

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

**Adopted by Resolution of the
SPA Faculty Council
March 8, 2006**

**Amended by Resolution of the
SPA Faculty Council
November 12, 2008**

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.

31 The SPA Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (hereinafter, “RTP”) Committee
32 and the Faculty Council make every reasonable effort to assure that these policies and
33 procedures remain contemporaneous with general policies and subject-specific
34 administrative policy statements on RTP matters emanating from the offices of campus
35 and university system-wide administrators, as well as with the text of current editions of
36 the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook and the Laws of the Regents. However,
37 whenever clear conflicts are found to exist between the School’s policies and procedures
38 and those of controlling sources of authority superior to and external to the School, the
39 latter shall be understood to prevail.

40

41

1. Mission and Goals.

42

43

44

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:

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

- 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.

55

56

57

58

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

59 of public affairs.

60

61

2. Criteria, Evidence, and Standards for Faculty Evaluation.

62

2.1. Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching and Evidence of Attainment.

63

2.1.1. Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance.

64

- Effective classroom instruction and assessment, such that students obtain

65

knowledge and skills needed to perform effectively in their careers based on current

66

knowledge, theory, research, and practice;

67

68

- Effective guidance and instruction to enhance students' knowledge and

69

professional growth outside of classroom settings (for example: advising; participation on

70

advanced seminar projects, theses, or dissertations; enhancing student learning through

71

research and community service projects, internships, facilitation of student participation

72

in actual policy or management processes.)

73

74

2.1.2. Evidence of Attainment. Below is a list of possible examples of evidence

75

of the attainment of teaching that would be deemed meritorious or excellent. It is not

76

expected that all faculty will have generated all these different forms of evidence during a

77

given review period. Performance in classroom instruction and assessment may be

78

demonstrated by:

79

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

80

81

82

- Course evaluations, in particular items indicating students' assessment of their

83

learning;

84

- 85 • Assessment measures or assignments given in the classroom and examples of
86 student performance;
87
- 88 • Innovative course activities or exercises designed to help students' attain specified
89 learning outcomes;
90
- 91 • A pattern of course standards, assessments, and grading that reflects appropriate
92 standards for the course level being taught;
93
- 94 • Evaluation of classroom performance by outside observers, e.g., other faculty,
95 staff from the Center for Faculty Development;
96
- 97 • Recognitions or awards for distinguished teaching;
98
- 99 • Surveys, letters, or other documents from former students or alumni.
100
- 101 Effective guidance and instruction to students outside of the traditional classroom setting
102 may be demonstrated by:
103
- 104 • Effective performance as a chair or reader on advanced seminar, thesis, and
105 dissertation committees and/or supervision of independent studies, or internships as
106 indicated by numbers of such activities and the quality of final products;
107
- 108 • Student advising;
109
- 110 • Organizing or actively participating in other activities that encourage student
111 learning, e.g., working with students on research or community-related projects,
112 mentoring Ph.D. students for research, organizing student activities for professional
113 growth such as attendance at conferences or organizing student seminars or guest
114 speakers
115
- 116 Participation in SPA curriculum design and policies regarding teaching and
117
118 student learning may be demonstrated by:
119
- 120 • Documents reflecting participation in program planning and curriculum design,
121 including participation in the planning and teaching of core courses in the degree
122 program(s) within which the faculty member teaches;
123
- 124 • Positive judgments by colleagues on curriculum committees, task forces, etc. on
125 the candidate's contribution to committee work (e.g., letters of support documenting type
126 and nature of contribution);
127
- 128 • Collaboration or sharing of teaching approaches and materials with other faculty;
129
- 130 • New course syllabi that address identified needs of students.

131

132 **2.2. Criteria for the Evaluation of Research and Evidence of Attainment.**

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

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

150 Funded research is critical to building excellence at the school. Faculty members are
151 expected to pursue significant funding opportunities that support their own research
152 whenever possible, including graduate student assistance in the performance of that
153 research.

