



Part 8 – Faculty Evaluation

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

Comprehensive Review provides a regular, systematic evaluation of performance to encourage professional development and renewal; to encourage individual excellence and achievement; to encourage activities that contribute to the mission and goals of the University, and one's college, department, school, or free standing program; and to help those who are not achieving at satisfactory levels to do so. The evaluation process should encourage excellence in both traditional and innovative approaches to instruction, research, scholarship, and creative works.

The substantive evaluation of a faculty member's performance is necessarily restricted to those with the disciplinary or, as appropriate, multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise needed to make the required judgments. The authority of the program area faculty and the chair/director/coordinator in this area carries with it significant responsibilities. These include the responsibility to make fair and honest judgments based on agreed upon criteria and to provide feedback regarding progress towards tenure and/or promotion when appropriate.

Graduate Faculty Status Review. Faculty will be reviewed on a cycle established by the graduate dean and is separate from Comprehensive Review.

2-3-801 Faculty Review

Faculty Reviews serve as mechanisms to provide performance evaluation, assessment of progress toward promotion and/or tenure, recognition of achievement, and feedback for improvement if needed [see 1-1-307(1) Purposes and Intent of Evaluation].

There are two categories of faculty review:

- 1) Comprehensive reviews serve as pre-tenure review, tenure review, promotion review, and post-tenure review.

- 2) Subperiod reviews provide faculty members holding academic rank an opportunity to receive evaluation and feedback prior to comprehensive review.

2-3-801(1) Definitions.

- (a) Review Period: The relevant years for the purposes of subperiod review [see 2-3-801(5) Subperiod Review] or comprehensive review [See 2-3-801(4) Comprehensive Review] or if not for any of these purposes, from the previous comprehensive review which shall not consist of one or more academic years notwithstanding that the faculty may not have worked the entirety of an academic year. [See also 2-3-901(1) Time Guidelines.]
- (b) Subperiod: A period of time covered by a review that is either an annual, biennial, or triennial review.
- (c) Unit Leader: The chair of a department, director of a school, or coordinator of a free-standing program who is not part of a department or school.
- (d) Unit/Program-Level Evaluation Committee: A committee containing no fewer than three members, but, if larger than three, no more than the total number of faculty members within the program area. In the case of an evaluatee who has a joint appointment in two program areas, the maximum shall be the total number of faculty in both programs. The committee shall not include the evaluatee or unit leader but shall be comprised of: (a) faculty members from an evaluatee's program area(s); or (b) faculty members from an evaluatee's program area plus additional faculty members from other program areas when needed to meet the minimum number of committee members [see 2-3-801(4)(b)(iv)]. The makeup of the unit/program-level evaluation committee is the responsibility of the program area faculty.
- (e) Dossier: Portfolio of information relative to performance during the review period. Dossiers shall include:
 - (i) a narrative of accomplishments during the review period that provides reasons, evidence, and impacts that align with the unit's/program area's approved evaluation criteria;
 - (ii) an updated vita in approved university format;
 - (iii) any relevant documentation based on the unit's evaluation criteria;
 - (iv) all student evaluations, during the review period, covering all

teaching assignments and

(v) other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate.

- (f) Comprehensive Review Dossier. A Dossier that also contains subperiod review outcomes from the review period, including the subperiod review letters from the unit/program-level evaluation committee, the unit leader, and the dean for the period under review.
- (g) Professional Activities: Activities pertaining to research, scholarship and creative works.
- (h) Program Area: For the purposes of this policy, “program area” shall mean a discipline-based unit which may be multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or unidisciplinary and may consist of several emphasis areas or graduate and undergraduate degrees.
- (i) School: An administrative subdivision of a college which may consist of one or more program areas. A school may be multidisciplinary, in which case it comprises more than one program area, or unidisciplinary, in which case it comprises a single program area.
- (j) Department: A department is an administrative subdivision of a college, which shall be considered to consist of one program area.
- (k) Free Standing Program: An administrative unit of a college that is neither a department nor housed within a school. The coordinator of such a program shall fulfill the duties assigned to unit leaders in the evaluation process.
- (l) Program Area Faculty: The faculty of a program area within a school. In the case of a unidisciplinary school, the faculty are the program area faculty. In the case of a multidisciplinary school, the faculty of each program area within the school are the program area faculty. The faculty of a department are also a program area faculty.
- (m) Program Coordinators: The program coordinator of a free standing program where there is no chair or director.
- (n) Department Faculty: All of the faculty members in a department shall be considered to be members of a single program area.
- (o) Multidisciplinary or Interdisciplinary Activities: Instruction, service or professional activities that draw from or are at the intersection of more than one discipline.
- (p) Performance Areas: There are three performance areas: Instruction,

