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## I. INTRODUCTION

All faculty members in the College of Natural and Health Sciences (NHS) who are reviewed for reappointment, annual/biennial evaluation, pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, graduate faculty status, and post-tenure review will be evaluated in accordance with University Regulations (UR) (<http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf> ), Board Policy (<http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf> ), and NHS processes. In case of any discrepancies between the policies and procedures of the college, academic unit or program areas and those found in University Regulations or Board Policy, the latter shall prevail.

Comprehensive and annual/biennial reviews provide a systematic evaluation of performance. Board Policy (1-1-307) specifies that the purposes and intent of faculty evaluation are:

1. To provide a regular, systematic evaluation of performance that contributes to the mission and goals of the University, the colleges and the departments/schools/programs.
2. To provide support and opportunities for professional development and renewal
3. To assess progress toward tenure and promotion and to be the foundation for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review decisions.
4. To recognize individual excellence and achievement
5. To provide a basis for merit salary increases
6. To provide adequate feedback on how to improve for those who are not achieving at satisfactory levels.

The College of Natural and Health Sciences *Faculty Evaluation Processes* provide the parameters for the faculty evaluation process for the College and NHS academic units.

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

## II. CONSIDERATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Comprehensive review is performed when evaluating individuals for pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. The required pre-tenure review is conducted at approximately the mid-point of a tenure-track faculty member’s probationary period and is intended as a check on an individual’s progress toward tenure. As such, the evaluative criteria and processes of the pre-tenure and comprehensive evaluations are the same, although accomplishments for the pre-tenure review will be considered within the context of a shorter time period. Based on the timeline provided in section 3-3-801(1) of University Regulations (UR), the timing of pre-tenure review will be as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Years of tenure credit awarded to the faculty member:** | **Pre-tenure review will occur****during the faculty member’s:** |
| 0 | Third full academic year |
| 1 | Second full academic year |
| 2 | First or second full academic year, if requested by faculty member |
| 3 | First full academic year, if requested by faculty member |

### A. Guidelines

The substantive evaluation of a faculty member’s performance is necessarily restricted to those with the disciplinary or as appropriate, multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise needed to make the required judgments. The authority of the program area faculty and the chair/director/coordinator in this area carries with it significant responsibilities. These include the responsibility to make fair and honest judgments based on agreed upon criteria and to provide feedback regarding progress towards tenure and/or promotion when appropriate (Board Policy Manual (BPM), Part 8) and must align with BPM Comprehensive Review Definitions 2-3-801(1).

The purpose and intent of evaluation is multifaceted. All procedures and policies are to be designed “to provide an equitable and fair assessment of each individual faculty member and his or her contribution…” [BPM, 1-1-307 (1)] and meet the purpose and intent of faculty evaluation as outlined in the BPM section 1-1-307(1). Comprehensive review must assess an individual’s accomplishments in the areas of instruction, professional activity (RSCW), and service related to assigned workload.

Program area faculty develop criteria which reflect the nature of teaching, professional activity, and service as valued within the discipline for each evaluation level. Each unit should develop criteria for the following purposes: pre-tenure review, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion. The criteria developed for each may differ from each other; however, since a positive tenure decision must be accompanied by a positive decision on promotion to associate professor, the criteria for these two purposes must be the same. [BPM 2-3-801(3)]. All criteria must be approved by the program faculty, the unit leader, the Dean, and the Chief Academic Officer (Provost). As part of Program Review, each program area will review and submit for approval their evaluation criteria according to the process outlined in the BPM 2-3-801(3).

It is essential that unit leaders meet at least once annually with faculty members on the path to promotion and/or tenure to discuss the results of annual/biennial reviews and to assess the candidate’s progress toward realizing a successful comprehensive review. Relevant promotion criteria will be discussed by the unit leader with each program area faculty member periodically to ensure that each member is cognizant of program area performance expectations and his or her fulfillment of them. Unit Leaders will engage in this process according to principles articulated in UR 2-3-901.