154

155 **2.2.1 Criteria for Assessing Research Activities**

- 156 • Productivity (sufficient quantity of published writing)
- 157
- 158 • Quality (noteworthy intellectual achievement, conceptual/methodological rigor)
- 159
- 160 • Impact (significant effect on the relevant field of study)
- 161

162 **2.2.2 Evidence of Attainment of Criteria for Research Evaluation.** In the

163 evaluation of research efforts, evidence of attainment of criteria can include:

164 **2.2.2.1. Productivity.** Evidence of productivity is fundamentally

165 quantitative: that is, how many written products have been generated. These products

166 may include (in general order of significance):

- 167 • books and book chapters (subject to some form of peer review)
- 168
- 169 • research articles and reflective essays (subject to some form of peer review)
- 170
- 171 • non-refereed publications of a scholarly nature or in publications targeted at
- 172 practitioners
- 173
- 174 • government documents and monographs (e.g., contract research reports)
- 175
- 176 • working papers
- 177
- 178 • papers delivered at scholarly and/or professional meetings
- 179
- 180 • proposals for research funding and research funding secured.
- 181
- 182 • the conveyance of knowledge in non-academic venues such as editorials in
- 183 newspapers. Publication may include dissemination in CD-ROM, video, or other non-
- 184 print media.

185

186 **2.2.2.2. Quality.** Evidence of quality is primarily achieved through review of

187 scholarly work by peers and public. Review may occur in many ways, and it is the

188 responsibility of the faculty member to show that his/her work has undergone appropriate

189 review.

190 • Publication in journals or by presses that employ a process of blind peer review

191 • Publication in journals to which many manuscripts are submitted and for which

192 few are chosen (thus indicating the esteem in which they are held by professionals in a

193 particular field)

194 • Publication in books for which chapters are peer-reviewed or reviewed by

195 respected editors (but where the author's name is known to the reviewers)

196

197 • Funding of grant proposals (indicating that the granting authority is giving a
198 favorable review)

199 • Book reviews of one's work or discussion of one's work in textbooks

200

201 • Reprinting of one's work in anthologies

202

203 • Honors and awards

204

205 • Positive judgments by academic and professional peers such as external reviewers
206 solicited during review for tenure and/or promotion.

207

208 **2.2.2.3. Impact.**

209

210 Evidence of impact is shown through the effect the work has on research and/or

211 practice in the relevant field. Such evidence may include:

212

213 • articles about the faculty member's work in professional or practitioner-oriented
214 journals or magazines

215

216 • reviews of the faculty member's work by other scholars in the field

217

218 • evidence that policy or administrative practice makes use of theory or findings
219 generated by a faculty member's research.

220

221 • Citations in publications such as the Social Science Citation Index.

222

223

224 **2.3. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service and Evidence of Attainment.**

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

228 **2.3.1 Criteria for Assessing Service Activities.**

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

238

239 **2.3.2. Evidence of Service Activities.**

- 240 • Membership on/leadership of committees and task forces at the School, campus,
241 and university level.
242
- 243 • Participation in professional societies as an office holder, chairperson, committee
244 member, editor, panelist, or convener.
245
- 246 • Awards from campus, university, or external organizations in recognition of
247 service contributions.
248
- 249 • Assistance to students or community members involved in community problem
250 solving.
251

- 252 • Participation in task forces, committees, special research teams or advisory groups
253 providing services to relevant local, state, regional, national, or international agencies or
254 institutions on issues of public policy, administrative reorganization, service delivery, or
255 related activities.
256
- 257 • Advising public or non-profit agencies or community interest groups in the role of
258 analyst or expert in the public policy process or otherwise assisting such organizations in
259 the accomplishment of their objectives. Specify whether remunerated or volunteer. The
260 latter may include expense reimbursement. Both forms of service merit recognition, but
261 some portion should be pro bono.
262
- 263 • Public addresses, newspaper columns, and presentations on issues relevant to the
264 missions of SPA.
265

266 **2.4. Standards for the Measurement of Attainment and Their Relationship to**
267 **Professional Development Plans.**

268 **2.4.1. Pre-tenure Professional Development.**

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

272 The plan should:

- 273 • identify existing courses in the SPA curriculum that need coverage and in which
274 the professor wishes to be prepared to teach;
275
- 276 • identify new courses and other curricular development activities in which the
277 professor wishes to be engaged;
278
- 279 • describe clear and coherent research themes the professor wishes to explore;
280
- 281 • discuss possible sources of financial support for the professor's research agenda
282 and plans for acquiring such support;
283
- 284 • discuss possible forms for the dissemination of research findings (e.g., journal
285 articles, books and book chapters, CD ROM production, Internet posting) and possible
286 specific venues for such publication;
287
- 288 • identify, at the professor's discretion, one or more tenured members of the SPA
289 faculty to advise in further development and implementation of the plan;

290

291 • suggest areas of service at the School, campus, and community levels in which
292 the professor wishes to specialize;

293

294 • identify professional societies and organizations the professor may already belong
295 to or may be planning to join, including plans for participation at annual meetings or
296 other sponsored activities of such associations; and

297

298 • identify, at the professor's discretion, sources of institutional support (at the
299 School, campus, or university level) which may be sought to assist in implementing the
300 plan.