professional activity, and service.

- (q) Evaluation score (i.e., score): A score is a number from 1 to 5 that is assigned by a unit/program-level evaluation committee, unit leader, Dean, or CAO (if appropriate, see procedure below) to indicate the performance of an evaluatee in a performance area.
- (r) Evaluation Level: There are five levels of evaluation: Excellent (V), Exceeds Expectations (IV), Meets Expectations (III), Needs Improvement (II), and Unsatisfactory (I). The evaluation level is using the evaluation Score Range. An evaluation level is also assigned to an Overall Evaluation.
- (s) Evaluation Score Range (Round to the nearest 10th)

Evaluation Score Range	Evaluation Level
4.6 - 5.0	Excellent (V)
3.6 - 4.5	Exceeds Expectations (IV)
2.6 - 3.5	Meets Expectations (III)
1.6 - 2.5	Needs Improvement (II)
1.0 - 1.5	Unsatisfactory (I)

- (t) Overall Evaluation: The average (arithmetic mean), weighted in accordance with workload, of evaluation levels in all performance areas. For example, a faculty with a workload of 0.6 instruction, 0.2 professional activity, and 0.2 service, who received a score of 4 for instruction, 3 for professional activity and a score of 1 for service would have an overall score of 3.2 ($0.6 \times 4 + 0.2 \times 3 + 0.2 \times 1 = 3.2$) which falls in the range of III Meets Expectations.

2-3-801(2) Comprehensive Review.

Any eligible faculty member must receive a comprehensive evaluation in any year upon their request. [See also 1-1-307 Faculty Evaluation and 3-3-801 Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures.] Post-tenure review of faculty members must be conducted at least once in every five years [Colorado Executive Order #D-0020-97, Declaring the Need for a Post-Tenure Review System for All Colorado's Institutions of Higher Education, 1997]. In keeping with this policy:

- (a) Tenured full professors must undergo a comprehensive review at least once every five years.
- (b) Tenured associate professors must undergo comprehensive review at least once every six years if at least one subperiod review is conducted in a year between comprehensive reviews.
- (c) The results of comprehensive review are the sole basis for decisions concerning tenure and promotion. Every comprehensive review of a tenured faculty member, for whatever purpose, is at the same time a post-tenure review.
- (d) Comprehensive review decisions (such as tenure and promotion), based only on the results of comprehensive review in the faculty performance areas (instruction, professional activity and service), preclude the use of collegiality as a separate dimension in making such decisions. The University of Northern Colorado adheres to the position of the American Association of University Professors: www.aaup.org, "On Collegiality As A Criterion for Faculty Evaluation" ([2016 Revision](#)). Collegiality shall not be used as a separate category in reaching evaluative decisions.

2-3-801(3) Comprehensive Review Types

- (a) Pre-tenure Review. Tenure-track faculty members shall undergo a pre-tenure review in their third year of a tenure-track appointment [see 3-3-801 Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures. Pre-tenure review shall address:
 - (I) degree of progress toward tenure/promotion, and
 - (II) what additional achievements are expected for tenure/promotion, if any
 - (III) the review period for pre-tenure review shall consist of all years since hire (and prior years of credit if applicable).
- (b) Tenure Review. Tenure review will address:
 - (I) degree of progress toward tenure;
 - (II) deficiencies in meeting the evaluation criteria, if any, and;
 - (III) the outcome of the evaluation, which determines whether tenure is recommended.
 - (IV) The review period for a comprehensive tenure review shall consist of all years since hire (and prior years of credit if applicable).

