

Faculty Evaluation Policies

School of Art and Design

School of Music

School of Theatre and Dance

College of Performing and Visual Arts, University of Northern Colorado

Approved November 2016

Updated August 2017

CONTENTS

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESSES	2
A. Annual and Biennial Review	2
1. Eligibility for Annual Review	2
2. Eligibility for Biennial Review	3
3. Evaluation Criteria and Outcomes	3
4. Dossier	4
5. Timeline and Process for Annual / Biennial Review	4
B. Comprehensive Review	5
1. Eligibility for Comprehensive Review	5
2. Evaluation Criteria and Outcomes	6
3. For Contract Renewable Faculty	7
4. Comprehensive Review Dossier	7
5. Comprehensive Review Peer Observation	7
6. Communication Process	7
7. Timeline and Process for Comprehensive Review / Promotion and Tenure	8
C. Director / Associate Dean Process – Comprehensive Review	9
PEER OBSERVATION AND MENTOR-protégé PROGRAM	9
Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation Process	10
Mentor-Protégé Program	10
LINKS TO DOCUMENTS	11

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESSES

All faculty evaluated for annual / biennial or comprehensive review shall adhere to these policies. If there are inconsistencies, Board Policy prevails as the guiding document for School procedures. Evaluation of faculty consists of three evaluative areas: teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Per Board Policy and University Regulations, Schools utilize the five (5) point evaluation scale. Additionally, narrative evaluation is required to be in alignment with the numerical score given to faculty. Faculty workload is assigned by the School Director and equals a total of 1.0 FTE. In consultation with the faculty member, specific workload assignments may be modified according to the greatest needs of the School. Recruiting and advising are categorized as service.

A. ANNUAL AND BIENNIAL REVIEW

Annual and Biennial Review serve as performance evaluations and are used to determine eligibility for merit pay consideration.

Annual and Biennial Review criteria are described in Board Policy Part 8 Faculty Evaluation and also Title 3, Article 3, Part 3, 3-3-303(5) Performance Evaluation, and University Regulations Part 8. Links to Board Policy and University Regulations are in the appendix at the end of this document.

1. ELIGIBILITY FOR ANNUAL REVIEW

Tenure Track Faculty

- Years 1, 2, 4
- Year 3 is the pre-tenure comprehensive review (see page 8)
- 4th Year Annual Review

Per University Regulations, tenure track faculty must complete an annual review in years 1, 2, 3 (in conjunction with pre-tenure review), 4 and 5. In the third year pre-tenure review, materials must be organized so that an annual review can also be completed. If, on the pre-tenure review, the evaluatee receives “exceeds expectations” or higher in either instruction or professional activity, and “meets expectations” or higher in the other areas, then he/she may opt out of the 4th year annual review. If not, then a 4th year annual review is required. In the absence of an application for tenure, which would include the 5th year annual review, an annual review in the 5th year is required. See University Regulations (3-3-801(f)(III)).

Following the 3rd year pre-tenure review, a 4th year annual review is strongly recommended by the Dean's Office to support the faculty member's appropriate progress toward achieving tenure and promotion.

Contract Renewable Faculty

- Contract renewable faculty must complete an annual/biennial review at least once every other year, and may request an annual/biennial review in any year. See University Regulations (3-3-801(f)(II)).
- Contract Renewable Faculty seeking rank change must submit a comprehensive review following the same process as tenure track faculty.

2. ELIGIBILITY FOR BIENNIAL REVIEW

- All tenured faculty must complete a biennial review, unless the faculty member is seeking promotion or required to complete a 6th year post-tenure comprehensive review.
 -
-

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND OUTCOMES

Evaluation Criteria

Each School provides a standards guide designed to aid all reviewers in their systematic evaluation of a faculty member's productivity during the respective evaluation period (annual/biennial, 3rd year pre-tenure, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure). The School-specific standards may be found on the PVA website [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>]. All School specific standards must align with University policies and be approved by the Dean.