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

### B. Evaluation Workload

In accordance with BMP 1-1-307(2)(a) individuals will be evaluated according to their documented responsibilities and job description which may cover teaching, research, scholarship and creative works, and service. Each evaluation area—instruction, professional activity, and service—is assigned a weight for evaluation purposes, based on a written workload plan and approved by the unit leader. This weighting allocation could vary as college or academic unit needs dictate. Such individualization of faculty effort must be the result of consultation between the faculty member, the faculty member’s colleagues in the academic unit, the unit leader, and, if appropriate the dean. The reassignment of an individual’s workload is subject to approval by the unit leader. Evaluation will be based on the agreed upon workload assignment. When workload distribution varies from one semester to the next in a given evaluation period, an average of the work assignment weights for the relevant semesters will be used.

C. Overall Evaluation[BPM 2-3-801(1)(m) and BPM 2-3-801(1)(n)]

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

**University Evaluation Scale**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| LEVEL | RATING | OVERALL EVALUATION |
| V | 4.6 – 5.0 | Excellent |
| IV | 3.6 – 4.5 | Exceeds Expectations |
| III | 2.6 – 3.5 | Meets Expectations |
| II | 1.6 – 2.5 | Needs Improvement |
| I | 1.0 – 1.5 | Unsatisfactory |

Consistent with the Board Policy Manual, Section 2-3-801(3)(a), faculty in each academic unit are to develop criteria for pre-tenure review, tenure review, promotion review and post-tenure review“ within the framework of the University’s mission that reflect the nature of teaching, professional activity, and service as valued within the discipline for each evaluation level.” These criteria are subject to approval by the faculty, the unit leader, the dean, and the CAO.

### D. Process

Individuals eligible for promotion and/or tenure and individuals due for pre-tenure or post-tenure review in a given year are notified by the unit leader following consultation with the NHS Associate Dean. The NHS Associate Dean will verify faculty eligibility for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review with Academic Affairs, and Human Resources. NHS and Academic Affairs deadlines for submission and review of evaluation materials are provided in Appendix B, although Units may have earlier deadlines. The individual will prepare a dossier, as defined in BPM 2-3-801(1)(b), that serves as the primary database for performance evaluation. The dossier will be completed and submitted in Digital Measures. If year(s) of credit for teaching, professional activity, and/or service at a prior institution is agreed upon at the time of hire, the activities that occurred during those years will be included in the first comprehensive review period, in accordance with BPM Section 2-3-901(4). Guidelines for preparation of the dossier appear in Appendices B and C. Examples of the types of information to be addressed in the dossier for each evaluation area are also included. Forms to be submitted as part of the evaluation process are available at: [https://share.unco.edu/sites/nhs/home/Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?RootFolder=%2Fsites%2Fnhs%2Fhome%2FDocuments%2FFaculty%20Evaluation%20Resources%2FNew%20Forms%20%2D%20Spring%202017](file://uncfs01/10-E/Ellen.Gregg/NHS%20Policies%20and%20Procedures/Faculty%20Evaluation%20NHS%20Policies%20and%20Procedures%202016/uments/Forms/AllItems.aspx?RootFolder=/sites/nhs/home/Documents/Faculty%20Evaluation%20Resources/New%20Forms%20-%20Spring%202017)

In accordance with BPM 2-3-801(3)(b), at each step in the review process the evaluatee will be informed in writing of the decision made. The evaluatee will be given seven days to respond to the review, with the option of providing additions and/or clarifications to their dossier. Any additions or clarification provided by the evaluatee will be provided to reviewers prior to the next step in the evaluation process. At each level of review, and prior to the next, the evaluatee will have one opportunity to respond.

