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I. INTRODUCTION

All faculty members in the College of Natural and Health Sciences (NHS) who are reviewed for reappointment, annual/biennial evaluation, pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, graduate faculty status, and post-tenure review will be evaluated in accordance with University Regulations (http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf) and Board Policy Manual (http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf), and NHS criteria and procedures. In case of any discrepancies between the policies and procedures in the college and University/Board documents, those of the University/Board shall prevail. The purpose of these faculty reviews is to maintain quality in undergraduate and graduate education, to advance knowledge through instruction and scholarship, and to promote service of distinction. This document provides the parameters for faculty performance evaluation standards and the evaluation process.

Faculty members at the University of Northern Colorado (UNC) have workload assignments in the areas of instruction, professional activity, and/or service. These three performance areas are defined in section 2-3-401(2) of the Board Policy Manual. As used in the current document, teaching and instruction shall be considered synonymous, as shall the terms scholarship, scholarly activity, and professional activity. Additionally, the term unit leader will refer to school directors and department chairs, and the term academic unit will refer to schools, departments, and program areas. Many UNC faculty members also have assignments in academic and career advising. As described in section 2-3-401(2) of the Board Policy Manual, directing students’ academic progress or professional development is a component of service. Section 2-3-401(1) of the Board Policy Manual, however states that each College will define the workload components of instruction, professional activity and service as appropriate to the disciplines and professions they represent. In NHS, advising related to career development and students’ academic progress will be considered service, while mentoring associated with theses and dissertations, directed studies courses, and the like, will be classified as instruction.

II. CONSIDERATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Comprehensive review is performed when evaluating individuals for pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. The pre-tenure review is conducted at approximately the mid-point of a tenure-track faculty member’s probationary period and is intended as a check on an individual’s progress toward tenure. As such, the evaluative criteria and processes of the pre-tenure and comprehensive evaluations are the same, although accomplishments for the pre-tenure review will be considered within the context of a shorter time period. Unless individual circumstances require a modification that is approved by both the relevant unit leader, the dean, and the provost, the timing of pre-tenure review will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of tenure credit awarded to the faculty member:</th>
<th>Pre-tenure review will occur during the faculty member’s:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Third full academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Second full academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second full academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>First full academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Guidelines

1. Comprehensive review will assess an individual’s accomplishments in the areas of instruction, professional activity, and service. The review serves two purposes: (1) to provide feedback information for faculty growth and development, and (2) to provide evaluative information for personnel decisions, such as retention, pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, and recognition or reward. In that instruction and professional activity are fundamental to the role of a teacher-scholar, the dossier should 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 should also be evaluated.

2. It is essential that unit leaders meet at least once annually with faculty members on the path to promotion and/or tenure to discuss the results of annual/biennial reviews and to assess the candidate’s progress toward realizing a successful comprehensive review (See Appendices).

3. In some cases, faculty members may be engaged in an activity that has direct application to two or even three areas of their appointment. Among the activities that might fall into more than one area of review include the
following: consulting; supervising graduate research; serving on editorial boards; and working on grants, depending on the nature of the work. It is incumbent upon the individual to select and defend the selected area(s). For example, a single project may involve publishing original data or work (Professional Activity), leading workshops for teachers/professionals related to that project (Instruction), or serving on a regional, national, or international board/committee (Service). In such cases, the individual should justify in detail why a particular activity should be allotted to more than one area.

B. Evaluation Workload

Each evaluation area—instruction, professional activity, and service—is assigned a weight for evaluation purposes, based on a written workload plan and approved by the unit leader. The sum of the weights equals 1.0. The basis for the workload of individuals in the college is a fifteen (15) hour equated load per semester. Most faculty members will have a work assignment consisting of .60 instruction, .20 for scholarship, and .20 for service, which equals 1.0. This weighting allocation could vary as college or academic unit needs dictate. Such individualization of faculty effort would be the result of consultation between the faculty member, unit leader, and if appropriate the dean. Instruction assignment less than .20 can only be approved by the unit leader. Alternative weights may be requested based on assignments. The reassignment of an individual’s workload is subject to approval by the unit leader. Evaluation will be based on the agreed upon workload assignment. When workload distribution varies from one semester to the next in a given evaluation period, an average of the work assignment weights for the relevant semesters will be used (see NHS Workload Policy at http://www.unco.edu/nhs/pdf/workload_policy.pdf).

C. Overall Evaluation

The performance evaluation process yields the overall score based on the weighted areas of the individual’s workload. The weights and the evaluation rating assigned for each area are multiplied and the products are summed to yield an overall evaluation measure between one (I) and five (V). The overall evaluation is assigned according to the university scale, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>OVERALL</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>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.0 – 1.5</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance standards are used to assign a rating for each evaluation area. These standards are described in Sections III A, B, and C for instruction/advising, professional activity, and service, respectively. The Performance Standards Rubric is provided in Appendix A.

D. Process

Individuals eligible for promotion and/or tenure and individuals due for pre-tenure or post-tenure review in a given year are notified by the Office of the Dean, following consultation with the unit leader and, in the cases of promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review, Academic Affairs, and Human Resources. College and Academic Affairs deadlines for submission and review of evaluation materials are provided in Appendix B, although Units may have earlier deadlines. The individual will prepare a dossier that serves as the primary database for performance evaluation. The dossier should be simple to interpret, organized, and reflective of the work to be evaluated. Guidelines for preparation of the dossier appear in Appendices C and D. Examples of the types of information to be addressed in the dossier for each evaluation area are also included. Forms to be submitted as part of the evaluation process are available at http://www.unco.edu/provost/facinfo.html.