- (c) Promotion Review. The Tenure-track, tenured, and contract-renewable faculty members may be eligible for promotion review [see 2-3-202(2) Contract Renewable, 2-3-301 Academic Ranks, 2-3-901(1) Time Guidelines]. Promotion review shall address:
- (I) degree of progress toward promotion, and
 - (II) action recommended.
 - (III) The review period for a comprehensive review for promotion, except in the case of a tenure-track faculty member applying for promotion to associate professor, shall be specified by the units approved program area evaluation criteria, which must be no less than four years.
- (d) Post-Tenure Review. Post-tenure review shall address:
- (I) progress toward promotion, if applicable;
 - (II) any deficiencies requiring improvement and a remediation plan, and;
 - (III) the outcome of the evaluation, as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
 - (IV) The review period for a post-tenure review (that is not for the purpose of promotion) shall be the years since the most recent comprehensive review.

2-3-801(4) Comprehensive Review Procedures

A guiding principle of faculty evaluation at the University of Northern Colorado is that peers in one's academic discipline are the most appropriate evaluators of a faculty member's performance in any performance area, but a faculty member in a closely aligned discipline may fulfill the role of an evaluator when necessary [2-3-801(2)(b)(II)(D)(iv)].

Faculty members shall be evaluated using only the criteria established by the faculty members in their program area. Unless otherwise specified in a faculty member's memorandum of understanding or contract, faculty members who hold a joint appointment in more than one program area shall be evaluated using the criteria of only one program area, determined by the program area wherein they were assigned the largest cumulative fraction of FTE in their

performance areas across the period under review. In the case of equal cumulative workload in multiple program areas, the evaluating program area shall be the one designated for evaluation purposes in their most recent contract or at the start of the review period.

(a) Preliminaries.

The Program Area faculty develops criteria within the framework of the University's mission that reflect the nature of instruction, professional activity, and service as valued within the discipline for each evaluation level. Each unit should develop criteria for the following purposes: pre-tenure review, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion. The criteria developed for each may differ from each other. However, because a positive tenure decision for a faculty member holding the rank of tenure track Assistant Professor must be accompanied by a positive decision on promotion to Associate Professor, the criteria for these two purposes must be the same. The criteria must be approved by the program area faculty, the unit leader, dean of the relevant college, and the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). No criteria shall be adopted unless acceptable to the program area faculty, the unit leader, the dean, and the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). As part of Program Review, each program area shall review and submit for approval their evaluation criteria according to the process described above.

(b) Process.

At each step of the review, the evaluatee shall be informed in writing which shall be transmitted via official university communication systems, of the recommendation made. The evaluatee shall be given the opportunity to respond to that review, with the option of providing additions and/or clarifications to their dossier. This additional information allows for the reconsideration of the decision made and provides additional information to the next step in the process. At each level of review, and prior to the next, the evaluatee and prior reviewers have one opportunity to respond.

- (I) The evaluatee prepares a dossier covering accomplishments over the evaluation period. Failure to submit a dossier for review shall result in an overall evaluation rating of unsatisfactory.

- (II) The unit/program-level evaluation committee [see 2-3-801(1)(d)] shall review the dossier and other relevant material or information.
- (III) Contract-renewable faculty may participate in the discussion and share relevant information, but may only participate in the assignment of scores regarding contract-renewable faculty members.
- (IV) If the program area(s) has fewer than 3 tenure/tenure-track faculty members, aside from the evaluatee and unit leader, then the unit/program-level evaluation committee must include additional members. To accomplish this, the program area, in collaboration with the evaluatee, shall identify faculty members from the University of Northern Colorado who have related expertise and who are willing to serve on the committee. These faculty members may be drawn from a pool of faculty members identified by the college to serve in this role.
- (V) The unit/program-level evaluation committee assigns a score, based on the approved program area criteria, in each of the performance areas relevant to the workload of the evaluatee. Each committee score may be calculated as mean, median, or mode scores submitted by each committee member. In either case, the process must result in a single score for each of the performance areas. Each program area shall decide the mechanisms whereby the rationale is determined and the scores are tabulated. In addition, the committee must provide a written explanation of its scores in terms of the approved program area criteria. The unit/program-level evaluation committee may include additional information about the evaluatee's performance if it has bearing on the evaluatee's instruction, professional activity, or service. This information must be shared with the unit leader, and the evaluatee, and included in the evaluation process.
- (VI) The unit/program-level evaluation committee shall forward its evaluation in writing (scores and reasons) to the unit leader and the evaluatee.