The College requires external reviews of a faculty member’s research and scholarship for promotion and/or tenure, but not for faculty members preparing for pre-tenure and post-tenure comprehensive review. Faculty applying for promotion to senior lecturer and contract renewable faculty members with no workload assignment of professional activity are not required to have an external review. A minimum of two external reviews are required by the College for candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure. Individual academic units may require additional external reviews. The unit leader is responsible for obtaining the external reviews. Candidates should provide to their unit leader the names and contact information of at least three prospective outside peer evaluators. The unit leader may consult with faculty members of the same discipline within the unit for suggested selections and/or may add names to the list to the unit leaders list. Only one reviewer will be from the unit leader’s list. Whether identified by the candidate or the unit leader, it is essential that all outside reviewers be individuals who are capable of objectively performing the evaluation. The following criteria must be satisfied with exceptions approved by the unit guidelines and/or unit leader:

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

The unit leader will serve as the point of contact with each selected outside reviewer in requesting the review. The packet forwarded to each individual who agrees to serve as an outside reviewer shall include the faculty member’s current *curriculum vitae*, Comprehensive Performance Narrative (Appendix D– Sections 1 and 3), Performance Report of Professional Activity, relevant supporting evidence and the relevant professional activity section of the academic unit’s approved faculty evaluation criteria. All outside reviewers’ letters of evaluation should be returned directly to the unit leader and must be inserted in the dossier, prior to faculty review, under the section “Comprehensive Performance Report and Vitae”. Candidates shall have the right to view external review letters and this fact shall be conveyed to all prospective peer reviewers. The standard letter of instruction for peer reviewers is provided in Appendix E. This College-level process should not be interpreted as altering the university’s policy on outside evaluation as outlined in section 3-3-802 of the University Regulations.

#### (i) Program Area Review

Academic units should prepare comprehensive review criteria which include expectations for reappointment, pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. The criteria for comprehensive reviews must reflect the nature of instruction, professional activity, and service valued by the discipline and must be approved by the program faculty, the unit leader, the Dean, and the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). No criteria will be adopted unless acceptable to the program area faculty**,** the unit leader,the dean, and the CAO. Relevant promotion criteria will be discussed by the unit leader, with each faculty member in his or her school/department periodically to ensure that each member is cognizant of program area performance expectations and his or her fulfillment of them, in accordance with University Regulations 2-3-901.

#### (ii) Program Area Faculty Review

For program area reviews of faculty dossiers, a minimum of three (3) tenure/tenure-track faculty members, aside from the evaluatee and unit leader, are required. For program areas with less than three qualified faculty, additional evaluating faculty must be included. To accomplish this, a list of names of faculty members from UNC who have related expertise must be submitted by the evaluatee, to consist of twice the number of people required.  The academic unit’s faculty, in consultation with the unit leader, will select from that list to bring the total number to three (3) [BPM, 2-3-801(3)(b)].

* In the case of tenure track and tenured faculty, tenured and tenure track faculty members in the program area, excluding the evaluatee and the unit leader,review the dossier and assign a score in each performance area relevant to the evaluatee’s workload. Contract renewable faculty may participate in the review process, but cannot assign scores.
* In the case of contract renewable faculty, tenured, and tenure track faculty members in the program area, excluding the evaluatee and the unit leader,review the dossier and assign a score in each performance area relevant to the evaluatee’s workload. Contract renewable faculty may also review and assign scores.

The evaluative process must result in a score for each performance area, and a written explanation of the scores with reference to the approved criteria. The faculty evaluation will be forwarded to the unit leader in writing, and shared with the evaluatee. The evaluatee will be given the opportunity to respond to that review, with the option of providing additions and/or clarifications to their dossier prior to the unit leader’s review of the dossier.

#### (iii) Unit Leader Review

The Unit Leader will conduct an independent review of the dossier and assign a score in each of the performance areas relevant to the workload of the evaluatee. In some instances, to gain a more complete understanding of the application, the unit leader may request additional information from the candidate, through interview or request for additional documentation. He or she may also seek information from other sources, such as, interviews with faculty member(s), individuals external to UNC, journal editors, etc. When information gleaned from this process is significant to the recommendation, it will be presented and discussed in the unit leader’s evaluation memo.

The unit leader’s evaluation (scores plus reasons addressing criteria) will be shared with the program area faculty and the evaluatee. Upon review of the unit leader’s evaluation, the evaluatee and the program area faculty have the opportunity to respond to the unit leader’s evaluation with the option of providing additions and/or clarifications to their dossier.

