



- 
- Title:** **Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for the ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION of Faculty**
- Approval:** Approved by a vote of the SPA Faculty in June, 2019 (*replaces all previous versions*)
- Previous:** Adopted by Resolution of the SPA Faculty Council, March 8, 2006 and Amended in 2012 and 2016
- Effective:** **July 1, 2019**
- Related:** Regent Law, Article 5. Faculty, Section B.6 Evaluation of Faculty:  
<https://www.cu.edu/regents/article-5-faculty>  
Regent Policy 11-B Processes for annual merit evaluations and annual performance ratings:  
<https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy-11b-faculty-salary>  
University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements (APS #5008):  
<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/5008>  
University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement (APS#1009 – Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation)  
<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009>  
University of Colorado Faculty Handbook:  
<https://www.cu.edu/oaa/faculty-affairs/faculty-handbook>  
CU Denver Campus Level Policies:  
[http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty\\_staff/faculty/faculty-affairs/policies-forms/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/faculty-affairs/policies-forms/Pages/default.aspx)
- 

## **Table of Contents**

1. Introduction
2. Policy Statement and Purpose
3. Review Procedures and Academic Personnel Committee (APC) Structure, Composition, and Responsibilities
  - a. General Responsibilities
  - b. General Procedures
  - c. Appointment Procedures and Composition of the Academic Personnel Committee (APCSPA Review Procedures and Committees (Structure, Composition, and Responsibilities)

## **Appendices:**

- 1a. Criteria for Annual Review of Tenured/Tenue-Track Faculty (TT)
- 1b. Criteria for Annual Review of Instructional/Research/Clinical Faculty (IRC) (pending)
2. Process/Procedures for Appeals (pending)

## **1. Introduction**

This document describes the policies, procedures, and criteria adopted by the School of Public Affairs to implement those portions of the University of Colorado Laws, Policies and Administrative Policy Statements of the Board of Regents and CU Denver (hereinafter, “campus”) policies related to the annual performance review (including peer review) for the purpose of decision making on questions of faculty remuneration.

**Appendix 1a.** Criteria for evaluating Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty (TT) performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service and leadership for assessing faculty members for annual reviews. This document and the criteria for annual review was voted on and approved by the Faculty Council in December 2018.

**Appendix 1b.** Criteria for evaluating Instructional/Research/Clinical (IRC) Faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service and leadership (as applicable) for assessing faculty members for annual reviews. This document and the criteria for annual review was approved by the Faculty Council vote on **INSERT DATE [still being drafted and will brought to Faculty Council for approval]**

**Appendix 2.** Process and procedures for appeals. **[still being drafted and will brought to Faculty Council for approval]**

## **2. Policy Statement and Purpose**

**Annual Performance Review.** University policy requires that annual performance reviews, conducted both for the purpose of assuring continuous faculty accountability and to provide a basis for the Dean’s decisions on salary adjustments, include peer review of faculty performance. To implement this policy, the Academic Personnel Committee will conduct annual peer reviews of faculty performance using the criteria approved by the Faculty Council (Appendix 1). The Committee will report its performance assessment of all full-time SPA faculty members to the Dean but will not make specific salary recommendations.

Results of annual reviews shall comprise one element of the record assessed by the RTP Committee in the periodic evaluation of faculty members undergoing post-tenure review, and for IRC faculty being reviewed for promotion.

**Policy Compliance.** All of the School’s criteria and policies for annual review are governed by the procedures and standards set forth in the Laws & Policies of the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado, and are outlined in the University of Colorado’s related Administrative Policy Statements, as well as CU Denver campus level policies. SPA has made every effort to ensure compliance with these higher level policies and procedures, however, as policies and procedures are amended from time to time, or if a discrepancy is found, the higher level policy will prevail.

## **3. Review Procedures and Academic Personnel Committee (APC) Structure, Composition, and Responsibilities**

The successful implementation of the criteria described in Appendix 1a and 1b 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 structure for this purpose is the SPA Academic Personnel Committee (APC).

