College of Humanities & Social Sciences

Policies & Procedures Manual

Adopted Spring 2006

Comprehensive Revision – Spring 2016

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Policies and Procedures Manual

Table of Contents

Forms Appendices

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Policies and Procedures Manual

Table of Revisions

<u>Section I HSS Standing Committees– Revisions</u>
- Awards Committee structure revised February 8, 2013
- Minor changes to PRAC, Award Committee Language, and Diversity Advisory Board - March 4, 2016
- Removal of Community Advisory Board and Development Committee – March 4, 2016
- Major change to Diversity Advisory Board language – October 6, 2017

<u>Section II HSS Faculty Qualifications and Search Procedures – Revisions</u>
- Changed title of section – October 6, 2017
- Major change to section – October 6, 2017

<u>Section III Sabbatical Leaves - Revisions</u>
- Board Policy references updated September 26, 2013
- Change to first paragraph – November 20, 2015

<u>Section IV HSS Policy for Interim and Summer Sessions – Revisions</u>
- Edits throughout section and table revised May 8, 2012
- University Regulations references updated September 26, 2013
- Major change to section – February 19, 2016

<u>Section V Faculty Professional Development Funding – Revisions</u>
- Section added February 24, 2012
- Funding Pool B modified March 23, 2012
- Major changes throughout section October 12, 2012
- Removed last outdated paragraph – November 20, 2015
- Rewrite – March 10, 2017
- Minor changes – February 16, 2018

<u>Section VI Academic Program Review and Assessment – Revisions</u>
- Section renumbered February 24, 2012
- Minor changes to Annual Progress Report section April 23, 2012

<u>Section VII Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines - Revisions</u>
- Section renumbered February 24, 2012
- Rubric heading correction March 13, 2012
- Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor March 13, 2012
- Rescind page 43, "Preface to College Faculty Evaluation Guidelines" April 26, 2013
- Part C, Section 2, College criteria for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecture added, September 27, 2013
- Part C, Section 2 (6) minor change to language

- Part C, replace reproduction of Board Policy & University Regulations highest level reference and links to documents, October 25, 2013
- Part C, minor change, November 8, 2013
- Part A, revisions and reformatting to Annual Evaluation form, January 24, 2014
- Part C, revisions and reformatting to Comprehensive Review form, January 24, 2014
- Part A, revisions and reformatting to Annual Evaluation form, September 12, 2014
- Part C, revisions and reformatting to Comprehensive Review form, January 23, 2015
- Part A, revisions to Annual Evaluation form, January 23, 2015
- Part A, change instances of 'Annual' to Annual/Biennial' throughout section – November 20, 2015
- Replace language under 'Evidence of Performance in Professional Activity; External Peer Review' with reference to University Regulations 3-3-802(2) – January 15, 2016
- Eliminate current language and replace with reference to Board Policy Part 8 2-3-801(2) and add Pre-Tenure option to the top of Comprehensive Review form – March 4, 2016
- Major revision to section, October 26, 2018

Section VIII Chairs Selection and Evaluation Processes Revisions

- Section renumbered February 24, 2012
- Duties and Evaluations of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators add – January 23, 2015
- Change language under Directors Evaluation to reference Board Policy – November 20, 2015
- Major change to section title and section – February 16, 2018

Section IX Office Space Usage and Assignment - Revisions

- Section added February 22, 2013
-

Section X Research Incentive Funding - Revisions

- Section added February 14, 2014

UNIVERSITY *of*
NORTHERN COLORADO

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

TO: David Caldwell
Dean, HSS

FROM: Allen Huang

DATE: May 30, 2006

SUBJECT: HSS Policies and Procedures Manual

I have reviewed the College of Humanities & Social Sciences Policies and Procedures Manual that was submitted to my office and I approve the same. The document is consistent with the Board of Trustees Policies & Procedures.

SECTION I
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES STANDING COMMITTEES

In addition to any necessary ad hoc committees, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences will maintain the following standing committees. All these committees are advisory to the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, with the exception of the Curriculum Committee, which has responsibilities described in Board policy provision, 1-1-304. Faculty committees will elect their own chairs and develop their own bylaws consistent with college and university policy.

Program Review and Assessment Committee
The purpose of this committee is to review 5-year comprehensive program reviews. See the description of the program review and assessment process in this document for more details.

Awards Committee
Members of this committee review applications for college awards including the following: Teaching Excellence; College Scholar; Excellence in Advising and Service and Excellence in Academic Leadership and other awards and select winners in each category to meet the appropriate due dates. The committee will also review applications for the Faculty Reassigned Time Awards for Research, Scholarship and Creative Works and determine those who will receive the awards. In addition, members review undergraduate student papers each spring for the outstanding student research paper awards.

The Committee will develop and/ or review written criteria for each of the awards. These criteria will be made available to all members of the college.

The committee shall consist of five members, drawn from the voting faculty of the college and elected at large by the college voting faculty with no more than one representative from any program area. Each member shall serve a three year term. In the initial election, however, two of the terms will be for only two years. Thereafter, all terms will be for three years.

College Leadership Council
This committee consists of all school directors, department chairs, program coordinators, and the dean with other dean's office personnel chosen by the dean as ex-officio members.

Curriculum Committee
The purpose of this committee is to review all curriculum proposals in the college and provide professional advice or comments to the originating units related to quality, consistency, and clarity of the proposals; their anticipated contribution to the curriculum of the college and the college mission; and the integration of the proposed curriculum into existing curriculum.

Budget and Planning Committee
Functions of the budget and planning committee include input to the dean on planning and budget issues.

Policy and Procedures Committee
The purpose of the policy and procedures committee is to review policies and procedures in the college and suggest changes where needed.

The Program Review and Assessment Committee, Curriculum Committee, Budget and Planning Committee and Policy and Procedures Committee will all consist of members who are elected. Committee membership is elected on an at large basis in the college. No more than thirty percent (30%) of the membership of any one of the committees listed in this paragraph may share the same department/school affiliation. Terms will be for 3 years and will be staggered so that there is some continuity in membership. Committee elections will be conducted each spring by the Humanities and Social Sciences senator who is a member of the Faculty Senate elections committee. Future structural changes will be addressed as changes occur.

Diversity Advisory Board
Purpose: The Diversity Advisory Board (DAB) fosters a welcoming climate for the HSS campus community consistent with the UNC Statement on Diversity. Specifically, the Board will serve as a resource, be available to answer questions related to diversity and work with members of the college on projects, plans, or activities that support diversity as an integral part of the academic mission of the college and the university. The Board also solicits nominations from students and selects an awardee for the annual Diversity in the Classroom faculty award. The DAB serves in an advisory capacity and is not a policy-making body.

Membership and Appointment: The Dean and/or the Board will invite participation by undergraduate or graduate student(s) whose majors are within HSS; HSS faculty member(s); HSS classified or exempt staff; and affiliated constituent(s) from other areas outside the college. In addition, constituent groups may be asked to determine representative membership.

Meetings: The Board shall meet at least once each semester to discuss and review current diversity-related activities, developments, or initiatives.

Undergraduate Success Committee
Constituency: Membership will consist of elected faculty representatives. The committee will also include one undergraduate or graduate student with a major in an HSS discipline. The student member may be recommended to the committee chair by the HSS College Student Council or may be an individual invited by the Dean in consultation with the committee chair. The committee will select its chair from among the committee's members. [The Associate Dean will continue to act as HSS liaison to the UNC Recruitment and Retention group.]

Description: The committee will study and evaluate conditions or circumstances that affect undergraduate success, including student support services, academic and co-curricular programming, and other areas of interface between the college and students. The committee may recommend specific changes to existing practices or develop and propose new ideas that would have a positive impact on the quality of the undergraduate experience.

SECTION II
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS AND SEARCH PROCEDURES

Part A – Qualifications

Qualified faculty members are identified primarily by credentials, but other factors, including but not limited to equivalent experience, may be considered in determining whether a faculty member is qualified. Instructors (excluding for this requirement teaching assistants enrolled in a graduate program and supervised by faculty) possess an academic degree relevant to what they are teaching and at least one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees or when equivalent experience is established. In terminal degree programs, faculty members possess the same level of degree. When faculty members are employed based on equivalent experience, a minimum threshold of experience and an evaluation process is used in the appointment process. Faculty teaching general education courses, or other non-occupational courses, hold a master's degree or higher in the discipline or subfield. If a faculty member holds a master's degree or higher in a discipline or subfield other than that in which he or she is teaching, that faculty member should have completed a minimum of 18 graduate credit hours in the discipline or subfield in which they teach.

Instructors teaching in graduate programs should hold the terminal degree determined by the discipline and have a record of research, scholarship or achievement appropriate for the graduate program.

Quality Assurance Expectations in Determining Minimally Qualified Faculty

Credentials should be the primary mechanism to ascertain minimal faculty qualifications. Experience also may be considered in determining faculty qualifications. (In some situations, a combination of these may be appropriate.)

Using Credentials as a Basis for Determining Minimally Qualified Faculty

Faculty credentials refer to the degrees that faculty have earned that establish their credibility as content experts and thus their competence to teach that content in the classroom. Common expectations for faculty credentials in higher education include the following:

Teaching faculty teaching should have completed a program of study in the discipline or subfield* (as applicable) in which they teach, and/or for which they develop curricula, with coursework at least one level above that of the courses being taught or developed. Completion of a degree in a specific field enhances an instructor's depth of subject matter knowledge and is easily identifiable.

UNC faculty teaching in undergraduate programs should hold a degree at least one level above that of the program in which they are teaching. If a faculty member holds a master's degree or higher in a discipline other than that in which he or she is teaching, that faculty member should have completed a minimum of 18 graduate credit hours in the discipline in which he or she is teaching.

If an individual faculty member has not achieved 18 graduate credit hours in the discipline in which he or she teaches, the unit should be able to explain and justify its decision to assign the individual to the courses taught. These decisions should be supported by policy and procedure that are acceptable to the professional judgment of HLC peer reviewers. See the following subsection for more information about how experience may be considered in determining faculty qualifications.

Faculty teaching in graduate programs should hold the terminal degree determined by the discipline and have a record of research, scholarship or achievement appropriate for the graduate program.

Faculty guiding doctoral education should have a record of scholarship and preparation to teach at the doctoral level. Research and scholarship should be appropriate to the program and degree offered.