The program area faculty’s evaluation (scores plus rationales), unit leader’s evaluations (scores plus rationales) and any responses or additional materials will be included in the dossiers submitted to the Dean for review.

#### (iv) Dean Review

The Dean reviews the dossier submitted by the academic unit. The Dean’s responsibility is to “verify that the scores assigned, and the rationales provided, are consistent with the approved program area criteria and procedures” [BPM, 2-3-801(3)(B)(v)] .

If the dean finds that the evaluation is not consistent with approved program area criteria or processes, he or she communicates that finding, in writing, with reasons to the program area faculty, Unit Leader, 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. The faculty and unit leader will have the opportunity to respond to the dean. The dean forwards his or her findings, along with those of the faculty and unit leader, together with all responses to the Chief Academic Officer [BPM, 2-3-801(3)(B)(v)].

#### (iv) Basis for the Academic Unit/Dean Recommendation

For promotion to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, an earned doctorate in the discipline or other terminal degree specified by the academic unit, and required time in rank [BPM 2-3-901(1)] are required. In addition, the following criteria from BPM 2-3-901(3) apply:

**Contract Renewable Faculty**

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer: 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

Promotion of Instructor to Assistant Professor: 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.

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: 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.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor: 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.

**Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty**

Pre-Tenure Review [University Regulations 3-3-801(2)(III)]: Tenure Track Faculty must undergo a comprehensive review in their third year, except in circumstances noted in BPM 3-3-801(2)(a)(iii), and utilize the approved program area evaluation procedures.

Tenure: Level IV or V rating for instruction or professional activity and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other two performance areas. Assistant professors may only be granted tenure if promoted to associate professor at the same time.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: Exceeds Expectations or higher (Level IV or V) rating for instruction or professional activity and Meets Expectations or higher (Level III, IV, or V) rating for the other two performance areas. Tenure-track assistant professors may only be granted tenure if promoted to associate professor at the same time.

Promotion to Professor: Exceeds Expectation or higher (Level IV or V) rating for instruction and professional activity and a Level III, IV, or V rating for service.

Post-tenure Review: An individual is evaluated on his/her assigned workload over a six-year period. To receive an overall satisfactory performance evaluation, the faculty member must receive an overall rating of a Level III or higher, which must include a Level III rating in instruction.

In that the **pre-tenure review** serves as an evaluation of an individual’s progress toward tenure, and notes what further achievements are expected for tenure/promotion, it will include scores and rationales for them based on the program area’s approved criteria [BPM, 2-3-801(2)(C)]. The results of this review may be used, along with annual/biennial reviews, as the basis for reappointment recommendations.

For **post-tenure review,** if an individual achieves an overall rating less that a Level III or if the evaluation includes a less than a Level III rating in instruction, the result of the review will be deemed unsatisfactory. Faculty who receive an unsatisfactory post-tenure review will meet with the department chair/school director/program coordinator and the program area faculty or their designee to develop a performance plan that is approved by the department chair/school director/program coordinator, and the dean. Faculty have two years to achieve a satisfactory evaluation on a comprehensive review. Failure to do so will constitute grounds for disciplinary action [UR (3-3-801(1)(d)(v)].

## III. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS IN EVALUATION AREAS

The following sections describe the philosophy, guidelines, and performance standards for each evaluation area. In addition to the area-specific elements, an attribute necessary for successful performance which cross-cuts and is included in all three performance areas is the relationship between the individual and the other members of the academic unit. Faculty members should establish effective working relationships with other members of the academic unit that facilitate open communication, collaborative efforts, the sharing of ideas and resources, and support of their academic unit’s mission. As stated in the Board Policy Manual 2-3-801, “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.”

For the purpose of evaluation, program area faculty members will utilize approved academic unit performance criteria to evaluate an individual’s effectiveness in instruction, professional activity and service. Performance expectations are commensurate with rank.

