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This document describes the policies and procedures adopted by the School of Public Affairs to implement those portions of the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook and UCDHSC-DDC (hereinafter, “campus”) policies related to the periodic review of faculty performance for the purposes of School decision making on questions of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. It also sets forth procedures for annual performance review (including peer review) for the purpose of decision making on questions of faculty remuneration.

Section 1 sets forth the School’s Mission Statement and Goals. Section 2 describes in general terms the criteria for evaluating faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and community service; what constitutes acceptable and appropriate evidence of attainment of these criteria; and what standards will be applied in the determination of how well faculty members are adhering to the general criteria at the time of periodic review (i.e., pre-tenure, tenure, promotion to full professor, post-tenure) and annual performance reviews. Section 3 of this document then describes the procedures (including decision structures) to be used in making decisions concerning these criteria, evidence, and standards in individual cases.
The SPA Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (hereinafter, “RTP”) Committee and the Faculty Council make every reasonable effort to assure that these policies and procedures remain contemporaneous with general policies and subject-specific administrative policy statements on RTP matters emanating from the offices of campus and university system-wide administrators, as well as with the text of current editions of the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook and the Laws of the Regents. However, whenever clear conflicts are found to exist between the School’s policies and procedures and those of controlling sources of authority superior to and external to the School, the latter shall be understood to prevail.

1. **Mission and Goals.**

The School of Public Affairs’ mission is to improve the quality of public life in our state, region, and nation. To achieve this mission, the School has set the following objectives:

- Build educational and research excellence, establishing SPA as the best school of public affairs in its region and a top-ranked, nationally recognized school;
- Focus on solving pressing public problems, both by developing students’ problem-solving skills and by engaging the School’s community in research and action that addresses important societal issues;
- Strengthen SPA’s contribution to successful student career development;
- Serve all of Colorado, the mountain West, and the global community.

Given its mission and goals, SPA requires a faculty representing a substantial range of disciplines and experience. Likewise, it calls for an integration of theory and practice, of model building and experience, in the study


- Effective classroom instruction and assessment, such that students obtain knowledge and skills needed to perform effectively in their careers based on current knowledge, theory, research, and practice;

- Effective guidance and instruction to enhance students’ knowledge and professional growth outside of classroom settings (for example: advising; participation on advanced seminar projects, theses, or dissertations; enhancing student learning through research and community service projects, internships, facilitation of student participation in actual policy or management processes.)

2.1.2. Evidence of Attainment. Below is a list of possible examples of evidence of the attainment of teaching that would be deemed meritorious or excellent. It is not expected that all faculty will have generated all these different forms of evidence during a given review period. Performance in classroom instruction and assessment may be demonstrated by:

- Course syllabi reflecting current knowledge, concepts, and principles in the relevant subject area;

- Course evaluations, in particular items indicating students’ assessment of their learning;
• Assessment measures or assignments given in the classroom and examples of student performance;
• Innovative course activities or exercises designed to help students’ attain specified learning outcomes;
• A pattern of course standards, assessments, and grading that reflects appropriate standards for the course level being taught;
• Evaluation of classroom performance by outside observers, e.g., other faculty, staff from the Center for Faculty Development;
• Recognitions or awards for distinguished teaching;
• Surveys, letters, or other documents from former students or alumni.

Effective guidance and instruction to students outside of the traditional classroom setting may be demonstrated by:

• Effective performance as a chair or reader on advanced seminar, thesis, and dissertation committees and/or supervision of independent studies, or internships as indicated by numbers of such activities and the quality of final products;
• Student advising;
• Organizing or actively participating in other activities that encourage student learning, e.g., working with students on research or community-related projects, mentoring Ph.D. students for research, organizing student activities for professional growth such as attendance at conferences or organizing student seminars or guest speakers

Participation in SPA curriculum design and policies regarding teaching and student learning may be demonstrated by:

• Documents reflecting participation in program planning and curriculum design, including participation in the planning and teaching of core courses in the degree program(s) within which the faculty member teaches;
• Positive judgments by colleagues on curriculum committees, task forces, etc. on the candidate’s contribution to committee work (e.g., letters of support documenting type and nature of contribution);
• Collaboration or sharing of teaching approaches and materials with other faculty;
• New course syllabi that address identified needs of students.
2.2. Criteria for the Evaluation of Research and Evidence of Attainment.