### **3a. General Responsibilities**

The two principal functions of the Academic Personnel Committee are to (1) perform the annual faculty professional performance evaluations; and (2) to review the APC's evaluative criteria (Appendix 1a & 1b) each year and when needed, recommend changes to the Faculty Council. The APC shall also include a process for faculty members to appeal the performance evaluation ratings of the APC (Appendix 2).

The APC shall assess the performance of each colleague using the University of Colorado's required rating system of Outstanding, Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, Below Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations. It shall conduct this assessment on each category of professional activity comprising the faculty member's employment agreement (Teaching/Research/Leadership & Service) and weighted accordingly to the faculty member's workload distribution (see below).

**Differential Workload.** Unless by prior written agreement between the faculty member being reviewed and the Dean, the standard university practice shall be followed of basing the evaluation of a tenure-track faculty member's professional performance 40% on research activities, 40% on teaching, and 20% on leadership and service. IRC faculty workloads vary depending on the rank/title and are defined in their letters of offer/contracts each year. Periodic reviews and annual reviews will take into consideration any differential workloads (e.g. course release, additional service), as noted in faculty contracts or letters of agreement with the Dean of the School.

To ensure rationality, consistency, continuity, and predictability in annual performance reviews over time, the APC shall derive a means for applying the criteria for evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Leadership & Service. This evaluative system may include both quantitative and qualitative elements, and may include elements of the faculty members' annual report of professional activities (FRPA), faculty self-assessment/narrative, time and effort actually spent in the realms of teaching, research, and service, and other materials requested by the APC or submitted by the faculty member.

### **3b. General Procedures**

At the end of each calendar year, faculty will submit the required/requested materials for review to the Dean's Office. The Academic Personnel Committee shall review those materials and make recommendations to the Dean adhering to the criteria in Appendix 1a for Tenure Faculty & 1b for IRC faculty.

When the APC meets at the beginning of each calendar year to evaluate their colleagues' performance. Tenured and tenure-track faculty will review and rate the performance of all faculty; IRC-track faculty will review and rate the performance of IRC-track faculty only.

Upon completion of its annual evaluation of their colleagues, the APC shall file a report to the dean on each TT and IRC faculty member's performance. A copy of this report shall simultaneously be delivered to the faculty member.

Final action on all academic personnel matters in the School of Public Affairs rests with the Dean of the School, including the official annual rating of Outstanding/Exceeding/Meeting/Below/Fails to Meet Expectation, and the annual salary determination.

### **3c. Appointment Procedures and Composition of the Academic Personnel Committee (APC).**

The APC shall consist of three tenure-track faculty members, including at least one tenured faculty member. Additionally, the APC shall include at least one instructional/research/clinical (IRC) faculty member for the purposes of evaluating the professional performance of IRC-track faculty. The committee composition should reflect a mix of faculty with backgrounds in public administration and criminal justice. The APC shall function as a standing committee throughout the academic year. Members of the APC shall choose among them who will serve as chair of the committee.

**Appointment.** All faculty will be eligible to serve on the APC on a rotating basis. During the spring term of each academic year, the members of the Academic Personnel Committee (APC) shall be selected for the upcoming academic year. Typically, two members of the APC will rotate off the committee each year and two members from the previous year will remain on the committee. No faculty member will serve more than two consecutive years<sup>1</sup>. When assigning the rotating committee members, it is important to overlap the terms of experienced and new members while taking into account the following:

- The amount of time since last service on this committee (or hire date), as faculty members who have the longest time since last service (or hire date) will have priority for serving as new members on the APC in a given year;
- Other committee assignments (Faculty who are serving as the RTP Chair, Dean's Review Committee Chair, and the VCAC representative to the university will not be included in the pool of eligible APC committee members during those service assignments);
- Ensuring representation from PA, CJ, and IRC faculty.

The Dean's Faculty Affairs Administrator/Coordinator will maintain a record of the rotation order, and record each faculty member's APC service to properly account for the criteria above.

---

<sup>1</sup> In an extreme/unusual circumstance when no other eligible faculty member is available/eligible to serve (i.e. a year with multiple sabbaticals, LOA, other administrative roles or committees which make faculty ineligible), an exception may be made for a faculty member to serve a third consecutive year.

