



# Attachment to Senate Action #1213

Approved by the Faculty Senate

April 5, 2021

---

## Revisions to 3-3-801(2)

*Clean copy version below to replace existing policy.*

3-3-801(2) Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review Procedures for annual/biennial/triennial review are for the purpose of performance evaluation and to determine eligibility for merit pay consideration.

(a) Criteria. Evaluation criteria are developed by each program area and approved as described in Board Policy 3-3-801(3)(a).

(b) Procedures. Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review procedures are described in the Board Policy Manual Title 1, Article 1, Part 3 Faculty Evaluation, and Title 2, Article 3, Part 8 Faculty Evaluation. All years of employment are subject to annual/biennial/triennial review. No review period may be included in more than one annual/biennial/triennial review.

(c) Evaluation Period. The calendar year is used as the review period for all annual/biennial/triennial reviews notwithstanding that the faculty member may not have worked the entirety of the calendar year.

(I) Annual Review Faculty activities from January 1 through December 31 of a calendar year are the subject of an annual evaluation conducted during the period of January 1 to May 31 of the following year.

(II) Biennial Review Faculty activities from January 1 through December 31 of a consecutive two-year period are the subject of a biennial evaluation conducted during the period of January 1 to May 31 of the following year.

(III) Triennial Review Faculty activities from January 1 through December 31 of a consecutive three-year period are the subject of a triennial evaluation conducted during the period of January 1 to May 31 of the following year.

(d) Evaluation Areas. Evaluation areas are based on the workload assigned by the chair/director/program coordinator. See Faculty Workload 3-3-801(4)(a).

(e) Evaluation Outcomes. Faculty are evaluated in each applicable performance area and their contributions in each area may vary according to assigned workload. A faculty member's scores are scored on a five (5) point scale. See 3-3-801(4)(a)(XI). Each faculty member will receive an overall evaluation based on the scores in each of the areas. A numerical weighting system that incorporates the percentage of the total workload for each performance area as specified in the assigned faculty workload will be used to calculate a weighted average using the evaluation scale in Board Policy 3-3-801(4)(a)(XII).

(f) Employment Status and Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review

(I) Adjunct Faculty. Adjunct faculty are evaluated by the program area faculty in consultation with the department chair/school director/program coordinator. Each College will develop procedures for evaluating its adjunct faculty.

(II) Contract Renewable Faculty. Contract Renewable faculty must complete an annual/biennial review at least once every two years and may request an annual/biennial review in any year.





## Part 8 Faculty Evaluation. [See Also Title 3, Article 3, Part 3303(5) Performance Evaluation.]

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

As appropriate, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary expertise needed to make required judgments. The authority of the program area faculty and the chair/director/coordinator in this area carries with it significant responsibility. These include the responsibility to make fair and honest judgments based on agreed upon criteria and provide feedback regarding progress towards tenure and/or promotion when appropriate.

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

(e) Program AreaF

(a) Promotion Review. Promotion review, when requested by the evaluatee, shall include:

(I) degree of progress toward promotion.

(II) action recommended (to promote or not).

(b) Pre-tenure Review. Tenure-track faculty members will undergo a pre-tenure review in their third year of a tenure-track appointment (see University Regulations § 301 et seq. implementation of faculty evaluation procedures for details, including exceptions to the third year rule). Pre-tenure review shall note degree of progress toward tenure/promotion and what further achievements are expected for tenure/promotion and will include scores and reasons based on the following criteria:

(c) Tenure Review. Tenure review will address one or more of the following:

(I) degree of progress toward tenure.

(II) deficiencies in meeting the evaluation criteria.

(III) the outcome of the evaluation, which determines whether tenure is recommended.

(d) Post-tenure Review. Post-tenure review shall address one or more of the following:

(I) Progress toward promotion, if appropriate.

(II) Deficiencies requiring improvement and a remediation plan, if needed.

(III) The outcome of the evaluation, which determines whether satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

### 2-3-801(3) Comprehensive Review Procedures

(a) Preliminaries.

The Program Area faculty develop criteria within the framework of the University's evaluation criteria for 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 the two purposes must be the same. The criteria must be approved by the program faculty, the chair/director/program coordinator, the dean of the relevant college, and the Chief Academic Officer. No criteria will be adopted unless acceptable to the program area faculty, the chair/director/program coordinator, the dean, and the Chief Academic Officer. As part of Program Review, each program area will review and submit for approval their evaluation criteria according to the process described above. Programs with approved criteria in place prior to spring 2016 need not resubmit those criteria for approval until the next Program Review.

(b) Process.

At each step of the review, the evaluatee will be informed in writing which will be transmitted via campus mail and university email, of the decisions made. The evaluatee will be given the opportunity to meet with the chair/director/program coordinator and the Chief Academic Officer.