301

302 The professor may amend the plan in response to experience with its

303 implementation, or should areas of interest and desired activities change over time.

304 The anticipation is that pre-tenure faculty will consult with members of their mentoring

305 committee as needed on an ongoing basis. At the end of each academic year, the chair of

306 the mentoring committee shall prepare a brief memorandum summarizing mentoring

307 activities during that year, for inclusion in the pre-tenure faculty member's file.

308 **2.4.2. Pre-tenure Comprehensive Review.**

309 Relative progress toward attainment of the goals established in the professional

310 development plan will constitute the primary measure of performance at the pre-tenure

311 level. For instance, by the beginning of the third year of service the candidate for review

312 should have begun to demonstrate both promise and productivity in amassing evidence of

313 the sort listed in sections 2.1.2., 2.2.2., and 2.3.2 of this document, with a predominant

314 emphasis on teaching and research.

315 By the beginning of the fourth year of membership on the faculty, during which

316 the first comprehensive external review of the assistant professor's record is conducted

317 by the SPA and Downtown Denver Campus RTP Committees, the candidate for review

318 should be able to produce evidence of continuing progress toward achievement of the

319 goals in the plan, as verified by external (as well as internal) scholarly review; that is, a
320 development trajectory progressing toward a tenurable record. At this stage of
321 development, evidence should include:

- 322
- 323 • multiple (that is, a minimum of two) articles in academic or professional journals,
324 and/or book chapters the contents of which are subject to some form of peer review, and
325 some of which should be sole-authored or co-authored (as a demonstration of the
326 professor's capacity for independent research and writing), as well as additional such
327 work at various stages of preparation and external review for publication;
328
 - 329 • an indication of improved teaching performance in the event that previous
330 teaching evaluations had indicated areas in which significant improvement was
331 warranted;
332
 - 333 • a record of continuing service to the School, campus, governmental institutions
334 and/or community-based organizations, and professional societies and organizations.
335

336 **2.4.3. Review for Tenure (simultaneous with promotion to Associate**
337 **Professor, and based on the same standards).**

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

- 344 • **Significant research contributions and publications:** The faculty member must
345 have initiated and successfully completed varied research assignments, assignments that
346 according to diverse independent scholars and practitioners, further knowledge
347 concerning public affairs theory and practice. Judgments concerning research

348 performance shall be guided by the quantity and quality of publications and their
349 significance and impact as a body of scholarly work.

350

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

357

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

368

369

370 **2.4.4. Review for Promotion to Full Professor.**

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

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

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

393 shall apply the most rigorous criteria to performance outcomes.

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

399 **2.4.5. Post-tenure Review and Continuing Professional Development.** In
400 accordance with campus and university policies, tenured professors at SPA will stand for
401 review every five years, as dated from the professor's most recent promotion. To assist
402 in post-tenure review primary unit committee deliberations, all candidates for post-tenure
403 review will prepare and present to the SPA RTP Committee a Continuing Professional
404 Development Plan. Post-tenure review shall be conducted by the RTP Committee, acting
405 in its capacity as Post-Tenure Review Committee. On its own initiative or at the request
406 of the faculty member being reviewed, an external member of the RTP Committee for the
407 purposes of such review may be appointed, subject to the approval of both the Dean and
408 the Chair of the RTP Committee. A candidate for review may likewise request the
409 recusal from committee membership on his or her case a colleague the candidate has
410 reason to believe is not capable of fairly assessing the candidate's record.

