (Senate Action 1078) are in black (highlighted).

---

Part 8: Faculty Evaluation

[See also Title 3, Article 3, Part 3, 3-3-303(5) Performance Evaluation and Title 3.]

3-3-801 Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures.

3-3-801(1) Annual/Biennial Review. Procedures for annual/biennial review are conducted for the purpose of performance evaluation, for consideration of the reappointment of tenure-track faculty, and to determine eligibility for merit pay consideration.

(a) Guidelines. Performance expectation guidelines are established by each department/program area, school, and college consistent with University guidelines described in this Board Policy Manual Title 1, Article 1, Part 3, 1-1-308 Promotion, and Title 2, Article 3, Part 9 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Guidelines are approved by Academic Affairs.

(b) Procedures. Annual/Biennial Review procedures are described in the Board Policy Manual Title 1, Part 3, 1-1-307 Faculty Evaluation, and Title 2, Article 3, Part 8 Faculty Evaluation.

(c) Evaluation Period.

(I) **Annual Review**: Faculty activities occurring from January 1 through December 31 (or a portion of a calendar year, as appropriate) are the subject of evaluation conducted during the period of January 1-May 31 of the subsequent year.

(II) **Biennial Review**: Faculty activities occurring from January 1 of one year through December 31 of the following year (or a portion of a calendar year, as appropriate) are the subject of evaluation conducted during the period of January 1-May 31 of the subsequent year.

(d) Evaluation Areas. Evaluation is based on an assigned workload approved by the chair/director and dean.

(e) Evaluation Outcomes. Faculty are evaluated in each relevant performance area; contributions in each area vary according to assigned workload. In each area a faculty member’s performance will be evaluated on a five (5) point scale. Each faculty member will receive an overall evaluation based on the outcome in the individual areas. This will be accomplished using a numerical weighting system which incorporates the percentage of workload for each of the performance areas as specified in the agreed upon faculty workload. The weighted average will be calculated by the following evaluation scale.

(f) Evaluation Scale

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>4.6 - 5.0</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>3.6 - 4.5</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>2.6 - 3.5</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>1.6 - 2.5</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. 1.0 - 1.5 Unsatisfactory

(g) Employment Status and Annual/Biennial Review

(I) Adjunct faculty – Evaluated by the program area faculty in consultation with the department chair/school director. Colleges will develop procedures for evaluating adjunct faculty.

(II) Contract-Renewable faculty – Must Ccomplete an annual/biennial evaluation review each at least once every other year. Contract-renewable faculty may request an annual/biennial review in any year.

(III) Tenure-track faculty – Must Ccomplete an annual review in years 1, 2, and 3 (in conjunction with pre-tenure review). 4, and 5, and a biennial review thereafter. In the third year pre-tenure review, materials must be organized so that an annual review can also be completed. If, on the pre-tenure review, the evaluatee receives “exceeds expectations” or higher in either instruction or professional activity, and “meets expectations” or higher in the other areas, then he/she may opt out of the 4th year annual review. If not, then a 4th year annual review is required. In the absence of an application for tenure, which would include the 5th year annual review, an annual review in the 5th year is required.

Tenure-track faculty members will have an evaluation in their first year of employment and another in their second year. Thereafter, a regular biennial schedule will begin.

When the individual is required to complete a comprehensive review for promotion and tenure and/or graduate faculty appointment/reappointment, materials must be organized so that an annual review can also be completed.

(IV) Tenured faculty – Must Ccomplete an annual/biennial review each at least once every other year. When the individual is required to complete a comprehensive review for post-tenure review, promotion, or graduate faculty appointment/reappointment, materials must be organized so that an annual review can also be completed. Tenured faculty may request an annual/biennial review in any year. If the annual/biennial review coincides with a comprehensive review, materials must be organized so that an annual/biennial review can also be completed.

3-3-801(2) Comprehensive Review. Procedures for comprehensive review are used to consider persons undergoing evaluation for pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, graduate faculty status, and/or post-tenure review. When undergoing comprehensive review, a faculty member’s materials must be organized so that an annual/biennial review can also be completed.

(a) Pre-Tenure Review.

(I) Tenure track faculty members will undergo a comprehensive pre-tenure review in their third year, except in the circumstance noted in 3-3-801(2)(a)(III).

(II) Procedures. Pre-tenure review procedures are the comprehensive evaluation procedures given in the Board Policy Manual Title 1, Part 3, 1-1-307 Faculty Evaluation and Title 2, Article 3, Part 8 Faculty Evaluation.

(III) Evaluation Period and Dossier. Comprehensive pre-tenure review requires a faculty member to prepare a dossier that summarizes and provides evidence of the individual’s performance accomplishments. The dossier for pre-tenure review should reflect activities accomplished while a member of the UNC faculty. The dossier may include activities accomplished in time periods occurring prior to service at UNC only when such time periods are negotiated at the time of hire as credit toward promotion and/or tenure.

Faculty members who negotiate two (2) years of credit toward tenure and promotion may
request a pre-tenure review in either the third year or the fourth year. Faculty members who negotiate three (3) years of credit toward tenure and promotion may request a pre-tenure review in their fourth year.