- (II) The tenured and tenure track faculty members in the program area, excluding the evaluatee and the chair/director/coordinator, review(s) the dossier and whatever other relevant material can reasonably be gathered and assign(s) a score in each of the performance areas relevant to the workload of the evaluatee. 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. If the unit has fewer than 3 tenure/tenure track faculty members, aside from the evaluatee and chair, then the evaluating faculty must include extra members as required to bring the number to 3. To accomplish this, a list of names of faculty members from the University of Northern Colorado who have related expertise must be submitted by the evaluatee, to consist of twice the number of people required. The faculty, including the chair, will select from that list to bring the total number to 3. For interdisciplinary programs (e.g., ENST, LOM) which have faculty advisory boards, the advisory board must choose from among its members at least 3 faculty members to serve the program area faculty for evaluation purposes.
- (III) The scores of the program area faculty may be determined either by using mean, median, mode scores or by a vote of the participating individual faculty members. In either case, the process must result in a single score for each of the performance areas. In addition, the program area faculty explains, in writing, its reasons, in terms of the approved program area criteria, for its scores. Each program area will decide mechanisms whereby the rationale is determined and the scores are tabulated.

(A) Tenure Applications

2-3-902(5) its evaluation (scores and reasons) will be forwarded to the department chair/school director/program coordinator and will be shared with the evaluatee

tenure, the evaluatee and the chair/director/program coordinator will be notified in writing and tenure will be denied unless the evaluatee appeals to the Tenure Appeal Committee (23-011-0000-X d Z .}o .} (}CE .μ Z %%% o .] . š Z š evaluation was not consistent with the program [ . %%% CE }À CE ] š CE ] v which resulted in a negative recommendation for tenure. Once the tenure appeal process is complete, the Tenure Appeal Committee will forward its findings, in writing, and the documentation it has received, to the chair/director/program area coordinator and shared with the evaluatee. If the Tenure Appeals Committee finds that the evaluation was not consistent with the program [ . %%% CE }À CE ] š CE ] v process will proceed to step 1. If the evaluation was consistent with the program [ . %%% CE }À CE ] š CE ] v will be denied.

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

The evaluation (scores and reasons) will be forwarded to the department chair/ school director/program coordinator in writing, and will be shared with the evaluatee.



- (IV) The department chair/school director/program coordinator will assign a score in each of the evaluation (scores plus reasons addressing criteria) will be shared with the program area faculty and with and the





resolve any differences between department/program area faculty evaluations and that of the department chair/school director/program coordinator. [See also (III) below].

(A) If the program area and department chair/school director/program coordinator cannot reach agreement on evaluation procedures, the same procedures used in comprehensive evaluation will apply.

(c) Process.

- (I) The evaluatee shall prepare a dossier covering the accomplishments for the period under review. Failure to submit a dossier for review shall result in an overall evaluation rating of unsatisfactory.
- (II) The program area faculty will conduct their evaluation in accordance with their approved annual/biennial/triennial evaluation criteria and procedures and forward evaluation (scores and reasons), in writing, to the department chair/school director/program coordinator.
- (III) The department chair/school director/program coordinator will conduct his/her own independent evaluation, based upon the approved program area criteria, of the faculty.
- (IV) In the case of contract/renewable faculty in promotable ranks, the evaluatee may request that the program area faculty, the department chair/school director/program coordinator, and the dean conduct an evaluation.
- (V) Both of these evaluations will be forwarded to the dean. The dean will assign scores except in the case of an evaluatee who appeals his or her evaluation score from the program area faculty or department chair/school director/program coordinator.
- (VI) If, on appeal from the evaluatee, the dean conducts an independent evaluation and if the department chair/school director/coordinator, after unsuccessful attempts have been made to resolve those disagreements, then the dean and the department/program area chair/school director will forward their individual evaluations and rationale to the dean, who will make the final decision.

2-3-801(5) Confidentiality and professional Ethics.

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

Review will provide regular and systematic evaluation of performance of faculty in the areas of teaching, research, scholarship and creative works, and service. Assessment of faculty performance in these areas will review their established responsibilities as determined by workload assignment. Faculty will consult with their department chair/school director /program coordinators regarding their individual assignment areas. This will allow the adjustment of their activities as goals for individuals and the University change. Single consultation will provide for the encouragement of professional development and renewal, and individual excellence and achievement. Post tenure review will encourage faculty to engage in activities that contribute to the mission and goals of the University, the colleges, departments, schools, and program areas. Review will ensure that faculty members are fulfilling their University responsibilities, and will assist faculty who are not achieving at satisfactory levels to do so. Evaluations must be consistent with principles of academic freedom, the tenure system, due process, and other protected rights.

---