(A) Tenure Applications

If the unit/program-level evaluation committee's evaluation results in a positive recommendation for

tenure [see 2-3-902(5)] its evaluation (scores and reasons) shall be forwarded to the and be shared with the evaluatee.

If the unit/program-level evaluation committee's evaluation does not result in a positive recommendation for tenure, tenure shall be denied, and the comprehensive review process stops, unless the evaluatee appeals to the Tenure Appeals Committee [see 2-3-902(7)]. The sole basis for such appeal is that the unit/program-level evaluation committee's evaluation was not consistent with the program area's approved criteria and procedures which resulted in a negative recommendation for tenure. Once the tenure appeal process is complete, the Tenure Appeals Committee shall forward its findings, in writing, and the documentation it has received, to the unit leader and the evaluatee. If the Tenure Appeals Committee finds that the unit/program-level evaluation committee's evaluation was not consistent with the program area's approved criteria and procedures, the evaluation process shall proceed to step VII below. If the Tenure Appeals Committee finds that the unit/program-level evaluation committee's evaluation was consistent with the program area's approved criteria and procedures, tenure shall be denied and the review procedure stops. In the case that tenure is denied, the unit leader, dean and provost shall be notified.

(B) Pre-Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review, and other comprehensive reviews.

The unit/program-level evaluation committee's evaluation (scores and reasons addressing criteria) shall be forwarded to the unit leader in writing, and shall be shared with the evaluatee.

- (VII) The unit leader shall assign a score, based on the approved program area criteria, in each of the performance areas relevant to the workload of the evaluatee. The unit leader's evaluation (scores plus reasons addressing criteria) shall be shared in writing with the unit/program-level evaluation committee and and with the evaluatee. The unit/program-level evaluation committee and the

evaluatee shall have the opportunity to respond to the unit leader. Both the unit/program evaluation committee's evaluation (scores plus reasons) and the unit leader's evaluation (scores plus reasons) shall be forwarded, in writing, to the college dean.

The unit leader may include additional information about the evaluatee's performance if it has bearing on the evaluatee's instruction, professional activity or service. This information must be shared with the unit/program-level evaluation committee and the evaluatee and included in the evaluation process. Additional confidential information may only be shared with the approval of the university's general counsel or the director of human resources.

- (VIII) The dean reviews the evaluations of the unit/program-level evaluation committee and the unit leader to verify that the scores assigned, and the reasons given, are consistent with the approved program area criteria and procedures. The dean may include additional information about the evaluatee if it has bearing on the evaluatee's instruction, professional activity or service. This information must be shared with the unit/program-level evaluation committee, the unit leader, and the evaluatee, and included in the evaluation process. Additional confidential information may only be shared with the approval of the university's general counsel or the director of human resources.

If the dean finds that the evaluation is not consistent with approved program area criteria or process, they communicate that finding, in writing, with reasons, to the unit/program-level evaluation committee, the unit leader and the evaluatee. In case of such disagreement, the dean shall indicate what evaluation levels they believe were warranted by the program area's criteria. The unit/program-level evaluation committee, unit leader, and evaluatee shall have the opportunity to respond to the dean. If the Dean finds the evaluation is consistent with the approved program area criteria or process, they shall communicate those findings to the unit/program area evaluation committee, the unit leader, and the evaluatee.

For comprehensive reviews involving tenure, promotion, and/or unsatisfactory comprehensive evaluation, the dean forwards their findings, along with those of the unit/program-level evaluation committee and unit leader, together with all responses, to the

CAO. In addition, the dean shall include the Tenure Appeals Committee findings if the Tenure Appeals Committee has decided that the unit/program-level evaluation committee's evaluation was not in accord with the program area's evaluation criteria or process. In all other cases, the evaluation process ends with the dean unless the dean decides to send the dossier for further review by the CAO or the CAO requests participation.