Evaluation Outcomes

Per University Regulations: Faculty are evaluated in each relevant performance area; contributions in each area vary according to assigned workload. In each area a faculty member's performance will be evaluated on a five (5) point scale. Each faculty member will receive an overall evaluation based on the outcome in the individual areas. This will be accomplished using a numerical weighting system which incorporates the percentage of workload for each of the performance areas as specified in the agreed upon faculty workload. The weighted average will be calculated by the following evaluation scale.

Evaluation Scale

V.	4.6 – 5.0	Excellent
IV.	3.6 – 4.5	Exceeds Expectations
III.	2.6 – 3.5	Meets Expectations
II.	1.6 – 2.5	Needs Improvement
I.	1.0 – 1.5	Unsatisfactory

Example of a Faculty Overall Evaluation

In this particular example, the faculty member has a work assignment of .60 for instruction, .20 for professional activity, and .20 for service, which equals 1.0.

Criteria	Evaluation Scale Rating	Evaluation Description	Evaluation Scale Rating Multiplied by Work Assignment Percentages	Total	Overall Evaluation
Teaching	4	Exceeds Expectations	$4 \times .60 =$	2.4	
Professional Activity	4	Exceeds Expectations	$4 \times .20 =$.8	
Service	3	Meets Expectations	$3 \times .20 =$.6	
			TOTAL	3.8	IV. Exceeds Expectations

4. DOSSIER

In accordance with Board Policy, a dossier of materials is developed by the faculty member. The following materials should be uploaded into Digital Measures:

- a narrative of accomplishments during the review period;
- an updated vita in approved university format;
- appropriate documentation;
- all student evaluations covering all teaching assignments;
- and other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate.

5. TIMELINE AND PROCESS FOR ANNUAL / BIENNIAL REVIEW

January

Faculty annual and biennial evaluation materials are due to the Dean's Office on the first day of class spring semester.

Per the BOT Annual / Biennial Process 2-3-801 (4)(c) p. 119:

School faculty will conduct their evaluation in accordance with their approved annual/biennial evaluation criteria and procedures and forward evaluation (scores and reasons), in writing, to the School Director.

February – March

The School Director will conduct his/her own independent evaluation, based upon the approved school criteria, of the faculty member's performance.

In the case of contract-renewable faculty in promotable ranks, the evaluatee may request that the school faculty, the School Director, and the Dean comment on the evaluatee's progress toward promotion.

Both of these evaluations will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will not assign scores except in the case of an evaluatee who appeals his or her evaluation scores from the School faculty or School Director.

If, on appeal from the evaluatee, the Dean conducts an independent evaluation, and if the Dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the School faculty and/or School Director, after unsuccessful attempts have been made to resolve those disagreements, then the Dean and the School Faculty and School Director will forward their individual evaluations and rationale to the CAO, who will make the final decision.

May

Annual and biennial evaluations are forwarded to the Provost.

B. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

The Comprehensive Review process evaluates progress towards the next promotion milestone, which includes 3rd year pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, graduate status, and post-tenure review, and recommends faculty for tenure and promotion.

Comprehensive Review criteria are described in Board Policy Part 8 Faculty Evaluation. Links to Board Policy and University Regulations are in the appendix at the end of this document.

1. ELIGIBILITY FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Comprehensive Review is used to consider persons undergoing evaluation for 3rd year pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, graduate faculty status, and post-tenure review. The pre-tenure review is conducted at approximately the mid-point of a tenure-track faculty member's probationary period and is intended as a check on an individual's progress toward tenure. As such, the evaluative criteria and processes of the pre-tenure and comprehensive evaluations are the same, although accomplishments for the pre-tenure review will be considered within the context of a shorter time period.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND OUTCOMES

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Each School provides a standards guide designed to aid all reviewers in their systematic evaluation of a faculty member's productivity during the respective evaluation period (annual/biennial, 3rd year pre-tenure, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure). The School-specific standards may be found on the PVA website [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>]. All School specific standards must align with University policies and be approved by the Dean.