### A. Instruction

Faculty members are expected to provide effective instruction which motivates students to learn while providing them with the opportunity to acquire knowledge and skills appropriate for the discipline. Effective instruction engages students meaningfully in learning by using appropriate pedagogies and methodologies for their disciplines, including active and dynamic instruction strategies. Faculty are expected to assess student learning, provide timely feedback to students, and adapt instruction appropriately to enhance student learning. Additionally, effective instructors provide opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes in their courses in multiple and meaningful ways. They also allow their students to apply their learning in research, internships, practica, or other related experiences. Effective instruction requires periodic review, including course and/or curricular development to meet program needs. Faculty members should maintain the appropriate credentials needed to practice in their field and maintain program accreditation, where applicable.

### B. Professional Activity

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

### C. Service

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

## IV. CONSIDERATIONS FOR ANNUAL/BIENNIAL REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT

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

1. Annual/biennial reviews are performed for calendar years.
2. Academic units will develop annual/biennial review procedures and criteria for annual/biennial reviews which will be subject to review and approval by the unit leader. Criteria for annual/biennial review may be different than criteria for comprehensive review. Additionally, academic units may choose to review a larger compilation of materials than submitted to the dean. Each academic unit is responsible for verifying the authenticity of all products included in the dossier for the period under review.
3. Unit level procedures shall include the unit’s decision regarding whether all faculty will have biennial reviews in specified years (e.g., even or odd numbered years) or whether biennial reviews will be staggered. Reviews must be consistent with the faculty members employment status and years of employment for contract renewable, tenure-track and tenured faculty.
4. The following parameters will apply to the development of academic unit evaluation procedures and criteria for contract renewable, tenure-track and tenured faculty :
	1. Procedures/criteria should reflect consensus or the views of a significant majority of the academic unit/program area faculty and be adopted and utilized during the evaluation process.
	2. Expectations in annual/biennial reviews must be clearly tied to guidelines for pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.
	3. The unit leader must provide an independent evaluation in the annual/biennial review process.
	4. Each unit/program area’s evaluation procedures must include a mechanism to resolve any differences between program area faculty evaluations and that of the unit leader. If the program area and unit leader cannot reach agreement on evaluation procedures, the same procedures used in comprehensive evaluation will apply [BPM, 2-3-801(4)(b)].
	5. Each academic unit is to define weighting of criteria on a fifteen (15) hour equated load per semester basis, which will be expressed as percentages.
5. In all cases, approved policy (Board Policy, University Regulations, College Policies) apply to the development of academic unit procedures and criteria.
6. The dean will review the application of all procedures and criteria by program faculty and the unit leader and may return the annual/biennial reviews (as a whole) to the academic unit for reconsideration if they are not in accord with approved procedures and criteria. If, after reconsideration by the academic unit, the dean and the academic unit are unable to agree on the application of approved procedures and criteria, the Chief Academic Officer will be the final appeal.

### A. Reappointment Procedures

Tenure Track Faculty

Results of the annual/biennial review and, when applicable, pre-tenure review, will be the primary basis for the determination of reappointment of tenure-track faculty. Academic units will determine reappointment processes for tenure-track faculty for reappointment from year 1 to year 2, and year 2 to year 3, since they do not match the annual evaluation review period. Reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty will involve a formal vote by eligible faculty voters. Results of the vote will be recorded on the college’s Recommendation for Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty Form (Appendix F) and will include the number of eligible faculty voters and the numbers of those eligible voters who: recommended reappointment; recommended non-reappointment; abstained; and were absent. To this report, the unit leader will add his or her recommendation along with a current copy of the evaluatee’s *curriculum vitae*, all of which will then be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean, after adding his or her recommendation, will forward the form to the Provost. Each level of review shall result in a letter to the individual under consideration for reappointment, identifying the recommendation at that level.

Contract Renewable Faculty

Results of the annual/biennial review and the ongoing need for instruction, clinical teaching, and/or research in the academic units, will be the primary bases for the determination of reappointment of contract renewable faculty. In addition, the unit leader will also seek feedback from program area faculty regarding reappointment. The unit leader will forward a recommendation memo to the Dean for each contract renewable faculty being recommended for reappointment.

