



**UCCS CAMPUS POLICY**

**Policy Title: Post-tenure Review**

**Policy Number: 200-016**

**Policy Functional Area: i.e. ACADEMIC**

Effective: March 3, 2008  
Approved by: Pam Shockley-Zalabak, Chancellor  
Responsible Vice Chancellor: Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (EVCAA)  
Office of Primary Responsibility: EVCAA  
Policy Primary Contact: EVCAA, 719-255-3700  
Supersedes: N/A  
Last Reviewed/Updated: March 3, 2008  
Applies to: Tenured faculty members

Reason for Policy: The purpose of this policy is to develop procedures for appropriate peer evaluation during PTR, for appeals of the PTR evaluation, and for granting PTR development awards.

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

Tenure is granted with the expectation of continued professional growth and ongoing productivity in teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and service. Thus, every tenured faculty member has a duty to maintain professional competence. The purposes of post-tenure review (PTR) are: (1) to facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with the academic needs and goals of the University and the most effective use of institutional resources; and (2) to ensure professional accountability by a regular, comprehensive evaluation of every tenured faculty member's performance.

Any PTR procedures developed at the college or department level must conform to this policy and the CU system APC on PTR.

## II. POLICY STATEMENT

- A. At its meeting on October 16, 1997, the Board of Regents adopted amendments to the Laws of the Regents (Section 5B.4[B]) regarding the evaluation of faculty. These revisions changed existing policy regarding post-tenure review and added to annual merit evaluations the possibility of a performance improvement agreement and a development plan for faculty performing inadequately. This policy was further revised to incorporate the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Tenure-related Processes of 2006. The CU system Administrative

Policy Statement implementing these changes was approved on November 1, 2006. The campus policy also reflects principles regarding post-tenure review and professional plans contained in a resolution of the Faculty Representative Assembly passed in 1998.

B. Procedures:

1. General

- a. The post-tenure review process begins at tenure with the first PTR occurring five years after the faculty member is continuously tenured and recurs at five year intervals unless interrupted by promotion review. Promotion serves to re-start the PTR clock. The PTR evaluation will be conducted by appropriate faculty peers within the campus, either the primary unit faculty or the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee. Each college will develop a written policy detailing how the committee will be constituted. This committee will be referred to below as "the PTR committee." Faculty undergoing PTR should not, in that year, serve on the PTR evaluation committee. Each faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the evaluation by the dean.
- b. The PTR committee shall review the professional plan (see below) developed by the faculty member at the time of tenure or at the last PTR to see whether the faculty member has been meeting the self-set goals and performance objectives of the plan, as well as whether the faculty member's performance meets or exceeds the primary unit's criteria for acceptable professional practice.
- c. The PTR committee will provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance as either outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, or below expectations in teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and service, and shall provide a narrative explanation of that evaluation. The PTR committee will also review the faculty member's new plan for the next five years. The primary unit's written standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion describe the nature and measures of achievement in teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and service within the discipline (as required by the administrative policy statement, "Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenure Faculty," 7/1/89) that should be employed in PTR evaluations. Primary units shall revise their written standards to include guidelines/descriptions of "meeting expectations," the standard of acceptable professional performance no later than fall 2009. These revisions will be reviewed and approved by the dean of the college and the vice chancellor for academic affairs no later than fall 2010.
- d. Faculty members who fail to participate in any aspect of the post tenure review process, as required, may be subject to sanctions for insubordination and dereliction of duty. These sanctions will be decided upon by the dean of the college, subject to VCAA review and approval and existing college grievance procedures.
- e. The level of review to be undertaken – Regular Five-Year or Triggered – will be determined by the record of annual "Performance Ratings for Faculty," the non-confidential summaries of annual merit evaluations (mandated by the administrative policy statement, "Performance Ratings for Faculty, Unclassified Staff/Administrators, and Officers," 7/1/89). The annual merit evaluation, which normally is based on peer review,

remains the basic annual instrument of faculty evaluation. Because the annual Performance Rating summary is the document that may trigger an Extensive Review, faculty who do not agree with their annual Performance Ratings may request reconsideration of the rating through established procedures in the department or college.

