A. INTRODUCTION

As is required by the University of Colorado APS #1022” Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion”, this document describes the University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus procedures for peer evaluation during post-tenure review (hereafter PTR), for appeals of the PTR evaluation, and for granting PTR development awards. It also includes other procedural details not explicitly covered in APS #1022. It supplements, but does not repeat, the information found in APS # 1022, including definitions and procedural details pertaining to: regular five-year PTRs; triggered reviews; Performance Improvement Agreements (PIAs); Extensive Reviews and Development Plans; sanctions that may be imposed when Development Plans do not produce the desired results; and assessment of
B. POLICY STATEMENT

Tenure is granted with the expectation of continued professional growth and ongoing productivity in teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service. Every tenured faculty member has a duty to maintain professional competence. The purposes of PTR, as stated in APS #1022 are: 1) to facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with the academic needs and goals of the University and the most effective use of institutional resources and; 2) to ensure professional accountability by a regular, comprehensive evaluation of every tenured faculty member’s performance.

C. PROCEDURES

1. PTR evaluations will be conducted by appropriate faculty peers—either the primary unit faculty or the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee. Each school and college, and the Auraria Library, will develop a written statement that describes how the primary unit or a different college personnel review committee will be constituted for the PTR evaluations. In addition to following the PTR procedures detailed in APS #1022, the primary unit or the college personnel review committee will make sure that:
   a. The faculty member under review must furnish an updated curriculum vitae; the five previous annual performance evaluation reports, including students’ evaluations of teaching, peer reviews of teaching, and, if desired, other types of teaching evaluation data; copies of recent publications and evidence about research funding; evidence of university and public leadership/service; and, if applicable, evidence of clinical work. The committee will also review the previous Professional Plan and an updated Professional Plan for the next five years. The committee may (but is not required to) request written evaluations from respected peers within or outside the faculty member’s department and school or college.

2. The PTR Committee will prepare a brief written report summarizing the faculty member’s academic accomplishments; it is not necessary to reiterate detailed information that is included in the vitae.

3. At the conclusion of the report, the PTR Committee must rate the faculty member’s overall academic performance as “outstanding,” “exceeding expectations,” “meeting expectations,” “below expectations” or “failing to meet expectations.” Each school and college, and the Auraria Library, shall develop guidelines for each of these categories; most important, each primary unit must define “meeting expectations,” the standard of acceptable professional performance. The guidelines should be incorporated into the primary unit’s written criteria for tenure and promotion, or into the unit’s bylaws.

4. The chair of the PTR Committee shall submit the committee’s written report to the
department chair (if applicable), who will forward it to the dean. (In schools and
colleges without departments, the committee chair will forward the report directly
to the dean.) The department chair may elect to attach a letter of concurrence or
non-concurrence. A copy of the PTR report will be given to the faculty member
and a copy should be placed in the faculty member’s departmental (or
school/college) personnel file.

5. If a faculty member receives a PTR summary rating of “below expectation” or
“failing to meet expectations,” the faculty member must undertake a Performance
Improvement Agreement as outlined in the University of Colorado APS 5008.

6. Early in the fall semester, the deans will provide a summary report on all PTRs
conducted during the previous year, as well as copies of the individual reports, to
the Provost’s Office.

D. APPEALS OF PTR EVALUATIONS

Faculty members who believe that the results of the PTR evaluations are mistaken may
appeal their ratings through established grievance procedures in the schools and colleges.
Each school and college, and the Auraria Library, will develop a grievance procedure. A
written document will detail the composition of the grievance committee for the
school/college/library, as well as procedures to be used to review the grievance. Faculty
members who wish to appeal their rating must submit their appeal, in writing, to the dean
of the college, school or library within two weeks of the receipt of the PTR results. As
stated in the University of Colorado APS on Post-Tenure Review, “This appeal process
should be completed within six weeks or less from the date it is initiated by the faculty
member…”

E. ADVICE FOR PIA

The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Faculty Affairs) will serve as the
advisor and resource person for the university. The Associate Vice Chancellor will
provide advice to the faculty member, the primary unit and the PTR committees on best
practices, models or templates for PIAs, benchmarks, and timelines. (See “Suggested
Template for Performance Improvement Agreements” and “Suggested Template for
Development Plans”, [link](http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/faculty-
affairs/policies-forms/Pages/default.aspx))

F. SANCTIONS

Per the University of Colorado APS # 1022, tenured faculty members who do not
achieve ratings of at least “meeting expectations” in response to triggered reviews,
extensive reviews and performance improvement agreements, are subject to sanctions.
In such cases, the dean of the faculty member’s college or school shall appoint an
appropriate faculty committee, which will review the materials submitted by the
department and the faculty member. After a thorough review of all pertinent documents,
the committee shall forward its findings, including any recommended sanctions, to the
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