External reviews are required for promotion and/or tenure and are not required for faculty members preparing for pre-tenure and
post-tenure comprehensive review, for promotion to senior lecturer and/or contract renewable faculty members with not workload assignment of professional activity. A minimum of two external reviews are required by the College for candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure. Individual units may require additional external reviews. The unit leader is responsible for obtaining the external reviews. Candidates should provide to their unit leader the names and contact information of at least three prospective outside peer evaluators. The unit leader may consult with faculty members of the same discipline within the unit for suggested selections and/or may add names to the list. Only one reviewer will be from the unit leader’s list. Whether identified by the candidate or the unit leader, it is essential that all outside reviewers be individuals who are capable of objectively performing the evaluation. The following criteria must be satisfied with exceptions approved by the unit guidelines and/or unit leader:

- Reviewers should be at or above the academic rank being sought.
- Reviewers should be faculty members within the candidate’s discipline.
- Reviewers should be from peer institutions or above.
- Reviewers must not have collaborated in scholarship activities with the candidate during the review period.
- Reviewers must not be individuals who served on the candidate’s dissertation/thesis committee.
- Conflicts of interest between reviewer and candidate must be avoided.

The unit leader will serve as the point of contact with each selected outside reviewer in requesting the review. The packet forwarded to each individual who agrees to serve as an outside reviewer shall include the faculty member’s current curriculum vitae, description of workload assignments for the period under review, complete narrative from the candidate’s dossier, and the relevant professional activity section of the faculty evaluation guidelines used in the College of Natural and Health Sciences and academic unit (if approved guidelines are available at that level). All outside reviewers’ letters of evaluation should be returned directly to the unit leader and must be inserted in the dossier, prior to faculty review, under the section, ‘Comprehensive Performance Report and Vitae”. Candidates shall have the right to view external review letters and this fact shall be conveyed to all prospective peer reviewers. The standard letter of instruction for peer reviewers is provided in Appendix E. This College-level process should not be interpreted as altering the university’s policy on outside evaluation as outlined in section 3-3-802(2) of the University Regulations.

(i) Academic Unit Review

Academic units shall apply college guidelines and criteria in the absence of an approved academic unit criteria. Academic units may prepare comprehensive review guidelines and performance standards which include expectations for reappointment, pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. The guidelines and/or standards for comprehensive review must reflect the nature of instruction, professional activity, and service valued by the discipline and be consistent with the college guidelines and criteria. The academic unit guidelines and standards shall be subject to review and approval by the dean. Once approved, they will be used in all comprehensive reviews (See IV.3 for guidance).

The faculty member and unit leader shall evaluate the candidate in accordance with University policy. In some instances, to gain a more complete understanding of the application, the unit leader may request additional information from the candidate, through interview or request for additional documentation. He or she may also seek information from other sources, such as, interviews with faculty member(s), individuals external to UNC, journal editors, etc. When information from this process is significant to the recommendation, it will be presented and discussed in the unit leader’s evaluation memo.

(ii) Dean Review

The Dean of NHS reviews all application materials submitted by the academic units, including the candidate’s curriculum vitae, dossier and statement, the academic unit faculty vote and recommendation, and unit leader evaluation and recommendation. Dossiers are submitted as described in Appendices C and D. The academic units may choose to review a larger compilation of materials than that submitted to the dean.

As in the case with the unit leader, the dean may request additional information from the candidate, through interview or request for additional documentation and may seek information from other sources. When information from this process is significant to the recommendation, it will be presented and discussed in the dean’s evaluation memo. The dean’s report summarizes performance evaluation data about the candidate and includes a recommendation.
For promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, an earned doctorate in the discipline or other terminal degree specified by the academic unit is required. In addition, the following criteria apply.

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer: Level IV or V rating for instruction and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other performance areas included in the faculty member’s workload.

Promotion of Instructor to Assistant Professor: Level IV or V rating for instruction and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other two performance areas.

Pre-Tenure Review: Level IV or V rating for instruction or professional activity and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other two performance areas.

Tenure: Level IV or V rating for instruction or professional activity and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other two performance 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 performance 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: An individual is evaluated on his/her assigned workload over a five-year period. To receive an overall satisfactory performance evaluation, the faculty member must be rated as Level III or above overall, which must include a Level III rating in instruction.

In that the pre-tenure review serves as a check on an individual’s progress toward tenure, the results of this review shall be utilized, along with annual/biennial reviews, as the basis for reappointment recommendations.

For post-tenure review, if an individual achieves a Level I (Unsatisfactory) or Level II (Needs Improvement) in any one of the three areas of performance evaluation (instruction, scholarship, or service), the individual will be required to develop a plan, including a timeline, which will be subject to approval by the unit leader, that will lead to a Level III (Meets Expectations) in the area. Individuals who achieve a Level I (Unsatisfactory) or Level II (Needs Improvement) as an overall outcome on the performance evaluation must prepare a professional development plan, including a timeline, which will be subject to approval by the unit leader and dean, and which indicates the steps the individual will take to achieve a Level III (Meets Expectations).

