

NOTE:

Following a two-year document development process headed up by the Task Force on Policies and Procedures, the College's Faculty Evaluation and Performance Policies and Procedures were submitted by the College to the Provost for his review and approval. In April 2006, the Provost approved the document for implementation in the 2006-07 academic year, with one exception: the proposed mandatory external review process to occur as part of promotion and tenure review. Approval of that portion was deferred pending University-level discussions regarding non-elective external review. The College instituted elective external review component in the 2006-07 academic year, and with the Provost's May 2, 2007 approval of the mandatory external review component, the entire document was approved as originally submitted. As was announced to College personnel in May 2007, the College will implement mandatory external review for the 2007-08 cycle of promotion and tenure reviews.

COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES

FACULTY EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

APPROVED:

APRIL 2006 (all portions except mandatory external review)

MAY 2007 (entire document as originally submitted in April 2006)

COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES

FACULTY EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

April 2006

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	2
II. Considerations for Comprehensive Review	2
A. Guidelines	3
B. Evaluation Workload	3
C. Overall Evaluation	3
D. Process	4
i. School/Program Area Review	5
ii. Dean Review	5
iii. Basis for School/Program Area/Dean Recommendation	5
III. Performance Standards in Evaluation Areas	6
A. Instruction	6
B. Professional Activity	9
C. Service	12
IV. Considerations for Annual Review and Reappointment	13
A. Reappointment Procedures	14
V. Considerations for Merit Pay	14
Appendices	15
A. Dossier and Evaluation Materials	15
i. Dossier Organization	15
ii. Guidelines for Instruction Materials	15
iii. Guidelines for Professional Activity Materials	16
iv. Guidelines for Service Materials	17
B. Faculty Evaluation Deadlines	19
C. Letter of Instruction for Peer Reviewers	20
D. Recommendation for Reappointment of a Tenure-Track Faculty Member	21

I. INTRODUCTION

All faculty members in the College of Natural and Health Sciences (NHS) who are reviewed for reappointment, annual evaluation, pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, graduate faculty status, and post-tenure review will be evaluated in accordance with University and Board of Trustees policies (http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf and http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf, respectively) 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 will provide 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/teaching, scholarship/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. Many UNC faculty 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. However, section 2-3-401(1) of the Board Policy Manual states that each College “will define the workload components of instruction, scholarship and services 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 tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. In addition to these reviews specified by University and Board policy, an additional type of comprehensive review carried out in the College of Natural and Health Sciences is the pre-tenure review, an evaluation conducted at approximately the mid-point of a tenure-track faculty member’s probationary period. The pre-tenure review is intended as a check on an individual’s progress toward tenure. As such, the evaluative criteria and processes of the two evaluations are the same, although accomplishments for the pre-tenure review will be considered within the context of a shorter time period. In addition, because the pre-tenure review process will be conducted within the College, materials associated with this review will not proceed beyond the College level. Unless individual circumstances require a modification that is approved by both the relevant director and dean, the timing of pre-tenure review will be as follows:

Years of tenure credit awarded to the faculty member:	Pre-tenure review will occur during the faculty member’s:
0	Third full academic year
1	Second full academic year
2	Second full academic year
3	Not applicable

In that pre-tenure review constitutes a new type of comprehensive review for NHS faculty, it will be made available in 2006-07 as an elective review, and will be fully instituted (that is, will be non-elective) in 2007-08.

A. Guidelines

1. Comprehensive review will assess an individual's accomplishments in the areas of instruction, scholarship, 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. Since 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 directors meet at least once annually with faculty on the path to promotion and/or tenure to discuss the results of annual reviews and to assess the candidate's progress toward realizing a successful comprehensive review.
3. In some cases, faculty members may be engaged in activities that have 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, scholarship, and service—is assigned a weight for evaluation purposes, based on a written workload plan and approved by the director and dean. 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. Most faculty will have a work assignment consisting of 0.60 instruction, 0.20 for scholarship, and 0.20 for service, which equals 1.0. This weighting allocation could vary as college or school needs dictate. Such individualization of faculty effort would be the result of consultation between faculty, director, and dean. Instruction should not be assigned less than 0.20 without prior approval of the director and dean. Alternative weights may be requested based on assignments. The reassignment of an individual's workload is subject to approval by the director and dean. 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.

C. Overall Evaluation

The performance evaluation yields an overall evaluation 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:

University Evaluation Scale

LEVEL	RATING	OVERALL EVALUATION
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

Performance standards are used to assign a rating for each evaluation area. These standards are listed in Sections III A, B, and C for instruction/advising, professional activity, and service, respectively.