EVALUATION OUTCOMES

FOR FACULTY

A faculty member will need to score at least a 4 (exceeds expectations) in teaching or creative work scholarship to achieve tenure and promotion. A faculty member applying for promotion to Full Professor will need scores of 4 or above in both teaching and scholarship and creative work.

As the Dean's Office understands it, this change will apply ONLY to faculty beginning in the 2016-17 year in our College. I am waiting on confirmation from Faculty Senate and the Provost regarding this point.

EVALUATION SCALE

Faculty compile a dossier. Each faculty member is evaluated on three (3) areas for promotion and tenure: teaching, scholarly and other professional activities, and service. In each area, a faculty member's performance will be evaluated on a five (5) point scale.

V.	4.6 – 5.0	Excellent
IV.	3.6 – 4.5	Exceeds Expectations
III.	2.6 – 3.5	Meets Expectations
II.	1.6 – 2.5	Needs Improvement
I.	1.0 – 1.5	Unsatisfactory

The scores of the program area faculty may be determined either by using mean, median, mode scores or by a vote of the participating individual faculty members. In either case, the process must result in a single score for each of the performance areas. In addition, the program area faculty explains, in writing, its reasons, in terms of the approved program area criteria, for its scores. Each program area will decide the mechanisms whereby the rationale is determined and the scores are tabulated. The committee should also score the annual review for that year.

3. FOR CONTRACT RENEWABLE FACULTY

Contract renewable faculty will need to score at least a 4 (exceeds expectations) in primary area of responsibility to achieve promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor; Assistant Professor to Associate Professor; Associate Professor to Professor; Lecturer to Senior Lecturer.

In the evaluation process, contract renewable faculty may participate in the discussion and share relevant information, but may only participate in the assignment of scores regarding contract-renewable faculty members.

4. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW DOSSIER

In accordance with Board Policy, the faculty member develops a dossier of the following materials:

- a narrative of accomplishments during the review period;
- an updated vita in approved university format;
- appropriate documentation;
- all student evaluations, from each year, covering all teaching assignments,
- all of the pre-tenure review and annual/biennial evaluations submitted by program area faculty, the chair/director/program area coordinator, and the dean for the period under review;
- other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate;
- Annual Review for the current year.

Responsibilities of the Evaluatee

Per the BOT 2-3-801(c), Each evaluatee will prepare a dossier covering performance and accomplishments over the comprehensive evaluation period. If years of credit for teaching, professional activity, and/or service at a prior institution have been agreed upon at the time of hire, the activities that occurred during those years will be included in the first comprehensive review dossier. It is the responsibility of the evaluatee to gather and submit evidence to be used as the basis of evaluation. Since the evaluatee is essentially “making a case”, it is also the right of the evaluatee to include whatever evidence he or she believes to be relevant to the evaluation of his or her performance.

5. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW PEER OBSERVATION

Peer Observation is strongly recommended for Comprehensive Review toward tenure and promotion.

6. COMMUNICATION PROCESS

At every level of the Comprehensive Review process, the faculty member being reviewed must be given a chance to respond to the faculty evaluation and the director review. At each level, the faculty member may respond only once. The results and reasons for scoring of the review, at each level, are shared with the entire faculty.

School level Annual/Biennial Review policies are not required to include the communication and response procedure.

7. TIMELINE AND PROCESS FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW / PROMOTION AND TENURE

September

The Dean's Office notifies faculty regarding status for eligibility for the next promotional milestone.

Faculty develop their dossier with the overall guidance of the mentor if desired. The dossier is compiled using the binder and dividers provided by the Dean's office.

January

Comprehensive review materials are due to the Dean's Office on the first day of class spring semester.