- (IX) The CAO or designee, reviews evaluations of the unit/program-level evaluation committee, the unit leader, along with the dean's findings on the consistency of the evaluations with the approved program area criteria and process, and the findings of the Tenure Appeals Committee, if applicable. The CAO may include additional information about the evaluatee if it has bearing on the evaluatee's instruction, professional activity or service. This information must be shared with the unit/program-level evaluation committee, the unit leader, dean, and the evaluatee, and included in the evaluation process. Additional confidential information may only be shared with the approval of the university's general counsel or the director of human resources.

The CAO determines whether or not the evaluations are consistent with the approved criteria and procedures. If the CAO finds that the evaluations are consistent with the approved criteria and procedures, or that the resulting scores would not affect the outcome of the comprehensive evaluation, no further scores need be assigned. If the CAO determines that the evaluations are not consistent with the approved criteria and procedures and disagrees with the scores assigned by the unit/program-level evaluation committee and/or unit leader, they must determine what evaluation levels were warranted by the program area's criteria.

For comprehensive reviews involving tenure and promotion, the CAO, consistent with the program area's criteria, decides whether the evaluation should result in a positive recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees. In all other comprehensive review cases that are forwarded to the CAO (see (viii) above), the CAO, consistent with the program area's criteria, decides the final outcome of the review. In all cases the CAO communicates their findings to the dean, the unit leader, unit/program-area evaluation

committee, and the evaluatee.

(c) Responsibilities of Participants in the Comprehensive Evaluation Process.

- (I) Evaluatee. Each evaluatee shall prepare a dossier [see 2-3-801(1)(e)] covering performance and accomplishments over the comprehensive evaluation period. If years of credit for instruction, professional activity, and/or service at a prior institution have been agreed upon at the time of hire, the activities that occurred during those years will be included in the appropriate comprehensive review dossier(s). It is the responsibility of the evaluatee to gather and submit evidence to be used as the basis of evaluation. Since the evaluatee is essentially “making a case”, it is also the right of the evaluatee to include whatever evidence they believe to be relevant to the evaluation of their performance.
- (II) Unit/Program-level evaluation committee. The substantive evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of instruction, professional activity and service, consistent with the program area criteria, and evaluation procedures, is the responsibility of the unit/program-level evaluation committee.
- (III) Unit Leader. The substantive evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of instruction, professional activity and service, consistent with the program area criteria, and evaluation procedures, is the responsibility of the unit leader in the program area, unless tenure was denied by the unit/program-level evaluation committee, and, if applicable, the Tenure Appeals Committee found that the unit/program-level evaluation committee’s evaluation was consistent with the program area’s approved criteria the evaluation.
- (IV) Dean. The responsibility of the dean is to ensure that the scores assigned and the reasons given by the unit/program-level evaluation committee and the unit leader are consistent with approved program area criteria and procedures, and if necessary to resolve score discrepancies between the unit leader and unit-program-level evaluation committee.
- (V) CAO. The responsibility of the CAO is to assure that the evaluation levels assigned and the reasons given by the unit/program-level

evaluation committee and the unit leader and dean (when applicable) are consistent with approved program area criteria and procedures. In particular, where there is a disagreement between the unit/program-level evaluation committee, unit leader, and/or the dean, it is the responsibility of the CAO to resolve the disagreement.

2-3-801(5) Subperiod (Annual/Biennial/Triennial) Review.

Subperiod review provides a mechanism for faculty members holding academic rank to receive feedback outside of a comprehensive review [see 1-1301(1) Purposes and Intent of Evaluation]. Required subperiod reviews occur at either annual, biennial, or triennial intervals appropriate to the (i) academic rank of a tenure-track/tenured faculty member, or (ii) the number of years of employment for a contract-renewable faculty member [see 3-3-801(2)]. A faculty member may request subperiod review in any year, except in the same academic year as a comprehensive review.

