UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Post Tenure (Non-promotion)
Comprehensive Review

Faculty Information

Name:

College:

Department/School/Program:

Current Rank:

☐ Assistant Professor

☐ Associate Professor

☐ Full Professor

Date tenured position at UNC: _____

Date of last promotion: _____

Review Period: _____ to _____

(year) (year)

Instructions and Example

Evaluation Scale (Round to the nearest 10th)

Evaluation Level	Score	
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

Evaluation Instructions

Step 1: Indicate workload distribution for instruction, professional activity and service.

Step 2: Based on percent of workload, indicate a single score for instruction, a single score for professional activity, and a single score for service.

Step 3: Calculate the Overall Evaluation: The average, weighted in accordance with workload, of evaluation levels in all applicable performance areas.

> *For example, a faculty with a workload of 0.6 instruction, 0.2 professional activity, and 0.2 service, who received a score of 4 for instruction, 3 for professional activity and a score of 1 for service would have an overall score of 3.2 (0.6x4) +(0.2x3) + (0.2x1) = 3.2 which falls in the range of III Meets Expectations.*

Step 4: Based on chart above, indicate evaluation level (I, II, III, IV, V)

Example	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service — Chair Responsibilities	Service — Non-Chair Responsibilities	Overall Evaluation
Workload Distribution %	0.6	0.2		0.2	
Score	4.0	3.0		1.0	
Weighted Score	2.4	0.6		0.2	3.2
Evaluation Level (I, II, III, IV, V)					**III**

University Regs: 3-3-801(1)(d): The result of a post-tenure review is either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A faculty member's post-tenure review is satisfactory if he/she receives an overall evaluation of level III or higher with a level III or higher evaluation in teaching. In this example, the faculty member received a 4.0 (level IV) in teaching and a level III for an overall evaluation: a satisfactory outcome.

Result of Evaluation Based on Scores (for Example) ☒ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory

---

Please consult BPM: 2-3-801(3) http://www.unco.edu/trustees/policy_manual.pdf and University Regs:3-3-801 http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf

Part I: Evaluation by Faculty

Number of tenure/tenure-track faculty assigning a score: _____

In accordance with approved school/department/program procedures for comprehensive evaluation of the unit's faculty, the following method was used for scoring:

☐ mean ☐ median ☐ mode/vote

If evaluating a Chair/Program Coordinator, evaluate both Chair and Non-Chair service:

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service		Overall Evaluation
			Chair Responsibilities	Non-Chair Responsibilities	
Workload Distribution %					
Score					
Weighted Score					
Evaluation Level (I, II, III, IV, V)					

Result of Evaluation Based on Scores ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory

Attach a memo explaining the reasons, in terms of the approved program area criteria, for the scores.

Signature (on behalf of the faculty): _____ Date: _____

Evaluatee notified of decision by:
Email (Date): _____ Campus Mail (Date): _____

(If evaluatee is Chair, Director, or Program Coordinator, after completing Part I, send form and materials to Dean.)

Part II: Evaluation by Chair, Director, or Program Coordinator

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service	Overall Evaluation
Workload Distribution %				
Score				
Weighted Score				
Evaluation Level (I, II, III, IV, V)				

Result of Evaluation Based on Scores ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory

Attach a memo explaining the reasons, in terms of the approved program area criteria, for the scores.
Signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluatee and faculty notified of decision by:
Email (Date): _____ Campus Mail (Date): _____

Part III: Dean Review

The Dean reviews the evaluations of the program area faculty and the chair/director/coordinator to verify that the scores assigned, and the reasons given, are consistent with the approved program area criteria and procedures. If the Dean finds that the evaluation is not consistent with approved program area criteria or process, he or she communicates that finding, in writing, with reasons, to the program area faculty, the chair/director/coordinator and the evaluatee. In case of such disagreement, the dean will indicate what scores he/she believes were warranted by the program area's criteria.

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service		Overall Evaluation
			Chair Responsibilities	Non-Chair Responsibilities	
Workload Distribution %					
Score					
Weighted Score					
Evaluation Level (I, II, III, IV, V)					

Result of Evaluation Based on Scores ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluatee, faculty, and Chair/Director/ Program Coordinator notified of decision by:
Email (Date): _____ Campus Mail (Date): _____

Part IV: CAO Review

The CAO reviews the evaluations of the program area faculty, the chair/director/coordinator, along with the dean's findings and determines whether or not the evaluations are consistent with the approved criteria and procedures. If the CAO disagrees with the scores assigned by the faculty and/or chair/director/coordinator, he or she must determine what scores were warranted by the program area's criteria.

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service		Overall Evaluation
			Chair Responsibilities	Non-Chair Responsibilities	
Workload Distribution %					
Score					
Weighted Score					
Evaluation Level (I, II, III, IV, V)					

Result of Evaluation Based on Scores ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluatee, faculty, Chair/Director/ Program Coordinator and Dean notified of decision by:
Email (Date): _____ Campus Mail (Date): _____

For Provost Office Use:
President Notification ☐   BOT Notification ☐

Comprehensive Post Tenure Form
1-27-17 version