



University of Colorado Denver

Campus Administrative Policy

Title: Post-Tenure Review Campus Policy and Procedures

Prepared by: Laura D. Goodwin, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Faculty Affairs)

Approved by: Roderick Nairn, Ph.D.
Provost

Effective date: October 1, 2009

Replaces: University of Colorado Health Sciences Center *Campus Procedures and Implementation Plan for Post-Tenure Review* (August 1999)

Applies to: All UC Denver campuses

References:

1. University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement, *Post-Tenure Review* (https://www.cusys.edu/policies/policies/HR_Post-Tenure-Review.html)
2. University of Colorado Denver *Suggested Template for Performance Improvement Agreements (PIA)* (<http://www.cudenver.edu/ADMINISTRATION/OFFICE%20OF%20THE%20PROVOST/FACULTYAFFAIRS/Pages/FacultyAffairs.aspx>)
3. University of Colorado Denver *Suggested Template for Development Plans* (<http://www.cudenver.edu/ADMINISTRATION/OFFICE%20OF%20THE%20PROVOST/FACULTYAFFAIRS/Pages/FacultyAffairs.aspx>)

Introduction

In 2006, the University of Colorado Advisory Committee on Tenure-Related Processes developed recommendations for revising the university's post-tenure review (PTR) process. A revised Administrative Policy Statement (APS) on *Post-Tenure Review*, signed by President Hank Brown on November 1, 2006, replaced the former policy statement (1984).

As is required by the University of Colorado APS on *Post-Tenure Review*, this document describes the University of Colorado Denver procedures for peer evaluation during PTR, for appeals of the PTR evaluation, and for granting PTR development awards. It also includes other procedural details not explicitly covered in the University of Colorado APS on *Post-Tenure Review*. It supplements, but does

not repeat, the information found in the University of Colorado APS on *Post-Tenure Review*, 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.

Policy

As stated in the University of Colorado APS on *Post-Tenure Review*:

Tenure is granted with the expectation of continued professional growth and ongoing productivity in teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and service. Thus, every tenured faculty member has a duty to maintain professional competence. The purposes of PTR 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.

Procedures

- Peer evaluation during PTR: As stated in the University of Colorado APS on *Post-Tenure Review*, PTR evaluations will be conducted by appropriate faculty peers—either the primary unit faculty or the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee. At UC Denver, 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. The primary unit or the college personnel review committee will follow the PTR procedures detailed in the University of Colorado APS on *Post-Tenure Review*. In addition for UC Denver PTRs:
 - The faculty member under review must furnish an updated curriculum vita; 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 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.
 - 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 vita.
 - At the conclusion of the report, the PTR Committee must rate the faculty member's overall academic performance as "outstanding," "exceeding expectations," "meeting expectations," or "below 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.

- The chair of the PTR Committee should 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.
 - If a faculty member receives a PTR summary rating of “below expectations,” the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement as outlined in the University of Colorado APS on *Post-Tenure Review*.
 - 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.
- 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. At UC Denver, 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.”
 - PTR development awards: As stated in the University of Colorado APS on *Post-Tenure Review*:

To contribute toward the developmental purpose of PTR, each college and school shall have a PTR development fund to which faculty undergoing PTR (or who have successfully completed PTR) may apply. A faculty committee shall make recommendations to the dean who shall make the final determination. In evaluating these applications, the committee should consider the return on investment to the college that might be anticipated. These modest awards are designed to assist faculty by providing training, travel, and other resources needed to move forward, as outlined in their Professional Plans. Colleges and schools shall develop their PTR development fund from existing or new resources and shall begin distributing funds by 2010.
 - Other procedural details for UC Denver:
 - Advisor and resource office for PIAs: The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Faculty Affairs) will serve as the advisor and resource person for UC Denver. 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”:
<http://www.cudenver.edu/ADMINISTRATION/OFFICE%20OF%20THE%20PROVOST/FACULTYAFFAIRS/Pages/FacultyAffairs.aspx>)

- Sanctions: Per the University of Colorado APS, 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.