The learning community of faculty and students of the School of Public Affairs assumes that all faculty members have an active, compelling, and coherent research agenda, the collective effect of which is (1) to assure the School’s national prominence in contributions to knowledge relevant to public affairs; and (2) to create a learning laboratory for students. Although faculty will develop individualized approaches to the generation of a well-regarded record of research-based scholarship, all faculty are expected to make a significant, original contribution to knowledge in their chosen field(s) of specialization, and to publish those contributions in authoritative venues appropriate to their disciplines. By the time of application for promotion to associate professor with tenure, it will be beneficial for the record of published research to include examples of both sole-authored scholarship and collaborative scholarship as well (including collaborative work with graduate students).

Consistent with campus-wide and CU system-wide guidelines, the most significant evidence of research proficiency is authorship of scholarly books, book chapters, and journal articles the text of which are subject to peer review. Faculty members are encouraged to submit at least some of their research writings for publication to academic venues that are widely read and highly regarded in the field of public affairs.

Funded research is critical to building excellence at the school. Faculty members are expected to pursue significant funding opportunities that support their own research whenever possible, including graduate student assistance in the performance of that research.
2.2.1 Criteria for Assessing Research Activities

- Productivity (sufficient quantity of published writing)
- Quality (noteworthy intellectual achievement, conceptual/methodological rigor)
- Impact (significant effect on the relevant field of study)

2.2.2 Evidence of Attainment of Criteria for Research Evaluation. In the evaluation of research efforts, evidence of attainment of criteria can include:

2.2.2.1. Productivity. Evidence of productivity is fundamentally quantitative: that is, how many written products have been generated. These products may include (in general order of significance):

- books and book chapters (subject to some form of peer review)
- research articles and reflective essays (subject to some form of peer review)
- non-refereed publications of a scholarly nature or in publications targeted at practitioners
- government documents and monographs (e.g., contract research reports)
- working papers
- papers delivered at scholarly and/or professional meetings
- proposals for research funding and research funding secured.
- the conveyance of knowledge in non-academic venues such as editorials in newspapers. Publication may include dissemination in CD-ROM, video, or other non-print media.

2.2.2.2. Quality. Evidence of quality is primarily achieved through review of scholarly work by peers and public. Review may occur in many ways, and it is the responsibility of the faculty member to show that his/her work has undergone appropriate
• Publication in journals or by presses that employ a process of blind peer review
• Publication in journals to which many manuscripts are submitted and for which few are chosen (thus indicating the esteem in which they are held by professionals in a particular field)
• Publication in books for which chapters are peer-reviewed or reviewed by respected editors (but where the author's name is known to the reviewers)
• Funding of grant proposals (indicating that the granting authority is giving a favorable review)
• Book reviews of one's work or discussion of one's work in textbooks
• Reprinting of one's work in anthologies
• Honors and awards
• Positive judgments by academic and professional peers such as external reviewers solicited during review for tenure and/or promotion.

2.2.2.3. Impact.

Evidence of impact is shown through the effect the work has on research and/or practice in the relevant field. Such evidence may include:

• articles about the faculty member's work in professional or practitioner-oriented journals or magazines
• reviews of the faculty member’s work by other scholars in the field
• evidence that policy or administrative practice makes use of theory or findings generated by a faculty member's research.
• Citations in publications such as the Social Science Citation Index.
2.3. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service and Evidence of Attainment.

SPA’s mission is built on public service, and all faculty, particularly after the award of tenure, are expected to provide meaningful service to the university community, Colorado, and their own national professional communities.

2.3.1 Criteria for Assessing Service Activities.

In keeping with the general policies of the University of Colorado, criteria for the evaluation of service activities shall include contributions of professional expertise to the School, campus, university, community, and professional societies and organizations. Given the mission of SPA, they shall also include activities that link academic and practitioner realms, featuring contributions of professional expertise to governmental institutions and non-profit organizations. Likewise, they should include the impact of contributions to the university, professional recognition brought to SPA and the Denver campus by the faculty member’s service, activities which build public support for the School, and the impact of the faculty member’s activities on policy and practice.