411 **2.4.5.1. Continuing Professional Development Plan.** The plan will include a
412 reflective self-assessment of professional performance since the most recent review in the
413 areas of teaching, research, and service; and a statement of intended future activities in
414 each of these three areas during the upcoming 5-year period. If there has been any
415 discernible decline in performance in any of these areas since the last review, the plan

416 will include a list of specific measures the faculty member will take to restore
417 performance to previous levels. This statement may include a description of institutional
418 support which may be sought to assist in making such improvements. If the faculty
419 member does not perceive a decline in performance to have occurred but the RTP
420 Committee does, in its written evaluation the Committee will recommend measures
421 which might be taken to restore performance.

422 Professors hired with tenure will prepare and present to the chair of the RTP
423 Committee a professional development plan within the first year of their appointment on
424 the SPA faculty. The plan will contain the same elements as those called for in § 2.4.1.
425 of this document, with the exception that no mentoring relationship need be established.
426

427 **2.4.5.2. Assessment of Performance of Faculty Standing for Post-Tenure**

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

434 **2.4.6. Annual Peer Review.** The Academic Personnel Committee shall, in
435 advising the Dean on the annual performance of SPA faculty members, adhere to the
436 same criteria and evidence used by the RTP Committee for periodic evaluation, as
437 described elsewhere in this document. The Committee shall use both qualitative and
438 quantitative measures of annual performance in the areas of teaching, research, and

439 service.

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

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

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

457 **2.4.7. Differential Workload.** Unless by prior written agreement between the
458 faculty member being reviewed and the Dean, the standard university practice shall be
459 followed of basing the evaluation of a faculty member's professional performance 40%
460 on research activities, 40% on teaching, and 20% on service.

461

462

3. Structures and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation.

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

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.

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

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.

478

479

480

481

482

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

483 to review. The chair of the Academic Personnel Committee shall be a tenured SPA
484 faculty member.

485

486 **3.2. Procedures for and Scheduling of Periodic Reviews.**

487 **3.2.1. Office of the Dean.** No later than the end of April, in the spring semester
488 prior to the academic year in which a SPA faculty member becomes a candidate for
489 periodic review, s/he shall be so informed by the Dean in a letter which also includes a
490 timetable for the review process. To ensure that all faculty scheduled for review in an
491 upcoming academic year are given adequate notice, the Office of the Dean shall maintain
492 a continuously updated database indicating when all tenure-track faculty are scheduled
493 for what form of periodic review, and when.

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

503

504 **3.2.2. Composition of the RTP Committee.** In consultation with all candidates
505 for review in the upcoming academic year and with the Faculty Council, by the end of

506 April of the spring term preceding the upcoming academic year, the Dean will appoint
507 three additional members of the RTP Committee for the year. In confidential
508 consultation with the Dean, the candidate for review may request recusal from
509 participation in the RTP process a faculty member the candidate has reasonable cause to
510 believe would not be capable of fairly evaluating his or her record.

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

521 The RTP Chair will assist the candidate in the preparation of materials for pre-
522 meeting committee review. For purposes of comprehensive pre-tenure review, review for
523 promotion to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to professor, external
524 evaluations of the candidate shall be obtained by the RTP Committee, the number of
525 external reviewers being not less than the minimum required for such review by Denver
526 campus and CU system guidelines. Additional letters may be sought at the RTP
527 Committee's discretion.

528 External reviewers will be selected by the RTP Committee. For the purposes of
529 comprehensive review, one such reviewer shall be chosen from a list of not less than four
530 names submitted to the RTP chair by the candidate for review. For the purposes of
531 application for promotion to associate professor with tenure, the applicant shall submit a
532 list of no less than six possible external reviewers, from which two shall be chosen. The
533 identities of external reviewers shall not be disclosed to the candidate for review.

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

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

550 For the purpose of reviewing applications for promotion to associate professor

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

560

561 **3.2.3. Dean's Review Committee.** In consultation with the Faculty Council, at
562 the beginning of the academic year the Dean will also appoint a Dean's Review
563 Committee, at least one member of which shall be from outside the school. This
564 committee will review all recommendations made to the Dean by the RTP Committee, to
565 assure that such recommendations were made fairly and accurately (i.e., in keeping with
566 § 2 of this document). Any appeal submitted by a candidate to the Dean of a letter of
567 recommendation made by the RTP Committee will be referred to the Dean's Review
568 Committee. The Dean's Review Committee will limit its consideration on individual
569 cases to the question of whether the RTP Committee's recommendation was arrived at
570 fairly and accurately, and will thus not conduct a *de novo* review of each case. At its
571 discretion, the Dean's Review Committee may consult with faculty elsewhere on campus
572 in making this determination, either on its own initiative or at the request of a candidate
573 for review.