### III. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS IN EVALUATION AREAS

The following sections describe the philosophy, guidelines, and performance standards for each evaluation area; see Appendices C and D for further information. In addition to these area-specific elements, an attribute necessary for successful performance which cross-cuts and is included in all three performance areas is the relationship between the individual and the other members of the academic unit. Faculty members should establish effective working relationships with other members of the academic unit that facilitate open communication, collaborative efforts, the sharing of ideas and resources, and support of their academic unit’s mission. Performance expectations are commensurate with rank.

#### A. Instruction

Effective instruction motivates students to learn while providing them with the opportunity to acquire their own knowledge. Effective faculty members engage students meaningfully in learning by using appropriate pedagogies and methodologies for their disciplines, including active and dynamic instruction strategies. Effective teachers assess student learning, provide timely feedback to students, and adapt their instruction as appropriate to enhance student learning. Subsequently, students are able to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes in their courses and apply their learning in research, internships,
practica, or other learning situations. Effective faculty members maintain currency in their area of assigned instruction and are able to evaluate research findings and other educational materials related to their field of specialization and incorporate them into their course offerings. Effective instruction requires periodic review, including course and/or curricular development to meet program needs. Faculty members may be engaged in mentoring student research and co-curricular activities as well as in field-based settings. Faculty members should maintain the appropriate licenses/certificates needed to practice in their field, and maintain program accreditation, where applicable.

Performance standards are used to evaluate an individual’s effectiveness in instruction. Performance standards for each rating level have been established by NHS (see Appendices).

B. Professional Activity

Faculty members are expected to engage in discipline-related professional activity at a level appropriate to their unit as determined by the standards of their discipline and commensurate with their assigned workload. Such work includes, but is not limited to, research, scholarship of teaching and learning, clinical work, workshops, and/or field work. This activity is expected to generate documented evidence of completed work during an individual’s review period. Demonstration of one’s professional activity is expected to be public and subject to peer review. Evaluation of scholarly products must take into consideration both the quality and quantity of scholarly contributions. The impact, outcome, and significance of the scholarly activities must be provided to help articulate the individual’s accomplishments. Each academic unit is responsible for verifying the authenticity of all products included in the dossier for the period under review. In addition, faculty members are expected to engage in professional involvement and/or development during the review period. Faculty members should maintain the appropriate licenses/certificates needed to practice in their field, and maintain program accreditation, where applicable.

C. Service

Faculty are expected to participate substantively in service efforts at the academic unit, college, and/or university level, as well as at the professional and/or community level commensurate with their assigned workload and academic rank. These service activities include but are not limited to: service to the institution, service to the profession, or the community, advising students, and mentoring faculty members. At the institutional level, service activities contribute to the operation and governance of the academic unit, college, or university. Service to the discipline includes participation in professional and scholarly organizations, while service to the public involves individuals using their professional expertise beyond the university community to the community-at-large at the local, national, and international levels. Faculty members serving as department chairs, program coordinators and/or graduate coordinators will document the management and leadership activities associated with this role.

IV. CONSIDERATIONS FOR ANNUAL/BIENNIAL REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT

Annual/biennial review will assess an individual’s accomplishments in the areas of instruction, professional activity, and service. It serves the following purposes: (1) to provide ongoing feedback and information for individual growth and development, (2) to provide ongoing evaluative information for personnel decisions, especially for faculty members seeking tenure and promotion and faculty members seeking reappointment, and (3) to provide an objective basis for merit pay. The following principles and procedures apply to annual reviews.

1. Annual/biennial reviews are performed for calendar years.
2. Academic units will develop annual/biennial review procedures and criteria for annual/biennial review which will be subject to review and approval of the unit leader. The academic units may choose to review a larger compilation of materials than submitted to the dean. Each academic unit is responsible for verifying the authenticity of all products included in the dossier for the period under review.
3. Unit level procedures shall include the unit’s decision regarding whether all faculty will have biennial reviews in specified years (e.g., even or odd numbered years) or whether biennial reviews will be staggered. If the reviews are to be staggered, the process for deciding which reviews occur each year should be specified.
4. For annual/biennial reviews only the following materials should be submitted to the NHS Dean’s Office in a file folder: Annual/Biennial Review Cover Sheet, Unit Leader Evaluation, Peer (Department/Program/School) Evaluation, Faculty Member’s Annual/Biennial Report, Faculty Member’s
The following parameters will apply to the development of academic unit procedures and criteria:

a) Adopted procedures/criteria should reflect consensus or the views of a significant majority of the academic unit. The vote, if taken, should be forwarded with the procedures/criteria. If the document is one that reflects academic unit consensus rather than a formal vote, it should be noted.

b) Expectations in annual/biennial reviews must be clearly tied to guidelines for pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

c) The unit leader must provide an evaluation in the annual/biennial review process.

d) The academic unit may choose to include participants in the process who are not faculty members. They will be non-voting.

e) There will be four levels of review (faculty, unit leader, dean, and Chief Academic Officer), as characterized in the Board Policy Manual 2-3-801 (3)(b)(IV) & (V).

f) Academic unit must develop criteria/indicators, etc., that distinguish among the several levels of evaluation. In the absence of such indicators, the college policies will be utilized.

j) Academic unit is to define weighting of criteria on a fifteen (15) hour equated load per semester basis, which will be expressed as percentages. The weighting for a typical appointment would be 60% instruction, 20% professional activity, and 20% service. Differential workloads would be negotiated by the unit leader and subject to approval by the dean prior to the start of a new evaluation period.