The tenured and tenure track faculty members in the School, excluding the evaluatee and the chair/director/coordinator, review(s) the dossier and whatever other relevant material can reasonably be gathered and assign(s) a score in each of the performance areas relevant to the workload of the evaluatee.

Contract-renewable faculty may participate in the discussion and share relevant information, but may only participate in the assignment of scores regarding contract-renewable faculty members.

The School's evaluation (scores and reasons addressing criteria) will be forwarded to the School director in writing, and will be shared with the evaluatee.

February – March

The School Director will assign a score in each of the performance areas relevant to the workload of the evaluatee. The School Director's coordinator's evaluation (scores plus reasons addressing criteria) will be shared with the program area faculty and with the evaluatee. The faculty will have the opportunity to respond to the chair/school director/program coordinator. Both the program area faculty's evaluation (scores plus reasons) and the School Director's evaluation (scores plus reasons) will be forwarded, in writing, to the Dean.

The Dean reviews the evaluations of the School faculty and the School Director to verify that the scores assigned, and the reasons given, are consistent with the approved program area criteria and procedures. The Dean may include confidential personnel information about the evaluatee if it has bearing on the evaluatee's teaching, professional activity or service. Unless the university's general counsel or the director of human resources deems that the information is to remain confidential, this information must be shared with the faculty and School Director and included in the evaluation process.

At each step of the review, the evaluatee will be informed in writing which will be transmitted via campus mail and university email, of the decision made. The evaluatee will be given the opportunity to respond to that review, with the option of providing additions and/or clarifications to their dossier. This additional information allows for the reconsideration of the decision made and provides

additional information to the next step in the process. At each level of review, and prior to the next, the evaluatee and prior reviewers have one opportunity to respond.

March

Dossiers due from the Dean to the Provost.

April

Comprehensive Review recommendations from Provost to President.

May

President and Provost send final promotion and tenure summary recommendations to BOT (June meeting)

C. DIRECTOR / ASSOCIATE DEAN PROCESS – COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

The following methodology is used for the promotion and/or tenure of a Director or Associate Dean within the College of Performing and Visual Arts.

According to Board Policy, Directors and Associate Deans within PVA are also appointed with faculty rank within a specific School. Therefore, their promotion/tenure process closely follows the School procedures in place for faculty evaluation. Due to the unique nature of their work within the College, there are also notable exceptions, all of which are described below.

- 1) Development of Materials. The same three areas for evaluation with different weighting factors-- Scholarship/Creative work (5%), Teaching (5%) and Service (90%) are evaluated by the faculty within the School. Director workload is assigned by the Dean. Faculty make comments, and vote with the criteria expressed in current Board Policy for voting procedures and voter eligibility. The comments are collected and summarized in a letter from the School Evaluation/Personnel Committee to the Dean. Votes are tabulated and collected by the Dean's Office and become a part of the promotion and/or tenure dossier.
- 2) For administrative appointments, administration effort is counted in the process as Service. In the other two areas--Teaching and Scholarship/Creative Works, the candidate needs to demonstrate competency in those two areas as defined by current Board Policy and University Regulations.
- 3) The Dean evaluates the documentation independently of the School process and makes a final recommendation to the Provost.

PEER OBSERVATION AND MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ PROGRAM

Peer observation and evaluation supports teaching excellence in PVA. It is part of two processes: 1. Tenure track faculty are observed in the Mentor-Protégé process years 1, 2, and 4, and for 3rd year pre-tenure evaluation (see

Mentor-Protégé Program below). 2. Peer observation is also part of the comprehensive review toward tenure and promotion to associate professor.

PEER TEACHING OBSERVATION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

The Associate Dean coordinates with the appropriate School Personnel Committee to arrange the peer observation.

The School Personnel Committee member conducts the observation and writes a narrative that aligns with the criteria in the School guidelines. The faculty being observed may also request the use of the PVA Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation form available at: [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>].