* *An academic* subfield *refers to a component of the discipline in which the instruction is delivered. The focus, in the context of HLC accreditation, is on the courses being taught and the general appropriateness of faculty qualifications with reference to such courses. The key consideration is whether a degree in the field or a focus in the specialization held by a faculty member appropriately matches the courses the faculty member would teach in accordance with the conventions of the academic field.*

Using Tested Experience as a Basis for Determining Minimally Qualified Faculty

Tested experience may substitute for an earned credential or portions thereof. For a unit to determine that a faculty member is qualified based on experience the unit determines what is equivalent to the degree it would otherwise require for a faculty position. This experience should be tested experience in that it includes a breadth and depth of experience outside of the classroom in real-world situations relevant to the discipline in which the faculty member would be teaching. (Note: Tested experience, as is explained in the following section on dual credit, is typically not based exclusively on years of teaching experience, although other experiential factors as noted below may be considered on a case-by-case basis.)

The value of using tested experience to determine minimal faculty qualifications depends upon the relevance of the individual faculty member's experience both to the degree level and to the specific content of the courses the faculty member is teaching. A unit that intends to use tested experience as a basis for hiring faculty must have well-defined policies, procedures and documentation that demonstrate when such experience is sufficient to determine that the faculty member has the expertise necessary to teach students in that discipline. In their policies on tested experience as a basis for hiring faculty members, units are encouraged to develop faculty hiring qualifications that outline a minimum threshold of experience and a system of evaluation. Tested experience qualifications should be established for specific disciplines and programs and could include skill sets, types of certifications or additional credentials, and experiences. Documented qualifications would ensure consistency and transparency in hiring and human resources policies. The faculty hiring qualifications related to tested experience should be reviewed and approved by the unit faculty, chair, and the dean.

Determining Minimally Qualified Faculty in the Context of Dual Credit

If a unit approves of awarding college credit by means of dual credit arrangements with high schools it must assure the quality and integrity of such offerings and their comparability to the same college credit offered on the institution's main campus or at the institution's other locations. As such, the faculty members teaching dual credit courses should hold the same minimal qualifications as required by the institution of its own faculty. This requirement is not intended to discount or in any way diminish the experience that the high school teacher brings into a dual credit classroom. Such classroom experience alone, however lengthy or respected, is not a substitute for the content knowledge needed for college credit.

Many high school teachers possess tested experience beyond their years in the classroom that may account for content knowledge for the dual credit courses they may teach. These teachers may have gained relevant experience while working in other sectors or through professional development or other relevant experience that now informs their teaching. They may be active in professional organizations and learned societies through presentations and publications on topics relevant to the dual credit courses they may teach. In combination with other credentials and/or tested experience, they may be able to provide direct evidence of their students' achievement on college-level tests that reflects a level of teaching and learning akin to a college classroom. However, evidence of students' achievement, on its own, is not sufficient to demonstrate minimal qualifications.

Faculty members who have obtained a Master of Education degree but not a master's degree in a discipline such as English, Communications, History, Mathematics, etc., may have academic preparation to satisfy HLC's expectations. In this context, the curricula of graduate degrees in the field of Education, when inclusive of graduate-level content in the discipline and methods courses that are specifically for the teaching of that discipline, satisfy HLC's dual credit faculty expectations. In other words, the attainment of a Master of Education degree does not demonstrate a qualification to teach dual credit courses in a particular discipline unless it is demonstrated that the content of that faculty member's Master of Education degree is sufficiently related to the discipline of the dual credit course.

* Dual credit *refers to courses taught to high school students at the high school for which the students receive both high school credit and college credit. These courses or programs are offered under a variety of names; HLC's Criteria on dual credit apply to all of them, as they involve the accredited institution's responsibility for the quality of its offerings.*

Sample Department/School Tested Experience Minimum Threshold for Tested Experience Policy

Minimum Threshold Criteria

The Department/School/Program Area of _________ has established a minimum threshold for tested experience when determining faculty qualifications by means other than earned credential. To be considered qualified through tested experience, a faculty member must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Substantial graduate-level academic coursework and/or methodological training related to [insert name of discipline];
- A record of research, creative activity, scholarship , or achievement appropriate to the field of instruction;
- Related research experience in industry and/or the private sector;
- Practical experience in the art, business, legal, or political sector;
- Relevant clinical experience;
- Relevant certifications, licensure, or additional credentials;

Prior to any appointment, the department will determine the appropriate level of experience required to meet the minimum threshold based on the nature of the appointment (e.g., different standards would apply for an adjunct teaching first-year students compared to a tenure track hire).

Special Considerations for World Languages

Being a native speaker is not considered sufficient by the HLC for meeting the requirements for tested experience. World languages departments choosing to qualify faculty via tested experience should establish additional criteria that demonstrate their qualification to teach languages at the undergraduate and/or graduate level as appropriate.

Special Considerations for Interdisciplinary Programs

The HLC has not established specific criteria for interdisciplinary programs; however, they do recognize that many interdisciplinary programs are in areas for which graduate degrees are not currently available. These programs should carefully consider what faculty qualifications are required to teach not only in the program but specific courses in the program (e.g., a faculty member with a PhD in English and a focus on women's literature would be qualified to teach gender studies literature courses but may not be qualified to teach a gender studies course focused on sociological issues in gender studies).

Special Considerations for Graduate Level Programs

Units should use caution when making appointments through tested experience for graduate programs.

Processes for Documenting Qualifications

Documenting Qualifications: Use one of the following descriptors to note the HLC qualification criteria on the appropriate form (fill in the blank with discipline/content):

Master's in ______________________

Doctorate in _____________________

Bachelors in ______________________ w/18 Graduate Credit Hours in X

Master's in ______________________ w/18 Graduate Credit Hours in X

Doctorate in ______________________ w/18 Graduate Credit Hours in X

Bachelors in ______________________ w/Tested Experience

Master's in ______________________ w/Tested Experience

Doctorate in ______________________w/Tested Experience

The HSS Dean's office will work with the HSS chairs and program coordinators to ensure that discipline specific qualifications for all faculty (tenured/tenure track, contract renewable, dual credit, and adjunct) are accurately documented.

Part B – Search Procedures

Guidelines for the search and interview process are set by Human Resource Services. They are frequently updated and are available on the Human Resource Services web site.

A faculty member from the program area of the hire, in accordance with the department/school/program area policy, will direct and organize the search process. All information regarding the search will be made available to department chair, school director, dean, and AA/EO coordinator of the search. In accordance with university hiring procedures as determined by Human Resource Services, application materials from candidates will be sent electronically and will be posted in a central electronic repository that is accessible to the search committee, AA/EO coordinator, department chair or school director, associate dean, dean, and to administrative assistants who are charged with supporting the search. Any information not available electronically (for example letters of recommendation, transcripts, etc.) shall be stored in a secure location by the hiring department/school/program/college as appropriate to the stage of the search until the search is completed.

Candidates interviewing on campus will meet with the dean or associate dean during the visit. There is an expectation that candidates will make a presentation while on campus. Examples include but are not limited to a forum for presenting and discussing research and/or a classroom teaching demonstration. The dean and/or associate dean will be invited to the candidate's presentation(s).

SECTION III
SABBATICAL LEAVES

See University Regulations 3-3-1001(1), Sabbatical Leave Application Procedures

Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used by faculty to report sabbatical leave activity. sabbatical leave reports are due within one academic year from completion of the leave. In accordance with Board of Trustees Policy, faculty who do not submit a sabbatical leave report within the required time frame will not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Sabbatical Leave Report

Name: _________________________
Department / School __________________________________
Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: ________ Year: ________
Date by which Sabbatical Leave Report is Due: ______________ (within one academic year from completion of leave).
Date of Sabbatical Leave Report: _______________

Each department / school will determine the method by which faculty will evaluate sabbatical leave reports. The chair / director is responsible for recording and reporting the results and, where appropriate, for providing the faculty member with a written notification of non-acceptance by the faculty. The protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports will be submitted to the dean for approval. At minimum, the sabbatical report will be evaluated considering the following criteria:

(1) Whether the report is complete and explicitly addresses each of the required elements (see below)
(2) Whether the sabbatical leave met its objectives as outlined in the proposal or, if applicable, as revised.

In order to complete the sabbatical leave report, use this form as a cover sheet for the following:

1. Provide a copy of your approved sabbatical leave proposal.

2. Provide your sabbatical leave report. In your report, please address each of the following:

   a. Summarize the key activities undertaken.

   b. Comment on what was accomplished during the leave, particularly with reference to goals articulated in your proposal.

c. Explain how the sabbatical has contributed to your own professional development, to the academic program(s) in which you teach, and to the university.

Submit this cover sheet and the above materials to the appropriate department / school faculty representative in accordance with the department's / school's approved procedure for evaluation.

Board of Trustees Policy stipulates the following expectations, requirements, and conditions regarding sabbatical leaves and sabbatical leave reports:

2-3-1001(3) Appropriate Use of Sabbatical Leaves. [See also 3-3-1001(1) Sabbatical Proposals].
The activities undertaken during sabbatical leave must be related to the individual's on-campus responsibilities. The proposal must specify the effect on professional growth, development of knowledge in the discipline, influence on the students' educational experience, and the enhancement of the University's reputation. Once the goals and plan are approved, the faculty member is obligated to fulfill them, unless amended [See also 2-3-1001(5), Approval Procedures].

(a) Examples of acceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:
  (I) The pursuit of research or study at an institution of higher education or similar entity where improvement of oneself as a teacher-scholar is the focus.
  (II) The pursuit of research projects or creative endeavors within a faculty member's specialty to advance knowledge, improve the —state of the art,‖ or to produce material for publication.
  (III) The acquisition of practical experience that will directly enhance the individual's capacity to meet University responsibilities.
  (IV) The pursuit of special studies or projects for the purpose of expanding institutional-related services beyond the faculty member's obligations.
(b) Examples of unacceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:
  (I) Study at an institution of higher education, the primary purpose of which is to gain a degree in an area or discipline not related to current University responsibilities.
  (II) Travel that is not directly related to University responsibilities. (A significant distinction is made herein between travel to improve oneself as a teacher-scholar and travel in and of itself.)
  (III) Any sabbatical request within the faculty member's current obligations to the University. (Examples include rewriting of course materials, course development, and the like.)
  (IV) Activities or research not related to current University responsibilities.

2-3-1001(5) Approval Procedures.
Approval of a leave request will be based upon the merits of the proposal communicated by the specific goals and plan for achievement outlined in the proposal.
(a) Sabbatical Proposal Submission. Individual sabbatical leave proposals shall first be submitted to the department chair/school director, who will then call a meeting of the faculty. (See 3-3-1001(1) Sabbatical Leave Application Procedures.) After due consideration, this group will either recommend approval or disapproval of the proposal based on protocols developed by the department/school faculty in consultation with the chair/director and approved by the dean. This decision shall be based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/ or staffing issues.
(b) Proposals recommended by the faculty for approval will be forwarded to the department chair/school director who will make recommendations based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/or staffing issues. Proposals not approved by the faculty for reasons of academic merit are disapproved and go no further in the process except for reporting purposes as specified in section (c) below. Proposals not recommended for approval by the faculty for reasons of resources and/or staffing issues will be forwarded to the department chair/school director who will make recommendations based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/or staffing issues. The recommendations of the faculty and the department chair/school director will be forwarded to the dean who will make his/her recommendations based solely on resource and/or staffing issues, and on whether the proposal clearly addresses how it meets one or more of the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified 2-3-1001(3). The recommendations of the faculty, the department chair/school director and the dean will be forwarded to the CAO who will make the final decision and report such decision to the President and to the BOT. The

applicant will be informed of the recommendations and will be afforded an opportunity to respond at each level of the review process up to the CAO, whose decision is final.