6. In all cases, Board approved policy applies to the development of academic unit procedures and criteria.

7. The dean will review the application of all procedures and criteria by academic unit and may return the annual reviews (as a whole) to the academic unit for reconsideration if they are not in accord with approved procedures and criteria. If, after reconsideration by the academic unit, the dean and the academic unit are unable to agree on the application of approved procedures and criteria, the provost will be the final appeal.

A. Reappointment Procedures

Results of the annual/biennial review and, when applicable, pre-tenure review, will be the primary basis for the determination of reappointment of tenure-track faculty. Reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty will involve a formal vote by eligible faculty voters. Results of the vote will be recorded on the college’s Recommendation for Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty Form (Appendix F) and will include the number of eligible faculty voters and the numbers of those eligible voters who: recommended reappointment; recommended non-reappointment; abstained; and were absent. To this report, the unit leader will add and his or her recommendation along with a current copy of the evaluatee’s curriculum vitae, all of which will then be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean, after adding his or her recommendation, will forward the form to the Provost. Each level of review shall result in a letter to the individual under consideration for reappointment, identifying the recommendation at that level.

V. CONSIDERATIONS FOR MERIT PAY

Merit pay will be awarded when the University makes such funds available. The distribution and allocation of merit funds will be handled as specified below.

1. The Dean of NHS shall distribute merit pay to academic units in proportion to the base salaries of eligible faculty members. All faculty members who receive ratings of Meets Expectations (2.6-3.5) or better in all areas are considered eligible. In the absence of unit level procedures for distribution of merit pay, an average of the overall scores, as well as the areas scores, of the faculty, unit leader and dean (if applicable), will be used to determine eligibility.

2. Academic units shall develop a dean-approved academic unit policy and procedure for the distribution of merit pay.
i. Instructions for Using Performance Standards Rubric

The performance standards rubric is designed to aid all reviewers in their systematic evaluation of a faculty member’s productivity during the respective evaluation period (annual/biennial, pre-tenure, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure). Each reviewer should follow the following steps in reviewing the provided materials:

1. Carefully and thoroughly review and examine the faculty member’s materials.
2. Review the materials for each evaluation category (Instruction, Professional Activity, and Service) using the meets expectations column first.
3. For each of the Meets Expectations criteria check the corresponding box providing the candidate materials satisfactorily meets each specific criterion. For criteria listed under If Appropriate, unit guidelines and/or unit leader shall determine “appropriateness” depending on faculty workload. For example, clinical faculty may have responsibilities involving field experience that requires evaluation in category (g) in Instruction; associate professors may be required to participate in service to the profession that requires evaluation in category (b) in Service.
4. After completing the meets expectations column for each evaluation category:
   a. If the candidate meets all the criteria required and/or deemed appropriate at the level of Meets Expectations, evaluate whether the candidate’s materials provide evidence of meeting criteria in either the Exceeds Expectations or Excellent categories. Check all criteria that are met.
   b. If the candidate did not meet all the criteria required and/or deemed appropriate at the level of Meets Expectations, evaluate whether the candidate’s materials are congruent with the criteria in the Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory columns. Check all criteria met.
5. Based on the unit’s evaluation policies and procedures, provide appropriate feedback to the unit’s evaluation committee. If comments are provided, these should be based on first person knowledge, direct observation, and/or candidate provided evidence. All comments should be constructive, tied to specific evaluation criteria, and phrased in a professional, ethical tone.
### INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness/ Pedagogical Performance</th>
<th>Curricular Performance</th>
<th>Field Based/Clinical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Excellent</strong> 4.6-5.0</td>
<td><strong>IV. Exceeds Expectations 3.6-4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>III. Meets Expectations 2.6-3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>II. Needs Improvement 1.6-2.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Content Knowledge**
  - a) Recognition of superior use of content which reflects depth and breadth of current knowledge in the area of assigned instruction
  - b) Demonstrates expertise in course design (as seen in syllabi, assignments, peer review, student evaluations)
  - c) Demonstrates expertise in the use of instructional methods to communicate and deliver content (demonstrated by student and/or peer evaluations)
  - d) Demonstrates a superior impact on student learning

- **Teaching Effectiveness/ Pedagogical Performance**
  - a) Applies content that reflects depth and breadth of current knowledge in the area of assigned instruction
  - b) Demonstrates proficiency in course design (as seen in syllabi, assignments, peer review, student evaluations)
  - c) Uses instructional methods that consistently exceed discipline standards to communicate and deliver content (demonstrated by student and/or peer evaluations)
  - d) Demonstrates performance that consistently exceeds standards of the discipline for demonstrating an impact on student learning

- **Curricular Performance**
  - e) Takes the leadership role in developing and/or implementing new courses and/or curricula that meet programmatic needs
  - f) Demonstrates superior performance as a mentor of student research and/or co-curricular activities

- **Field Based/Clinical**
  - g) Demonstrates superior performance in supervision and/or mentoring of students in clinical, laboratory or field experience settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Appropriate:</th>
<th>Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness/ Pedagogical Performance</th>
<th>Curricular Performance</th>
<th>Field Based/Clinical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Content Knowledge**
  - a) Applies content that reflects current knowledge

- **Teaching Effectiveness/ Pedagogical Performance**
  - b) Demonstrates adequacy in course design
  - c) Demonstrates the use of instructional methods that adequately communicate and deliver content (demonstrated by student and/or peer evaluations)
  - d) Demonstrates a positive impact on student learning