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 School Directors and, in the cases of promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review, Academic Affairs, and Human Resources. Deadlines for submission and review of evaluation materials are provided in Appendix B. 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 Appendix A. 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>.

Individuals applying for tenure or promotion at any rank are required to include a minimum of two peer evaluations of scholarship from faculty within the discipline from other institutions. Peer evaluations from outside the university are not required for faculty preparing for pre-tenure and post-tenure comprehensive review. Candidates for tenure or promotion should provide to their Director the names and contact information of three to four prospective outside peer evaluators. The Director may consult with faculty of the same discipline within the unit for suggested selections and/or may add names to the list. Whether identified by the candidate or the Director, it is essential that all outside reviewers be individuals who are capable of objectively performing the evaluation; for example, current collaborators and individuals who served on the candidate's dissertation/thesis committees must not serve as external reviewers. At least one of the reviewers shall be selected from the list provided by the candidate. The Director 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, narrative from the candidate's dossier, and the relevant faculty evaluation guidelines used in the College of Natural and Health Sciences and School (if approved guidelines are available at that level). All outside reviewers' letters of evaluation should be returned directly to the School Director and 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 C. In that a College-directed external review process constitutes a new element of promotion and tenure review for NHS faculty, it will be made available in 2006-07 as an elective review component, and will be fully instituted (that is, will be non-elective) in 2007-08. This phased implementation of the 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) School/ Program Area review

Schools/program areas should 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 should reflect the nature of instruction, professional activity, and service valued by the discipline and be consistent with the college guidelines and criteria. The school/program area guidelines and standards shall be subject to review and approval by the dean. Once approved, they will be used in all comprehensive reviews. College guidelines and criteria shall be applied when approved school/program area criteria are not in place.

The faculty and director shall evaluate the candidate in accordance with University policy. In some instances, to gain a more complete understanding of the application, the director may request additional information from an individual, through interview or request for additional documentation. He or she may also seek information from other sources, such as, interviews with the faculty, 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 director's evaluation memo.

(ii) Dean review

The Dean of NHS reviews all application materials submitted by the schools, including the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, dossier and statement, the school/program area faculty vote and recommendation, and director evaluation and recommendation. Dossiers are submitted as described in Appendix A. The schools/program areas may choose to review a larger compilation of materials than that submitted to the dean.

As in the case with the director, the dean may request additional information from an individual, 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.

(iii) Basis for the School/Program Area/Dean Recommendation

For promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, an earned doctorate in the discipline or other terminal degree specified by the School or program area is required. In addition, the following criteria apply.

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 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, which will be subject to approval by the director, 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, which will be subject to approval by the director 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 Appendix A 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 school. Faculty 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 school's mission.

A. Instruction

Effective instruction is demonstrated by the intellectual development of students. Characteristics of effective instruction include professional dedication to student learning and outcomes. Individuals engage students meaningfully in learning by using appropriate pedagogies and methodologies for their disciplines, including active and dynamic instruction strategies. Effective instruction motivates students to learn while providing them with the opportunity to acquire their own knowledge. When instruction is successful, students develop critical and creative thinking skills that they will continue to use long after the completion of a degree. Effective teachers carefully monitor and appropriately assess student learning, provide timely feedback to students, and adapt their instruction as appropriate to improve student learning. Students are then able to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes in their courses and in applying their learning in research, internships, practica, or other learning situations.

An effective instructor is guided by the "teacher/scholar" model in which excellence in instruction is complemented by professional activities. Instructors must maintain currency in their subject matter and be able to evaluate research findings and other educational materials related to their field of specialization and incorporate them into their course offerings. They should maintain the appropriate licenses/certificates needed to practice in their field, and maintain program accreditation, where applicable.

The comprehensive nature of UNC's mission also dictates that teacher-scholars engage in activities which are best described as blends between instruction and scholarship and between instruction and service. The former, defined as mentoring, includes research-enhanced learning activities with undergraduate and graduate students and has been termed "shared discovery" (Krahenbuhl, 1998, *Change*, Nov/Dec). The

latter blend, termed “service learning,” encompasses many instruction-based activities in which faculty foster student participation that reaches beyond the traditional classroom. Some faculty, especially those with a heavy emphasis on graduate education, will have a significant portion of their instruction, mentoring and advising devoted to these integrated activities.

Performance standards are used to evaluate an individual’s effectiveness in instruction. The information provided in the dossier is assessed using the performance standards. The following lists include descriptions of activities that, if documented appropriately, may minimally qualify a candidate for specific ratings; that is, 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. It is not necessary that a candidate meet all of the performance standards in a particular category.

