Multiple methods are used to evaluate and measure faculty performance in teaching, patient care, scholarship, and service. All full-time faculty are evaluated on an annual basis by department chairs and the Dean. Faculty and courses are also evaluated at the end of each semester by students. Faculty performance and progress in fulfilling the requirements for promotion and/or tenure are evaluated by peers in a comprehensive manner several years prior to the year in which they are actually recommended for promotion and again when they are put forth for promotion. Following promotion to the associate professor level each faculty must undergo post-tenure/post-promotion review every five years. The usual timing of these five separate faculty evaluation processes is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluator(s)</th>
<th>Timing of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Review and Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>Department Chair and Dean</td>
<td>Annually in March or April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher &amp; Course Evaluation</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Completion of Every Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Review</td>
<td>Promotion and Tenure Committees</td>
<td>Midway in Tenure Probationary Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/Tenure Review</td>
<td>Promotion &amp; Tenure Committees &amp; Dean</td>
<td>Seventh Year for Associate Professor and Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-tenure/Post-promotion Review</td>
<td>Post-tenure Review Committee</td>
<td>Every Five Years Following Promotion to Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation
Performance of all full-time faculty is evaluated on an annual basis as part of the University salary setting process. This evaluation process begins with all faculty members being notified of the timeframe for completing the faculty review and planning process, and being provided a copy of the applicable forms to be used. Faculty complete the review form and attach supporting materials such as grant face sheets, copies of published articles, teaching materials developed, etc. These materials are submitted to the department chair who reviews the information. If there are questions concerning the material submitted, the department chair meets with the faculty for further clarification.
Each department chair submits the reviews for departmental faculty to the Dean’s Office for review and scoring. The department chair then meets with the Dean to review and discuss the performance of and scoring for each faculty member. They jointly agree on the final performance rating for each faculty member. The Dean ensures that there is consistency of ratings across departments. It is the department chair’s responsibility to meet with faculty to provide feedback on the evaluation of performance in teaching, patient care, research, and service and on the overall performance rating for the year.

The performance of each faculty member is based in part on the goals established for the faculty member the previous year and the agreed upon manner in which the faculty member’s effort was to be distributed for the year. All faculty have a Professional Plan that includes one- and five-year goals, as well as how the faculty member’s work effort should be distributed in the year. For example, a faculty member who is to devote 70% effort to research and 20% effort to teaching would have more substantial research goals that someone devoting only 20% effort to research. When reviewing a faculty member’s annual review and performance rating, the department chair and faculty member jointly agree upon new one- and five-year goals and the distribution of effort for the following year.

The final step of the annual evaluation and salary setting process is the determination of the salary increases for faculty. A “Base, Supplement and Incentive” (BSI) compensation plan was established by a faculty committee approved by the Faculty Senate in October 2004. The BSI compensation plan provides the basis for determining salary levels for each faculty member. The base is determined consistent with changes in the mean salary levels of peers. Each rank in each classification (clinical, research, allied, etc.) has an established base salary level. The established amount is equivalent to eighty (80) percent of the mean peer salary.

The base is adjusted annually consistent with peer salary changes and funding availability. The supplement portion of a faculty’s compensation is established based on merit, market, equity, and other pertinent factors. The supplement level is individually determined while the base is rank and classification determined. Clinical supplement plans were recently established to reward and incentivize faculty participation in the student clinics and other specified academic activity. The incentive portion of the compensation plan provides incentive bonuses for the faculties’ participation in the Dental Faculty Practice Plan.

After a review of funding availability the Dean determines the amount of monies that are to be available for the base and supplement components of the compensation plan. The criteria for each component then dictate the annual salary adjustments. The clinical supplement plan adjustments are implemented as part of the annual salary process and also as a separate mid year adjustment. These adjustments are based on individual and clinic/program productivity. The Dean finalizes and approves all salary adjustments after review and input from the pertinent chair persons. The faculty incentive payments from the Dental Faculty Practice Plan are made once a quarter based on clinical earnings.

**Teacher and Course Evaluation**
All faculty who participate in a substantial manner in lecture, laboratory, and clinical teaching
are evaluated regularly by students. These evaluations are coordinated by the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the evaluation forms used are approved by the Curriculum Committee. In addition, students evaluate every course, every year. The results of the evaluations performed by students are provided to the faculty member, his/her department chair, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Course evaluations are also provided to members of the Dental Curriculum Subcommittee.

Periodic surveys of graduates are also performed by the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. These surveys obtain information from graduates concerning the adequacy and quality of courses and recommendations for improving courses. The results of these surveys are also provided to course directors, department chairs and the Dental Curriculum Subcommittee.

**Peer Review** ([Link to Policy](#))
The School has recently implemented a Peer Review for all faculty participating in didactic course teaching. A peer faculty member will observe at least two lectures per semester and document the observance. The documentation (standard form) will indicate the reviewers’ perspective of the performance of the faculty member. The reviewer will present the documentation to the faculty member for discussion and clarification. The faculty member acknowledges the review by signing the document. The document is sent to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the department chairperson.