- **Curricular Performance**
  - e) Develops and/or implements new courses and/or curricula that meet programmatic needs
  - f) Demonstrates performance that consistently exceeds standards of the discipline for mentoring of student research and/or co-curricular activities

- **Field Based/Clinical**
  - g) Demonstrates effective supervision and/or mentoring of students in clinical, laboratory or field experience settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness/ Pedagogical Performance</th>
<th>Curricular Performance</th>
<th>Field Based/Clinical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Unsatisfactory</strong> 1.0-1.5</td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Content Knowledge**
  - a) Does not apply content that reflects current knowledge

- **Teaching Effectiveness/ Pedagogical Performance**
  - b) Does not demonstrate adequacy in course design
  - c) Does not use instructional methods that adequately communicate and deliver content
  - d) Does not demonstrate an impact on student learning

- **Curricular Performance**
  - e) Does not revise courses and/or curricula that meet programmatic needs
  - f) Does not reference standards of the discipline for mentoring of student research and/or co-curricular activities

- **Field Based/Clinical**
  - g) Does not demonstrate effective supervision and/or mentoring of students in clinical, laboratory or field experience settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Appropriate:</th>
<th>Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness/ Pedagogical Performance</th>
<th>Curricular Performance</th>
<th>Field Based/Clinical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Appropriate:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Professional Participation

**V. Excellent 4.6-5.0**
- **a)** Engages in discipline-related scholarly activity that makes a significant, recognized impact on the professional community

**Professional Productivity**
- **b)** Annual/Biennial review: Is on track within the individual’s current comprehensive period to document evidence of outstanding scholarly activity based on the standards of the discipline. Demonstration of annual/biennial productivity includes documented evidence of laudable scholarly activity, including, but not limited to:
  1. Published scholarly work in highly regarded forums
  2. Delivery of invited or peer-acknowledged professional presentations
  3. Stewardship of active grants requiring substantial time and resources and/or funding of a competitive external grant

**Comprehensive review:** Completion of a body of documented works that has a significant, recognized impact on the field based on the standards of the discipline

**If Appropriate:**

**Professional Service**
- **c)** Actively participates in

---

**IV. Exceeds Expectations 3.6-4.5**
- **a)** Engages in discipline-related scholarly activity that positively impacts the professional community

**Professional Productivity**
- **b)** Annual/biennial review: Is on track within the individual’s current comprehensive period to document evidence of notable scholarly activity based on the standards of the discipline. Demonstration of annual/biennial productivity includes evidence of quality scholarly activity, including, but not limited to:
  1. Published peer-reviewed scholarly work
  2. Delivery of peer-reviewed professional presentations
  3. Stewardship of active grants requiring substantial time and resources, and/or submission of a competitive external grant proposal, and/or funding of internal or non-competitive external grant

**Comprehensive review:** Completion of a body of documented works that contributes to the advancement of the field based on the standards of the discipline

**If Appropriate:**

**Professional Service**
- **c)** Actively participates in

---

**III. Meets Expectations 2.6-3.5**
- **a)** Engages in discipline-related scholarly activity appropriate for the standards of the discipline, including, but not limited to research, clinical work, and/or field work

**Professional Productivity**
- **b)** Annual/biennial review: Is on track within the individual’s current comprehensive period to document evidence of scholarly activity deemed appropriate for the standards of the discipline. Demonstration of annual/biennial productivity includes evidence of quality scholarly activity, including, but is not limited to:
  1. Progress on written dissemination of scholarly work
  2. Preparation of professional presentations
  3. Stewardship of active grants and/or progress toward grant proposal submissions

**Comprehensive review:** Demonstrates completion of documented works at a level deemed appropriate for the standards of the discipline

**If Appropriate:**

**Professional Service**
- **c)** Actively participates in

---

**II. Needs Improvement 1.6-2.5**
- **a)** Engages in discipline-related scholarly activity, but below the level deemed appropriate for the standards of the discipline

**Professional Productivity**
- **b)** Documents evidence of scholarly activity that falls short of the expected standards of the discipline or does not generate documented works in a timely fashion for a comprehensive review

**Professional Service**
- **c)** Actively participates in

---

**I. Unsatisfactory 1.0-1.5**
- **a)** Does not engage in relevant discipline-related scholarly activity at any level

**Professional Productivity**
- **b)** Does not work towards the generation of documented evidence of scholarly activity

**Professional Service**
- **c)** Actively participates in

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>V. Excellent</th>
<th>IV. Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>III. Meets Expectations</th>
<th>II. Needs Improvement</th>
<th>I. Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6-5.0</td>
<td>3.6-4.5</td>
<td>2.6-3.5</td>
<td>1.0-2.5</td>
<td>1.0-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ a)</td>
<td>Engages in significant leadership roles in unit, college and/or university</td>
<td>a) Provides valuable service to the unit, college or university</td>
<td>If Appropriate: b) Participates in documented service efforts within the unit, college, or university that contribute to the quality and vitality of the academic programs</td>
<td>If Appropriate: a) Limited participation and contribution to service efforts within the unit, college or university</td>
<td>If Appropriate: a) Does not participate and contribute to service efforts within the unit, college or university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Appropriate:</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Provides valuable service to professional organizations and/or enhances community and societal well-being</td>
<td>If Appropriate: b) Limited contribution of expertise to benefit profession and/or community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ b)</td>
<td>Assumes significant leadership role(s) in professional organization(s) and/or provides significant service that enhances community and societal well-being</td>
<td>c) Demonstrates a positive impact on students through advising activities that are sustained over a period of time or that have broader impacts</td>
<td>If Appropriate: c) Provides student advising that does not promote student success or that bears minimal impact on student success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ c)</td>
<td>Demonstrates a positive impact on students through advising activities that is sustained over a period of time and that has broad impacts on the students, the unit, the college, and/or the university</td>
<td>d) Formally mentors other faculty members in ways that positively impact the unit, college and/or university</td>
<td>If Appropriate: d) Limited mentoring of other faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ d)</td>
<td>Takes a leadership role in mentoring other faculty members in ways that positively impact the unit, college and/or university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
APPENDIX B – FACULTY EVALUATION DEADLINES