(a b) Promotion and Tenure.

(i) Guidelines to establish a faculty member’s eligibility for promotion and/or tenure consideration are described in this Board Policy Manual Title 1, Article 1, Part 3, 1-1-308 Promotion, and Title 2, Article 3, Part 9 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, respectively. Colleges define performance expectation guidelines, consistent with University guidelines. College guidelines are approved by Academic Affairs.

(ii) Procedures. Promotion and tenure review procedures are described in this Board Policy Manual Title 1, Part 3, 1-1-307 Faculty Evaluation, and Title 2, Article 3, Part 8 Faculty Evaluation.

(iii) Evaluation Period and Dossier. Comprehensive review for promotion and tenure requires a faculty member to prepare a dossier that summarizes and provides evidence of the individual’s performance accomplishments. The dossier for tenure and first University of Northern Colorado (UNC) promotion should reflect activities accomplished while a member of the UNC faculty. The dossier may include activities accomplished in time periods occurring prior to service at UNC only when such time periods are negotiated at the time of hire as credit toward promotion and/or tenure. Subsequent promotions will only consider activities accomplished since the last promotion. Each department/school will determine the last date when materials can be added to the dossier.

(iv) Evaluation Areas. Each faculty member is evaluated on three (3) areas for promotion and tenure: teaching, scholarly and other professional activities, and service. In each area, a faculty member’s performance will be evaluated on a five (5) point scale. To be considered for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member’s performance must, as a minimum, be rated "Level III" or above in each area.

(v) Evaluation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>4.6 - 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>3.6 - 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>2.6 - 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>1.6 - 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>1.0 - 1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(VI) Promotion and/or Tenure Decision. The recommendation at each level of review, the department/program area faculty, department chair/school director [in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Board Policy Manual 2-3-801(3)(a)(II)], dean, and CAO, will be to tenure and/or promote or not tenure and/or not promote.

3-3-801(2)(b)

(c) Post-Tenure Review.

(i) Guidelines. The year a faculty member is tenured establishes the five-year (5) cycle for post-tenure review. A faculty member may request a promotion or graduate faculty appointment...
review “out of cycle.” When this occurs, a post-tenure review and an annual review will be conducted at that time and this will establish a new five-year (5) review cycle. Every tenured faculty member must have a comprehensive review at least once every five (5) years. If a faculty member requests a comprehensive review (for promotion, graduate faculty appointment, or any other reason) this will establish a new five-year (5) review cycle.

(II) Schedule. The following schedule will be used during the period of transition from a four-year (4) summative evaluation cycle to a five-year (5) review cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty scheduled for post-tenure review in</th>
<th>Will complete post-tenure review in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tenured in Spring 2005</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(III) Procedures. Post-tenure review procedures are described in this Board Policy Manual 1-1-307 Faculty Evaluation and 2-3-801 Faculty Evaluation.

(IV) Evaluation Period and Dossier. The dossier for post-tenure review should include only activities accomplished since the last comprehensive review.

(V) Evaluation Areas. A faculty member is evaluated on assigned workload over the five- year (5) period. In each area, a faculty member’s performance will be evaluated on a five point scale. To receive an overall satisfactory performance evaluation, the faculty member must be rated as “Level III” or above overall, and this must include a “Level III” or above in teaching.

(VI) Post-Tenure Review Decisions. Faculty evaluated as unsatisfactory on a post-tenure review will meet with the department chair/school director and the department/program area faculty or their designee to develop a performance plan that is approved by the department chair/school director and the dean. Faculty have two years to achieve a satisfactory evaluation. Failure to do so will constitute grounds for disciplinary action. If a faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” evaluation, the faculty member has two years to achieve a satisfactory evaluation. If a satisfactory evaluation is not achieved, a two-year probationary period commences.

(VII) Calendar. Post-tenure review occurs on the same time line as promotion and tenure reviews.

(c) Graduate Faculty Appointment/Review.

(I) Guidelines. Initial appointment to the graduate faculty may be initiated at the time of hire when requested by the faculty member or department chair/school director. Review will occur simultaneous with post-tenure review. Performance expectations for appointment and reappointment to the graduate faculty are described in the Graduate Faculty Guidelines. [See also Board Policy Manual 2-3-801(1)(m) and 2-3-801(2)(a)(VII).]

(II) Evaluation Period and Dossier. The dossier used for graduate faculty appointment/reappointment review is the same dossier prepared for tenure, promotion and/or post-tenure review, as appropriate.

(III) Evaluation Areas. Faculty are evaluated on three areas for consideration of appointment/reappointment to the graduate faculty: teaching, scholarly and other professional activities, and service. To receive an endorsement required for the supervision of doctoral dissertations, faculty must achieve additional standards for scholarship and research advisement as described in the Graduate Faculty Guidelines. [See also Board Policy Manual 2-3-801(1)(m) and 2-3-801(2)(a)(VII).]
(IV) Graduate Faculty Appointment/Reappointment Decision. Failure to achieve an appropriate graduate faculty status may have adverse consequences for promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review. Future expectations of the faculty member and related consequences in subsequent evaluation(s) could involve a variety of measures including but not limited to: more time and greater attention to meeting requirements for the particular graduate status, reassignment of graduate responsibilities, adjustments to the program department/program area’s or school’s graduate program(s), and/or other consequences as recommended by the dean of the college and approved by the CAO.