(a) Preliminaries.

- (I) The program area develops criteria for subperiod review within the framework of the university's mission that reflect the nature of instruction, professional activity, and service as valued within the discipline for each evaluation level. All subperiod review criteria must be approved by the unit leader, dean and CAO [see 2-3-801(2)(b)(I)]. Criteria for comprehensive review may be different from criteria for comprehensive review.
- (II) Each program area shall develop its own procedures for subperiod evaluation subject to the approval of the unit leader (e.g., meeting schedule, selection of unit/program-level evaluation committee, etc.) Each program area's procedures must include a mechanism to resolve any differences between unit/program-level evaluation and that of the unit leader.

If the unit/program-level evaluation committee and unit leader cannot reach agreement on evaluation procedures, the same procedures used in comprehensive evaluation shall apply.

(b) Process

- (I) The evaluate shall prepare a dossier covering the accomplishments for the period under review. Failure to submit a dossier for review shall result in an overall evaluation rating of unsatisfactory. The evaluatee shall have the opportunity to respond to the reviews at all levels.
- (II) The unit/program-level evaluation committee shall conduct their evaluation in accordance with their approved subperiod evaluation criteria and procedures and forward evaluation (scores and reasons), in writing, to the unit leader. If the evaluation is in a promotable rank, the unit/program-level evaluation committee shall also comment on the evaluatee's progress toward promotion and/or tenure.
- (III) The unit leader shall conduct their own independent evaluation, based upon the approved program area criteria, of the faculty member's performance. If the evaluatee is in a promotable rank, the unit leader shall also comment on the evaluatee's progress toward promotion and/or tenure.
- (IV) All evaluations for a faculty member shall be forwarded to the dean. The dean will not assign scores except in the case of a disagreement between the unit/program-level evaluation committee and unit leader or if an evaluatee appeals their evaluation scores from the unit/program-level evaluation committee or unit leader. If the evaluatee is in a promotable rank, the dean may comment on the evaluatee's progress toward promotion and/or tenure.
- (V) If, on appeal from the evaluatee, the dean conducts an independent evaluation, and if the dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the unit/program-level and/or unit leader, then the dean shall forward the review to the CAO, who shall decide the final outcome of the review.

2-3-801(6) Confidentiality and Professional Ethics.

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

the law.

Policy History

2-3-801 PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE.

Section 2-3-801(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) Faculty Evaluation amended (April 2026)

Subsection 2-3-801(1)(3)(4)(b)(c) Faculty Evaluation amended (Jun 2021)

Section 2-3-801(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) Faculty Evaluation amended (Jul 2016)

Subsection 2-3-801(1)(h) Definitions amended (Nov 2011)

Subsection 2-3-801(3)(b) General Processes amended (Nov 2011)

Subsection 2-3-801(3)(b)(iv) General Processes amended (Nov 2011)

Subsection 2-3-801(4) Evaluation Areas amended (Nov 2011)

Section 2-3-901 Promotion Guidelines unnumbered paragraph five and six amended (Nov 2011)

Subsection 2-3-901(1)(b)(c) Academic and Professional Qualifications amended (Nov 2011)

Subsection 2-3-901(2) Performance Guidelines unnumbered paragraph one amended (Nov 2011)

Subsection 2-3-901(3) Time Guidelines deleted and replaced (Nov 2011)

Subsection 2-3-901(4) Promotion Criteria deleted and replaced (Nov 2011)

Subsection 2-3-801(1) Definitions: (c)(d), (e), (f), (g) (h), and (i) amended (Dec 2010)

Subsection 2-3-801(2)(b)(III) Tenure Track Review amended (Dec 2010)

Subsection 2-3-801(3) General Processes (a) amended (Dec 2010)

Subsection 2-3-801(3) (a) Comprehensive Review (II), (III), and (IV) amended (Dec 2010)

Subsection 2-3-801(3) (b) Annual Review (I), (II), (III), (IV), and (V) amended (Dec 2010)

Subsection 2-3-801(4) Evaluation Areas amended (Dec 2010)