(c) All proposals that are not recommended for approval, with the exception of those withdrawn by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the department chair/school director, dean, and CAO for reporting purposes.

(d) All sabbatical leave proposals approved by the CAO will be presumed to be of equal merit. If for any reason in a given year the University cannot support all of the sabbatical leaves that have been approved, the CAO or his or her designee(s) will prioritize the proposals in the following manner:

(I) Sabbatical leave proposals that are time sensitive will take precedence over proposals that are not time sensitive. A proposal will be deemed time sensitive if it cannot be completed at all if postponed beyond the proposed dates. Information relevant to making this determination must accompany the sabbatical leave proposal (See 3-3-1001(2) for required information.)

(II) Within each group of proposals ordered as in paragraph (I), any proposals that have already been postponed in favor of more time sensitive proposals will take precedence over proposals that have not been so postponed. Notes of any previous postponements must accompany the proposal.

(III) Within each group ordered by the above principles, proposals from faculty members for whom the period of time since last sabbatical leave has been longest take precedence over those for whom the period since the last sabbatical has been shorter. Proposals will contain an indication of the period of time since the last sabbatical leave or, in the case of a first sabbatical leave, since the time of hire.

When a leave is postponed for the above reasons, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.

(e) Delay of Leave by Faculty Member. Faculty members who apply for and are granted a sabbatical leave, and who, for any reason, are unable to take the leave at the time specified, may request postponement of the leave for up to one year. Postponement requires the recommendation of the department chair/school director and dean. If in this time the individual has not begun the leave, the leave is null and void and the individual must submit a new application. When a leave is postponed, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.

(f) Delay of Leave by the Dean. The dean for the affected unit has the right to change the effective dates of the leave. The dean may not postpone the leave for more than one year from the requested beginning date, unless the affected faculty member agrees. When a leave is thus postponed, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.

(g) Proposal Revisions. Revisions of approved leave plans must be approved by the department chair/school director and dean. The applicant will be informed of the recommendations and, if the revised proposal is not approved, will be afforded an opportunity to provide additional information.

2-3-1001(8) Faculty Report Obligation.

In accepting a sabbatical leave, the faculty member agrees to provide to the department/school faculty a written report of the activities, the goals attained, and the benefits derived during the course of the leave. Upon approval of the faculty, the report will be forwarded to the department chair/school director and the dean. The department chair/school director and the dean will review the report to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in 2-3-1001(3). If the department chair/school faculty or dean finds the report unacceptable, the faculty member will be notified in writing and will have the opportunity to respond. Once the report has been accepted, copies will be forwarded to the CAO. Faculty members who do not submit an acceptable report within one academic year of completion of the leave shall not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

2-3-1001(9) Institutional Accountability.

(a) All sabbatical leave records and approved and disapproved plans, will be available for inspection, upon request, by the Joint Budget Committee, the Education Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Withdrawn plans will not be included in the records and will be returned to the faculty members.

(b) Final sabbatical reports are not considered a part of personnel files and become open record for public disclosure pursuant to the Colorado Open Records Statute (C.R.S. 24-72-204).

The complete Board of Trustees Policy, including other provisions related to sabbatical leaves, is available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf . University Regulations related to sabbatical leaves are available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf

Evaluation of Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used for evaluation of a faculty sabbatical leave report:

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Evaluation of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report

This form is to be completed by the faculty evaluation representative, school director or department chair, and dean and copied to the faculty member who has submitted a sabbatical leave report. It is intended to record evaluative responses and recommendations concerning the sabbatical leave report. It is the responsibility of the department chair or school director to ensure that approved protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports is followed and, along with the dean, to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). Additional pages of comments may be attached as needed. Under BOT Policy 2-3-1001(8) faculty and dean have the responsibility for assessing the acceptability or non-acceptability of the sabbatical leave report.

Faculty Member: _________________________ Department / School___________________________
Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: ________ Year: ________
Date of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report: _______________ ____ First Report ____ Second Report

1. Faculty Evaluation: Indicate the faculty's approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report. Include the means by which the determination was reached according to approved protocol for the academic unit. Attach comments as needed. If the approved protocol of the unit includes voting, indicate the faculty vote concerning the sabbatical leave report*:

   ____ Approve: acceptable _____ Disapprove: not acceptable*

   __________________________________ ________________________
   Faculty representative Date

2. Review by Department Chair / School Director:

   This sabbatical leave report ____ does ____ does not* clearly address how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). (See Appendix.)

   __________________________________ ________________________
   Department Chair / School Director Date

3. Determination of Dean: _____ Approve: acceptable _____ Disapprove: not acceptable*

Dean Date

*If the sabbatical leave report is found unacceptable or in non-compliance with BOT Policy by the faculty, chair/director, or dean, a written notification must be provided to the faculty member from the level(s) of evaluation which did not approve the report. Attach and submit to the faculty member notifications of non-acceptance together with this form.

In cases where the original faculty report has been found unacceptable, the faculty member may submit a second report to the faculty representative for consideration and evaluation. In such cases, this form will be used for responses by faculty, chair/director, and dean for second responses and recommendations. The second response by the dean is the final determination of approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report.

c. Explain how the sabbatical has contributed to your own professional development, to the academic program(s) in which you teach, and to the university.

Submit this cover sheet and the above materials to the appropriate department / school faculty representative in accordance with the department's / school's approved procedure for evaluation.

Board of Trustees Policy stipulates the following expectations, requirements, and conditions regarding sabbatical leaves and sabbatical leave reports:

2-3-1001(3) Appropriate Use of Sabbatical Leaves. [See also 3-3-1001(1) Sabbatical Proposals].
The activities undertaken during sabbatical leave must be related to the individual's on-campus responsibilities. The proposal must specify the effect on professional growth, development of knowledge in the discipline, influence on the students' educational experience, and the enhancement of the University's reputation. Once the goals and plan are approved, the faculty member is obligated to fulfill them, unless amended [See also 2-3-1001(5), Approval Procedures].

(a) Examples of acceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:
  (I) The pursuit of research or study at an institution of higher education or similar entity where improvement of oneself as a teacher-scholar is the focus.
  (II) The pursuit of research projects or creative endeavors within a faculty member's specialty to advance knowledge, improve the ―state of the art,‖ or to produce material for publication.
  (III) The acquisition of practical experience that will directly enhance the individual's capacity to meet University responsibilities.
  (IV) The pursuit of special studies or projects for the purpose of expanding institutional-related services beyond the faculty member's obligations.

(b) Examples of unacceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:
  (I) Study at an institution of higher education, the primary purpose of which is to gain a degree in an area or discipline not related to current University responsibilities.
  (II) Travel that is not directly related to University responsibilities. (A significant distinction is made herein between travel to improve oneself as a teacher-scholar and travel in and of itself.)
  (III) Any sabbatical request within the faculty member's current obligations to the University. (Examples include rewriting of course materials, course development, and the like.)
  (IV) Activities or research not related to current University responsibilities.

2-3-1001(5) Approval Procedures.
Approval of a leave request will be based upon the merits of the proposal communicated by the specific goals and plan for achievement outlined in the proposal.

(a) Sabbatical Proposal Submission. Individual sabbatical leave proposals shall first be submitted to the department chair/school director, who will then call a meeting of the faculty. (See 3-3-1001(1) Sabbatical Leave Application Procedures.) After due consideration, this group will either recommend approval or disapproval of the proposal based on protocols developed by the department/school faculty in consultation with the chair/director and approved by the dean. This decision shall be based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/ or staffing issues.

(b) Proposals recommended by the faculty for approval will be forwarded to the department chair/school director who will make recommendations based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/or staffing issues. Proposals not approved by the faculty for reasons of academic merit are disapproved and go no further in the process except for reporting purposes as specified in section (c) below. Proposals not recommended for approval by the faculty for reasons of resources and/or staffing issues will be forwarded to the department chair/school director who will make recommendations based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/or staffing issues. The recommendations of the faculty and the department chair/school director will be forwarded to the dean who will make his/her recommendations based solely on resource and/or staffing issues, and on whether the proposal clearly addresses how it meets one or more of the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified 2-3-1001(3). The recommendations of the faculty, the department chair/school director and the dean will be forwarded to the CAO who will make the final decision and report such decision to the President and to the BOT. The applicant will be informed of the recommendations and will be afforded an opportunity to respond at each level of the review process up to the CAO, whose decision is final.

(c) All proposals that are not recommended for approval, with the exception of those withdrawn by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the department chair/school director, dean, and CAO for reporting purposes.

(d) All sabbatical leave proposals approved by the CAO will be presumed to be of equal merit. If for any reason in a given year the University cannot support all of the sabbatical leaves that have been approved, the CAO or his or her designee(s) will prioritize the proposals in the following manner:

(I) Sabbatical leave proposals that are time sensitive will take precedence over proposals that are not time sensitive. A proposal will be deemed time sensitive if it cannot be completed at all if postponed beyond the proposed dates. Information relevant to making this determination must accompany the sabbatical leave proposal (See 3-3-1001(2) for required information.)

(II) Within each group of proposals ordered as in paragraph (I), any proposals that have already been postponed in favor of more time sensitive proposals will take precedence over proposals that have not been so postponed. Notes of any previous postponements must accompany the proposal.

(III) Within each group ordered by the above principles, proposals from faculty members for whom the period of time since last sabbatical leave has been longest take precedence over those for whom the period since the last sabbatical has been shorter. Proposals will contain an indication of the period of time since the last sabbatical leave or, in the case of a first sabbatical leave, since the time of hire.

When a leave is postponed for the above reasons, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.

(e) Delay of Leave by Faculty Member. Faculty members who apply for and are granted a sabbatical leave, and who, for any reason, are unable to take the leave at the time specified, may request postponement of the leave for up to one year. Postponement requires the recommendation of the department chair/school director and dean. If in this time the individual has not begun the leave, the leave is null and void and the individual must submit a new application. When a leave is postponed, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.

(f) Delay of Leave by the Dean. The dean for the affected unit has the right to change the effective dates of the leave. The dean may not postpone the leave for more than one year from the requested beginning date, unless the affected faculty member agrees. When a leave is thus postponed, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.

(g) Proposal Revisions. Revisions of approved leave plans must be approved by the department chair/school director and dean. The applicant will be informed of the recommendations and, if the revised proposal is not approved, will be afforded an opportunity to provide additional information.