All time frames are for planning purposes. Specific deadlines will be announced by the Dean’s Office.

Second year reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their first year of service:
DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - First half of December
     Academic Affairs - Mid-January

Third year reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their second year of service:
DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - First half of September
     Academic Affairs - Mid-October

Fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh year reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their second, third, fourth or fifth year of service (respectively):
DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - Mid-March
     Academic Affairs - Mid-April

Reappointment of contract renewable faculty/exempt administrators in any year of service: DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - First week of March
     Academic Affairs - Mid-March

Comprehensive Reviews, other than pre-tenure reviews (including applications for promotion and/or tenure, and graduate faculty status; and post-tenure review):
DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - First week of February
     Academic Affairs - Mid-March

Pre-Tenure Reviews:
DUE: NHS Dean’s Office – First week in March
     Academic Affairs – mid-April

Annual/Biennial Evaluations:
DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - First week in March
     Academic Affairs - Mid-May
APPENDIX C – DOSSIER AND EVALUATION MATERIALS FOR PRE-TENURE, PROMOTION, AND TENURE AND PROMOTION

(i) Dossier Organization

Any included documents may be considered by readers to be reference documents and may be scanned rather than read in detail. Hence, the information should be displayed in an easy-to-scan, attractive format. Use scanning tools effectively and consistently: bold type, underlining, type size, type variety (italics), text centering and spacing, headings, and labels. Since some readers will not know what abbreviations mean, spell out the name in full the first time the abbreviation is used.

The dossier is presented in a single, loose-leaf binder (maximum size of 2 inches). Materials to be included, with indexed separations, should appear in the order shown below:

Pocket Divider

1. Appropriate university request forms requiring signatures
2. Unit leader evaluation
3. Evaluation from the academic unit
4. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
5. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
6. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
7. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
8. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
9. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
10. Comprehensive Performance Report (See Appendix G for required template)

*NOTE: Number of dividers will differ (annual and/or biennial reviews; years towards Tenure/promotion; level of promotion being sort. For each review include all evaluation reports from the academic unit, unit leader and Dean

Tab 1  Curriculum Vitae

Tab 2  External peer review letters (required for promotion/tenure at any level)

Tab 3  Performance Report of Instruction & Supporting Evidence

Tab 4  Performance Report of Professional Activity & Supporting Evidence

Tab 5  Performance Report of Service & Supporting Evidence

Label the cover and spine of the binder with your name and academic unit, and indicate the nature of the dossier (e.g., tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, post-tenure review, etc.). Refrain from inserting pages in plastic sleeves because this makes the folder bulky and difficult to review.

Evidence of accomplishments in all assigned performance areas – normally, instruction, professional activity, and service - must be included. It is important to illustrate the impact, outcome, significance, and/or results in each of the three categories, rather than simply enumerating accomplishments. Guidelines for items to be included for each evaluation area follow.

(ii) Guidelines for Instruction Materials

Assessments of performance should focus on teaching effectiveness, which is not to be confused with popularity or adherence to any particular teaching style. It is the responsibility of individuals being
evaluated to provide materials sufficient to demonstrate that they are effective teachers and mentors who
develop their students’ ethical and critical thinking and analytical and expressive abilities. The materials
in the dossier should show the scope and quality of the individual’s instruction performance and value to
his/her academic program area. The range of information about instruction that can be collected and
presented is very broad. Per Board Policy Manual, Part 8 Section 2-3-801, all dossiers must contain a
representative sample of student evaluations, from each year, covering the range of teaching
assignments. Student evaluations chosen as a representative sample will include all responses submitted
by students for each course selected. The following list is not intended to be all-inclusive. It is provided
as a suggested list from which to select items for inclusion in the dossier to demonstrate effective
instruction.