2.3.2. Evidence of Service Activities.

- Membership on/leadership of committees and task forces at the School, campus, and university level.
- Participation in professional societies as an office holder, chairperson, committee member, editor, panelist, or convener.
- Awards from campus, university, or external organizations in recognition of service contributions.
- Assistance to students or community members involved in community problem solving.
• Participation in task forces, committees, special research teams or advisory groups
providing services to relevant local, state, regional, national, or international agencies or
institutions on issues of public policy, administrative reorganization, service delivery, or
related activities.

• Advising public or non-profit agencies or community interest groups in the role of
analyst or expert in the public policy process or otherwise assisting such organizations in
the accomplishment of their objectives. Specify whether remunerated or volunteer. The
latter may include expense reimbursement. Both forms of service merit recognition, but
some portion should be pro bono.

• Public addresses, newspaper columns, and presentations on issues relevant to the
missions of SPA.

2.4. Standards for the Measurement of Attainment and Their Relationship to
Professional Development Plans.

2.4.1. Pre-tenure Professional Development.

By the end of the first year of service of any newly hired pre-tenure, tenure-track
professor on the SPA faculty, the professor shall, in consultation with the RTP Chair and
one or more tenured members of the faculty, prepare a professional development plan.
The plan should:

• identify existing courses in the SPA curriculum that need coverage and in which
the professor wishes to be prepared to teach;

• identify new courses and other curricular development activities in which the
professor wishes to be engaged;

• describe clear and coherent research themes the professor wishes to explore;

• discuss possible sources of financial support for the professor’s research agenda
and plans for acquiring such support;

• discuss possible forms for the dissemination of research findings (e.g., journal
articles, books and book chapters, CD ROM production, Internet posting) and possible
specific venues for such publication;

• identify, at the professor’s discretion, one or more tenured members of the SPA
faculty to advise in further development and implementation of the plan;
• suggest areas of service at the School, campus, and community levels in which
  the professor wishes to specialize;
• identify professional societies and organizations the professor may already belong
  to or may be planning to join, including plans for participation at annual meetings or
  other sponsored activities of such associations; and
• identify, at the professor’s discretion, sources of institutional support (at the
  School, campus, or university level) which may be sought to assist in implementing the
  plan.

The professor may amend the plan in response to experience with its
implementation, or should areas of interest and desired activities change over time.

The anticipation is that pre-tenure faculty will consult with members of their mentoring
committee as needed on an ongoing basis. At the end of each academic year, the chair of
the mentoring committee shall prepare a brief memorandum summarizing mentoring
activities during that year, for inclusion in the pre-tenure faculty member’s file.

2.4.2. Pre-tenure Comprehensive Review.

Relative progress toward attainment of the goals established in the professional
development plan will constitute the primary measure of performance at the pre-tenure
level. For instance, by the beginning of the third year of service the candidate for review
should have begun to demonstrate both promise and productivity in amassing evidence of
the sort listed in sections 2.1.2., 2.2.2., and 2.3.2 of this document, with a predominant
emphasis on teaching and research.

By the beginning of the fourth year of membership on the faculty, during which
the first comprehensive external review of the assistant professor’s record is conducted
by the SPA and Downtown Denver Campus RTP Committees, the candidate for review
should be able to produce evidence of continuing progress toward achievement of the
goals in the plan, as verified by external (as well as internal) scholarly review; that is, a
development trajectory progressing toward a tenurable record. At this stage of
development, evidence should include:

- multiple (that is, a minimum of two) articles in academic or professional journals,
and/or book chapters the contents of which are subject to some form of peer review, and
some of which should be sole-authored or co-authored (as a demonstration of the
professor’s capacity for independent research and writing), as well as additional such
work at various stages of preparation and external review for publication;

- an indication of improved teaching performance in the event that previous
teaching evaluations had indicated areas in which significant improvement was
warranted;

- a record of continuing service to the School, campus, governmental institutions
and/or community-based organizations, and professional societies and organizations.