2-3-1001(8) Faculty Report Obligation.

In accepting a sabbatical leave, the faculty member agrees to provide to the department/school faculty a written report of the activities, the goals attained, and the benefits derived during the course of the leave. Upon approval of the faculty, the report will be forwarded to the department chair/school director and the dean. The department chair/school director and the dean will review the report to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in 2-3-1001(3). If the department chair/school faculty or dean finds the report unacceptable, the faculty member will be notified in writing and will have the opportunity to respond. Once the report has been accepted, copies will be forwarded to the CAO. Faculty members who do not submit an acceptable report within one academic year of completion of the leave shall not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

2-3-1001(9) Institutional Accountability.

(a) All sabbatical leave records and approved and disapproved plans, will be available for inspection, upon request, by the Joint Budget Committee, the Education Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Withdrawn plans will not be included in the records and will be returned to the faculty members.

(b) Final sabbatical reports are not considered a part of personnel files and become open record for public disclosure pursuant to the Colorado Open Records Statute (C.R.S. 24-72-204).

The complete Board of Trustees Policy, including other provisions related to sabbatical leaves, is available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf . University Regulations related to sabbatical leaves are available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf

Evaluation of Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used for evaluation of a faculty sabbatical leave report:

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Evaluation of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report

This form is to be completed by the faculty evaluation representative, school director or department chair, and dean and copied to the faculty member who has submitted a sabbatical leave report. It is intended to record evaluative responses and recommendations concerning the sabbatical leave report. It is the responsibility of the department chair or school director to ensure that approved protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports is followed and, along with the dean, to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). Additional pages of comments may be attached as needed. Under BOT Policy 2-3-1001(8) faculty and dean have the responsibility for assessing the acceptability or non-acceptability of the sabbatical leave report.

Faculty Member: _________________________ Department / School___________________________
Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: ________ Year: ________
Date of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report: _______________ ____ First Report ____ Second Report

1. Faculty Evaluation: Indicate the faculty's approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report. Include the means by which the determination was reached according to approved protocol for the academic unit. Attach comments as needed. If the approved protocol of the unit includes voting, indicate the faculty vote concerning the sabbatical leave report*:

   ____ Approve: acceptable _____ Disapprove: not acceptable*

   __________________________________ ________________________
   Faculty representative Date

2. Review by Department Chair / School Director:

   This sabbatical leave report ____ does ____ does not* clearly address how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). (See Appendix.)

   __________________________________ _________________________
   Department Chair / School Director Date

3. Determination of Dean: _____ Approve: acceptable _____ Disapprove: not acceptable*

Dean Date

*If the sabbatical leave report is found unacceptable or in non-compliance with BOT Policy by the faculty, chair/director, or dean, a written notification must be provided to the faculty member from the level(s) of evaluation which did not approve the report. Attach and submit to the faculty member notifications of non-acceptance together with this form.

In cases where the original faculty report has been found unacceptable, the faculty member may submit a second report to the faculty representative for consideration and evaluation. In such cases, this form will be used for responses by faculty, chair/director, and dean for second responses and recommendations. The second response by the dean is the final determination of approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report.

SECTION IV
HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES POLICY FOR INTERIM AND SUMMER SESSIONS

Summer and interim courses provide opportunities for students to make progress towards graduation. All courses must conform to the University's summer or interim session and block time schedules. Any exceptions must be approved by the dean and any other relevant administrative offices.

Summer and interim session pay is determined by University Regulations. The College uses the drop date to determine the enrollment of the class and thus the faculty member's compensation. Rules guiding compensation, maximum teaching loads, and dates by which the faculty member must commit to teaching are guided by University Regulations 3-3-702, which are included below. Faculty should check to make sure that they are following the most recent University Regulations. Faculty should consult the Regulations and the chart with the prorated compensation levels.

Faculty pay is prorated in the event that full enrollment is not met by the drop deadline. A minimum compensation rate of $1,500 per credit hour has been set; otherwise compensation depends on the academic year salary. Refer to University Regulations for details.

Faculty may decide to cancel their course(s) but they must notify their chairs/director, coordinators at least 20 days before their session begins. Most often, that means before May 1 for the first summer session, June 1 for the second summer session, or December 1 (interim session). Because schedules change, faculty should check on the dates. There is a limit with regard to how many credits a faculty member may teach – see University Regulations.

University Regulations 3-3-702 Summer and Interim Session Compensation and Workload Policy

3-3-702(1) Workload.
(a) The maximum credit hours of instruction for summer including all modes of delivery for both on campus and off campus courses will be at 12 credit hours with 6 credit hours and 9 credit hours maximum each for short and long summer sessions respectively.

(b) The maximum credit hours of instruction for Interim session will be at 6 credit hours.

3-3-702(2) Compensation
(a) The compensation for both Extended Studies and all summer and interim courses regardless of location, method of course delivery, or funding source, for all faculty holding the rank of lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor will be at 1/36th of the faculty member's academic year salary if the faculty member is on a full-time contract. In the case of non-full-time faculty, holding one of the above ranks, the compensation will be 1/36th of what the salary would be if the faculty member were full-time.
(b) To allow flexibility for faculty and programs, the following compensation table will be utilized.

Undergraduate Class Size	Undergraduate Prorated Rate	Graduate Class Size	Graduate Prorated Rate
15+	100%	10+	100%
14	94%	9	90%
13	87%	8	80%
12	80%	7	80%
11	80%	6	80%
10	80%	5	80%
9	80%	4	40%

8	80%	3	30%
7	80%	2	20%
6	40%	1	10%
5	33%		
4	27%		
3	20%		
2	13%		
1	7%		

(c)The proposed pay scale for the summer and interim sessions does not apply to the overload instruction during regular semesters nor is it applicable to adjunct faculty.
(d) To insure an equitable treatment of those faculty whose 1/36th per credit compensation falls short of $1500.00 per credit, a minimum floor of $1500.00 at the class size of 15+ for undergraduate and 10+ for graduate for summer and interim session courses will be instituted. Authorization to offer multiple sections will reside with the responsible Dean given that maximum number of enrollment that is pedagogically feasible is reached.
(e) There might be some instances in which, with the approval of the Dean, a full payment to a faculty member without reaching the desired full compensation enrollment is warranted. Such exemptions can be made if the average enrollment of the program in the interim and combined summer sessions is reached at 20 and 15 for undergraduate and graduate courses respectively.
(f) In rare cases where undergraduate and graduate students are combined in one course, the compensation and corresponding adjusted pay table will revert to the appropriate prorated rate that corresponds to the majority cohort.
(g) In cases of limitations imposed by laboratory stations, accreditation requirements, clinical instruction, student teaching, and any other externally authorized constraints, the maximum number of enrollment will be limited to the sanctioned enrollment. Accordingly the rate of compensation will be set at $1500.00 per credit or at the adjusted rate according to the 1/36 of the base compensation and proposed pay table, whichever will afford a higher level of compensation to the affected faculty.

3-3-702(3) Calendar

(a) The decision to teach a course at a regular and/or reduced compensation level resides with the faculty member. However, faculty members are expected to notify their chairs/directors prior to May 1st (first 6-week and 12-week sessions), June 1st (second 6-week session) and December 1st (winter interim session), or at least twenty (20) days prior to the beginning of any other session, if they do not wish to teach their assigned courses at a reduced rate.

SECTION V

FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUNDING

The professional development funding distribution model for HSS is described below:

Initial Distribution of Funds

Professional Development funds will be distributed to the HSS Departments/School/Programs according to the total FTE of base funded faculty rostered in them. Each unit shall develop criteria and procedures and define eligibility for distribution of these funds among unit faculty.

The primary purposes of these funds are: (1) to meet or offset faculty travel expenses related to program participation in professional meetings; (2) to meet or offset the cost of professional training for faculty; and (3) to support faculty's scholarly research.[*]

All authorizations will be approved by school/department chair or program coordinator and, in case of travel, by the dean. Faculty receiving this funding remain eligible for other professional development funding sources at the university, e.g. through OSP and FRPB. NOTE: Before applying for funds from the Provost's Award for Travel, applicants must have applied for all travel funding available to them from their college and/or schools/departments/programs.

The amount of funding available per faculty member will depend upon the amount of the overall allocation to the college and may vary from year to year.

Funds unspent by the end of the fiscal year will not rollover into the following year. Thus, by February 1, the chairs and program coordinators will determine the amount of any encumbered funds in their programs and the remainder will be transferred to the College Pool for Professional Development.

The College Pool for Professional Development

The funds not encumbered by the departments/school/programs will provide additional funds for needs not met by the program allocations described above. The funds returned to the

---

[*] Questions about eligibility of expenditures in support of scholarly research should be directed to the HSS Financial Analyst. Support of scholarly research may include membership fees for professional organizations, journal subscriptions, etc. (However, please do not subscribe to journals already available from the University Libraries.) It may also include equipment purchases with the following caveats: 1) Faculty members may only have one university computer at any one time; 2) Information Management & Technology calculates eligibility for the computer refresh program based on the most recently purchased computer listed in the inventory, regardless of funding source; 3) tablets are considered computers if and only if their capabilities are similar to a laptop or desktop (for example, a Microsoft Surface Pro is considered a computer.) For faculty who wish to use their computer in the field, please note that UNC laptops are under a 5 year protection plan, which includes loss and accidental damage. IM&T highly recommends saving all data directly to OneDrive for Business to minimize the risk of losing data.

College from the departments/school/programs will be made available for use by eligible faculty.

The College Pool will be administered by the dean and the dean is responsible for approving requests submitted by chairs/program coordinators on behalf of their faculty. The dean is also responsible for the distribution of these funds.

Funds will be distributed in two rounds as follows:

- Round 1
  - Chair/program coordinator reports unspent/unencumbered funds: February 1st
  - Call for Submissions: February 8th
  - Submission Date: February 22nd
  - Notification Date: March 8th

- Round 2
  - Financial Analyst determines unspent/unencumbered funds: March 10th
  - Call for Submissions: March 22nd
  - Submission Date: April 5th
  - Notification Date: April 19th

Process:

After verifying the amount of unspent/unencumbered funds available for each round**,** the dean's office will issue a **Call for Submissions**. Faculty who have professional development needs not met by the original allocation of professional development funds shall consult with their chairs/program coordinators, who will review the requests and submit those that are approved, along with the appropriate documentation, to the dean by the **Submission Date**. The dean will notify chairs/program coordinators and applicants of the decision no later than the **Notification Date**. Funding for an individual faculty member shall not exceed $1200 in each round.

If there are funds remaining after round 2, the dean's office will consider further requests on a first-come, first-served basis.