## V. CONSIDERATIONS FOR MERIT PAY

Merit pay will be awarded when the University makes such funds available. The distribution and allocation of merit funds will be handled as specified below, unless a university-wide process is put in place that supersedes these processes.

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

2. Academic units shall develop an academic unit policy and procedure for the distribution of merit pay, which must be approved by the dean.

## VI. Evaluation of Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty are to be evaluated at least annually, by program area faculty in consultation with the unit leader. Unit level procedures for adjunct faculty review must to be included in the unit’s annual/biennial review procedures. [University Regulations 3-3-801(2)(f)]

## APPENDIX A: FACULTY EVALUATION DEADLINES

All time frames are for planning purposes. Specific deadlines will be announced by Academic Affairs ant the NHS Dean’s Office annually.

* Second year reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their first year of service:

DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - First half of December

Academic Affairs - Mid-January

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

DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - First half of September

Academic Affairs - Mid-October

* Fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh year reappointment recommendations for tenure-track faculty in their second, third, fourth or fifth year of service (respectively):

DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - Mid-March

Academic Affairs - Mid-April

* Reappointment of contract renewable faculty/exempt administrators in any year of service:

DUE: NHS Dean’s Office - First week of March

Academic Affairs - Mid-March

* Comprehensive Reviews, other than pre-tenure reviews (including applications for promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure review):

DUE: NHS Dean’s office - First week of February

Academic Affairs - Mid-March

* Pre-Tenure Reviews:

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

 Academic Affairs – Mid-April

* Annual/Biennial Evaluations:

DUE: NHS Dean’s office - First week in March

Academic Affairs - Mid- May

**APPENDIX B: DOSSIER AND EVALUATION MATERIALS FOR PRE-TENURE, PROMOTION, AND TENURE AND PROMOTION**

### (i) Suggested Dossier Organization

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

The dossier is submitted in an electronic format through Digital Measures (DM). The following materials are required and will be uploaded at the faculty upload screen in the Workflow module in DM.

1. Annual/Biennial evaluations \*
2. Comprehensive Performance Report (See Appendix D for required template)
3. Interactive Vita (A report Generated in DM and Uploaded)
4. Historical Curriculum (Automatically uploaded)
5. Performance Report of Instruction and Supporting Evidence
6. Performance Report of Professional Activity and Supporting Evidence
7. Performance Report of Service and Supporting Evidence
8. Unit specific Annual/Biennial review materials

\*NOTE: Number the number of Annual/Biennial Files uploaded will differ (annual and/or biennial reviews; years towards Tenure/promotion; level of promotion being sought.

Once you have uploaded all your completed materials and confirmed and verified that all the information in accurate you will submit click submit. Upon submission, your electronic materials will be sent to the unit leader to external peer review letters (required for promotion/tenure, if workload includes RSCW)

Evidence of accomplishments in all assigned performance areas – normally instruction, professional activity, and service - must be included. It is critical to illustrate the impact, outcome, significance, and/or results in each of the three categories, rather than simply enumerating accomplishments. Guidelines for items to be included for each evaluation area follow. ***Faculty members should refer to the approved unit-level criteria to assure that the artifacts included in the dossier will assist their faculty peers in determining how the evaluatee’s achievements align with the unit-level criteria.***

### (ii) Guidelines for Instruction Materials

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

 *Summary of practices, approaches, and attitudes related to instruction and student learning.*

 *Evidence of the way classes and instruction are monitored and evaluated.*

 *How student difficulties are identified and participation in courses or programs is*

 *encouraged.*

 *Description of student assessment methods and rationales and feedback to students.*

 *Changes made as a result of student input, collaboration or review from colleagues, or self-evaluation.*

 *Examples of innovations designed or adopted and their effectiveness.*

 *Contributions to the improvement of instruction in the academic unit.*

 *Participation in seminars, workshops, and professional meetings to improve instructing abilities.*

 *Success at securing grants and external funding for instruction and related activities.*

 *Summary and analysis of student evaluations of courses and instruction.*

 *Summary of what students have learned and achieved from the courses you have taught.*