For clarification, examples of possible performance indicators (in parentheses) follow some of the standards. Performance standards for each rating level may include, but are not limited to, the following:

V. Excellent

- a) Demonstrates significant ability and recognition as a master teacher (e.g. provides leadership in mentoring, instruction of teachers, peer review).
- b) Receives significant peer and student recognition for excellence in instruction (as seen in instruction awards, outstanding student evaluations, peer review).
- c) Directs or takes major responsibility for curriculum development (new or significantly revised minors or majors) having a major positive 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, clinical practica, internships, clinical rotations, and field studies (description of activities, narratives from external participants or evaluators, etc.).
- e) Directs and mentors student research projects, theses, dissertations, performances or creative endeavors of demonstrably high quality (as seen in 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, residency, or instruction grant from a relevant professional or educational organization.
- h) Documents significant ability and recognition as a mentor to student advisees (theses, dissertations, etc.).

IV. Exceeds Expectations

- a) Uses instruction methods in a way that develops advanced critical thinking skills and/or sophisticated content (as seen in syllabi, assignments, student evaluations, peer review).
- b) Demonstrates current 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, clinical learning, online learning, service learning).
- d) Demonstrably creates a climate/environment conducive to student learning, both within and outside the classroom (e.g., provides evidence of ongoing independent student learning and/or research).

- e) Encourages student research, and demonstrates effective mentoring of student activities such as student practice, clinical rotations, laboratories and research, internships, field studies, theses, and dissertations in addition to one's regular course load or as a primary instruction assignment.
- f) Participates effectively in instructional assignments that require a significant extra time commitment, such as field excursions, online instruction, intensive lab experiences, etc.
- g) Provides effective leadership in establishing and/or maintaining instructional partnerships with other academic units.
- h) Receives and completes a competitive state fellowship, instruction grant, or residency from a relevant professional or educational organization.
- i) Documents performance that consistently exceeds unit expectations for mentoring of student advisees (theses, dissertations, etc.).

III. Meets Expectations

- a) Uses instruction methods that impart basic content and/or develop basic critical thinking skills (as seen in 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 (as seen in 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/or implements new and revised courses and curricula that meet programmatic needs.
- h) Demonstrates effective supervision and/or mentoring of students under clinical or field experience setting.
- i) Meets unit expectations for mentoring of student advisees (thesis, dissertation, etc.).

II. Needs Improvement

or

I. Unsatisfactory

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

- a) Uses instruction methods that fail to impart basic content and/or develop basic critical thinking skills (as seen in syllabi, assignments, student evaluations, peer review).
- b) Demonstrates little understanding of course design and/or does not consistently articulate or uphold course expectations and expected outcomes (as seen in syllabi, assignments, peer review, exams).
- c) Fails to develop or maintain basic depth and breadth of knowledge in the subject fields (as seen in syllabi, peer review).
- d) Demonstrates ongoing and consistent inadequacy in the preparation and presentation of course content (as seen in student evaluations, peer review, video of instruction).
- e) Demonstrably creates a climate/environment that is unconducive or hostile to student learning (e.g., through documented denigration or sexual harassment, student evaluations, signed letters from students, or video of instruction).
- 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 practica, internships, clinical rotations, 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, as documented in evaluation reports, in returning homework, exams, papers, and other student work and/or is consistently late in submitting final grades.
- j) Provides minimal or poor mentoring of student advisees (theses, dissertations, etc.).

B. Professional Activity

Faculty are expected to engage in advancing one or more aspects of their discipline through scholarly pursuits, unless specifically excused in writing by their director and dean. Judgments about scholarly products must take into consideration both the quality and quantity of contributions. More specifically, the impact, outcome, significance, and/or results of the scholarly activities must be provided to describe, articulate, and clarify the individual's accomplishments. Each school/program area is responsible for documenting the authenticity of all products included in the dossier for the period under review. Documentation and evaluation of scholarship will focus on the quality and significance of scholarship rather than the recitation of tasks and projects.

Professional activity must include published research/scholarship that contributes to the knowledge base of the discipline. The activity can take many forms including the scholarship of discovery, integration, instruction, and application (Boyer, 1990). 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. Professional activity is meant to include the authoring of books, book chapters, peer reviewed articles, technical writing, and other scholarly products typically recognized as such by the individual's discipline.

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

V. Excellent

- a) Authors and publishes a significant body of high quality, discipline-related, refereed scholarly and/or creative work appropriate to the author's area(s) of expertise that makes a significant contribution to the field.
- b) Serves as principal or co-principal investigator on funded grants that make a major contribution to the discipline and/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. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under "service."
- e) Serves as grant reviewer for national funding source. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under "service."
- f) Serves as lead visitor for national professional accrediting body. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under "service."