SECTION VI
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

Program Review and assessment processes are designed to incorporate continuous improvement into academic programs. As a consequence, program evaluation and the assessment of student learning outcomes should occur on an ongoing basis. Both program review and assessment should result in outcomes that strengthen academic programs and directly benefit students. Program review and assessment support the university's mission to promote effective teaching and learning. In addition, the Higher Learning Commission (UNC's regional accreditor) and the State of Colorado (Department of Higher Education) expect program review and assessment of student learning to be incorporated into the practice of academic units.

This section of the Manual is divided into three parts: Part A addresses assessment of student learning; Part B describes the comprehensive program review process at UNC; and Part C is a glossary that contains commonly used terms in both assessment and program review.

Part A. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment of student learning is one component of the comprehensive program review process. Student learning outcomes (learning objectives; SLOs) describe what students will know and be able to do as a result of the courses, programs of study, and other activities associated with earning a degree. Making learning outcomes explicit addresses two ends: it provides faculty with goals against which to evaluate student progress, and ultimately the efficacy of the course/program; and it provides students with a set of stated expectations to help them to understand the structure of the course/program and their progress toward meeting course/program goals. In making learning objectives transparent and assessing progress toward meeting them, faculty can gather evidence about what is and is not working in current practice, and use that evidence to improve course/program quality.

Core elements of academic program area assessment strategy include:

1. Program level undergraduate and graduate student learning outcomes. At a minimum, an assessment plan must specify what it is that any student graduating with a particular degree should know and be able to do. A well developed assessment strategy will map individual course offerings to the larger program goals (see the entry for 'curriculum map' in Part C).

2. Methods of assessing student performance on each of the student outcomes. The methods must include consideration of direct evidence, and may include indirect evidence. Best practice includes multiple measures. Examples of both direct and indirect evidence for courses and programs are provided at the end of Part C.

3. A process that identifies, on a regular basis, the results of the assessment process and how these results will be used to develop programmatic improvements to address the areas in which outcomes are not being achieved or require additional support.

4. A centralized (at the unit level) electronic repository that contains the unit's assessment materials (including collected evidence, analysis and documentation of use of the results of assessment). The repository may be kept in TracDat (a software program used across the university for keeping track of assessment and program review data), although TracDat is not required[1]. Assessment and program review recordkeeping should be supervised by a faculty member from the program area and should be updated at least annually.

Faculty members on the College of Humanities and Social Sciences Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) are available to serve as resources to answer questions and provide input on program area assessment plans. In addition, support is available from the Provost's Office of Assessment and the HSS Dean's Office.

Part B. Comprehensive Program Review Process

The program review process consists of two main elements, the comprehensive review, typically completed every five years, and the annual progress report, undertaken on a yearly basis.

Guidelines for the comprehensive program review are available at the following URL: http://www.unco.edu/assessment/programReview/index.html. Comprehensive program review documents receive written feedback from the Program Review and Assessment Committee, the dean and the provost.

The Annual Progress Report is completed by each program area in order to summarize progress toward comprehensive program review goals and items identified for action in the dean's response and the provost's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The annual report is reviewed at the college level only.

HSS Format for Program Review Annual Progress Report

In addition to providing the dean with information useful in evaluating programs' annual progress, this format has been designed to provide programs with a tool that will be useful for the comprehensive review process. The categories of reporting outlined in Sections 1 and 2 are taken from the comprehensive review protocols. The report is due to the dean's office on October 1st of each year.

Section 1: Report Narrative

The narrative portion of the report should be no more than 5 pages.

a. Discussion of progress toward goals. The program should discuss progress toward accomplishing its goals, providing a description of specific actions taken during the previous year related to these goals. If goals have changed, the program should describe why.

[1] See p. 3 of the UNC Program Review Policy for conditions to be met in opting out of TracDat.

REV: 4/23/12

b. Discussion of Provost's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)[2] and the Dean's Recommendations. The program should provide an update on the status of actions outlined in the Provost's MOU and the Dean's recommendation letter.
c. Discussion of program review data. The program should discuss any significant changes that occurred over the previous year. The discussion should address known or suspected reasons for these changes and how the program intends to respond to the changes.
d. Discussion of resource needs. The program should briefly discuss any changes in resource needs resulting from its annual assessment and review of student learning outcomes, quality measures, program review data, and/or progress toward goals.

Section 2: Assessment Report

The assessment report consists of two tables and accompanying explanatory narrative, as needed. Assessment data, rubrics, and other related materials (such as that in TracDat or elsewhere) should be included as an attachment rather than as a link. The tables should contain five categories of information: (1) the outcome or quality measure being evaluated; (2) methods and evidence that are being used to evaluate the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) or Quality Measures (QM); (3) what was learned about the SLO or QM by virtue of undertaking the assessment; (4) evaluation of whether the results met, failed to meet, or exceeded expectations; and (5) what actions were or will be taken as a result of what was learned. The two tables below provide examples of the table formats and reportage. While it is not an expectation that each SLO and each QM be assessed each year, the unit should have in place a plan that provides for regular periodic evaluation of each articulated SLO and QM.

OUTCOME (Student Learning)	**METHODS/ EVIDENCE**	**RESULTS (Describe results of assessment related to outcome specified)**	**STATUS (exceeded expectations, met expectations, did not meet expectations)**	**ACTIONS TAKEN (describe specific actions taken based on results of assessment)**
Students are able to formulate a testable research hypothesis	Research project for capstone course includes hypothesis formulation	Only 60% of students were successfully able to formulate a testable hypothesis in the capstone course	Did not meet expectations	COUR 344, a prerequisite to capstone, will be reconfigured to focus more specifically on hypothesis formulation. Target for accomplishment:

[2] This section refers only to those who have completed a comprehensive review since the MOU process was implemented in 2008.

REV: 4/23/12

				spring 2012.
Students are able to develop an idea in writing through the use of concrete examples and specific details	Random sample of writing assignments from COUR 131, 223, and 389; blind reviews by two faculty members	Comparison of writing samples to evaluation rubric found that 84% of students achieved this outcome	Met expectations	None required. Will resample in fall 2011.

OUTCOME (Quality Measure)	**METHODS/ EVIDENCE**	**RESULTS (Describe results of assessment related to outcome specified)**	**STATUS (exceeded expectations, met expectations, did not meet expectations)**	**ACTIONS TAKEN (describe specific actions taken based on results of assessment)**
Each FT faculty member will present/publish one or more juried papers each year.	Professional meeting programs; journal tables of contents	Each FT faculty member had at least one juried paper/publication; several had two or more.	Exceeded expectations	None required. Will re-compile at end of spring 2012.
Graduating senior survey will show 90% or greater satisfaction with program quality	Senior survey contains two items asking about program quality, one closed-ended, the other open-ended	Likert scale item showed 95% of graduating seniors satisfied or very satisfied with program quality. Narrative responses overwhelmingly positive, with exception of 30% who suggested reordering COUR 245-COUR 287 course sequence.	Met expectations	Will explore feasibility/ advisability of reordering 245/287 sequence. Decision to be made by end of fall 2011.

*Note – Programs should save evidence used in the assessment process, annual progress reports and any written responses from the college program review team and dean in an electronic file to serve as resource documents for the comprehensive review. These documents may be stored in TracDat using any standard file format, or may be compiled and stored electronically elsewhere.

Part C: Assessment and Program Review Glossary

Annual Progress Report: A report completed by each program area in order to summarize progress toward comprehensive program review goals and to report on progress toward meeting the recommendations in the dean's letter and the provost's MOU. The annual progress report is reviewed at the college level.

***Assessment Methods:** The discipline-appropriate collection and analysis of aggregate-level data that form the basis for evaluating program performance with respect to its defined student learning outcomes and quality measures. The strongest assessment relies on multiple types of data. Programs must include direct evidence of student learning outcomes and may also include indirect evidence as appropriate.

***Criterion:** The measure, performance indicator, or descriptor defined by the program against which program performance is assessed. Criteria may be aspirational or they may reflect the minimum standard of performance required without triggering a decision to make changes in one or more aspects of the program.

Curriculum Map: A matrix that cross-lists SLOs with courses in a program of study in order to explicitly describe how the courses contribute to ensuring that students achieve SLOs over the course of the program. Typically, the cells of the matrix will indicate whether a particular SLO is introduced, applied and/or mastered in the context of a given course.

Descriptor: A word or phrase used as a label to describe or classify how a particular piece or pieces of evidence demonstrate achievement of a particular SLO or QM.

Direct Evidence: Direct evidence includes student products or performances that demonstrate specific learning has taken place. Evidence differs from data or information in that it entails interpretation and reflection in addition to collection and analysis.

Formative Assessment: Assessment done on an ongoing basis to help determine whether changes should be made at the course, program or unit level. Formative assessment is most typically undertaken at the course level.

Indicator: (1) an indirect measurement of an outcome. For example, the proportion of graduates that are hired by employers in a particular field may be viewed as an indicator of the quality of the training that program graduates receive; **(2)** a composite measure that is composed of several pieces of evidence that point to a particular conclusion with respect to a QM or SLO.

Indirect Evidence: A form of data that relies on self-report, or reporting of others' perceptions, with respect to achieving standards or outcomes. Evidence differs from data or information in that it entails interpretation and reflection in addition to collection and analysis.

Measure/Measurement: (1) numerical information that quantifies outcomes. Measure most often refers to the results of performance on a particular dimension. For example, a measure might be a test score or the percentage of students who agree with an evaluative statement; **(2)** a general gloss used to refer to evidence collected and analyzed to assess SLO or QM

Program Review: A regularly recurring evaluation of an academic program that is intended to support, develop, and maintain high quality academic programs. The process involves collecting, synthesizing, evaluating and reporting information related to practices and outcomes within programs typically on a five year cycle. After the unit has completed its report, it is reviewed by PRAC, the dean and the provost.

Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC): Standing HSS committee that is charged with reviewing and responding to five year comprehensive program reviews. In addition, PRAC reviews annual progress reports and may offer assistance with assessment plans from the various programs in the college.

Quality Measures: Describes the standards programs have identified as necessary to achieve desired levels of quality in relation to program mission and goals. Quality measures may be phrased in reference to structure, productivity and/or activities.

Student Learning Outcomes: Program level SLOs describe what students will know or be able to do by the time they graduate. Another way of looking at program level SLOs is that they describe knowledge, skills and/or dispositions that students will demonstrate by the time they graduate. SLOs defined at the course level should describe what students will know or be able to do by the time they complete the course. Course level and program level SLOs should articulate (see curriculum map).

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Assessment Methods: discipline-appropriate collection and analysis of aggregate-level data that form the basis for evaluating student performance with respect to the defined SLOs.

Summative Assessment: methods that attempt to capture the end results of learning in a course or program of study.

*Indicates wording taken from the assessment council document.