- Summary of practices, approaches, and attitudes related to instruction and student learning.
- Evidence of the way classes and instruction are monitored and evaluated.
- How student difficulties are identified and participation in courses or programs is encouraged.
- Description of student assessment methods and rationales and feedback to students.
- Changes made as a result of student input, collaboration or review from colleagues, or self-
evaluation.
- Examples of innovations designed or adopted and their effectiveness.
- Contributions to the improvement of instruction in the academic unit.
- Participation in seminars, workshops, professional meetings to improve instructing abilities.
- Success at securing grants and external funding for instruction and related activities.
- Summary and analysis of student evaluations of courses and instruction.
- Summary of what students have learned and achieved from the courses you have taught.
- Feedback from colleagues regarding aspects of instruction that are generally not evaluated by
  students (e.g. course development, content, administration, instruction materials, text selection,
  reading lists, student support practices) and out-of-class activities such as instructional and
  curricular development.
- Reports from colleagues or independent observers who have viewed you in the classroom or
  other instructional settings.
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues on course development or instruction improvement.
- Invitations from outside institutions and organizations to teach or to demonstrate effective
  instruction methods.
- Invitations to present at conferences on topics about instruction.
- Evidence of development and implementation of innovative pedagogical methods and materials,
  including development of technologies that advance student learning.
- Adoption at other universities of your creative curriculum and/or approach to instruction.
- Contributions to course, program or other curricular development.
- Description of ways students are helped outside of class.
- Honors, awards, or recognition for teaching excellence.
- Copies of exams, graded exams, graded papers, syllabi.
- Mentoring undergraduate and graduate research, student presentations.
- Mentoring associated with theses and dissertations, directed studies courses, and the like.

(iii) Guidelines for Professional Activity Materials

Provide evidence and/or examples, as well as the significance or noteworthiness of:

- Your research, including research aimed at improving teaching skills or understanding of course
  subject matter.
- Publishing in particular professional journals.
- Books or book chapters in your discipline.
- Technical writing in the discipline.
- Grants, contracts, and other externally funded projects.
Professional presentations (local, state, national and international).
Invited presentations.
Research collaboration with undergraduate and graduate students.
Research collaboration with colleagues both inside and outside the university.
Contributions to the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary, or inter-institutional research programs.
The scholarly development of instructional technology, computer software, or equipment.
Research consultancies, both paid and unpaid.
Membership on review panels (state, national, or international) for research review or editorial boards.
Being an editor or member of an editorial board of professional journal.
Scholarly development of technology used for instruction, research, or clinical practice.
Impact, outcomes, significance, and number of citations on professional writing, both juried and non-juried.
Evidence of research that contributes directly to teaching or improving clinical practice.
Awards and recognition from professional or community organizations for research and scholarship.
Reports from colleagues or independent observers of the significance or noteworthiness of your research and/or scholarship.
Requests for or acknowledgement of scholarly participation or consultation given to professional or community organizations.
Scholarly development of innovative clinical or pedagogical methods and/or materials.
Adoption by others of your models, methods, practices, or procedures for problem resolution, intervention programs, clinical practice or process by others who seek solutions to similar problems.

(iv) Guidelines for Service Materials

The following list which is not all-inclusive includes examples of faculty service activities. Provide evidence and/or examples, as well as the significance or noteworthiness of:
Serving on department, college or university committees, governance bodies, interdisciplinary task forces or advisory boards.
Addressing specific problems or issues brought to one’s attention within the university profession or community.
Serving as Faculty Advisor for student organization.
Including students in professional activities.
Participating in collaborative endeavors within the university, profession or community organizations.
Providing services through a college clinic or laboratory.
Adopting models for problem solving, intervention programs, prevention and early detection programs, instruments or processes by others in the university, profession or community who seek solutions to similar problems.
Holding a leadership position in the profession or community relevant to your area of academic expertise (e.g. officer roles, advisory boards).
Providing public policy analysis for local, state, national or international governmental Agencies.
Writing for popular and non-academic publications directed to agencies, professionals or other specialized audiences.
Contributing to the development or delivery of services/educational programs for underserved Populations.
Participating in economic and community development activities utilizing your area of academic expertise.
Offering testimony related to your area of academic expertise at either the state or federal
legislative or congressional committee.

☐ Providing information relevant to your area of academic expertise to the media, courts or community.

☐ Engaging in activities that represent new interpretations and applications of knowledge

☐ Consultation, evaluation, intervention, or service design, policy analysis or technical assistance related to your area of academic expertise and provided to the university, profession or community organization.

☐ Election to office undertaking service to professional associations or learned societies including editorial work or peer reviewing for national or regional accrediting organization.

☐ Honors, awards and other forms of special recognition received for professional or public service.

☐ Serving on master’s thesis and/or doctoral dissertations.

The following list is not intended to be all inclusive of the advising process. It is a suggested list to assist you in the planning and selection of items to include in your dossier to demonstrate effective advising.

Provide evidence or examples of:

☐ Helping undergraduate and graduate students to understand the academic and administrative processes of the college and university.

☐ Helping undergraduate and graduate students to understand the expected standards of achievement and potential for success in their chosen field of study.

☐ Availability and accessibility as an advisor.

Provide results, outcomes, noteworthiness, impact of:

☐ Interactions and assistance with students requiring special needs.

☐ Student recruitment efforts.

☐ Student retention efforts.

☐ Honors, awards, recognitions by students of advising excellence.
APPENDIX D – DOSSIER AND EVALUATION MATERIALS FOR POST-TENURE

Any included documents may be considered by readers to be reference documents and may be scanned rather than read in detail. Hence, the information should be displayed in an easy-to-scan, attractive format. Use scanning tools effectively and consistently: bold type, underlining, type size, type variety (italics), text centering and spacing, headings, and labels. Since some readers will not know what abbreviations mean, spell out the name in full the first time the abbreviation is used.