**APC Annual Performance Rating Criteria**  
**December 7, 2018**

**Teaching**

Rating	Construct	Sample indicators (not exhaustive nor restrictive)	CTF sample indicators
<b>Outstanding</b>	Surpasses Exceeding, by demonstrating extraordinary performance in either one of the following criteria, or high quality across multiple criteria: (a) course design, modification and instruction; (b) student relations; (c) teaching outside the traditional classroom (mentoring, supervision of student research); (d) effectiveness of learning assessment techniques; (e) creativity an innovation in overall teaching; (f) curriculum or program development; or (g) impact of teaching on students, community, and professional organizations.	See indicators below (note: must demonstrate extraordinary performance on one or high quality across multiple criteria)	Leading teaching workshops at SPA; leading teaching workshops through Center for Faculty Development.
<b>Exceeding</b>	Achieves Meeting, plus demonstrates high quality in at least one of the following: (a) course design, modification and instruction; (b) student relations; (c) teaching outside the traditional classroom (mentoring, supervision of student research); (d) effectiveness of learning assessment techniques; (e) creativity and innovation in overall teaching; (f) curriculum or program development; or (g) impact of teaching on students, community, and professional organizations.	In addition to the examples for meeting, might include some of the following (a) strong teaching evaluations; demonstration that course design is cutting edge based on best practices; develop a course for a new mode of delivery; teaching a breadth of types of courses (F2F, online, PhD); significant new or revised content or pedagogical practice; pedagogical training, etc.	Attending Center for Faculty Development workshops; receiving grants to support teaching
		(b) creating a class environment that builds positive rapport; demonstrating availability; maintaining student support post-course; letters of recommendations; providing students with resources and information, etc.	
		(c) greater than average mentoring activities; advising multiple PhD dissertations; serving on a large number of capstone committees; advising student leadership groups, etc.	
		(d) implementing novel approaches for evaluating student performance/learning assessments (e.g., use of rubrics); use of learning assessment techniques for curriculum improvement, program design, and/or improvement in student relations, etc.	Contributing to the Canvas teaching resources site

		(e) use of high impact practices; experiential learning; multiple modes of course content delivery, etc.	
		(f) individual course curriculum reform.	
		(g) teaching a large number of students; publication of research that advances teaching; facilitating student involvement in community and professional outreach	Publication of research that advances teaching--may be considered by Research criteria instead
<b>Meeting</b>	Maintain (a) contractual obligation regarding teaching; (b) generally performing adequately on evaluations of the course and instructor; and c) supporting the teaching mission of SPA.	(a) Teaching the expected number of courses agreed upon and is available to teach courses per the school's needs (b) FCQ scores and other faculty assessments indicate performance at at least the average level for SPA (c) Maintains and periodically updates complete syllabus; includes relevant course competencies in syllabi and teaching materials; attends class; engages students; provides feedback in a timely manner; responds to student needs in a timely manner; teaches in different modes or at different levels; assumes non-classroom teaching activities (capstone second readers, independent studies, dissertations, etc.)	
<b>Below</b>	Does not fully achieve Meeting	See criteria above	
<b>Failing</b>	Significantly deviates below Meeting.	See criteria above	