IV. Exceeds Expectations

- a) Authors or co-authors and publishes a body of high quality, discipline-related, refereed scholarly and/or creative work appropriate to the author's area(s) of expertise.
- b) Serves as principal investigator or co-principal investigator on a funded external grant.

- c) Serves as author or co-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. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “service.”
- g) Serves as grant reviewer for outside funding agency. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “service.”
- h) Serves as accreditation site visitor for national professional accreditation body. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “service.”

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) Is principal or co-principal investigator for submitted grant proposals to external agencies.
- c) Participates in collaborative research or other scholarly efforts.
- d) Authors or co-authors other published professional materials (e.g., study guide, instruction manual, software).
- e) Makes refereed scholarly presentations at professional conferences.
- f) Serves as peer reviewer for scholarly publications. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “service.”
- g) Organizes scholarly panels or symposia for professional conferences. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “service.”
- h) Documents the completion of one or more chapters of a manuscript for a book or monograph in the review period.
- i) Maintains competence in clinical practice specialty/discipline.

II. Needs Improvement

or

I. Unsatisfactory

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

- a) Engages in activities that have not resulted in documented outcomes, such as refereed publications, books or monographs, other professional materials, or external grant proposals.
- b) Is unable to demonstrate competence in clinical practice necessary for student supervision.
- c) Fails to engage in activities appropriate to maintaining currency in his/her academic discipline.
- d) Fails to attempt to produce scholarly products.

C. Service

Faculty are expected to contribute substantively to the governance and professionally related service activities of the school/program area and college. In addition to instruction and research, an individual is expected to demonstrate a solid record of accomplishments in service. Service activities fall into three categories: service to the institution, service to the profession, and service to the public. At the institutional level, service activities contribute to the efficient operation of the school/program area and

college, or enhance the life of the university community. NHS recognizes service to the discipline through participation in professional and scholarly organizations and encourages cooperation with colleagues at every educational level. NHS also acknowledges the importance of individuals using their professional expertise beyond the university community to the community-at-large as part of public service to support local, state, regional, national and international endeavors.

Public service may be performed in many different locations: on-campus or off-campus as when consulting with a community organization or governmental agency. Public service entails the application of an individual's areas of expertise in addressing real-world problems, issues or concerns. Such service may be performed as part of college responsibilities or in addition to stated faculty responsibilities, in which case it may be either uncompensated or compensated. In terms of compensation, the nature and extent of all public service work should be in keeping with university policies and regulations. Whether or not compensation is received for public service is not a criterion for an activity being considered public service. At the same time, activities that are engaged in mainly to make money, such as running a business or a consulting firm on the side, are not part of an individual's university public service activities, even though those activities may benefit the public, organizations, or individuals. It's important to differentiate volunteer community activities, from activities that require professional expertise. Also, appropriate service could include a community effort if undertaken as a representative of UNC.

Consideration will be given to how the individual's contribution benefited the recipients of the service activity, the inclusion of students or other faculty in these service activities as well as the value added to the university and individual's growth and understanding in the academic field. Contribution of the service to the university or community will serve as the basis for evaluation. Documentation of service should focus on the quality and significance of those contributions relevant to the profession or discipline of the faculty member.

Academic and career advising are also part of NHS's commitment to effective service. Academic advising is a process that assists students in planning their education and in making the best use of resources available at the University. Career advising provides resources/information and other forms of support which help students to make critical decisions regarding post-graduate education, career, and life goals. Faculty advisors serve as mentors, guides, and coordinators of learning experiences through course, program, and career planning. They also provide academic progress review and when necessary, refer students to other campus units.

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

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, research, or service 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.

- g) Serves as editor of a major journal. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “professional activity.”
- h) Serves as grant reviewer for national funding source. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “professional activity.”
- i) Serves as lead visitor for national professional accrediting body. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “professional activity.”
- j) Documents significant ability and recognition as an advisor to students.

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 or clinical expertise to participate in documented service efforts that contribute in a significant way to cultural life outside the institution.
- f) Serves as the program chair or in a similar function for conferences. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “professional activity.”
- g) Serves as grant reviewer for outside funding agency. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “professional activity.”
- h) Serves as accreditation site visitor for national professional accreditation body. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “professional activity.”
- i) Documents performance that consistently exceeds unit expectations for advising students.

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.
- 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.
- g) Serves as peer reviewer for scholarly publications. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “professional activity.”
- h) Organizes scholarly panels or symposia for professional conferences. Depending upon the nature of the activity, this work may more appropriately be placed under “professional activity.”
- i) Meets unit expectations for advising students.