Some examples of Direct and Indirect Measures of Student Learning at the Course and Program Levels

	DIRECT MEASURES	INDIRECT MEASURES
Course Level	Exams and quizzes; pre/post tests; embedded questions on exams	Student course evaluations
	Standardized tests	"Muddiest points" and other in-class techniques
	Research papers and reports, case study analysis with direct and explicit links to learning objectives	Surveys of time of task, numbers of hours spent on homework, co-curricular activities
	Observations and ratings of field work, internship performance, service learning, clinical experiences	Quality of class participation
	Rubric scores for writing, oral presentations, and performances	
	Grades based on explicit performance criteria related to clear learning goals	
Program Level	Capstone projects, senior theses, exhibits, or performances with clear evaluation criteria linked to SLOs; portfolio of student work through the course of the program	Focus groups or exit interviews with graduating students, employers, alumni, faculty
	Pass rates or scores on licensure, certification, or subject area tests	Job placement
	Student publications or conference presentations	Employer, student, alumni surveys
	Employer and internship supervisor ratings of specific aspects of students' performance	Graduate school placement rates

	Analysis of student work products (e.g., essays, oral presentations, exams), particularly when these are undertaken by multiple observers with inter-rater reliability	Transcript studies that examine patterns of course selection and grading

SECTION VII
FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

Introduction

The UNC *Board Policy Manual (BPM)*, Title II, Article III, Part 8 and *University Regulations (UR)*, Article III, Part 8, dictate the faculty evaluation process.

This section of the HSS Policies & Procedures Manual provides guidelines to help clarify the process and provide suggestions on ways to ensure compliance with policy, but *BPM* and *UR* should always be consulted as well. When evaluation is for the purpose of tenure and/or promotion, Part 9 of both *BPM* and *UR* should also be consulted. Everyone involved in the faculty evaluation and/or promotion processes must ensure they are compliant with these policies and regulations.

Purpose of faculty evaluation

While all types of faculty evaluation are intended to ensure high quality instruction, professional activity, and service, the type of each evaluation serves a different purpose.

1. Annual/Biennial evaluations are used to provide regular feedback and to determine the allocation of merit pay, including "maintenance of effort" salary increases, when money has been allocated in the budget for this purpose.
2. Comprehensive evaluations are used for each of the following:
   a) Tenure-track faculty
      i) Pre-tenure (3rd year) review
      ii) Tenure and Promotion
   b) Tenured faculty
      i) Promotion
      ii) Post-tenure review
   c) Contract renewable faculty
      i) Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer
      ii) Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor
      iii) Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
      iv) Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
3. Adjunct faculty evaluations are required by *UR* 3-3-801(2)(f)(I) and are used to ensure adjunct faculty are teaching the appropriate content as well as using effective teaching methods.

Digital Measures

All evaluations are done in Digital Measures. Faculty being evaluated must ensure that all information relevant to the evaluation period is correct and up-to-date before the evaluation begins. Tenure-track faculty who were awarded years of credit toward tenure and promotion should include the professional activity conducted during those years.

A variety of help sheets on Digital Measures are available on the HSS SharePoint site. In addition, the university schedules occasional training sessions. Contact the Dean's office for information on training if needed.

Evaluation Criteria

Tenured, Tenure-track, and Contract-renewable faculty

For both annual/biennial and comprehensive evaluations, the program area faculty develops criteria that reflect the professional standards of the discipline and are compatible with UNC's teacher-scholar model. *BPM* 1-1-307(1) states "The evaluation process should encourage excellence in both traditional and innovative approaches to teaching, research, scholarship and creative works, and service." It is recommended that criteria be as explicit as possible regarding the variety of activities and approaches that are routinely recognized, but also allow for the evaluatee to make a case for activities or approaches that weren't anticipated when the criteria were developed. Criteria should also include guidance for evaluation of faculty who had a differentiated workload during the evaluation period. For example, if a faculty member had a course reassignment for research during the evaluation period, how are the expectations for teaching and/or professional activity modified (if at all)?

Comprehensive criteria must be approved by the program area faculty, unit leader, dean and Chief Academic Officer (CAO, aka Provost). Annual/biennial criteria should be made available to the dean for informational purposes only.

Criteria are needed for each level of the evaluation scale for each of the three areas of instruction, professional activity, and service.

Evaluation Scale (Round to the nearest 10th)

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

The qualitative descriptions ("Excellent," "Exceeds Expectations," etc.) should be understood as reflecting these levels *as defined by the criteria*. For example, the faculty or chair cannot argue that an evaluatee does not meet their expectations in an area if the criteria for a score of III are met in that area. If the expectations of the individuals assigning scores are incompatible with the criteria, then the criteria need revision. However, all evaluations must conform to the criteria in place *at the time of evaluation*.

Annual/biennial criteria generally differ from comprehensive criteria. Optionally, you may use different comprehensive criteria for different purposes, i.e., pre-tenure review, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion. This means that the criteria for achieving "meets expectations" (for example) could be different for someone applying for tenure and promotion to associate professor than for someone applying for promotion to full professor. There is one exception: the criteria for tenure must be the same as those for promotion to associate professor [see *BPM* 2-3-902(3)(a)(v)]. If you are using the same criteria for more than one purpose, the criteria should clearly state that this is the case. Satisfactory annual/biennial reviews do not guarantee or determine a successful comprehensive review.

Criteria should be specific enough to provide faculty with clear expectations regarding performance yet also flexible enough to provide room for professional judgement when needed. For example, in the area of professional activity, many units specify the number of presentations, publications, or other activities that qualify for each evaluation level. However, the quality of these activities should also be taken into account. It is up to each unit to determine how such quality will be evaluated, based on the professional standards of the discipline.

Current Criteria

The criteria currently in use by each program area are available on the [HSS SharePoint site](). Units that wish to develop new criteria or update existing criteria may review those in use by other units for ideas.

Adjunct faculty

Although *BPM* and *UR* do not explicitly require units to develop evaluation criteria for adjunct faculty, you are required to develop procedures for evaluating these instructors [see *UR* 3-3-801(2)(f)(I)]. It is good practice to have clearly defined criteria on which to base the evaluations.

Evaluation Procedures

The timelines for comprehensive and annual/biennial evaluations are specified in *UR* 3-3-801(1) and 3-3-801(2)(f). If the annual/biennial evaluation coincides with a comprehensive evaluation, *both must be done*. For tenured faculty, it is recommended that an annual evaluation be requested if the biennial evaluation schedule does not coincide with the comprehensive evaluation so that no evaluation is required in the subsequent year.

Comprehensive

BPM 2-3-801(3) specifies the procedures for conducting comprehensive evaluations. There are several principles contained in the policy that should be kept in mind:

1. Responsibilities
   a) The program area faculty and the chair or program coordinator have 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. *BPM* 2-3-901 requires that "Relevant promotion criteria will be discussed by the department chair/school [chair]/program coordinator with each faculty member in his or her school/department/program periodically to insure that each member is cognizant of program area performance expectations and his or her fulfillment of them."
   b) *BPM* 2-3-801 specifies that UNC adheres to the position of the American Association of University Professors "On Collegiality As A Criterion for Faculty Evaluation" (November 1999). Collegiality should not be used as a separate category in reaching evaluative decisions. Where legitimate, it should be incorporated into the criteria for instruction, professional activity, and service.
   c) The tenured and tenure track faculty members in the program area, excluding the evaluatee and the chair/director/coordinator, are expected to participate in the evaluation of their colleagues. 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.

d) *BPM* 2-3-801(5) states: "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."

2. Opportunity to respond

   BPM 2-3-801(b) specifies that at each step of the review, the evaluatee will be informed <u>in writing</u> which will be transmitted via <u>campus mail **and** university email [*BPM* requires *both*]</u>, of the decision made. The evaluatee will 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 immediately prior reviewers* have <u>one</u> opportunity to respond.

Annual/Biennial

BPM 2-3-801(4)(b)(I) charges the program area faculty with developing its own procedures for annual/biennial evaluation subject to the approval of the chair/ program coordinator. If the program area faculty and chair/ program coordinator cannot reach agreement on evaluation procedures, the same procedures used in comprehensive evaluation will apply.

There are several principles contained in the policy that should be kept in mind when developing annual/biennial evaluation procedures.

1. Program area faculty

   Unlike comprehensive review, it is not necessary for all program area faculty to participate in annual/biennial evaluation. Although smaller units frequently include all faculty members except the evaluatee and the chair or program coordinator, larger units often choose a subset of the faculty for this task. In this section, the term "program area faculty" refers to the faculty who are involved in the annual/biennial evaluation, whether the entire faculty or a proper subset thereof.

   The program area faculty must assign scores and provide a written rationale for those scores. The rationale *must be tied to the criteria*. <u>Specific examples of activities meeting the criteria for the assigned scores are required</u>. The program area faculty should agree on the rationale – it is intended to represent the voice of the committee *as a whole*, not fragmented comments from individual faculty members.

2. Chair or program coordinator

   The chair or program coordinator conducts a separate evaluation. Again, a written rationale *tied to the criteria* must be provided for each score.

3. Assigning Scores

Program areas may determine for themselves how to aggregate the scores assigned by different faculty members (e.g., mean, median, vote, etc.) but the aggregated score must be translated into a whole number according to the following scale:

Evaluation Scale (Round to the nearest 10th)

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

The procedures must include a mechanism for resolving differences between the program area faculty and the chair/program coordinator. Since only whole numbers are assigned, this mechanism would be invoked if and only if, after translation into a whole number as specified above, the score assigned by the program area faculty and that of the chair/program coordinator do not agree in one or more areas.

The dean reviews annual/biennial evaluation materials for informational purposes only. The dean does not assign scores except in the case of an evaluatee appealing the score assigned by the program area faculty and chair/program coordinator in one or more areas of evaluation.

4. Other Principles
   a) It is recommended that units include the opportunity for the evaluatee to respond to the evaluations of the program area faculty and the chair/program coordinator before the evaluation process is complete.
   b) For units that count articles or books that have been accepted for publication but are not yet published, devise a method of keeping track of what was counted in the previous year to avoid double-counting.

Adjuncts

UR 3-3-801(2)(f)(I) requires the program area faculty to evaluate adjunct faculty in consultation with the chair or program coordinator. Current practice in HSS allows each unit to develop its own procedures for evaluating adjunct faculty.

Evaluation Outcomes

Annual/biennial and post-tenure review

The overall score is the weighted average of the evaluation levels in all performance areas, where the weights are defined by the evaluatee's assigned workload during the review period. For example, the overall score of a faculty member 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 be calculated as follows:

$$(0.6x4) + (0.2x3) + (0.2x1) = 3.2$$

REV: 2.24.2012, 3.13.2012, 4.26.2013, 9.27.2013, 10.25.2013, 11.8.2013, 1.24.2014, 9.12.2014, 1.23.2015, 10.26.2018

Based on the Evaluation Scale, this overall score indicates that the faculty member meets expectations (level III).