 *Feedback from colleagues regarding aspects of instruction that are generally not evaluated by students (e.g. course development, content, administration, instruction materials, text selection, reading lists, student support practices) and out-of-class activities such as instructional and curricular development.*

 *Reports from colleagues or independent observers who have viewed you in the classroom or other instructional settings.*

 *Evidence of collaboration with colleagues on course development or instruction improvement.*

 *Invitations from outside institutions and organizations to teach or to demonstrate effective instruction methods.*

 *Invitations to present at conferences on topics about instruction.*

 *Evidence of development and implementation of innovative pedagogical methods and materials, including development of technologies that advance student learning.*

 *Adoption at other universities of your creative curriculum and/or approach to instruction.*

 *Contributions to course, program or other curricular development.*

 *Description of ways students are helped outside of class.*

 *Honors, awards, or recognition for teaching excellence.*

 *Copies of exams, graded exams, graded papers, syllabi.*

 *Evidence of mentoring undergraduate and graduate research, student presentations and professional activities.*

 *Evidence of mentoring associated with theses and dissertations, directed studies courses, and the like.*

### (iii) Guidelines for Professional Activity Materials (RSCW)

Assessments of performance should focus on the impact and significance of RSCW activities and outcomes. It is the responsibility of individuals being evaluated to provide materials sufficient to demonstrate that they are effective contributors to the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of engagement, and/or the scholarship of teaching and learning (Boyer 1990) in their disciplines. The materials uploaded on the faculty evaluation UPLOAD page and through the INTERACTIVE CV, should show the scope and quality of the individual’s RSCW and value to his/her discipline. ***The following list is not intended to be all-inclusive or dictate materials that must be included. It is provided as a suggested list from which to select items for inclusion in the dossier to demonstrate performance in RSCW.***

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

 *Your research, including research aimed at improving teaching skills or understanding of course subject matter.*

 *Publishing in particular professional journals.*

 *Books or book chapters in your discipline.*

 *Technical writing in the discipline.*

 *Grants, contracts, and other externally funded projects.*

 *Professional presentations (local, state, national and international).*

 *Invited presentations.*

 *Research collaboration with undergraduate and graduate students.*

 *Research collaboration with colleagues both inside and outside the university.*

 *Contributions to the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary, or inter-institutional research programs.*

 *The scholarly development of instructional technology, computer software, or equipment.*

 *Research consultancies, both paid and unpaid.*

 *Membership on review panels (state, national, or international) for research review or editorial boards.*

 *Being an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal.*

 *Scholarly development of technology used for instruction, research, or clinical practice.*

 *Impact, outcomes, significance, and number of citations on professional writing, both juried and non-juried.*

 *Evidence of research that contributes directly to teaching or improving clinical practice.*

 *Awards and recognition from professional or community organizations for research and scholarship.*

 *Reports from colleagues or independent observers of the significance or noteworthiness of*

 *your research and/or scholarship.*

 *Requests for or acknowledgement of scholarly participation or consultation given to professional or community organizations.*

 *Scholarly development of innovative clinical or pedagogical methods and/or materials.*

 *Adoption by others of your models, methods, practices, or procedures for problem resolution, intervention programs, clinical practice or process by others who seek solutions to similar problems.*

* *Engaging in the scholarship of application and integration*

### (iv) Guidelines for Service Materials

Assessments of performance should focus on the impact and significance of the faculty member’s engagement in service to the academic program, the college, the university, the discipline, and the community. The materials uploaded on the faculty evaluation UPLOAD page and through the INTERACTIVE CV, should show the scope and quality of the individual’s service and its value to his/her academic program area. ***The following list is not intended to be all-inclusive or dictate materials that must be included. It is provided as a suggested list from which to select items for inclusion in the dossier to demonstrate engagement in meaningful service.***

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

 *Serving on department, college or university committees, governance bodies, interdisciplinary task forces or advisory boards.*

 *Addressing specific problems or issues brought to one’s attention within the university*

 *profession or community.*

 *Serving as Faculty Advisor for a student organization.*

 *Participating in collaborative endeavors within the university, profession or community organizations.*