II. Needs Improvement

or

I. Unsatisfactory

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

- a) Serves as a committee member but 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.

IV. CONSIDERATIONS FOR ANNUAL REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT

Annual 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 seeking tenure and promotion and faculty seeking reappointment, and (3) to provide an objective basis for merit pay. The following principles and procedures apply to annual reviews.

1. Annual reviews are performed for calendar years.
2. Schools/program areas will develop annual review procedures and criteria for annual review which will be subject to review and approval by the dean.
3. The following parameters will apply to the development of school/program area procedures and criteria:
 - a) Adopted procedures/criteria should reflect consensus or the views of a significant majority of the unit/school. The vote, if taken, should be forwarded with the procedures/criteria. If the document is one that reflects school/program area consensus rather than a formal vote, it should be noted.
 - b) Expectations in annual reviews must be clearly tied to guidelines for pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.
 - c) The director must provide an evaluation in the annual review process.
 - d) The school/program area may choose to include participants in the process who are not faculty. They will be non-voting.
 - e) There will be five levels of review (faculty, school director, dean, Chief Academic Officer, and President), as characterized in the Board Policy Manual.
 - f) School/program area 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) School/program area are to define weighting of criteria on a 15 hour equated load 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 director and subject to approval by the dean prior to the start of a new evaluation period.
4. In all cases, Board approved policy applies to the development of school/program area procedures and criteria.

5. The dean will review the application of all procedures and criteria by unit/school and may return the annual reviews (as a whole) to the school/program area for reconsideration if they are not in accord with approved procedures and criteria. If, after reconsideration by the school/program area, the dean and the school/program area 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 review and, when applicable, pre-tenure review, will be the primary bases 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 D) 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 Director will add 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 schools in proportion to the base salaries of eligible faculty. All faculty who receive ratings of Meets Expectations (2.6 – 3.5) or better in all areas are considered eligible. An average of the overall scores as well as the area scores of the faculty, director and dean (if applicable) will be used to determine eligibility.
2. Schools shall develop a dean-approved school policy and procedure for the distribution of merit pay.

APPENDIX A – DOSSIER AND EVALUATION MATERIALS

(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”). Materials to be included, with indexed separations, should appear in the order shown below:

Pocket Divider

1. Appropriate university request forms requiring signature (normally available on-line)
2. Annual evaluations for the review period
3. Evaluation from the academic unit
4. Director evaluation
5. Dean evaluation

Tab 1 Comprehensive Performance Report and *Curriculum Vitae*

- a. Brief narrative summary performance report of accomplishments for the review period
- b. Current *curriculum vitae* consistent with University format
- c. External peer review letters (required for promotion/tenure at any level)

Tab 2 Performance Report of Instruction

Tab 3 Performance Report of Professional Activity

Tab 4 Performance Report of Service

Label the cover and spine of the binder with your name and school, 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 pages.

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. 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*
- *Participation on thesis and dissertation committees.*

(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.*
- *Serving on master's thesis and/or doctoral dissertations.*
- *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*

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.*
- *Service as faculty advisor to student clubs and associations.*
- *Honors, awards, recognitions by students of advising excellence.*

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 January
Academic Affairs - First half of February

Third year reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their second year of service:

DUE: NHS Dean's Office - First half of November
Academic Affairs - First week in December

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 - First week in March
Academic Affairs - First half of April

Reappointment of term faculty/exempt administrators in any year of service:

DUE: NHS Dean's Office - First half of March
Academic Affairs - First week in April

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 - Last half of January
Academic Affairs - First half of March

Pre-Tenure Reviews,:

DUE: NHS Dean's office – First week in March

Annual Evaluations:

DUE: NHS Dean's office - First week in March
Academic Affairs - First half of April

APPENDIX C - LETTER OF INSTRUCTION FOR PEER 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.

[School Director'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 scholarly accomplishments of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure are subject to evaluation by at least two peer reviewers. Such external reviews are a significant component of our faculty evaluation process, and I appreciate your willingness to take on this important responsibility. 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 scholarship and professional activity. Particularly useful will be your assessment of the quality, significance, and impact of [his/her] scholarly contributions 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 School, 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 work assignments for the period under review. In this review, please consider the candidate's accomplishments since [specify date, taking into consideration any years of credit awarded toward tenure and/or promotion, if applicable.] 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. 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
 Narrative from the candidate's dossier
 Faculty evaluation criteria of the College and School
 [list any other enclosures here]

APPENDIX D - 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/nhstest/pdf/tenure-track_reappt_form_Oct08.pdf