

Subject: Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review

Reference to Senate Minutes dated: April 5, 2021

Senate Action:

MOTION: Welfare

Attachment to Senate Action #1213

Approved by the Faculty Senate

April 5, 2021

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 workload assigned by the chair/director/program coordinator. See Faculty Workload Policy 3-3-801(4)(a)(XII).

(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 performance will be evaluated and 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.

(III) TenureTrack Faculty. TenureTrack faculty must complete an annual review in years 2, 3 (in conjunction with pretenure review), 4 and 5 (and year 6, if applicable). In year 3, pre-tenure review materials must be organized so that an annual review can also be completed. If, in the pre-tenure review, the faculty member receives “exceeds expectations” or higher in either instruction or professional activity, and “meets expectations” or higher in the other areas, they may complete a biennial review covering years 4 and 5, instead of completing annual reviews for years 4 and 5.

(IV) Tenured Associate Professors. Tenured Associate Professors must complete, at a minimum, a biennial review once every two years, and they may request an annual review in any year. When the annual/biennial review coincides with a comprehensive review, materials must be organized so that an annual/biennial review can also be completed.

(V) Tenured Full Professors. Tenured Full Professors must complete, at a minimum, a triennial review once every three years. They may request an annual/biennial review in any year. When the annual/biennial/triennial review coincides with a comprehensive review, materials must be organized so that an annual/biennial/triennial review can also be completed.

(VI) Tenured faculty may opt out of an annual review for the 2020 review period or opt for a biennial review for the 2019/2020 review period. Faculty who do so shall either complete an annual review for the 2021 review period or a biennial review for the 2021/2022 review period. A tenured faculty member who opts out of an annual/biennial review under this subsection (VI) does not modify the timing of their next comprehensive review, which comprehensive review will include evaluation of

(II)

Part 8 Faculty Evaluation. [See Also Title 3, Article 3, Part 3, 3-3-303(5) Performance Evaluation.)

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

The substantive evaluation of a faculty member's performance is necessarily restricted to those disciplines or, as appropriate, multidisciplinary 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.

- (e) Program Area: For the purposes of this policy, “program area” shall mean a discipline based unit which may be multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or unidisciplinary and may consist of several emphasis areas or graduate and undergraduate degrees.
- (f) Department: A department is an administrative subdivision of a college, which shall be considered to consist of one program area.
- (g) Free standing program: An administrative unit of a college that is not a department nor housed within a school. The coordinator of such a program will fulfill the duties assigned to department chairs/school directors in the evaluation process.
- (h) Program Area Faculty: For the purposes of this policy, “Program Area Faculty” shall mean the faculty of a program area within a school. In the case of a single discipline school, the faculty of the school is the program area faculty. In the case of a multidisciplinary school, the faculty of each program area within the school is the program area faculty. The faculty of a department are also program area faculty.
- (i) Program Coordinators: For the purposes of this policy, program coordinators refer to the coordinator of a free standing program where there is no chair or director.
- (j) Department Faculty: All of the faculty in a department will be considered to be members of a single discipline based unit or program area.
- (k) Multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary activities: Teaching or professional activities that draw from or are at the intersection of more than one discipline.
- (l) Evaluation level: There are five levels of evaluation: Excellent (= V), Exceeds Expectations (= IV), Meets Expectations (= III), Needs Improvement (= II), Unsatisfactory (= I). The evaluation level is determined by the following evaluation scale in the table below:
- (m) Evaluation Scale (Round to the nearest 0.1)

V. 4.6 - 5.0 Excellent

IV. 3.6 -

(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 program area's approved 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 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 mission that 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 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 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. Program area approved criteria in place pri

(II)

(IV) The department chair/school director/program

responsibility of the evaluatee to gather and submit evidence to be used as the basis of evaluation. Since the evaluatee is essentially “making a case”, it is also the right of the evaluatee to include whatever evidence he or she believes to be relevant to the evaluation of his or her performance.

- (II) Faculty, Chair/School Director/Program Coordinator. The substantive evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, professional activity and service, consistent with the program area criteria, and evaluation procedures, is the responsibility of the faculty and the chair/school director/program coordinator in the program area.
- (III) Dean. The responsibility of the dean is to assure that the scores assigned and the reasons given by program area faculty and the chair/school director/program coordinator are consistent with approved program area criteria and procedures.
- (IV) Chief Academic Officer. The responsibility of the Chief Academic Officer is to assure that the evaluation levels assigned and the reasons given by program area faculty and the chair/ director and dean are consistent with approved program area criteria and procedures. In particular, it is the responsibility of the Chief Academic Officer to resolve disagreement between the program area faculty and chair and the dean on this matter in cases involving application for tenure, promotion or posttenure review.

2-3-801(4) Annual/Biennial/Triennial Review.

Annual/Biennial/Triennial review provides a mechanism for regular feedback to all faculty members regarding academic rank as to their performance and determining merit pay. Satisfactory annual/biennial/triennial reviews do not guarantee or determine a successful comprehensive review. A faculty member may request annual/biennial/triennial review in any year.

(a) Definitions

- (I) Dossier: Portfolio of information relative to performance which shall include a narrative of accomplishments during the review period, an updated vita in approved university format; appropriate documentation; all student evaluations covering all teaching assignments, and other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate.
- (II) Professional activity: Activities pertaining to research, scholarship and creative works.
- (III) School: An administrative subdivision of a college which may consist of more program areas. A school may be multidisciplinary, in which case it comprises more than one program area, or single disciplinary, in which case it comprises a single program area.
- (IV) Program Area: For the purposes of this policy, “program area” shall mean a discipline-based unit which may be multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or unidisciplinary and may consist of several emphasis areas or graduate and undergraduate degrees.
- (V) Department: A department is an administrative subdivision of a college which shall be considered to consist of one program area.
- (VI) Free standing program: An administrative unit of a college that is neither a department nor housed within a school. The coordinator of such a program will fulfill the duties assigned to department chairs/school directors in the evaluation process.

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 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 member's performance.
- (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 comment on the evaluatee's progress toward promotion.
- (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 to 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 dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the department/program area faculty and/or chair/school director/coordinator, after unsuccessful attempts have been made to resolve those disagreements, then the dean and the department/program area and chair/school director will forward their individual evaluations and rationale to the CA, 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 administer the affairs of the University, or to comply with the law

Additional BPM policy section in need of update. Additions highlighted.

1-1-307(3) Post-Tenure Review.

All faculty at the University are subject to annual/biennial/triennial review and comprehensive post-tenure review. Faculty review and evaluation at the University has long included a comprehensive, summative, multi-year requirement, as well as an annual/biennial/triennial review process. Both of these review procedures meet the guidelines developed by the Colorado Comm 15.67onten.2 (n2.2 (n)2.3 (al))TJ 0s)-1.3 (r)-5.5 (alu)26 (w)-3.8 (an)2.

Review will provide regular and systematic evaluation of performance of faculty in the areas of teaching, research,