2.4.3. Review for Tenure (simultaneous with promotion to Associate Professor, and based on the same standards).

Up to and including review for tenure, the Professional Development Plan (as
amended, if necessary) will continue to be the primary framework for measuring
attainment of individualized professional development goals. Tenure will be awarded
only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three
areas of teaching, research, and service; and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or
research. To secure tenure in SPA will require a faculty member to reflect:

- Significant research contributions and publications: The faculty member must
have initiated and successfully completed varied research assignments, assignments that
according to diverse independent scholars and practitioners, further knowledge
concerning public affairs theory and practice. Judgments concerning research
performance shall be guided by the quantity and quality of publications and their
significance and impact as a body of scholarly work.

- **An exemplary teaching record.** The faculty member must be able to illustrate an
ability to impart knowledge to students concerning theory and/or practice, and must view
teaching as an important element of his or her responsibilities. The faculty member
should be able to demonstrate meritorious proficiency or sustained improvement to the
level of meritorious teaching performance (including advising) during the pre-tenure
period; as reflected in the evidence described in § 2.1.2. of this document.

- **A contribution to SPA, the Downtown Denver Campus, the University of Colorado system, and the Community.** The faculty member must demonstrate
sustained service to SPA, the campus, and the community, and/or relevant analogous
experience. Service shall entail but shall not be limited to service contributions on
university and SPA committees, and advice and/or consultation to relevant community
and/or public sector groups. Judgments concerning service performance will be guided
by an active, demonstrated level of service contribution to at least one internal
organization (that may include the School, campus, or university level), and at least one
external organization (that may include local, state, national, or international
organizations, agencies, institutions, and professional associations and societies).
2.4.4. Review for Promotion to Full Professor.

Promotion to Full Professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative activity, and service.

The record established following tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must reveal not only continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching, research and service activities, but represent the highest standards of professional performance. Judgments concerning research performance will be guided by the quantity and quality of publications and their significance and impact as a body of scholarly work. More specifically, a significant volume of important books and/or articles published in journals (the contents of which are subject to peer review) or book chapters recognized as contributing to the field of knowledge is essential to promotion to Full Professor. Some of this work should be sole-authored, and preference will be given to candidates who have authored at least one book.

Judgments concerning teaching performance will be guided by a sustained record of outstanding course evaluations, strong curriculum development, pedagogical innovations, and distinguished leadership. Judgments concerning service performance will be guided by a significant level of service contributions with demonstrated leadership in a variety of areas, which may include the School, campus, and university as well as contributions to local, state, national, and international organizations, agencies, institutions, and professional associations and societies. In employing standards concomitant with promotion to the highest academic rank conferred, the RTP Committee
shall apply the most rigorous criteria to performance outcomes.

Application for promotion to full professor will include preparation of a Continuing Professional Development Plan, as described in § 2.4.5. below. A tenured associate professor at SPA may apply for promotion to full professor at any time; the normative minimum period for such application is five years subsequent to promotion to associate professor.

2.4.5. Post-tenure Review and Continuing Professional Development. In accordance with campus and university policies, tenured professors at SPA will stand for review every five years, as dated from the professor’s most recent promotion. To assist in post-tenure review primary unit committee deliberations, all candidates for post-tenure review will prepare and present to the SPA RTP Committee a Continuing Professional Development Plan. Post-tenure review shall be conducted by the RTP Committee, acting in its capacity as Post-Tenure Review Committee. On its own initiative or at the request of the faculty member being reviewed, an external member of the RTP Committee for the purposes of such review may be appointed, subject to the approval of both the Dean and the Chair of the RTP Committee. A candidate for review may likewise request the recusal from committee membership on his or her case a colleague the candidate has reason to believe is not capable of fairly assessing the candidate’s record.

2.4.5.1. Continuing Professional Development Plan. The plan will include a reflective self-assessment of professional performance since the most recent review in the areas of teaching, research, and service; and a statement of intended future activities in each of these three areas during the upcoming 5-year period. If there has been any discernible decline in performance in any of these areas since the last review, the plan would include...
will include a list of specific measures the faculty member will take to restore performance to previous levels. This statement may include a description of institutional support which may be sought to assist in making such improvements. If the faculty member does not perceive a decline in performance to have occurred but the RTP Committee does, in its written evaluation the Committee will recommend measures which might be taken to restore performance.