## 2. Professional Plans

- a. Faculty members will develop their initial professional plan within twelve months of the award of tenure and will develop a new professional plan as a part of each post-tenure review. The professional plan should be reviewed and, if needed, updated each year during the annual merit review process. Plans may be updated at any time. This may be necessary to accommodate a variety of situations such as the receipt of grant awards, acceptance of fellowships, or changes in the focus of scholarly inquiry/teaching interest.
- b. The primary purpose of the professional plan is to promote faculty development. The plan should give faculty members an opportunity to contemplate and communicate their plans for continuing or enhancing their professional contributions in the areas of scholarship (*research, writing, or creative work*), teaching, and service. The initial plan should describe projections for professional productivity over a five year period. The following components should be considered in developing the plan:
  - i. The professional plan should generally not exceed two pages in length. The plan should provide a general description of planned activities in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. A model template for the professional plan is attached.
  - ii. Professional plans should be qualitative rather than quantitative in nature. The purpose of the plan should be to provide an overview of the likely areas of professional accomplishments over the next five years. The document should not be used to set, for example, a specific number of publications projected for that period. Yearly or post-tenure evaluations of the plan should be based on a review of the quality of the work and a determination of whether appropriate efforts were made in targeted areas.
  - iii. Professional plans should be written and evaluated based on a "good faith" effort on the part of the faculty member to contribute professionally and for the university to adequately support that professional contribution. The professional plan should not be viewed as the literal fulfillment of a set of nonnegotiable demands or rigid expectations, quantitative or otherwise. The Professional Plan shall not require a faculty member to exceed the expectations applied at the time tenure was granted.
  - iv. Projections made in the professional plan, when compared to the faculty member's progress and achievements, should be considered as one of many possible bases for evaluating professional performance.
- c. The head of the primary unit or a faculty committee (*based on the policy of the primary unit*) will review professional plans annually. **Teaching and advising** loads must be approved by the reviewer(s) to assure that the teaching needs of the unit are met. In the area of **scholarly productivity**, the reviewers may only comment on the adequacy,

feasibility, or wisdom of the plan, but do not formally approve or disapprove it. In the area of **service**, the reviewer(s) will generally comment only on the adequacy, feasibility, or wisdom of the plan unless, in rare cases, the primary unit determines that a particular kind of service is vital to the mission of the primary unit.

- d. At the time of post-tenure review, a faculty member may choose to submit a one-page funding proposal for an amount no greater than \$1,000 to assist in the implementation of the new professional plan prepared in conjunction with the review. This proposal, if the review is successful, and if the proposal is approved by the primary unit and, if different, the dean, will be forwarded to the campus for consideration (see Section C below).

### 3. Regular Five-Year Review

- a. Faculty who have achieved summary evaluations of "meeting expectations" or better since the last PTR (or since receiving tenure if this is their first PTR) will undergo Regular Review. Departments or colleges/schools may wish to develop coaching programs for faculty with one or more years of "below expectation" in a single area. A differentiated workload might also be considered.
- b. In a Regular Five-Year Review, the Post-Tenure Review committee examines the five previous annual performance evaluation reports, including FCQs, peer reviews, and other types of teaching evaluation, the curriculum vitae, and the faculty member's Professional Plan(s) from that PTR cycle. In addition, the faculty member will provide the PTR committee with an updated Professional Plan for the next five years.
- c. The PTR committee will write a brief report stating whether the candidate is meeting expectations or not. The report will summarize the unit's findings regarding the faculty member's adherence to the previous Professional Plan(s) (taking into account the differentiated workload, where present), meeting the department's/primary unit's standards, and conclusions about his/her productivity and contributions to the University in teaching, research/creative work, and service. A copy of this report will be given to the faculty member. The report is an opportunity to evaluate the faculty member's contributions over the past 5 years to the unit, the university, the community (where relevant) and the profession. The reports will be forwarded to the dean, who will provide a summary report and copies of the individual reports to the academic vice chancellor on the results of all the post-tenure reviews in the college/school. A copy of the PTR report will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. In the case that the PTR committee determines that the faculty member is not "meeting expectations," the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement. (See Section E.)
- d. To contribute to the developmental purpose of PTR, the campus will have a PTR development fund to which faculty who have successfully completed PTR may apply. The dean may choose to endorse and forward to the VCAA any proposals received as part of the post-tenure review process for funding (up to \$1,000) to support the professional plan submitted as part of the review. The faculty assembly awards committee shall make recommendations to the VCAA, who shall make the final determination. In evaluating these applications, the committee should consider the return on investment to the

university that might be anticipated. These modest awards are designed to assist faculty by providing training, travel, and other resources needed to move forward, as outlined in their Professional Plans. The campus will begin distributing funds by 2010.