(V) Calendar. Once faculty are appointed to the graduate faculty, the review for reappointment occurs at the same time as promotion and/or tenure or post-tenure review.

3-3-801(3) Calendar for Faculty Evaluation. Colleges will establish calendars for the review of evaluation materials as described in the Board Policy Manual 1-1-307 Faculty Evaluation, and 2-3-801 et seq. Faculty Evaluation.

(a) Reappointment Recommendations for Tenure-Track Faculty. See Board Policy Manual 2-3-202(2). Pre-Tenure Review. A tenure-track faculty member receiving a rating of “Meets Expectations” or higher in all three areas (instruction, professional activity, and service) in his/her pre-tenure review will automatically have his/her contract renewed for the fifth and sixth years. If a tenure-track faculty member receives a rating below “Meets Expectations” in any of the three areas, renewal for the fifth and sixth year will not be automatic.

For the purpose of reappointment, a vote by the department/program area faculty shall be forwarded to the department chair/school director. The department chair conducts independent evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. A school director adds his or her own evaluation of the faculty member’s contributions to the school in accordance with the following procedure:

(I) in case the school director and evaluatee are in different disciplines, the school director’s recommendation shall be on non-discipline specific matters only.

(II) in case the school director and evaluatee are in the same discipline, the recommendation shall be based on all aspects of the evaluatee’s performance.

(III) the report from the department/program area shall include the following:

(A) number of eligible voters.

(B) number of actual voters.

(C) number of yes voters.

(D) number of no voters.

(E) number of abstaining voters.

The report shall be sent to the department chair/school director who shall add his or her recommendation as specified above. These materials shall be sent to the dean and the dean shall add his or her recommendation and forward to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). Each level of review shall result in a letter to the faculty member who is being considered for reappointment, informing him or her of the recommendation at each level.

(b) Reappointment upon Denial of Tenure. Faculty members who do not receive tenure in year six (6) will be given a term contract for their final (7th) year.

(c) Term Contract-Renewable Faculty Member Reappointment Notification. Reappointment decisions for
3-3-802 Responsibilities of the Faculty in the Evaluation Process.

(1) The faculty plays the primary role in comprehensive and annual review, including, but not limited to such matters as appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, granting tenure, and dismissal. The faculty in the evaluatee’s discipline will conduct an evaluation of the evaluatee, with particular consideration to the evaluatee’s teaching, scholarly and other professional activities, and service in the discipline and forward the evaluations to the department chair/school director. [See also Board Policy Manual 2-3-801(2)(a)(I).]

(2) If the department/program area consists of fewer than four individuals in the evaluatee’s discipline, for the purpose of tenure and promotion only, the evaluatee shall propose three individuals in his or her own area of scholarship to the department chair/school director who will then select one for an outside evaluation of the evaluatee’s scholarly and other professional activity. This evaluation will become part of the dossier for review by the department/program area faculty. This provision will not go into effect until the 2006-2007 academic year.

3-3-803 Responsibilities of the Department Chair/School Director in the Evaluation Process. The department chair/school director upon receipt of the department/program area faculty’s evaluation will make an independent evaluation of the evaluatee’s contribution to the department/school mission. The department chair conducts an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. A school director makes an evaluation in accordance with the following procedure:

(1) in case the school director and evaluatee are in different disciplines, the school director’s recommendation shall be on non-discipline specific matters only.

(2) in case the school director and evaluatee are in the same discipline, the recommendation shall be based on all aspects of the evaluatee’s performance.

This evaluation will be shared with the evaluatee.

3-3-804 Responsibilities of the College Dean in the Evaluation Process. It is the particular responsibility of the dean to ensure due process has been followed and procedural integrity has been achieved. The dean shall provide an independent evaluation of the evaluatee, with rationale, which is shared with the voting faculty, the department chair/school director, and the evaluatee. In cases of disagreement with the voting faculty or the department chair/school director, the Evaluation Conference Committee shall be convened by the dean [See also Board Policy Manual 2-3-801(1)(g).]

3-3-805 Responsibilities of the Chief Academic Officer (CAO), the President, and the Board of Trustees in the Evaluation Process.

(1) the CAO will make recommendations to the President regarding promotion, tenure, reappointment, comprehensive post-tenure review, and recommendations for disciplinary action, after ensuring procedures have been followed.

(2) the President will forward his or her recommendations and a summary of all previous recommendations as appropriate to the Board of Trustees.

(3) final authority rests with the Board of Trustees.

3-3-806 Confidentiality and Professional Ethics. It is intended that all information reviewed, evaluation data collected, committee deliberations, decisions, and other work products generated during the course of evaluations conducted in accordance with this procedure shall be maintained as confidential, except as otherwise authorized under the terms and provisions of this procedure, or when used to administer the affairs of the University, or to comply with the law.