Professors hired with tenure will prepare and present to the chair of the RTP Committee a professional development plan within the first year of their appointment on the SPA faculty. The plan will contain the same elements as those called for in § 2.4.1 of this document, with the exception that no mentoring relationship need be established.

### 2.4.5.2. Assessment of Performance of Faculty Standing for Post-Tenure Review

In evaluating the professional performance of faculty standing for post-tenure review, the RTP Committee shall include a characterization of such performance as Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, or Below Expectations. It shall be the responsibility of the RTP Committee to prepare (and amend as necessary) operational definitions of these categories of assessment, subject to the approval of the SPA Faculty Council.

### 2.4.6. Annual Peer Review

The Academic Personnel Committee shall, in advising the Dean on the annual performance of SPA faculty members, adhere to the same criteria and evidence used by the RTP Committee for periodic evaluation, as described elsewhere in this document. The Committee shall use both qualitative and quantitative measures of annual performance in the areas of teaching, research, and
service.

During the spring term of the academic year, the RTP Committee (or a representative thereof) will meet individually with each assistant professor and the SPA faculty member s/he has chosen as a mentor or senior advisor, to review the professor’s annual Faculty Report of Professional Activities (hereinafter, “annual report”). The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the faculty members’ professional progress as it relates to tenure and promotion.

They may consult the faculty member’s Professional Development Plan submitted during the first year of appointment to the faculty, and the Annual Endorsement to the plan to assist in providing evaluative recommendations for continued professional development. The RTP Committee or its representative will convey the results of these annual consultations with assistant professors to the RTP chair and the Dean, and will do so prior to the Dean receiving the annual faculty performance evaluations from the Academic Personnel Committee.

Annual performance review of tenured faculty will be conducted by the Dean, on advice from the Academic Personnel Committee. Campus and university policies concerning performance ratings and the remedial consequences of substandard ones shall be observed.

2.4.7. Differential Workload. Unless by prior written agreement between the faculty member being reviewed and the Dean, the standard university practice shall be followed of basing the evaluation of a faculty member’s professional performance 40% on research activities, 40% on teaching, and 20% on service.

3.1. Committee Structures and Committee Leadership. The successful implementation of the criteria and standards described in § 2. above requires decision structures and procedures that the faculty deem to be both fair and capable of achieving an accurate determination in individual cases. The principal structures for this purpose are (1) the SPA Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee (the “primary unit” committee); (2) the Dean’s Review Committee; and (3) the Academic Personnel Committee.

The RTP Committee plays two roles: (a) a developmental role with faculty to clarify SPA expectations and standards and to advise faculty in appropriate methods for meeting those standards; and (b) a judgment role in determining whether tenure and promotion are granted. The Dean’s Review Committee determines whether, in its view, the RTP Committee fairly and accurately applied this document’s standards to evaluation of a faculty member’s record. The Academic Personnel Committee advises the Dean on faculty performance ratings to be made by the Dean, with regard to the contents of faculty members’ annual report of professional activities.

The RTP Committee Chair will be a tenured full professor on the SPA faculty, and will be appointed by the Dean, upon a vote of the faculty at the April faculty meeting of the spring term, to serve for the upcoming academic year. The RTP Chair shall serve no more than two consecutive one-year terms. The chair of the Dean’s Review Committee shall be a tenured SPA faculty member at or above the rank of faculty subject
to review. The chair of the Academic Personnel Committee shall be a tenured SPA faculty member.

3.2. Procedures for and Scheduling of Periodic Reviews.

3.2.1. Office of the Dean. No later than the end of April, in the spring semester prior to the academic year in which a SPA faculty member becomes a candidate for periodic review, s/he shall be so informed by the Dean in a letter which also includes a timetable for the review process. To ensure that all faculty scheduled for review in an upcoming academic year are given adequate notice, the Office of the Dean shall maintain a continuously updated database indicating when all tenure-track faculty are scheduled for what form of periodic review, and when.

By the end of the academic year preceding the review year, the RTP Committee – in consultation with the Dean and having solicited reviewer suggestions from each candidate for review – shall prepare a list of potential external reviewers for each candidate for review for whom external review is required. By the end of the academic year preceding the review year, the RTP chair will also inform all candidates for periodic review of what materials and supporting documentation they must provide to the RTP Committee, including deadlines for the production of such materials and documentation in the fall of the upcoming academic year. [See Table 3.2., appended to this document, for a listing of the annual RTP schedule of activities.]