**Interim Evaluation** ([Link to Procedures and Guidelines](#))
Interim evaluations are intended to facilitate faculty development consistent with the academic needs and goals of the School of Dental Medicine, and in compliance with the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook. These procedures apply to all faculty in their probationary period, including faculty with the following types of appointment: tenure track, clinical/teaching (C/T) track, and research track.

Each faculty member below the rank of associate professor is evaluated in a comprehensive manner at least once during the probationary period apart from the review for promotion and/or award of tenure. The evaluation includes extramural evaluation of the candidate. Each faculty member is informed orally and in writing of the results of the evaluation.

Interim evaluations generally occur in the third or fourth year of a faculty member’s full-time appointment. If a faculty member receives credit for experience at another institution toward the probationary period, the interim review would normally be conducted earlier than the third or fourth year. During the first year of a faculty member’s appointment, the department chair (or the Dean, if the faculty member is a department chair) and faculty member jointly determine during which year the interim evaluation will be conducted, and state the agreed-upon year in writing. The written agreement is maintained in the departmental files (or the Dean’s Office, if the faculty member is a department chair) and a photocopy forwarded to the Office of Financial Affairs.

Department chairs (or the Dean, if the faculty member is a department chair) advise each faculty member regarding the criteria and standards that the School of Dental Medicine uses in reaching
a decision about the candidate’s performance, and provides the criteria and standards in writing to each faculty member well in advance of the interim evaluation period. In addition, department chairs (or the Dean, if the faculty member is a department chair) advise faculty members at least once each year as to how that individual is progressing toward fulfilling the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

The criteria for evaluating the performance of faculty include those that are used in the School of Dental Medicine for promotion and tenure of full-time faculty. The faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly activities, and service are the main focus of the evaluation. The general guideline in determining acceptable performance is whether the faculty member's growth and accomplishments in these three areas are progressing at a level consistent with other faculty members at the University of Colorado Denver School of Dental Medicine and other similar institutions. The balance of accomplishments in the three areas are also evaluated in light of the goals of the School and department and any official changes in job assignment, e.g., major increases or decreases in administrative, teaching, or research duties.

External evidence of a faculty member's performance is incorporated in the evaluation. This evidence includes, but is not limited to, national awards, honors, offices in national or international academic/professional organizations, editorial functions for scholarly journals, publications in refereed journals, and papers presented at regional, national, or international meetings.

**Promotion and Tenure Review**
The manner in which faculty are evaluated for promotion in rank and/or tenure is specified in the Laws of the Regents of the University of Colorado and further defined in School of Dental Medicine Faculty Senate documents. Since the promotion and tenure process is described in detail in the response to Standard 3-5, it is only briefly described in this section.

Evaluation of faculty performance and accomplishments to determine the degree to which faculty performance satisfies the relevant criteria for promotion in rank or for tenure is a multi-phase process.

This process includes evaluation by a faculty member’s department chair, peers from within the School, peers from other dental schools and/or other professional organizations or agencies, two committees of peers in the School of Dental Medicine, and another campus-wide committee consisting of faculty from all of the schools on campus, i.e., Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and the Graduate School. The breadth of the peer review and evaluation for promotion and tenure helps ensure that faculty are evaluated in a thorough, comprehensive, and objective manner.

**Post-tenure Review** *(Link to Procedures and Guidelines)*
The intent of post-tenure peer review is to facilitate continued faculty development consistent with the academic needs and goals of the University and the most effective use of institutional resources, and to ensure professional accountability by a regular, comprehensive evaluation of the performance of every tenured faculty member and every clinical-track faculty member promoted to the associate professor C/T level and above.

Post-tenure reviews are conducted in the fall of each year. Faculty will normally be reviewed for
the first time in the fifth year following the granting of tenure. In unusual cases, a faculty member may be reviewed earlier than the fifth year. Review prior to the fifth year must be initiated by either the faculty member or his/her department chair and approved by the dean.

The criteria for evaluating the post-tenure performance of faculty include those that are used in the School of Dental Medicine for promotion and/or tenure of full-time faculty members. The faculty member's continued accomplishments in teaching, scholarly activities, and service following the granting of tenure/promotion shall be the main focus of the review. The general guideline in determining acceptable performance is whether the faculty member's growth and accomplishments in these three areas have continued at a level consistent with tenured/promoted faculty members at the University of Colorado Denver School of Dental Medicine and other similar institutions. The balance in accomplishments in the three areas should also be evaluated in light of the goals of the School and department and any official changes in job assignment e.g. major increases or decreases in administrative, teaching, or research duties.

External evidence of a faculty member's performance is incorporated in the review. This evidence includes, but is not limited to, national awards, honors, offices held in national or international academic/professional organizations, editorial functions for scholarly journals, publications in refereed journals, and papers at regional, national, or international meetings. The review may also include evaluations from persons external to the University who have been selected from lists provided by the faculty member and the peer-review group.

The level of post-tenure review undertaken - Regular or Extensive - is determined by the public record of annual performance ratings for faculty. Faculty receiving an evaluation of “meeting expectations” or better since the award of tenure/promotion or the last post-tenure/post-promotion review undergoes Regular Review. Faculty who have a single "below expectations" in the review period undergo Regular Review, and must also participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement. Faculty who receive two "below expectations" ratings within the previous five years undergo Extensive Review.