The observation should be completed by the last day of classes, and the narrative submitted to the faculty member and School Director by the first day of finals week.

Faculty who are observed include the Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation form in their Annual or Comprehensive Review materials.

Faculty may request peer observation at any point.

School Directors may observe and evaluate teaching in the classroom/studio/ensemble. The Director decides if and when to observe the faculty member. The School Director's observation will be a part of a larger formal review process that supplements the Director's response to the faculty member's Faculty Annual Report. This observation will be focused on evaluating the effectiveness of the faculty member in the classroom/studio/ensemble for a report that becomes part of that faculty member's permanent record.

MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ PROGRAM

The PVA Mentor-Protégé program is designed to help faculty achieve appropriate progress towards tenure and/or promotion. The program provides a forum wherein new faculty may engage in dialogue about their professional development as educators, scholars, artists, and citizens of the university and in which senior faculty may share their experiences and insights into their academic fields and the institutional culture. Both formal and informal mentorship relationships and activities are encouraged. A formal mentor is assigned to new faculty by the Dean's office. A naturally-occurring affinity among faculty may foster informal mentorship.

The Mentor-Protégé program is not limited to tenure track faculty. Participation by faculty seeking promotion to Professor are welcome and encouraged to participate.

The Associate Dean coordinates the PVA Mentor-Protégé Program in collaboration with School Directors.

Key Mentor Responsibilities

Mentors serve as a role model, and in this capacity they give constructive feedback, provide support and encouragement, and serve as a resource for the policies and procedures of PVA. Mentors:

- Orient the protégé to School and College policies and culture.
- Assist the protégé in creating a timetable/plan for professional development. Discussion should include a 1 year and 5 year trajectory; also the protégé should talk with both the Mentor and School Director as his or her timetable/plan evolves.
- Arrange and conduct a Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation with Protégé.
- Review the Protégé's binder for annual and comprehensive review.
- Discuss the Protégé's strengths and areas of improvement with the Protégé.

Key Protégé Responsibilities

- Meet with the Mentor during the fall and spring semesters.
- Develop a 1 year and 5 year timetable or plan for professional development to discuss with your Mentor.
- Communicate with the Mentor about progress made on the annual or comprehensive review documents.
- Discuss summative and formative teaching observation evaluations with Mentor.

General Schedule of Mentor-Protégé Events

During the fall semester, the Dean's office organizes a series of discussions with the Mentors and Protégés. During the spring semester, the mentor conducts a peer observation and informally discusses the Protégé's teaching and plan for tenure and/or promotion.

The Mentor-Protégé Formative Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation

PVA mentors conduct a formative peer teaching observation and evaluation annually during the spring semester as part of the mentoring relationship. The PVA Mentor will consult with the Protégé and together they will decide when the observation is to be scheduled. For the purpose of consistency, the Mentor uses the PVA Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation form. This observation is not included in the formal evaluative process. The results of this observation are confidential to the Mentor/Protégé pairing and are aimed at helping the protégé improve effectiveness in the classroom/studio/ensemble. This confidentiality enables the mentor to provide candid feedback.

The Associate Dean will be notified when the Mentor-Protégé observation has been completed.

Summative Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation

Faculty are also formally observed in the fall. A member(s) of the School Personnel/Evaluation Committee conducts a summative observation(s) of the protégé once a year. This formal observation provides comments that become a part of the annual review/ 3rd year pre-tenure/tenure and promotion review process for the protégé.

LINKS TO DOCUMENTS

Board Policy: http://www.unco.edu/trustees/policy_manual.pdf

University Regulations: http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf

Graduate School forms for GFS and DRE: http://www.unco.edu/grad/faculty/graduate_faculty_status.html

PVA Forms including Annual / Biennial Faculty Review, Promotion / Tenure, Sabbatical Leave Checklist, and School-specific performance standards: <http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>