3.2.2. Composition of the RTP Committee. In consultation with all candidates for review in the upcoming academic year and with the Faculty Council, by the end of
April of the spring term preceding the upcoming academic year, the Dean will appoint three additional members of the RTP Committee for the year. In confidential consultation with the Dean, the candidate for review may request recusal from participation in the RTP process a faculty member the candidate has reasonable cause to believe would not be capable of fairly evaluating his or her record.

Each candidate for review will then recommend to the Dean appointment of a fifth member of the committee for the purpose of that candidate’s evaluation. This person may be a member of the SPA faculty (at or above the level of review being applied for), or may be a member of another School or department on campus or elsewhere in the university system (at or above the level of review being applied for) who has subject matter expertise in one or more subject areas in which the candidate has declared competency for review purposes. The level of scholarly achievement of an external appointee shall be commensurate with that of a SPA faculty member; and such appointments are subject to the approval both of the Dean and the chair of the RTP Committee.

The RTP Chair will assist the candidate in the preparation of materials for pre-meeting committee review. For purposes of comprehensive pre-tenure review, review for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to professor, external evaluations of the candidate shall be obtained by the RTP Committee, the number of external reviewers being not less than the minimum required for such review by Denver campus and CU system guidelines. Additional letters may be sought at the RTP Committee’s discretion.
External reviewers will be selected by the RTP Committee. For the purposes of comprehensive review, one such reviewer shall be chosen from a list of not less than four names submitted to the RTP chair by the candidate for review. For the purposes of application for promotion to associate professor with tenure, the applicant shall submit a list of no less than six possible external reviewers, from which two shall be chosen. The identities of external reviewers shall not be disclosed to the candidate for review.

To the extent legally permissible, the identities of all reviewers will be held in confidence by the committee. The committee will review the candidate’s materials as presented in keeping with the criteria, evidence, and standards described in § 2 of this document, and will then vote a recommendation on the candidate’s record to the Dean. Deliberations conducted by the RTP Committee, all correspondence between Committee members regarding the capabilities of candidates for review, and all external evaluations obtained by the Committee in support of those deliberations are of a confidential nature; and campus policies and procedures regarding the handling of confidential personnel material shall apply.

For the purpose of post-tenure review and in consultation with candidates for such review and the RTP Chair, the Dean will adjust the membership of the RTP Committee to ensure that all members are at or above the rank of the candidate for review. In some instances (and in consultation with the candidate and the RTP Chair), this may include senior faculty external to the School, which it shall be the prerogative of the faculty member being reviewed to nominate, appointment subject to the assent of the Dean and Chair of the RTP Committee.

For the purpose of reviewing applications for promotion to associate professor
with tenure, the RTP chair and the Dean will invite all tenured SPA faculty members who wish to do so to participate in advising the RTP Committee on the tenure decision. Tenured faculty participating in this regard will be organized into subcommittees to review and evaluate, respectively, the applicant for promotion’s teaching, research, and service records. Upon such review and evaluation, these advisory subcommittees will then advise the RTP Committee as to whether – in their view – the applicant’s record meets the standards for promotion set forth in this document. The RTP Committee will take notice of these subcommittee reports in crafting its recommendation to the Dean on the application for promotion.

3.2.3. Dean’s Review Committee. In consultation with the Faculty Council, at the beginning of the academic year the Dean will also appoint a Dean’s Review Committee, at least one member of which shall be from outside the school. This committee will review all recommendations made to the Dean by the RTP Committee, to assure that such recommendations were made fairly and accurately (i.e., in keeping with § 2 of this document). Any appeal submitted by a candidate to the Dean of a letter of recommendation made by the RTP Committee will be referred to the Dean’s Review Committee. The Dean’s Review Committee will limit its consideration on individual cases to the question of whether the RTP Committee’s recommendation was arrived at fairly and accurately, and will thus not conduct a de novo review of each case. At its discretion, the Dean’s Review Committee may consult with faculty elsewhere on campus in making this determination, either on its own initiative or at the request of a candidate for review.
3.2.4. **Appellate Review of Post-tenure Performance Assessments.** In the event that a faculty member wishes to appeal either a periodic or annual post-tenure performance assessment, s/he shall so inform the Dean in writing, which statement shall include the specific bases for the appeal. If the appeal does not prove susceptible to informal resolution, the Dean shall, within 10 days of the receipt of the written appeal, appoint a PTR Appellate Review Committee, consisting of not less than three members. Appointees to the Committee may not have participated in the original assessment of the faculty member’s performance. The Committee may include full-time faculty members from other academic units within the University of Colorado at or above the rank of the SPA faculty member filing the appeal. Appointment of external members of the PTR Appellate Review Committee shall be subject to the approval of the Dean and the RTP Committee Chair.