Overall weighted scores are only used for annual/biennial evaluation and for post-tenure review.

> *UR* 3-3-701(a)(III) specifies that a faculty member must receive an overall score of at least meets expectations (level III, level IV or level V) on the annual/biennial evaluation in order to be eligible for an annual salary increase. It also specifies that if a faculty member falls below this level, the "years in rank" used to calculate parity adjustments are decreased accordingly (resulting in smaller parity adjustments).
>
> *UR* 3-3-801(1)(c)(V) specifies that the result of a post-tenure review is "satisfactory" if and only if the overall score indicates that the faculty member at least meets expectations (level III, level IV or level V) *and* the score in instruction also at least meets expectations (level III, level IV or level V). The consequences of receiving an unsatisfactory post-tenure review are also specified in this section of *UR*.

The evaluatee and the chair/program coordinator should ensure that the correct workload weights are used. For example, if a faculty member has a course reassignment for research and their normal semester workload is normally 0.3/0.1/0.1, the adjusted workload for the semester would be 0.2/0.2/0.1. The workload weights used in the evaluation must reflect this differentiated workload. The Workload Calculator on the HSS SharePoint site will automatically make those adjustments.

Tenure and/or promotion

Although the criteria for evaluation levels themselves may differ depending on the purpose, the levels needed for each type of promotion and for tenure are specified in *BPM* 2-3-901(3) and 2-3-902(5), respectively, and may not be changed. They are:

1. Lecturer to Senior Lecturer (contract-renewable only): Exceeds expectations or higher (level IV or level V) in primary area of responsibility and at least meets expectations (level III, level IV or level V) in the other areas of responsibility, if any.
2. Instructor to Assistant Professor (contract-renewable only): Exceeds expectations or higher (level IV or level V) in primary area of responsibility and at least meets expectations (level III, level IV or level V) in the other areas of responsibility, if any.
3. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
   a) Tenure-track: Exceeds expectations or higher (level IV or level V) in either teaching or professional activity and meets expectations or higher (level III, level IV or level V) in the other two areas. (These are the requirements for tenure also.)
   b) Contract-renewable: Exceeds expectations or higher (level IV or level V) in primary area of responsibility and at least meets expectations in the other areas of responsibility, if any.
4. Associate Professor to Professor
   a) Tenured or Tenure-track: Exceeds expectations or higher (level IV or level V) in both teaching and professional activity and at least meets expectations (level III) in service.
   b) Contract-renewable: Excellent (level V) in primary area of responsibility and at least meets expectations (level III, level IV, or level V) in the other areas of responsibility, if any.

REV: 2.24.2012, 3.13.2012, 4.26.2013, 9.27.2013, 10.25.2013, 11.8.2013, 1.24.2014, 9.12.2014, 1.23.2015, 10.26.2018

Reappointment

BPM and *UR* do not formally require that decisions on whether to re-hire adjunct faculty or to reappoint contract-renewable and tenure-track faculty be based on evaluation outcomes but in practice most units do rely on these as a major factor.

Section VIII
Chairs Selection and Evaluation Processes

Chair Selection and Evaluation

For the purposes of this policy, the term "chair" shall be understood to include all unit leaders. Coordinators of free-standing programs shall be selected and evaluated according to university policies for chair selection and evaluation.

Selection Procedures

University Regulations (UR) 3-3-301(1)(a) specifies:

> Chairs are at-will employees in their capacity as chair. Normally they will be appointed from tenured or tenure track faculty within the department. Chairs will be appointed for a three-year term. There is no limit to the number of terms a chair may serve. If the chair is to be selected from the current faculty of the department, an agreement between the dean and a majority of the faculty of the department, outlining the recommendation process, including faculty involvement, will be required prior to initiating the search for a chair. Faculty involvement may include department faculty vote and/or conferences with the faculty in the department. Upon completion of this process, the dean of the college shall recommend a department chair to the CAO for approval.

Although the facts that (1) chairs are at-will employees in their capacity as chair and (2) there is no limit to the number of terms a chair may serve together imply that the specification of a three-year term can be viewed as arbitrary, there is value in asking the faculty to formally weigh in on the choice of chair on a regular basis. Current chair terms and each unit's existing selection process (if they have one) are available on SharePoint.

In the event that it is not possible to appoint a chair from among the tenured or tenure track faculty, the procedures outlined in *UR* 3-3-301(1)(b) will be followed.

Evaluation Procedures

A chair has responsibilities to both the college and the department, school, or program. In accordance with *UR* 3-3-301(4), the portion of a chair's workload devoted to chair duties and responsibilities shall be evaluated as part of that person's annual/biennial and comprehensive faculty evaluations. Chair duties and responsibilities are considered service but are evaluated separately from non-chair service.

Faculty's role
Each unit will develop criteria for the evaluation of chair duties and responsibilities. These will be stored in SharePoint.

On a comprehensive evaluation, faculty should evaluate the chair's service in accordance with the comprehensive evaluation procedures outlined in *Board Policy Manual (BPM)* 2-3-Part 8 and *UR* 3-3-Part 8. Annual/biennial evaluation of the chair's service should follow the program's annual/biennial review process. In each case, the program area faculty must assign scores and provide a written rationale for those scores. The rationale *must be tied to the criteria*. Specific examples of activities meeting the criteria for the assigned scores are required. The program area faculty should agree on the rationale – it is intended to represent the voice of the committee *as a whole*, not fragmented comments from individual faculty members.

Faculty are encouraged to have a conversation with a Chair as soon as a problem arises rather than waiting to include it in the evaluation. If there are ongoing issues that have not been resolved, it is appropriate to note those in the evaluation process.

Dean's role

On a comprehensive evaluation, the Dean will follow the comprehensive evaluation procedures outlined in *Board Policy Manual (BPM)* 2-3-Part 8 and *UR* 3-3-Part 8. For annual/biennial evaluation, the dean will assign scores in evaluating the "chair responsibility" section of service in accordance with *UR* 3-3-301(4).

The dean is responsible for determining whether the chair has satisfactorily carried out the duties and responsibilities of the position (listed below). Because this is a binary outcome, the determination is provisionally assigned either "sufficient" or "insufficient." An evaluation of "sufficient" will be assigned *unless* the Chair demonstrates serious or persistent failure to carry out one or more of the duties and responsibilities of the position.

The Dean's final score is determined as discussed below.

The Dean is encouraged to have a conversation with a Chair as soon as a problem arises rather than waiting to include it in the evaluation. If there are ongoing issues that have not been resolved, it is appropriate to note those in the evaluation process.

Assigning scores

The assignment of scores is based on the assessment of both the faculty and the dean as follows:

- If the dean's provisional determination is "sufficient" and the faculty assign a score of III or above:
  - the dean will assign the same score as the faculty if he or she deems the faculty's rationale to be consistent with the criteria;
  - the dean will consult with the faculty before assigning a score if he or she deems the faculty's rationale to be inconsistent with the criteria.
- In accordance with *UR* 3-3-301(4), if the dean's provisional determination is "insufficient" and/or if the faculty assign a score of I or II, the dean shall convene a meeting with the department faculty to discuss the evaluation.

Chair Duties and Responsibilities

- Ensuring student, faculty, and staff concerns are addressed in a professional and timely manner
- Responding to communications in a timely manner
- Creating course schedules that efficiently meet the needs of students
- Managing enrollments to ensure efficient use of resources

- Managing the departmental budget in a way that ensures responsible use of university funds
- Distributing faculty workloads efficiently and equitably
- Ensuring all faculty have adequate training and resources to provide accurate and high quality advising within the unit
- Attending advising and recruitment activities such as New Student Orientation and campus events for prospective students
- Advising new and returning students as necessary
- Completing transfer equivalencies, annual progress reports, and other required documents accurately and in a timely manner
- Regularly reviewing curriculum with program area faculty to ensure high quality academic offerings and submitting changes when necessary
- Working with program area faculty to develop and implement an effective plan for program assessment and using the data to inform programmatic changes as needed
- Fulfilling the role assigned to the chair in the faculty evaluation and tenure and promotion processes in *BPM* 2-3-Part 8, *BPM* 2-3-Part 9, *UR* 3-3-Part 8, and *UR* 3-3-Part 9
- Facilitating open, honest, and respectful communication with faculty, staff, students and/or others affiliated with the unit, college, or university
- Providing opportunities for regular interaction and communication with program area faculty, e.g., through faculty meetings
- Communicating important information to and from the dean
- Participating in College Leadership Council meetings and activities
- Ensuring summer administrative duties are performed as needed
- Facilitating the work of program area committees
- Submitting requests to fill vacant, or to create, full-time faculty lines if departmental needs warrant
- Reviewing hiring pool applications and hiring qualified adjunct faculty when necessary
- Regularly evaluating the performance of adjunct faculty in accordance with UR 3-3-801(2)(f)(I) and working with them to ensure high quality instruction (if applicable)
- For those units with graduate programs, ensuring that graduate teaching and research assistants receive appropriate supervision and provide high quality instruction (if applicable)
- Hiring qualified classified staff when necessary
- Supervising classified staff
- Supporting fundraising and development for the program area when opportunities arise
- Ensuring college and university policies and procedures are followed
- Performing other duties arising from unforeseen circumstances

Program area criteria

Program areas will develop criteria appropriate to their unit. Because program area faculty must award a score, criteria should be clearly specified for each of the evaluation levels as follows.

Evaluation Scale (Round to the nearest 10th)

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

The qualitative descriptions ("Excellent," "Exceeds Expectations," etc.) should be understood as reflecting these levels *as defined by the criteria*. For example, the faculty cannot argue that a chair does not meet their expectations if the criteria for a score of III are met. If the expectations of the individuals assigning scores are incompatible with the criteria then the criteria need revision.

SECTION IX
Office Space Usage and Assignment

The primary responsibility for the management of office space lies with unit leaders, although the ultimate responsibility for assignment of office space to a unit resides with the dean. Office space should be used for the maximum benefit of the College mission in support of instruction, student advising, scholarship, and professional activity. It is desirable that all full-time HSS faculty members and individuals who provide essential administrative and support functions have office space adequate to performing these tasks. It is also expected that part-time faculty and graduate students have access to on-campus space, as available, to support their activities.

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance for assignment of office space in the College. It is recognized that relocation of offices is a significant imposition and all reasonable efforts will be made to minimize moves among continuing personnel.

Each full-time faculty member should have one private office to facilitate meeting with students and conducting professional activities. Adjunct faculty will typically share an office with at least one other adjunct faculty member or with a teaching or graduate assistant that has a demonstrated need for office space. Where possible, graduate students without an office should have access to a common study area with desks and/or meeting tables. To the maximum extent possible, storage space between and within units should be consolidated in order to open up additional office space. Storage space that is office-sized should be used as an office whenever possible. The dean's office will assist in finding alternative storage space. The dean in consultation with the unit will identify convertible spaces.