#### 4. Triggered Review

Faculty who receive a summary evaluation of "below expectations" at any time during the five year PTR cycle are required to meet with members of their primary unit and/or the unit head, as determined in the by-laws of the primary unit, to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and to plan and implement a written Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) to remedy their problems. (See Section E below)

#### 5. The Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA)

- a. Faculty who receive a "below expectations" summary rating as the result of their annual performance evaluation must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) designed to improve their performance. Faculty members who do not agree with the below expectations rating may request a peer review of their annual performance record using the established primary unit process or a specific written process developed by the unit for this purpose. Subsequently, faculty members who believe the primary unit's evaluation is mistaken may appeal the rating through established grievance procedures in the college/school. No action will be taken to begin a PIA until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date it is initiated by the faculty member.
- b. Working with the primary unit head or an appropriate committee of the primary unit (as determined by primary unit policy), the faculty member develops a PIA that includes specific goals, timelines, and benchmarks that will be used to measure progress at periodic intervals. Usually, PIAs will be established for one year. But, if research deficiencies warrant longer, the PIA may be set up for two years. The Teaching and Learning Center will develop a library and other resources that provide ideas and best practices for successful development plans, and assist departments and faculty in identifying useful strategies. The next annual merit evaluation following the term of the PIA shall address whether the goals of the PIA have been met.
- c. If the goals of the PIA have been met, as evidenced in the next annual merit evaluation, the faculty member continues in the current five-year post-tenure review cycle.
- d. If the goals of the PIA have not been met at the next annual merit evaluation, an extensive review process shall be initiated.

#### 6. Extensive Review

- a. Faculty who have received two "below expectations" ratings within the previous five years or whose PIA did not result in an evaluation of "meeting expectations" or better will undergo Extensive Review by the primary unit. Faculty members who do not agree with

the below expectations rating may request a peer review of their annual performance record using the established primary unit process. In units without such a process for this purpose, the unit shall develop and formally adopt a process for this review. Subsequently, faculty members who believe the primary unit's evaluation is mistaken may appeal the rating through established grievance procedures in the college/school. No action will be taken to begin an Extensive Review until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date the second "below expectations" rating is received. Failure by the faculty member to participate in developing or implementing the Extensive Review is insubordination and dereliction of duty and will be subject to sanctions, *which include the possibility of termination of employment.*

- b. Because Extensive Review is designed to assist faculty who are falling below the level of satisfactory professional performance, it takes place whenever a faculty member establishes a pattern of unsatisfactory performance, i.e., two evaluations of performance "below expectations" in a five year period.
- c. For an Extensive Review, the primary unit will examine: (1) the five previous annual performance evaluation reports; (2) the FCQs from those years, peer evaluations, and other types of teaching evaluation; (3) evidence of research/creative work and clinical productivity; (4) the faculty member's previous Professional Plan (and any amendments to the plan, and differentiated workload agreements, where present); (5) the faculty member's self-evaluation of performance as it relates to the Professional Plan(s); (6) record of service activities; and (7) any other material the faculty member would like the unit to consider.
- d. The primary unit prepares an evaluative report of the faculty member's teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and service based upon its review of the materials and information covering the period in question. If there is disagreement about the faculty member's performance in research/creative work, or if the faculty member under review or the primary unit so requests, the review will also include evaluations from qualified persons external to the University. In this case, the faculty member and the primary unit shall jointly develop a list of external reviewers who will be asked to evaluate the faculty member's performance in research/creative work.
- e. Primary units, colleges/schools, and campuses may require other materials for Extensive Reviews, if appropriate, but the aim should be to keep the process efficient and effective.
- f. The Development Plan
  - i. Upon completion of the evaluative report, the faculty member, working with the appropriate primary unit committee, shall write a Development Plan for the next one or two years with specific goals and actions designed to address the areas of deficiency identified in the Extensive Review process. The Development Plan must address the teaching, research/creative work, clinical activities, and service assignments anticipated during the period of the plan. It must describe performance

goals in light of identified deficiencies, strategies for improvement, and the time frame (up to two years) in which the problems are to be solved. Further, the Plan must contain definite means of measuring progress in achieving the goals and periodic monitoring of progress. Finally, the Development Plan must be approved by the primary unit head and the dean, following consultation with the appropriate primary unit committee.