**Research**

Rating	Construct	Sample indicators (not exhaustive nor restrictive)	CTF sample indicators
Outstanding	Surpasses Exceeding, by demonstrating extraordinary performance in either one of the following criteria, or high quality across multiple criteria taking into account the stage of career development: a. scholarly refereed and non-refereed activities; b. external funding; c. collaboration with students; d. evidence of impact; e. evidence of originality; and f. evidence of impact on the mission of SPA and the university.	See indicators below (note: must demonstrate extraordinary performance on one or high quality across multiple criteria).	
Exceeding	Achieves Meeting, plus demonstrates high quality in at least one of the following, taking into account the stage of one's career : a. scholarly refereed and non-refereed activities; b. external funding; c. collaboration with students; d. evidence of impact; e. evidence of originality; f. evidence of impact on the mission of SPA and the university	a. Publishes in high quality journals or academic presses in their field/sub-field; has a leading article; is lead author of co-authored publications; publishes an above-average number of publications (e.g., >2) in either peer reviewed journals or book chapters; has a book proposal accepted by a reputable press, edits a book; etc.	
		b. Receives a substantial grant to support one's research agenda	
		c. Provides meaningful opportunities for students to participate in a research project, as evidenced by co-authorship on journal articles, conference papers, or creation of other joint research products.	
		d. Demonstrates an impact on the field, discipline, interdisciplinary scholarship, or society by the nominee [for example, a high number of citations given norms for the field or discipline; memberships on review panels; keynote addresses; book awards; other awards; supportive data from established alternative metrics (e.g., number of page views/downloads of public works); impact on practice; media citations to one's research; significant professional collaborations; success of student collaborators; unfunded projects that had impacts on the field; and indicators of the quality of journals, such as their rankings]	

		e. Evidence of originality of work (e.g., as recognized by colleagues in the field in reviews or citations; professional association awards recognizing originality, etc.)	
		f. Evidence of impact on the mission of the academic unit and the university (e.g., in attracting new faculty members, graduate students, visiting professors; in enhanced educational opportunities for students; etc.)	
<b>Meeting</b>	Demonstrates an active scholarly research agenda.	Demonstration of an active research agenda in one's field/sub-field, as evidenced by data collection, proposals, academic publications, or research dissemination through conferences and other venues.	
<b>Below</b>	Does not fully achieve Meeting	See criteria above; A notable absence of proposals, manuscripts in progress, efforts to collect or compile data, and conference attendance.	
<b>Failing</b>	Significantly deviates below Meeting.	See criteria above; Violates principles of academic integrity or professional ethics as defined by AAUP or professional organizations in the conduct of research.	



**Service**

Rating	Construct	Sample indicators (not exhaustive nor restrictive)	CTF sample indicators
<b>Outstanding</b>	Surpasses Exceeding by demonstrating extraordinary performance in at least one of the following or high quality in multiple areas: a. leadership/service to scholarly or professional organizations; b. leadership/service on program-level, school-level, or university-level committees; c. leadership/service to the community	See indicators below (note: must demonstrate extraordinary performance on one or high quality across multiple criteria)	
<b>Exceeding</b>	Achieves Meeting, plus demonstrates high quality in at least one of the following: a. leadership/service to scholarly or professional organizations; b. leadership/service on program-level, school-level, or university-level committees; c. leadership/service to the community	a. Edits a journal; referees a large number of manuscripts for journals or proposals for funding agencies; serves on professional committees/boards; takes on consulting activities for scholarly or professional organizations in his/her field; volunteers for program reviews of other schools; conference planning /organizing; serving as an invited speaker for scholarly or professional groups, as documented in the faculty member's C.V and FRP	
		b. Serves in a leadership position or officer position on a university committee; takes on extra, uncompensated, service duties for the school beyond committee membership (e.g. running a strategic planning committee, chairing a search committee, directing a concentration, advising a student organization, organizing a seminar series). For faculty in leadership positions (e.g., program or center directors) that are compensated, high quality leadership would require undertaking activities that go above and beyond the regular duties of the leadership position and support the strategic mission of SPA (e.g., leading a program review, undertaking curriculum reform, leading a change to the design of a program; establishing new ways to interface with students or the community), etc.	
		c. Consults or volunteers his/her academic knowledge/resources for community groups; gives public lectures; organizes public events related to his/her area of expertise as documented in the faculty member's C.V and FRPA	
<b>Meeting</b>	Actively serves on Faculty Council and <u>two</u> committees within the following: System, Campus, School/College, Department/Primary Unit, Institute/Center/Concentration, Professional Association, Community.	Regularly attends and contributes to two committees, regularly attends SPA Faculty Council, and provides service within their discipline (e.g., conference session chairs/discussants; organizing workshops, etc.), as documented in the faculty member's C.V. and FRPA.	
<b>Below</b>	Participates in less service than meeting.	Nominal participation in service activities.	
<b>Failing</b>	Does not contribute to any service within or outside the University.	Absence of examples.	