574 **3.2.4. Appellate Review of Post-tenure Performance Assessments.** In the
575 event that a faculty member wishes to appeal either a periodic or annual post-tenure
576 performance assessment, s/he shall so inform the Dean in writing, which statement shall
577 include the specific bases for the appeal. If the appeal does not prove susceptible to
578 informal resolution, the Dean shall, within 10 days of the receipt of the written appeal,
579 appoint a PTR Appellate Review Committee, consisting of not less than three members.
580 Appointees to the Committee may not have participated in the original assessment of the
581 faculty member's performance. The Committee may include full-time faculty members
582 from other academic units within the University of Colorado at or above the rank of the
583 SPA faculty member filing the appeal. Appointment of external members of the PTR
584 Appellate Review Committee shall be subject to the approval of the Dean and the RTP
585 Committee Chair.

586

587 **3.2.4. Final Action by the Dean.** The Dean's Review Committee will report to
588 the Dean on each case forwarded to it, either upholding the RTP Committee's decision or
589 recommending other action. If the recommendations of the Dean's Review Committee
590 differ with those of the RTP Committee, the case shall be remanded to the RTP
591 Committee for reconsideration and resubmission of recommendations to the Dean. Final
592 action on all academic personnel matters in the School of Public Affairs rests with the
593 Dean of the School, prior to subsequent action at the campus and university levels.

594

595 **3.2.5. Academic Personnel Committee.** Upon recommendation of the Faculty
596 Council, the Dean shall also annually appoint a three-member Academic Personnel
597 Committee, one member of which will also be one of the four standing members of the
598 RTP Committee. The primary purpose of the Academic Personnel Committee will be to
599 perform the peer review function of the annual faculty performance evaluation process.
600 The Academic Personnel Committee shall include one assistant professor, one associate

601 professor, and one full professor.

602

603 **3.3. Annual Performance Review.** University policy requires that annual
604 performance review, conducted both for the purpose of assuring continuous faculty
605 accountability and to provide a basis for decisions on salary adjustments, include peer
606 review of faculty performance. To implement this policy, the Academic Personnel
607 Committee will conduct annual peer review of faculty performance, in keeping with §
608 2.4.6. of this document and using evaluation procedures recommended by the Faculty
609 Council. The Committee will report its performance assessment of all full-time SPA
610 faculty members to the Dean in a form usable for the computation of salary adjustments,
611 but will not make specific salary recommendations.

612 Annual peer review of faculty performance is to be coordinated between the
613 Academic Personnel Committee (APC), which provides performance assessments to the
614 Dean for purposes of salary adjustment; and the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion
615 Committee, which is to work with the APC to ensure that all faculty members receive
616 annual evaluations consistent with the standards for periodic review. Results of annual
617 reviews shall comprise one element of the record assessed by the RTP Committee in the
618 periodic evaluation of faculty members undergoing comprehensive review, review for
619 tenure, and post-tenure review.

620 Table 3.2.

621 Annual Schedule for RTP Activities

622

Date		Action
January	1.	Candidates for post-tenure review prepare dossiers, submit to Dean's office by start of Spring semester.
February-March	1.	RTP Committee conducts post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty scheduled for such review; reports recommendations to Dean.
April	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.
	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.
	3.	Faculty Council and Dean choose RTP chair for upcoming academic year.
	4.	Dean appoints RTP Committee for upcoming academic year.
April-May	1.	In consultation with RTP Committee members and candidates for review, RTP Chair identifies and solicits agreement to participate of external reviewers.
	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.
May-August	1.	Candidates for review compile dossiers and supporting documentation; submit materials to Dean's office by start of Fall semester.
August	1.	RTP Chair transmits candidates for review's (1) teaching, research, and service essays and (2) research dossiers and supporting documentation to external reviewers.
September	1.	External reviewers evaluate candidates' materials, transmit review letters to RTP Chair.
October-November	1.	RTP Committee evaluates completed files of candidates for review, reports recommendations to the Dean.
November	1.	Dean's Review Committee reviews reports of RTP Committee, makes recommendations to the Dean.
November-December	1.	Dean prepares letters of recommendation to UCDHSC Chancellor.

623

624