- ii. While the individual faculty member is responsible ultimately for the successful outcome of the Development Plan, the primary unit has an obligation to assist the faculty member who seeks guidance in developing a realistic plan to remedy the identified areas of deficiency. The Teaching and Learning Center will develop a library and other resources that provide ideas and best practices for successful development plans, and assist departments and faculty in identifying useful strategies.
- iii. Assessments of professional competence depend upon peer review. At the conclusion of the Development Plan period, either (1) the faculty and head of the primary unit or (2) the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee assess the progress of the faculty member and forward their conclusions to the dean. After consultation with the dean's review committee, the dean determines whether the faculty member has achieved the goals of the Development Plan and thus has returned his/her professional performance to meeting expectations. Those who are judged to be meeting expectations begin a new 5-year PTR cycle in the next academic year. Those who are judged not to have achieved professional competence will face sanctions, including the possibility of revocation of tenure and dismissal. Copies of the Extensive Review Development Plan and the primary unit's assessment of the progress achieved by the end of the development period will be added to the faculty member's personnel file.

## 7. Sanctions

- a. Ordinarily, in cases where the Development Plan has not produced the desired results the faculty member will have his/her tenure revoked and be dismissed. Under certain circumstances, other sanctions may be imposed. Possible sanctions include: suspension of pay, salary reduction, and demotion in rank.
- b. The Vice Chancellor's Review Committee shall recommend sanctions. The chancellor makes the final determination of sanctions. If the chancellor's decision is to recommend revocation of tenure and dismissal of the faculty member to the Board of Regents, the Laws of the Regents provide the faculty member with an opportunity for a hearing and set other conditions for handling such cases. (See Laws of the Regents, Article 5.C.1 and 5.C.4; and 8/27/66 Regent Action adopting 1940 AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure). Revocation of tenure and dismissal for the cause of demonstrable professional incompetence has long been recognized policy at the University of Colorado, and across higher education in the United States. Professional incompetence is defined to mean the *failure to perform teaching, research/creative works, and service duties in a consistent and satisfactory professional manner*. A judgment of professional incompetence is based upon peer review of the faculty member's performance. The PTR

process provides such peer review. (Other causes for dismissal also exist and are outlined in Article 5.C.1 of the Laws of the Regents.)

### III. KEY WORDS

- A. Post-tenure Review (PTR)
- B. Triggered Review
- C. Extensive Review
- D. Summary Evaluation
- E. Development Awards

### IV. RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, FORMS, GUIDELINES, AND OTHER RESOURCES

- A. Administrative Policy Statements (APS) and Other Policies
- B. Procedures
- C. Forms
  - 1. Professional Plan Template (see below)
- D. Guidelines
- E. Other Resources (i.e. training, secondary contact information)
- F. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

### V. HISTORY

|                         |               |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Initial policy approval | March 3, 2008 |
| Revised                 | N/A           |

University of Colorado Colorado Springs

Faculty Professional Plan

(A public document under the Open Records Act)

For the period \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.

Faculty Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Rank: \_\_\_\_\_ Percent appointment: \_\_\_\_\_

The primary purposes of the Professional Plan are to encourage faculty development and assure accountability. The Professional Plan is designed to communicate the faculty member's teaching, research/creative work, and service goals and to relate those goals to the needs of the primary unit. The director or chair of the primary unit (or appropriate primary unit committee) must approve any specific workload assignments defined by the plan (in accordance with school or college procedures for approving differentiated workloads), and may comment on the adequacy or wisdom of the plan, but may not approve or disapprove it.

Workload Weighting

Teaching

Research/Creative

Service

Percent: \_\_\_\_\_

**Teaching.** Describe in general terms your plan for contributing to your unit's teaching and advising mission over the next five years. Address the areas of classroom teaching, individualized instruction, graduate training, etc. Do not list specific course assignments.

**Research/Creative Work.** Describe your plan for contributing to your unit's research/creative work mission over the next five years. Describe work you intend to conduct, and how it will contribute to your overall body of work. Address the issues of proposed funding, publications, performances, and presentations, as appropriate.

**Service.** Describe in general your plan for contributing to your unit's, college or school's, and campus' service mission over the next five years. Please address the nature of your service activities at various levels within the University, as well as your service external to the University.

I submit the above information as my Professional Plan. I understand that the contents of my Professional Plan do not necessarily constitute the standards and criteria against which I will be evaluated for the purposes of annual merit and/or promotion and/or tenure.

\_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

I have reviewed the above Professional Plan and discussed its content with the author.

\_\_\_\_\_

Authorized Primary Unit signature (chair, director, or dean)

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

I acknowledge receipt of the above Professional Plan and agree that the stated workload weighting above has been approved.

\_\_\_\_\_

School or College Official

\_\_\_\_\_

Date