



Administrative Policy

Policy Title: Post-Tenure Review Campus Policy and Procedures

Policy Number: 1050 Functional Area: **Academic and Faculty Affairs**

Effective: July 1, 2015
 Date Last Amended/Reviewed: July 1, 2015
 Date Scheduled for Review: July 1, 2022
 Supersedes: Post-Tenure Review Campus Policy and Procedures (October 1, 2009)

Approved by: Roderick Nairn
 Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs

Prepared by: Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 Reviewing Office: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Responsible Officer: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Applies to: University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus
 University of Colorado Denver

A. INTRODUCTION

As is required by the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement (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 PTR.

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" (Exhibit A))

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

Provost and Chancellor.

Notes

1. Dates of official enactment and amendments:
October 1, 2009: Adopted by Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs
July 1, 2015: Amended
2. History:
May 8, 2018: Modified to reflect a Campus-wide effort to recast and revitalize various Campus policy sites into a standardized and more coherent set of chaptered policy statement organized around the several operational divisions of the university.
February 8, 2019: Links corrected
3. Initial Policy Effective Date: October 1, 2009
4. Cross References/Appendix:
 - [Administrative Policy Statement 1022, Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion](#)
 - [Administrative Policy Statement 5008, Performance Ratings for Faculty](#)
 - [Exhibit A, Suggested Template for Development Plans](#)

University of Colorado Denver
Suggested Template for Development Plans

Background

The University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement (APS) on *Post-Tenure Review* (PTR) requires that a faculty member who has received two “below expectations” ratings within the previous five years (either as a result of annual performance evaluations or as a result of PTR), or whose Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) rating did not result in an evaluation of “meeting expectations” or higher, must undergo an Extensive Review by the primary unit. The result of an Extensive Review is the Development Plan.

Appealing the “Below Expectations” Rating

If a faculty member does not agree with a rating of “below expectations” (from either the annual performance evaluation or a PTR), he/she can appeal the rating through established grievance procedures in the school/college/library. The faculty member must submit a written appeal within two weeks of the receipt of the “below expectations” results. No action to begin an Extensive Review will be taken until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. The appeal process should be completed within six weeks from the date it is initiated by the faculty member.

Extensive Reviews

For procedural information about Extensive Reviews, see the University of Colorado APS 5008 *Performance Ratings for Faculty*.

The Development Plan and Timeframe

As described in the University of Colorado APS 5008:

Upon completion of the [Extensive Review] evaluative report, the faculty member, working with the appropriate primary unit committee, shall write a Development Plan for the next one or two years with specific goals and actions designed to address the areas of deficiency identified in the Extensive Review process. The Development Plan must address the teaching, research/creative work, clinical activities, and Leadership and service assignments anticipated during the period of the plan. It must describe performance goals in light of identified deficiencies, strategies for improvement, and the time frame (up to two years) in which the problems are to be solved. Further, the Plan must contain definite means of measuring progress in achieving the goals and periodic monitoring of progress. Finally, the Development Plan must be approved by the primary unit head and the dean, following consultation with the appropriate primary unit committee.

Evaluating Progress

As stated in the University of Colorado APS 5008:

At the conclusion of the Development Plan period, either (1) the faculty and head of the primary unit or (2) the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee assess the progress

of the faculty member and forward their conclusions to the dean. After consultation with the dean's review committee, the dean determines whether the faculty member has achieved the goals of the Development Plan and thus has returned his/her professional performance to meeting expectations. Those who are judged to be meeting expectations begin a new 5-year PTR cycle in the next academic year. Those who are judged not to have achieved professional competence will face sanctions, including the possibility of revocation of tenure and dismissal. Copies of the Extensive Review Development Plan and the primary unit's assessment of the progress achieved by the end of the development period will be added to the faculty member's personnel file.

Suggested Development Plan Template

Name: _____ Dept. Chair: _____

Department: _____ School/College/Library: _____

Date: _____

I. Statement of general deficiencies warranting the Extensive Review and the Development Plan:

II. Specific deficiencies (list for each area, if applicable):

- Research/creative work:

- Teaching:

- Leadership and service:

- Clinical work:

- Other areas of professional responsibility:

III. Goals and actions designed to address the deficiencies identified in the Extensive Review process: Include goals for teaching, research/creative work, clinical activities, and service assignments anticipated during the period of the Development Plan. For each goal, indicate the action plan or strategies for improvement; the timeline (expected date by which the goal will be met); benchmarks or indicators of success; and date(s) for periodic progress reviews.

Goal	Action Plan or Strategies for Improvement	Timeline (by when will goal be met?)	Benchmarks/Indicators of Success	Date(s) for Periodic Progress Reviews
------	---	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

IV. Timeframe for the Development Plan:

- Start date: _____
- Duration (one or two years?): _____
- Date for assessment of progress: _____

V. Routing: The original, signed copy of the Development Plan should be kept in the dean’s office. Copies of the signed Development Plan go to: the faculty member, the head of the primary unit or the school/college/library personnel review committee, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Faculty Affairs).

VI. Signatures:

 Faculty Member Date

 Head of Primary Unit or College Personnel Review Committee Date

 Dean Date