The dossier is presented in a single, loose-leaf binder (recommended size of 1 inch; maximum size of 2 inches). Materials to be included, with indexed separations, should appear in the order shown below:

Pocket Divider
1. Appropriate university request forms requiring signature
2. Unit leader evaluation
3. Evaluation from the academic unit
4. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
5. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
6. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
7. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
8. Annual/Biennial evaluation *
9. Annual/Biennial evaluation *

*NOTE: Number of dividers will differ (annual and/or biennial reviews; years towards Tenure/promotion; level of promotion being sort). For each review include all evaluation reports from the academic unit, unit leader and Dean at UNC and prior institutions if credit towards tenure and/or promotion was awarded, upon hire, for the review period.

Tab 1: Curriculum Vitae

Tab 2: Faculty self-evaluation (including annual/biennial evaluation for most recent year)

Tab 3: Supporting documentation
- Representative sample of student evaluations. Per Board Policy Manual, Part 8 Section 2-3-801, all dossiers must contain a representative sample of student evaluations, from each year, covering the range of teaching assignments. Student evaluations chosen as a representative sample will include all responses submitted by students for each course selected.
- First Page/s of Publications, Grant Acceptance Letters, Sample Presentation materials, presentation acceptance letters.
- Sabbatical reports during the evaluation period.
- Official comprehensive review forms since previous post-tenure review, if any.
- Performance plan from previous post-tenure review, as required for faculty members evaluated as "unsatisfactory" [University policy 3-3-801(2)(b)(VI)], if any.

Label the cover and spine of the binder with your name and school, and “post-tenure review”. Refrain from inserting pages in plastic sleeves because this makes the folder bulky and difficult to review.
APPENDIX E - TEMPLATE LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Unless otherwise approved by the dean, the following format should be used for letters of instruction for individuals who have agreed to serve as an external peer reviewer.

[Academic Unit Leader’s name and contact information]

[date]

Dear [peer reviewer’s name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a peer reviewer for [faculty evaluatee’s name], who is undergoing review for [specify type of review – tenure, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, etc.]. Within the College of Natural and Health Sciences, the professional activity (scholarship) of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure is subject to evaluation by at least three external peer reviewers. Such external reviews are a required component of our faculty evaluation process, and I appreciate your willingness to take on this important responsibility. It is essential that all outside reviewers be individuals who are capable of objectively performing the evaluation; for example, recent (within the review period) collaborators or individuals who served on the candidate’s dissertation/thesis committee must not serve as external reviewers. If you cannot objectively perform an evaluation, either due to professional or personal association with the evaluatee, please inform me promptly so that another potential reviewer can be identified. The purpose of this letter is to provide guidance as you undertake your review, which I ask that you provide directly to me at the above address by no later than [specify date – normally no less than one month].

I request that you supply, for insertion into the candidate’s dossier, an evaluative letter that addresses [Dr./ Mr./ Ms. faculty evaluatee’s name] ’s professional activity (scholarship). I request that you begin your letter by listing your current position and institutional affiliation and providing a statement of the nature and duration of your acquaintance with the candidate, if any. Particularly useful will be your assessment of the quality, significance, and impact of [his/her] professional activities to date as well as [his/her] potential to sustain and expand upon them in the future. The relevant faculty evaluation criteria of the College [and Academic Unit, if approved guidelines exist], which should form the basis of your review, are enclosed for your information. Also to be considered are the candidate’s workload assignments for the period under review. In this review, please consider the candidate’s accomplishments since [specify date], as Dr. [Faculty Member’s name] was awarded [X /year(s)] of credit towards promotion and tenure at the time of hire based on his/her prior experience at [Institution’s Name].

Please be informed that it is the practice of the College to permit a candidate to view external letters of review that are received as part of his or her faculty evaluation.

Please contact me at [list phone # and e-mail address] if you have any questions about how to proceed. Once again, thank you for your service as an external peer reviewer. Your contributions to our faculty evaluation process are greatly appreciated.

[Closing]

Enclosures: Candidate’s curriculum vitae
Description of candidate’s work assignments for the period under review
Complete narrative from the candidate’s dossier
Professional Activity section of the faculty evaluation criteria of the College and Academic Unit
[ list any other enclosures here]
APPENDIX F - Recommendation for Reappointment of a Tenure-Track Faculty Member

The form to be used for reappointment is available on the web at:
http://www.unco.edu/nhs/pdf/tenure-track_reappt_form.pdf
APPENDIX G: Comprehensive Performance Report

Section 1: Workload Distribution and Annual/Biennial Evaluation Summary

The presented dossier describes my accomplishments in the areas of Instruction, Professional Activity, and Service for calendar years **** - ****. On my comprehensive review sheet the weighting factors were determined based on the actual workload distributions I was assigned during the review period. My annual workload percentages and mean distribution for the review period are summarized in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Workload Distribution during the Review Period

During the review period, my annual/biennial evaluations for the three areas of review (Instruction, Professional Activity and Service) during the review period have been compiled in Table 2. The first number in each column represents the assigned score from the program area faculty/faculty evaluation committee. The second score is the assigned score from the school director or department chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20**</td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rating (**** - ****)</td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
<td><strong>/</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Annual/Biennial Evaluation

(“++If an additional comprehensive review (Pre-tenure/Post-Tenure) was conducted during the review period include the ratings for the Faculty/Unit Leader/Dean)

Section 2: Executive Summary

The executive summary should address the overlap and interplay between the areas of instruction, professional activity and service during the review period. Individual accomplishments in each of the evaluation categories should be addressed in the relevant
performance reports. The summary should be written so that the reviewers have a quick snapshot of your accomplishments across the three categories during the review period and is limited to no more than 500 words.