



University of Colorado
Anschutz Medical Campus

School of Medicine

MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard D. Krugman, MD
Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs and Dean, School of Medicine

FROM: Steven R. Lowenstein, MD, MPH
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs

RE: Appeals Process: Appeals of Faculty Performance Ratings

DATE: April 24, 2014

Background

Consistent with Regent laws and policies and Administrative Policy Statement APS 5008 (Performance Ratings for Faculty), the performance of all faculty members will be evaluated and rated annually. The *performance evaluation* (the substantive, written evaluation conducted using PRiSM) provides the basis for merit and other pay adjustments. The narrative performance evaluation also provides the basis for the individual *performance rating*; the performance rating is the overall, numerical (1-5) summary of the faculty member's performance and constitutes the public record, in accordance with the Colorado Open Records Act.

Faculty members who receive a rating of "below expectations" or "fails to meet expectations" must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA).

Importantly, APS 5008 also provides that "Faculty members who believe that the [department's] evaluation is mistaken may appeal the rating through established grievance procedures in the college or school." This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date it is initiated by the faculty member, and no action will be taken to begin a PIA until this appeal process is completed." This memorandum outlines the SOM appeals process, which is in addition to any appeals procedure provided by an individual department or division.

Recommended Appeals Process for the School of Medicine

1. A faculty member who disagrees with his or her performance rating shall notify, in writing, the department chair and the Dean of the School of Medicine. The department chair and faculty member shall meet, in order to review the reasons why the chair selected a "below expectations" or "failed to meet expectations" rating and the reasons why the faculty member feels the rating is mistaken, in an attempt to resolve their differences.
2. If the chair and faculty member cannot reach an agreement on the performance rating, then the faculty member shall prepare a written statement, outlining why the performance rating is not accurate; the faculty member shall submit this document to the Dean of the School of Medicine (or his or her designee). The faculty member must submit this written statement within 7 business days after meeting with his or her chair.



Downtown Campus
Denver, Colorado

Anschutz Medical Campus
Aurora, Colorado

3. The Dean shall forward the faculty member's written appeal to the department chair. The department chair shall respond, in writing, within 7 days. The Dean (or designee) shall provide a copy of the department chair's response to the faculty member.

4. Once the Dean (or designee) has reviewed the written statements of the faculty member and the chair, the Dean may:
a) Ask that the faculty member and department chair meet again to reconsider their positions regarding the performance rating; b) Submit both documents to an ad hoc committee, which shall review the documents and make a recommendation to the Dean; or c) decide in favor of the faculty member or the department chair. The dean shall uphold the chair's decision, unless there is clear evidence that the chair failed to consider all relevant information, failed to follow departmental and School of Medicine policies, or that the performance rating assigned to the faculty member was biased or arbitrary.