3.2.4. **Final Action by the Dean.** The Dean’s Review Committee will report to the Dean on each case forwarded to it, either upholding the RTP Committee’s decision or recommending other action. If the recommendations of the Dean’s Review Committee differ with those of the RTP Committee, the case shall be remanded to the RTP Committee for reconsideration and resubmission of recommendations to the Dean. Final action on all academic personnel matters in the School of Public Affairs rests with the Dean of the School, prior to subsequent action at the campus and university levels.

3.2.5. **Academic Personnel Committee.** Upon recommendation of the Faculty Council, the Dean shall also annually appoint a three-member Academic Personnel Committee, one member of which will also be one of the four standing members of the RTP Committee. The primary purpose of the Academic Personnel Committee will be to perform the peer review function of the annual faculty performance evaluation process. The Academic Personnel Committee shall include one assistant professor, one associate...
professor, and one full professor.

3.3. Annual Performance Review. University policy requires that annual performance review, conducted both for the purpose of assuring continuous faculty accountability and to provide a basis for decisions on salary adjustments, include peer review of faculty performance. To implement this policy, the Academic Personnel Committee will conduct annual peer review of faculty performance, in keeping with § 2.4.6. of this document and using evaluation procedures recommended by the Faculty Council. The Committee will report its performance assessment of all full-time SPA faculty members to the Dean in a form usable for the computation of salary adjustments, but will not make specific salary recommendations. Annual peer review of faculty performance is to be coordinated between the Academic Personnel Committee (APC), which provides performance assessments to the Dean for purposes of salary adjustment; and the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, which is to work with the APC to ensure that all faculty members receive annual evaluations consistent with the standards for periodic review. Results of annual reviews shall comprise one element of the record assessed by the RTP Committee in the periodic evaluation of faculty members undergoing comprehensive review, review for tenure, and post-tenure review.
### Annual Schedule for RTP Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td>1. Candidates for post-tenure review prepare dossiers, submit to Dean’s office by start of Spring semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February-March</strong></td>
<td>1. RTP Committee conducts post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty scheduled for such review; reports recommendations to Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td>1. RTP Committee or representative thereof meets with all pre-tenure faculty to discuss relationship between annual report of professional activities and professional plan; fashion work plan or amend professional plan if divergences are discovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dean’s office identifies all faculty due for periodic review (pre-tenure comprehensive review, review for tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, and review for promotion to professor) and so informs them in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Faculty Council and Dean choose RTP chair for upcoming academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dean appoints RTP Committee for upcoming academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April-May</strong></td>
<td>1. In consultation with RTP Committee members and candidates for review, RTP Chair identifies and solicits agreement to participate of external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. RTP Chair transmits to candidates for review (1) latest instructions from UCDHSC-DDC administration regarding procedures for review and contents of dossiers, and (2) SPA RTP Policies and Procedures; offers counsel regarding compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May-August</strong></td>
<td>1. Candidates for review compile dossiers and supporting documentation; submit materials to Dean’s office by start of Fall semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td>1. RTP Chair transmits candidates for review’s (1) teaching, research, and service essays and (2) research dossiers and supporting documentation to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
<td>1. External reviewers evaluate candidates’ materials, transmit review letters to RTP Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October-November</strong></td>
<td>1. RTP Committee evaluates completed files of candidates for review, reports recommendations to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td>1. Dean’s Review Committee reviews reports of RTP Committee, makes recommendations to the Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November-December</strong></td>
<td>1. Dean prepares letters of recommendation to UCDHSC Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>