In the event that a department has a vacant base-funded faculty line, the office allocated for that vacant position shall remain within the unit, as long as approval for filling the position exists. If approval for filling the position is withdrawn, the allocated office shall revert to the pool of office space available for other departments that have demonstrated needs. The dean's office will manage this pool of available space until such time as it is reallocated to a unit.

The Dean's Office will conduct an inventory of all office, storage, and department library space as needed.

The following policy will be implemented when academic units are unable to meet their office space needs within their assigned space, taking into consideration all office, storage, and department library spaces within their unit.

1. Additional office space requests will be submitted to the Dean's Office and will address the basis of need and current occupancy using the priority ranking below.
    a. Unit leaders and essential unit support staff
    b. Full-time faculty
    c. Part-time faculty
    d. Graduate teaching assistants and other graduate assistants
    e. Emeritus faculty

2. Requests for office space will be handled on a case-by-case basis by the Dean’s Office, understanding that the dean’s office has the ability only to assign unassigned office space.

SECTION X
Research Incentive Funding

The Research Advisory Council at UNC put out a Research Plan in April 2012 entitled "Enhancement of Research, Scholarship, Creative Works, and Grant Activity: 2012-2015." This document outlines the many goals and strategies of UNC to promote scholarship for faculty, students and staff. (http://www.unco.edu/osp/news/UNCResearchPlan_2012-15.pdf)

The overarching objective for the use of Research Incentive dollars in HSS is to promote and support the goals outlined in the above document by investing resources in Research Scholarship and Creative Works (RSCW) and helping PIs/PDs overcome financial and other barriers related to research.

To accomplish these goals as of fall 2014, HSS will follow the structure of distributing F&A costs to HSS schools/departments/programs outlined below:

- If administrative support is provided within a unit, 25% of the distribution (83% of the 30% returned to the college) would go to the unit and 5% (17% of the 30% returned to the college) would remain with the Dean's office.
    - Beyond this distribution the unit should have a written policy that outlines how decide how to further allocate the funds to the PI/PD.
- If administrative support is not provided within a unit, the full 30% of the distribution would remain with the Dean's office to cover the additional administrative expenses necessary to support the PI/PD.
    - A percentage could potentially be negotiated back to the PI/PD for discretionary funding. Negotiation for the percentage to be returned to the PI/PD should take place between the Dean and the PI/PD at the time the grant proposal is being submitted.

<u>Possible Items to Fund with Research Incentive Dollars</u>
Following is a (non-exhaustive) list of items related to RSCW for which research incentive money might be used:

- Fees associated with publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals
- Book publishing fees
- Honorariums/official functions for faculty to give talks, poetry readings, etc. at UNC as a community wide event (to include faculty, students, staff and community)
- Time
    - Faculty reassigned time or course releases for adjunct faculty
- Materials, supplies and equipment related to RSCW
- Service & maintenance agreements for instrumentation
- Specialized needs not covered by unit
    - Recording devices for conducting interviews
    - Rental fees for rooms for community based programs
    - Specialized software (supported by IM&T)
    - Travel visas required to undertake research
- Cost sharing for grant applications
- Entrance fees to archives/museums for research
- Cost of shipping research equipment to a site

- Translators
- Transcribers
- Students to do data entry, technicians, technical writing editors
- Grant training workshops
- Support for undergraduate and graduate students in making presentations and publishing papers
    - Travel
    - Printing
    - Publishing fees

If there are questions about an item that is not included in the above list, please contact the HSS Dean's Office.

Other Resources Available for Research at UNC

Other internal resources available for research at UNC are outlined on the website of the Office of Research http://www.unco.edu/research/support.html. This website outlines all the different internal awards available to faculty, including Research, Dissemination, & Faculty Development Awards (RDFD), Provost Awards for Travel (PAT), Faculty & Research Publications Board New Project Awards (FRPB), Annual Scholarly Activity Travel Grants (ASATS), Summer Support Initiative (SSI), and others.

College of Humanities & Social Sciences
Policies & Procedures Manual

Forms Appendices

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Policies and Procedures Manual

Appendices Table of Contents

Appendix I

Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used by faculty to report sabbatical leave activity. sabbatical leave reports are due within one academic year from completion of the leave. In accordance with Board of Trustees Policy, faculty who do not submit a sabbatical leave report within the required time frame will not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Sabbatical Leave Report

Name: ________________________

Department / School_________________________________

Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: ________ Year: ________

Date by which Sabbatical Leave Report is Due: ______________ (within one academic year from completion of leave).
Date of Sabbatical Leave Report: _______________
Each department /school will determine the method by which faculty will evaluate sabbatical leave reports. The chair/director who is responsible for recording and reporting the results and, where appropriate, for providing the faculty member with a written notification of non-acceptance by the faculty. The protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports will be submitted to the dean for approval. At minimum, the sabbatical report will be evaluated considering the following criteria:

(1) Whether the report is complete and explicitly addresses each of the required elements (see below)
(2) Whether the sabbatical leave met its objectives as outlined in the proposal or, if applicable, as revised.

In order to complete the sabbatical leave report, use this form as a cover sheet for the following:

1. Provide a copy of your approved sabbatical leave proposal.

2. Provide your sabbatical leave report. In your report, please address each of the following:

   a. Summarize the key activities undertaken.

   b. Comment on what was accomplished during the leave, particularly with reference to goals articulated in your proposal.

   c. Explain how the sabbatical has contributed to your own professional development, to the academic program(s) in which you teach, and to the university.

Submit this cover sheet and the above materials to the appropriate department / school faculty representative in accordance with the department's / school's approved procedure for evaluation.

APPENDIX

Board of Trustees Policy stipulates the following expectations, requirements, and conditions regarding sabbatical leaves and sabbatical leave reports:

2-3-1001(3) Appropriate Use of Sabbatical Leaves. [See also 3-3-1001(1) Sabbatical Proposals]. The activities undertaken during sabbatical leave must be related to the individual's on-campus responsibilities. The proposal must specify the effect on professional growth, development of knowledge in the discipline, influence on the students' educational experience, and the enhancement of the University's reputation. Once the goals and plan are approved, the faculty member is obligated to fulfill them, unless amended [See also 2-3-1001(5), Approval Procedures].
(a) Examples of acceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:
(I) The pursuit of research or study at an institution of higher education or similar entity where improvement of oneself as a teacher-scholar is the focus.
(II) The pursuit of research projects or creative endeavors within a faculty member's specialty to advance knowledge, improve the ―state of the art,‖ or to produce material for publication.
(III) The acquisition of practical experience that will directly enhance the individual's capacity to meet University responsibilities.
(IV) The pursuit of special studies or projects for the purpose of expanding institutional-related services beyond the faculty member's obligations.
(b) Examples of unacceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:
(I) Study at an institution of higher education, the primary purpose of which is to gain a degree in an area or discipline not related to current University responsibilities.
(II) Travel that is not directly related to University responsibilities. (A significant distinction is made herein between travel to improve oneself as a teacher-scholar and travel in and of itself.)
(III) Any sabbatical request within the faculty member's current obligations to the University. (Examples include rewriting of course materials, course development, and the like.)
(IV) Activities or research not related to current University responsibilities.

2-3-1001(5) Approval Procedures.
Approval of a leave request will be based upon the merits of the proposal communicated by the specific goals and plan for achievement outlined in the proposal.
. . .
(g) Proposal Revisions. Revisions of approved leave plans must be approved by the school director or his or her designee in the program area and dean. The applicant will be informed of the recommendations and, if the revised proposal is not approved, will be afforded an opportunity to provide additional information.

2-3-1001(8) Faculty Report Obligation. In accepting a sabbatical leave, the faculty member agrees to provide to the program area faculty a written report of the activities, the goals attained, and the benefits derived during the course of the leave. Upon approval of the program area faculty, the report will be forwarded to the school director and the dean. The school director and the dean will review the report to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in 2-3-1001(3). If the program area faculty or dean find the report unacceptable, the faculty member will be notified in writing and will have the opportunity to respond. Once the report has been accepted, copies will be forwarded to the CAO. Faculty who do not submit an acceptable report within one academic year of completion of the leave shall not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

2-3-1001(9) Institutional Accountability.
(a) All sabbatical leave records and approved and disapproved plans, will be available for inspection, upon request, by the Joint Budget Committee, the Education Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Withdrawn plans will not be included in the records and will be returned to the faculty members.
(b) Final sabbatical reports are not considered a part of personnel files and become open record for public disclosure pursuant to the Colorado Open Records Statute (C.R.S. 24-72-204).
The complete Board of Trustees Policy, including other provisions related to sabbatical leaves, is available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf . University Regulations related to sabbatical leaves are available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf

Appendix II

Evaluation of Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used for evaluation of a faculty sabbatical leave report:

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Evaluation of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report

This form is to be completed by the faculty evaluation representative, school director or department chair, and dean and copied to the faculty member who has submitted a sabbatical leave report. It is intended to record evaluative responses and recommendations concerning the sabbatical leave report. It is the responsibility of the department chair or school director to ensure that approved protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports is followed and, along with the dean, to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). Additional pages of comments may be attached as needed. Under BOT Policy 2-3-1001(8) faculty and dean have the responsibility for assessing the acceptability or non-acceptability of the sabbatical leave report.

Faculty Member: _________________________ Department / School___________________________
Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: ________ Year: ________
Date of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report: _______________ ____ First Report ____ Second Report

1. Faculty Evaluation: Indicate the faculty's approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report. Include the means by which the determination was reached according to approved protocol for the academic unit. Attach comments as needed. If the approved protocol of the unit includes voting, indicate the faculty vote concerning the sabbatical leave report*:

   ____ Approve: acceptable _____ Disapprove: not acceptable*

   ___________________________________ ________________________
   Faculty representative Date

2. Review by Department Chair / School Director:

   This sabbatical leave report ____ does ____ does not* clearly address how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). (See Appendix.)

   ___________________________________ _________________________
   Department Chair / School Director Date

3. Determination of Dean: _____ Approve: acceptable _____ Disapprove: not acceptable*

   __________________________________ __________________________
   Dean Date

*If the sabbatical leave report is found unacceptable or in non-compliance with BOT Policy by the faculty, chair/director, or dean, a written notification must be provided to the faculty member from the level(s) of evaluation which did not approve the report. Attach and submit to the faculty member notifications of non-acceptance together with this form. In cases where the original faculty report has been found unacceptable, the faculty member may submit a second report to the faculty representative for consideration and evaluation. In such cases, this form will be used for responses by faculty, chair/director, and dean for second responses and recommendations. The second response by the dean is the final determination of approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report.