 *Providing services through a college clinic or laboratory.*

 *Adopting models for problem solving, intervention programs, prevention and early detection programs, instruments or processes by others in the university, profession or community who seek solutions to similar problems.*

 *Holding a leadership position in the profession or community relevant to your area of academic expertise (e.g. officer roles, advisory boards).*

 *Providing public policy analysis for local, state, national or international governmental*

 *agencies.*

 *Writing for popular and non-academic publications directed to agencies, professionals or other specialized audiences.*

 *Contributing to the development or delivery of services/educational programs for underserved populations.*

 *Participating in economic and community development activities utilizing your area of academic expertise.*

 *Offering testimony related to your area of academic expertise at either the state or federal legislative or congressional committee.*

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

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

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

 *Serving on master’s thesis and/or doctoral dissertations or capstone committees.*

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

Provide evidence or examples of:

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

 *Helping undergraduate and graduate students to understand the expected standards of*

*achievement and potential for success in their chosen field of study.*

 *Availability and accessibility as an advisor.*

Provide results, outcomes, noteworthiness, impact of:

 *Interactions and assistance with students requiring special needs.*

 *Student recruitment efforts.*

 *Student retention efforts.*

 *Honors, awards, recognitions by students of advising excellence.*

## APPENDIX C: DOSSIER AND EVALUATION MATERIALS FOR POST-TENURE

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

The dossier is submitted in an electronic format in Digital Measures (DM). The following materials are required and will be uploaded at the faculty upload screen in the Workflow module in DM

1. Annual/Biennial evaluations \*
2. Interactive Vita (A report Generated in DM and Uploaded)
3. Historical Curriculum (Automatically uploaded)
4. Faculty comprehensive Self-Evaluation Narrative
5. Faculty self-evaluation and supporting documentation.

Per Board Policy Manual, Part 8 Section 2-3-801, all comprehensive evaluations must contain all student evaluations, from each year, covering all teaching assignments. Additionally, the following materials must be included they occurred during the review period.

* Sabbatical reports during the evaluation period.
* Performance plan from previous post-tenure review, as required for faculty members evaluated as "unsatisfactory" [UR, 3-3-801(2)(b)(VI)], if any.

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

## APPENDIX D: Comprehensive Performance Narrative

***NOTE: For external review, ONLY Sections 1 and 3 are included in the performance report as not to bias external reviewers.***

### Section 1: Workload Distribution

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

 Year Instruction Professional Activity Service

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20\*\* | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| 20\*\* | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| 20\*\* | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| 20\*\* | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| 20\*\* | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| **Mean** | **60%** | **20%** | **20%** |

*Table 1: Workload Distribution during the Review Period*

### Section 2: Annual/Biennial Evaluation Summary

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Instruction | Professional Activity | Service | Overall Rating |
| 20\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* |
| 20\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* |
| 20\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* |
| 20\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* |
| 20\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* |
| Average Rating (\*\*\*\* - \*\*\*\*) | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Comprehensive Review+ | \*\*/\*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\*/\*\* | \*\*/\*\*/\*\* |  |

*Table 2: Annual/Biennial Evaluation*

*(+If an additional comprehensive review (Pre-tenure/Post-Tenure) was conducted during the review period include the ratings from all reviewers who provided ratings per board policy)*

### Section 3: Executive Summary

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

## APPENDIX E: TEMPLATE LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

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

[Academic Unit Leader’s name and contact information]

[date]

Dear [peer reviewer’s name]:

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

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

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

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

*[Closing]*

Enclosures: Candidate’s *curriculum vitae*

Comprehensive Performance Report (Appendix D – Sections 1 and 3)

Performance Report of Professional Activity

Relevant supporting evidence

Professional Activity section of the unit’s approved faculty evaluation criteria

 [list any other enclosures here]

## APPENDIX F: Recommendation for Reappointment of a Tenure-Track Faculty Member

The form to be used for reappointment is available on SharePoint under Faculty Evaluation Resources at:

<https://share.unco.edu/sites/nhs/home/Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx>