

UNIVERSITY *of*
NORTHERN COLORADO



College of Humanities and
Social Sciences

Policies and Procedures
Manual


Spring 2006
(Revised 3/27/2009)

UNIVERSITY of
NORTHERN COLORADO



Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

TO: David Caldwell
Dean, HSS

FROM: Allen Huang 

DATE: May 30, 2006

SUBJECT: HSS Policies and Procedures Manual

I have reviewed the College of Humanities & Social Sciences Policies and Procedures Manual that was submitted to my office and I approve the same. The document is consistent with the Board of Trustees Policies & Procedures.



**College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Policies and Procedures**

Table of Contents

Section I

HSS Standing Committees..... 1-3

Section II

HSS Search and Interview Processes.....4

Section III

Basic Components of Sabbatical Leave Proposal..... 5

Section IV

HSS Policy for Summer Session.....6-7

Section V

Elements of an Academic Program Area Assessment
and Program Review Plan.....8-9

Section VI

Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines.....10-33

Table of Revisions

Section I – Revisions

Page 1/2 – Rev. 4/15/09

Page 3 – Rev. 5/22/09

Section II - Revisions

Section III - Revisions

Section IV - Revisions

Section V - Revisions

Section VI - Revisions

Page 33 – Rev. 3/27/09

SECTION I HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES STANDING COMMITTEES

In addition to any necessary ad hoc committees, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences will maintain the following standing committees. All these committees are advisory to the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, with the exception of the Curriculum Committee, which has responsibilities described in Board policy provision, 1-1-304. Faculty committees will elect their own chairs and develop their own bylaws consistent with college and university policy.

Program Review and Assessment Committee

The purpose of this committee is to review assessment impact reports and assessment plans from the various programs in the college. In addition, committee members will review 5 year program reviews. See the description of the program review and assessment process in this document for more details.

Awards Committee

Members of this committee review applications for college awards each fall and make award recommendations to the dean. Membership on this committee differs from the others in that it consists of award winners for the prior year plus two faculty members elected at large for staggered 3 year terms.

College Leadership Council

This committee consists of all school directors and the dean with other dean's office personnel chosen by the dean as ex-officio members.

Community Advisory Board

This board will consist of up to 25 members who are invited by the dean to participate in developing ideas, recommend college initiatives, and to enhance community relations in consultation with the College Leadership Council and the dean.

Curriculum Committee

The purpose of this committee is to review all curriculum proposals in the college and provide professional advice or comments to the originating units related to quality, consistency, and clarity.

Budget and Planning Committee

Functions of the budget and planning committee will include input to the dean on planning and budget issues.

Policy and Procedures Committee

The purpose of the policy and procedures committee is to review policies and procedures in the college and suggest changes where needed.

The program review and assessment committee, curriculum committee, budget and planning committee and policy and procedures committee will all consist of members

who are elected. Each school will elect one member to each of the committees and each committee will also have 2 members elected at large in the college. Terms will be for 3 years and will be staggered so that there is some continuity in membership. Committee elections will be conducted each spring by the Humanities and Social Sciences senator who is a member of the Faculty Senate elections committee. Future structural changes will be addressed as changes occur.

Development Committee

The purpose of the HSS Development Committee is to promote college relations with donors and potential donors and to support the Dean as well as the college's Development Officer or Special Projects Officer with development goals for the college. The committee will consist of the college's Development Officer or Special Projects Officer, the Dean, and at least one faculty member representing each academic program in the college, to be selected by means that are determined by the school's director and faculty. Individual members will work with the college's Development Officer or Special Projects Officer and Dean on an as-needed basis for purposes of maintaining contact with identified donors and potential donors. The Development Committee will meet as a group at least once each academic year, at which time development activities will be coordinated and the Development Officer or Special Projects Officer and the Dean will report to the committee on development goals, activities, and progress. Terms for faculty members will be for one year with annual renewal of membership possible upon consent of faculty member, school director, and dean.

Added to Policies and Procedures Manual Sept. 26, 2008. Effective date for committee: Dec. 1, 2008.

Diversity Advisory Board

Definition: The HSS Diversity Advisory Board is a body of constituents of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences who can advise on matters of human diversity as they relate to the academic mission of the college.

Purpose: The Diversity Advisory Board will support the enrichment of academic pursuits brought about by the diversity of human identity and experience, consistent with the UNC Statement on Diversity <http://www.unco.edu/diversity/statement.html>. Specifically, the board will serve as a resource dedicated to providing ideas, perspectives, insight, and knowledge about the contribution that diverse human resources make to higher education in the humanities and social sciences. The board will be available to answer questions related to diversity and, when requested, to work with members of the college on projects, plans, or activities that support diversity as an integral part of the academic mission of the college and the university. In particular, the board will support the annual Summit on Social Justice and Diversity sponsored by the Summit Organizing Committee (SOC) made up of students, staff, and faculty from UNC. The board shall be invited to submit content related to HSS for inclusion in diversity reports requested of the college by internal or external bodies. The Diversity Advisory Board serves in advisory capacity and is not a policy-making body.

Membership and Appointment: The Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences will invite participation by the following constituent members, who will serve for staggered terms of from one to three years: one to two undergraduate or graduate student(s) with majors within the College of Humanities & Social Sciences; one to two full-time or part-time College of Humanities & Social Sciences faculty member(s) (apart from faculty organizers of the Summit on Social Justice and Diversity); one to two faculty organizers of the Summit on Social Justice and Diversity; one to two member(s) of College of Humanities & Social Sciences classified or exempt staff; and at least one affiliated constituent from the community or from another academic areas outside the college.* In addition to the dean's invitations to specific individuals, constituent groups may be asked to determine representative membership.

Meetings: The board shall meet at least once each fall semester with the dean and any other invited participants to discuss and review current diversity-related activities, developments, initiatives, and to provide information for any diversity reports requested of the college by university officials or by the CCHE. The dean shall convene the board as needed throughout the academic year in response to occasional issues or requests and in support of the Summit on Social Justice and Diversity. Meetings in person may be supplemented by electronic communication facilitated by the dean.

*Community or non-college members may be invited from among the following groups and bodies, among others: the HSS Community Advisory Board, UNC Cultural Centers, the UNC Board of Trustees, Special Assistant to the President for Diversity Issues, student organizations, and municipal or governmental personnel with job duties related to diversity.

Added to the Policies and Procedures Manual December 3, 2008.

SECTION II HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES SEARCH AND INTERVIEW PROCESSES

Guidelines for the search and interview process are set by Human Resources. They are frequently updated and are available on the Human Resources web site.

In the search process a faculty member from the program area of the hire will be designated by the director to direct and organize the search process. All information regarding the search given to the dean should also be copied to the director.

SECTION III BASIC COMPONENTS OF THE SABBATICAL LEAVE PROPOSAL

The following elements should be described or addressed. Sabbatical leave awards are competitive and the limited number of leaves will be awarded based, in part, upon the following elements in the proposal. Use as many extra sheets as necessary (two-six pages, single spaced, expected).

- Description of the proposed project.
- Relation of the project to the discipline.
- Contribution of the project to scholarly activity and/or teaching.
- Travel and contact with resources external to UNC.
- Expected benefits of the project to UNC.

SECTION IV HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES POLICY FOR SUMMER SESSION

Faculty Loads

Humanities & Social Sciences will adhere to University policies as approved by the President (10/9/02).

1. The maximum state-funded portion of a faculty member's load is 7 hours (1 unit of work).
2. The maximum teaching load for a six-week session is 7 hours (7 units of work).
3. The maximum teaching load for a one-week session is 2 hours.
4. Faculty desiring to teach more than 7 units are paid at the adjunct rate for units in excess of 7; or they can teach more than 7 units if the funding for units above 7 comes from extended education or other non-state sources.

For full-time faculty (lecturers, tenured, and tenure-track) FTE for summer is calculated using 12 hours as the base; a three-hour course is 3/12 or 0.25. For part-time faculty, we will continue to pay the same per credit rate as during the academic year.

Administrative FTE for Summer

The College of Humanities and Social Sciences will develop a new policy for administrative compensation for summer.

Faculty Salaries

Faculty will receive pay based on their academic year base, divided by 3, times FTE ($\text{BASE}/3 * \text{FTE}$). This rate is the maximum pay per credit hour for summer loads. Academic Affairs provides the College a dollar allocation for the summer Program Area and we then convert this to an approximate number of FTE positions. Guaranteed funding will apply only to administrative FTE. All instructional FTE will be paid on a contingency basis. The overall productivity for a Program Area will allow the flexibility of paying faculty teaching low enrollment courses at full or almost full pay. Summer schedules should be planned with this productivity balance in mind.

Humanities & Social Sciences Policy for Summer Courses

The "student make numbers" (number of students required for full pay) for summer courses will be: 18 for an undergraduate class, and 10 for a graduate class. Double-numbered classes will be treated as undergraduate classes. Faculty who accept a summer class need to know that they are making an agreement to teach the class if that class enrolls at least a minimum of 9 students in the undergraduate class and 5 students in the graduate class. These numbers will be determined by the number of students on the class roll for the first day of class. Classes not meeting the minimum enrollment two working days before the start of the course will be cancelled by the school director and the affected students will be notified.

Summer Faculty Pay Scale

Faculty pay for tuition-funded courses will be determined by the following sliding scale on a per student basis: Graduate Courses – 10 or more = 100%, 9 = 90%, 8 = 80%, 7 = 70%, 6 = 60%, 5 = 50%. If enrollment is less than 5, the course will be cancelled. Undergraduate Courses - 18 or more = 100%, 17 = 95%, 16 = 90%, 15 = 85%, 14 = 80%, 13 = 70%, 12 = 65%, 11 = 60%, 10 = 55%, 9 = 50%. If enrollment is less than 9, the course will be cancelled.

Summer Faculty Pay Schedule

Instructors teaching in the first six-week session and the twelve-week session could receive payment early (the end of May) if their classes have high enrollments by the first week of May. Otherwise, all first six-week session summer classes will receive payment at the end of June and the twelve-week session classes will be paid in June and July. Payment for the second six-week session will be paid in July.

A contract reflecting pay at 100% will be issued when we know that a class has met minimum enrollment. Once final enrollment numbers are determined for each session, profit and loss figures will be reviewed. If these figures for the program area do not support pay at 100%, an adjustment will be made for the final payroll for that session.

Courses Funded by Grant Dollars

The Humanities & Social Sciences position is that grant-funded workshops should be entered at the same time as summer courses or as soon as the funds are available and the courses are advertised. Faculty teaching these courses need to follow the regular curriculum procedures for entering and approving their courses.

Overseas Courses

Overseas courses will require approval of the dean pending evidence of adequate funding.

SECTION V ELEMENTS OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM AREA ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN

The assessment/program review process is designed to bring continuous improvement to academic program areas. Therefore, program review occurs yearly as well as on a 5 year cycle. In addition, student outcomes assessment occurs continuously. These procedures should result in outcomes that directly benefit students.

The core elements of an academic program area student outcomes assessment plan are as follows:

1. Undergraduate and graduate student outcomes (knowledge and skills). The plan must specify what it is that any student, regardless of emphasis area, graduating with your degree should know and be able to do.
2. Methods of assessing student performance on each of the student outcomes. The methods must include multiple types of measures such as course embedded assessment, exit interviews, alumni surveys, standardized tests, locally developed tests, portfolio reviews, senior seminars, etc. The college requires, at a minimum, the use of the following three measures:

Primary assessment that measures student learning
Exit interview/survey
Alumni survey (done periodically, not annually)

In addition to student outcomes, there should be outcomes in place which relate to the program as a whole. Typically, outcomes/goals are developed during the 5 year program review and progress toward these goals is updated each year or more frequently depending on when data are gathered.

3. Procedures must be in place for analyzing the results of student outcome assessment measures as well as broader program goals. In addition to data analysis procedures, techniques for applying the results to program area improvement should be specified. It is presumed that data may be numerical or non-numerical or both.

The student outcomes assessment plan as well as broader program area goals and the relevant data analysis should be entered into TracDat which is a university wide software program used for keeping track of assessment and program review data. Entries into TracDat should be supervised by a faculty member from the program area and should be added to each semester.

Other features of student outcomes assessment/program review are:

1. Any behaviors or products used to determine the amount and quality of student learning or program quality should be judged by more than one qualified person who may be either internal or external to the university.
2. Faculty members on the College of Humanities and Social Sciences Program Review and Assessment Committee serve as a resource to answer questions and provide helpful input on any program area assessment plan. When a student outcomes assessment plan or program goals are revised and re-written, they must be reviewed by the college committee for comment and approval.

SECTION VI FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

Board Approved Constitutions and Procedures: Article 3 Faculty Part 8 Faculty Evaluation.

2-3-801 Procedures for Evaluation of Performance.

All faculty members (see also 2-3-201, Faculty: Definition and Contracts) being reviewed for reappointment, promotion, tenure, appointment to the graduate faculty, and all tenured faculty undergoing post-tenure review shall be evaluated in accordance with the procedures specified in this section 2-3-801, Faculty Evaluation and 1-1-307, Faculty Evaluation, and University Regulations 3-3-801, Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures.

2-3-801(1) Definitions. Definitions are provided to give guidance and should be substantially adhered to in the processes that follow:

(a) **Dossier:** Portfolio of information relative to performance and accomplishments during the comprehensive evaluation period, which shall include the updated vita; appropriate documentation; a representative sample of student evaluations, from each year, covering the range of teaching assignments; and other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate. Student evaluations chosen as a representative sample will include all responses submitted by students for each course selected.

(b) **Colleges:** Humanities and Social Sciences, Monfort College of Business, Education & Behavioral Sciences, Natural and Health Sciences, University Libraries, and Performing and Visual Arts.

(c) **School:** An administrative subdivision of a college which may consist of one or more program areas.

(d) **School Director:** The leader/manager of a school.

(e) **Program Area:** For the purposes of this policy, “program area” shall mean a disciplinary based unit which may consist of several emphasis areas or graduate and undergraduate degrees.

(f) **Voting:** All full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty in the program area will participate in review and evaluation of faculty in their discipline but only tenured faculty must participate in voting; each tenure-track faculty member may choose to vote or not. Tenured faculty in the program area who are on full-time administrative assignment may not vote. Nor shall term faculty vote.

(g) **Evaluation Conference Committee (ECC):** A conflict resolution committee, convened by the dean, consisting of the dean, the school director, program area

faculty or their designee. The ECC re-examines evaluation materials, responses, and any new information when there is disagreement among the recommendations of the program area faculty, the school director, and the dean regarding overall comprehensive evaluation, promotion, tenure, remediation, and disciplinary action.

2-3-801(2) Types of Review. Comprehensive Review is used for faculty who are under consideration for promotion, tenure, post-tenure review, or graduate faculty status. Tenured faculty will undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review on a five-year cycle. A faculty member must receive a comprehensive evaluation in any year upon his or her request. (See also 1-1-307 et seq., Faculty Evaluation; and University Regulations 3-3-801 et. seq., Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures.)

(a) **Promotion Review.** Promotion review, when requested by the evaluatee, shall include:

- (I) Degree of progress toward promotion.
- (II) Action recommended.

(b) **Tenure-Track Review.** Tenure-track review will address one or more of the following:

- (I) Degree of progress toward tenure.
- (II) Deficiencies requiring improvement and a development plan.
- (III) Whether requirements for the position as listed in the position description or as modified through the program area and school planning processes have been met.
- (IV) Whether tenure is recommended.

(c) **Post-Tenure Review.** Post-tenure review shall address one or more of the following:

- (I) Progress toward promotion, if appropriate.
- (II) Deficiencies requiring improvement and a remediation plan, if needed.
- (III) Recommendation and rationale.

(d) **Graduate Faculty Status Review.** Faculty will be reviewed on a cycle established by the graduate dean to coincide with post-tenure review or every five years for non-tenured faculty. [See also the Graduate Faculty Guidelines and 2-3-107(3) The Graduate Council.]

2-3-801(3) General Processes

(a) **Comprehensive Review.** Comprehensive Review provides a regular, systematic evaluation of performance to encourage professional development and renewal; to encourage individual excellence and achievement; to encourage activities that contribute to the mission and goals of the University, the colleges, schools, and the program areas; and to help those who are not achieving at satisfactory levels to do so. The evaluation process should encourage excellence in both traditional and innovative approaches to teaching, scholarly and other professional activities, and service.

- (I) Each evaluatee will prepare a dossier [see also 2-3-801(1)(a)] covering performance and accomplishments over the comprehensive evaluation period.
- (II) Program area faculty will conduct its evaluation and forward its findings to the school director. The school director adds his or her evaluation of the faculty member's contributions to the school in accordance with the following procedure:
 - (A) in case the school director and evaluatee are in different disciplines, the school director's recommendation shall be on non-discipline specific matters only;
 - (B) in case the school director and the evaluatee are in the same discipline, the recommendation shall be based on all aspects of the evaluatee's performance.

Both these evaluations will be forwarded to the dean. The dean will make an independent evaluation with rationale that is shared with the program area faculty the school director and the evaluatee.

- (III) In case of disagreement with the voting program area faculty by the school director or dean, the Evaluation Conference Committee (ECC) shall be convened by the dean to resolve differences and arrive at a common decision
- (IV) If the ECC's cannot reach consensus, the program area faculty, the school director, and the dean, will forward their individual recommendations and rationale to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO).
- (V) The CAO, after insuring that procedures have been followed, shall make a recommendation to the President of the University.
- (VI) In cases of post-tenure review, graduate faculty status, and tenure track review, the President of the University will make the final decision. In

cases of promotion, or the granting of tenure, the President will forward his or her recommendations to the BOT, which will make the final decision.

(VII) The graduate faculty status review will follow procedures defined by the bylaws of the Graduate Council, as approved by the President.

(b) **Annual Review.** Annual Review provides a mechanism for regular feedback to all faculty members as to their performance, for determining merit pay, and for assessing progress toward tenure and promotion. This review will occur each year during the Spring Semester in either of the following ways.

(I) Each program area will develop its own procedures for annual evaluation, subject to the approval of the school director. Each program area's procedures must include a mechanism to resolve any differences among program area and dean's evaluations in cases where the dean chooses to evaluate all faculty [see also (III) below].

(II) If the program area and school director cannot reach agreement on evaluation procedures, the same procedures used in comprehensive evaluation will apply.

(III) The program area will conduct its evaluation in accordance with its approved annual evaluation procedures and forward its findings to the school director. The school director will add his or her evaluation of the faculty member's contributions to the school in accordance with the following procedure:

(A) in case the school director and evaluatee are in different disciplines, the school director's recommendation shall be on non-discipline specific matters only;

(B) in case the school director and the evaluatee are in the same discipline, the recommendation shall be based on all aspects of the evaluatee's performance.

Both of these evaluations will be forwarded to the dean. The dean may, at his or her discretion, independently evaluate all or none of the faculty in the college. In case the dean chooses to evaluate faculty in his or her college, he or she will forward his or her findings, with rationale, to the program area faculty, the school director, and the evaluatee. In case a dean chooses not to conduct an independent evaluation, he or she must still do so in the case of any faculty member who chooses to appeal his or her evaluation from the program area of school director.

(IV) In the case of tenure track faculty and tenured faculty at the rank of assistant or associate professor, the program area's annual evaluation

will note, in addition to rankings in the three (3) performance areas, the evaluatee's progress toward a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. In all such cases, the program area faculty, school director and the dean shall comment on the evaluatee's progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

- (V) If the dean conducts an independent evaluation, and if the dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the program area and/or school director, after unsuccessful attempts have been made to resolve those disagreements, then the dean and the program area and school director will forward their individual evaluations and rationale to the CAO, who will make the final decision.

2-3-801(4) Evaluation Areas. Unless otherwise specified in an evaluatee's job description, he or she will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarly and other professional activities, and service. However, the faculty member need not contribute to each area equally in every evaluation period. Expectations and evaluations should be in accordance with the evaluatee's background, goals, experience, and current professional status, as well as the expectations of the program area and the characteristics of the discipline. The evaluation process must take into consideration the faculty member's assigned workload.

2-3-801(5) Possible Consequences to Tenure Status. A faculty member who receives an unacceptable comprehensive post-tenure review evaluation will be given a period of two (2) years to achieve an acceptable evaluation. Failure to do so will constitute grounds for disciplinary action, including the initiation of dismissal proceedings as specified in 2-3-1101, Disciplinary Action of Tenured Faculty.

2-3-801(6) Confidentiality and Professional Ethics. It is intended that all information reviewed, evaluation data collected, committee deliberations, decisions, and other work products generated during the course of evaluations conducted in accordance with this procedure shall be maintained as confidential, except as otherwise authorized under the terms and provisions of this procedure, or when used to administer the affairs of the University, or to comply with the law.

HSS Principles and Procedures Re: Annual Review

1. The following principles and procedures apply to annual reviews beginning with those for calendar year 2006.
2. Program Areas will develop review procedures and criteria for annual review which will be reviewed and approved by the dean.
3. The following parameters will apply to the development of Program Area procedures and criteria:
 - a. Program Areas forward their procedures/criteria to the dean for approval.
 - b. The Program Area may choose to include participants in the process who are not faculty. They will be non-voting.
 - c. There will be five levels of review, as characterized in the BOT faculty evaluation policy.
 - d. Program Areas must develop criteria/indicators, etc., that distinguish between the levels of evaluation.
 - e. Program Areas may define their weighting of criteria on either a 15 hour equated load basis or on a Program Area mission basis. If the equated load basis is chosen, the weighting for a “typical” appointment would be 60% teaching, 20% professional activity, and 20% service. If a mission definition is adopted: teaching for a “typical” appointment must be weighted no less than 40% and no more than 60%; professional activity must be weighted no less than 20% and no more than 40%; and service must be weighted no less than 10% and no more than 30%.
4. In all cases, the Board approved policy applies to the development of Program Area procedures and criteria.
5. The dean of Humanities and Social Sciences will not participate in assigning ratings (i.e., a level of annual review) unless the Program Area does not have approved criteria and procedures or unless involved at the level of appeal. The dean will review the application of all procedures and criteria by Program Areas and may return the Program Area annual reviews (as a whole) to Program Areas for reconsideration if they are not in accord with approved procedures and criteria. If, after reconsideration by the Program Area, the dean and the Program Area are unable to agree on the application of approved procedures and criteria, the provost will be the final appeal.

6. Any change in procedures and criteria must be submitted to the dean and approved prior to start of a new evaluation cycle.

This numbered section from Article 3 of the Policy Manual will be replaced by the new policy.

Board Approved Constitutions and Procedures: Article 3 Faculty

Part 9 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

2-3-901 Promotion Guidelines.

Promotion at the University provides a mechanism for the recognition of personal contributions of faculty members to the mission of the institution and its reputation as well as a professional contribution of the advancement of the state of the art and the society at large. While judgment of potential contributions must necessarily be based on past performance, it is expected that persons achieving a given rank will continue to take initiatives which are valued by the institution.

Although the administration of promotion policies at the University must be equitable, it must not be perceived as implying identical standards for types of contributions by each individual faculty member. The promotion policy must facilitate the recognition of diverse potentials which harmonize individual competence and initiative with institutional needs and values. The promotion policy attends to both qualitative and quantitative contributions, with greater emphasis on the former.

Although historically promotion policies have been primarily related to degree status and length of service, it is well recognized that these dimensions do not guarantee qualitative productivity for the institution, the profession, or society at large.

Further, it is well recognized that learning and growth occur in other than formalized learning environments.

Specific academic or professional qualifications, performance guidelines, and promotion criteria shall be established by the program area faculty in consultation with the school director and be approved by the appropriate dean and the chief academic officer (CAO). These must be written in consultation with the program areas of the respective school and shall be approved by the appropriate school director and dean and by the CAO.

The school director will discuss relevant promotion criteria with each faculty member in his or her school periodically so as to insure that each member is cognizant of program area and college performance expectations and his or her fulfillment of them according to the following principle:

- (1) in case the school director is in the same discipline as the program area, he or she will discuss these matters with each faculty member.

- (2) in the case the school director is not in the discipline of a program area, he or she shall assign someone from that program area to discuss relevant promotion criteria with each faculty member.

2-3-901(1) Academic and Professional Qualifications. The University must be committed to academic excellence, requiring faculty members to meet high academic and professional qualifications. Minimum eligibility requirements for promotion to the ranks of associate professor and professor require any one of the following:

- (a) Possession of an appropriate earned doctorate.
- (b) Academic degrees and/or professional certification considered terminal in specific disciplines.
- (c) In exceptional cases, clearly demonstrated capacity for sustained and significant contribution to the goals of the University.

Eligibility for promotion from instructor to assistant professor shall be contingent upon documented evidence of substantial progress toward meeting the above qualifications.

2-3-901(2) Performance Guidelines. The following are areas of contribution or initiative which are deemed valuable and attend to fulfilling the explicit or implicit mission of the institution. These identified areas do not establish criteria for judgment, but identify areas for which specific guidelines must be developed at the program area level to facilitate decisions regarding promotion in individual cases. It is not intended that faculty members would or could show initiative in all identified areas or that each would necessarily be appropriate in given program areas.

Major consideration will be given to fulfillment of contractual duties and performance in those duties commensurate with the rank aspired to (i.e., teaching, advising, librarianship, etc.). Consideration will University of Northern Colorado Board Approved Constitutions and Procedures Faculty be given to performance and accomplishment in the areas which follow:

- (a) Area I - Excellence in Teaching, Librarianship, etc.
 - (I) It is assumed that the use of this category would require as much extra effort and produce sufficient results as to be recognized "as productivity above and beyond the basic contractual duties of the aspired rank."
- (b) Area II - Professional Growth and Activities.
 - (I) Scholarly activities, i.e., research, knowledge dissemination, advancement of the state of the art, writing, etc.
 - (II) Professional involvement/active participation, i.e., leadership, officership, service on task forces, commissions, etc.

- (III) Presentations at professional organizations, learned societies, exhibitions, recitals, etc.
 - (IV) Continued formal education, professional development, seminars, workshops, professional internships, etc.
- (c) Area III - Professional Service and Institutional Leadership.
- (I) Professional Service - Internal.
 - (A) Contribution to committees.
 - (B) Program development.
 - (C) Curricular and instructional innovations.
 - (D) Development of training facilities or placement opportunities for graduates.
 - (E) Resource development.
 - (II) Professional Service - External.
 - (A) Position-relevant professional consultation or service.
 - (B) Position-relevant government consultation or service.
 - (C) Position-relevant community service.
 - (III) Institutional Leadership.
 - (A) Increasing levels of leadership, responsibility and initiative.

2-3-901(3) Time Guidelines. Instructors are eligible for promotion to the assistant professor rank as soon as they have met the requirements necessary for appointment to that rank. Assistant professors are first eligible for promotion to the associate professor rank during their fifth year in rank. Associate professors are first eligible for promotion to the full professor rank during their fifth year in rank.

2-3-901(4) Promotion Criteria. Promotion Criteria shall be developed by the program area faculty in consultation with its director and approved by the appropriate dean and the CAO prior to consideration of any individual for promotion. Promotion criteria must be written within the confines of the University's promotion policy to insure that criteria for promotion are generally comparable throughout the University, yet accommodate differences within the academic disciplines.

Department chairs will discuss relevant promotion criteria with each faculty member in her or his department periodically so as to insure that each member is cognizant of departmental and college performance expectations and his or her fulfillment of them.

2-3-901(5) Eligibility. Eligibility for consideration for promotion shall be based upon academic years in which the individual is contracted with the University to a full-time position. Up to three years credit (out of the five-year probationary period) toward both promotion and tenure may be negotiated by newly hired faculty who have been tenured, or who have held tenure-track appointments at another institution of higher education, or who possess a record of outstanding achievement in the area in which they are being hired. Under exceptional circumstances, faculty may become eligible for early consideration for promotion and/or tenure. Time in which the individual is on leave for academic purposes, with or without pay, shall be counted as if the individual had not been on leave. It shall be the responsibility of the individual who is eligible for consideration to initiate the review through a formal request to the appropriate school director.

2-3-901(6) Consideration. At the time of the formal request for consideration for promotion it shall be the responsibility of the candidate to document satisfactory fulfillment of the appropriate areas of consideration for promotion as defined within the approved college criteria for promotion.

2-3-901(7) Review. Professional ethics require that decisions regarding promotion be made on the basis of approved criteria. It is also important that professionals judging fellow professionals accept the responsibility to review appropriate and applicable supporting material to insure that decisions are fair and based upon the approved criteria. Review of each candidate shall be made by faculty members eligible under 2-3-801(1)(f) Voting, excluding the individual being considered for promotion. (See also 1-1-307, Faculty Evaluation, 2-3-801, et seq., Faculty Evaluations and 3-3-801, et seq., Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures.)

Promotion and tenure become effective upon BOT approval.

2-3-902 Tenure.

2-3-902(1) Purpose. The purpose of tenure is to create an environment in which the concept of academic freedom is protected. The decision to grant or not grant tenure is influenced by the desirability of maintaining a continuing collegial and professional relationship between the candidate and his or her peer professionals. While a program area cannot remain viable under conditions of sharp disharmony, neither can it achieve vitality in the absence of a diversity of interests, opinions, and personalities; a balance of these considerations must, therefore, be sought. Members of educational institutions -- concerned as they are with lively exchanges of ideas, and with students who themselves are varied in terms of interests and personalities -- should be particularly receptive to such differences, and particularly mindful of accepting them when making decisions about tenure.

These areas necessitate that professionals must accept their responsibilities to other professionals, to students, to the University, and to the community at large.

2-3-902(2) Eligibility. Eligibility shall be calculated on full academic years in which the individual was contracted to a full-time, tenure-track position. Time which the individual has spent on leave or as a visiting faculty member shall not be calculated as applicable toward eligibility for tenure. Tenure is in a person's program area and does not apply to any administrative position.

2-3-902(3) Tenure Guidelines. Tenure-track faculty become eligible for tenure consideration in their fifth year at UNC but must receive tenure consideration in their sixth year. If tenure is denied in the fifth year, faculty may reapply in their sixth year. If tenure is not granted before the end of the sixth year, the seventh will be the terminal year.

- (a) Promotion and tenure become effective upon BOT approval.
- (b) In unusual circumstances, immediate tenure may be granted to faculty being hired from outside the University as associate and full professors.
- (c) Up to three years credit (out of the five-year probationary period) toward both promotion and tenure, may be negotiated by newly hired faculty who have been tenured, or who have held tenure-track appointments at another institution of higher education, or who possess a record of outstanding achievement in the area in which they are being hired.
- (d) Under exceptional circumstances, faculty may become eligible for early consideration for promotion and/or tenure.
- (e) Applications for promotion to the rank of associate professor by tenure-track faculty must always be accompanied by an application for tenure, so that the two decisions may be considered at the same time. In these cases, tenure and promotion to the associate rank must be granted at the same time.

2-3-902(4) Administrators With Tenure. Tenure shall not be lost by appointment to an administrative position and may be granted to administrative officers in their respective teaching disciplines or program area. Upon termination of the non-teaching position, a faculty member with tenure may return to the previous professional assignment or one of equal status in accordance 3-4-102, Contract/Appointment Status.

2-3-902(5) Voting. In all cases, tenure shall be granted only upon approval of a plurality of the faculty voting in the academic program area in which the faculty member will hold tenure. In the case of a negative department vote on tenure, an appeal may be made to the Tenure Appeals Committee (Committee) as outlined in 2-3-902(6) below.

2-3-902(6) Tenure Appeals Committee. In the case of a program area voting against tenure, the faculty member may appeal to the Tenure Appeals Committee (Committee) which is herein established. The committee shall consist of two faculty representatives from each college, and one from the University libraries. Each college representative

shall be a member of the faculty and shall serve for a term of two years. Elections shall be held annually so that one member of each college is elected each year. At the initial elections, one position in each college shall be designated as a one year term. Elections will be conducted by the Faculty Senate and will be held during the spring semester. Terms of office will begin with the next academic year. The Committee shall select its own chair, and establish its own bylaws.

Appeals must be filed within ten working days (excluding winter and spring breaks) of notification of the program area vote. The Committee will hear appeals only in those cases in which the faculty member alleges that the program area's negative vote on tenure was arbitrary, capricious, or the result of prejudice. The Committee shall conclude its deliberations no fewer than ten working days before the date on which recommendations on tenure are due in the Office of Academic Affairs. If by a majority vote the Committee finds reasonable grounds for the allegations that the program area's decision was arbitrary, capricious or the result of prejudice, its decision, with rationale and a vote count, will be forwarded to the appropriate officer. If however, the Committee does not find reasonable grounds to support the candidate's allegations, tenure will be denied in that program area and the appellant will be notified.

Evidence of Teaching

The following is a list of supporting materials that may be submitted for review of teaching in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences:

Statement of teaching philosophy

Copies of course syllabi

Narrative descriptions of course syllabi

Copies of exams

Copies of graded exams

Copies of graded papers

New courses

New programs

Student evaluations (no numbers or numbers de-emphasized)

Analyses of student evaluations

Professor description of class "personality," ability, performance

Letters from students

Student awards

Student research presented

Other evidence of effects on students

Video of teaching

Peer review of teaching

Chair review of teaching (dean mandates)

College of Humanities and Social Sciences Guidelines For the Evaluation of Directors and Deans

Director – In consultation with the dean and director each school will develop procedures and guidelines for evaluation of directors.

Dean – The dean will be evaluated in accordance of the evaluation procedures approved by the Board of Trustees.

Faculty Evaluation Deadlines and Forms

Current deadlines for submission of faculty evaluation materials are available on the HSS share-drive (S-drive) in the folder labeled “HSS Dean’s Office” and sub-folder labeled “Deadlines.”

Downloadable forms for annual and comprehensive evaluation are available on the HSS website at:

http://www.unco.edu/hss/documents_and_forms.htm

ANNUAL EVALUATION
For Calendar Year _____

PART I: Evaluatee Information

Name _____

College _____ School/Department _____ Rank _____

Date 1st Hired at UNC _____ Contract Status (check one) Tenured _____ Tenure Track _____ Term _____

Member of the graduate faculty? Yes ___ No ___ Doctoral research endorsement? Yes ___ No ___

Date of last appointment _____

Graduate program responsibilities? (check all that apply) Teaching _____ Advising _____ Supervision of research _____
MA _____ Doc _____

PART II: Annual Performance Evaluation

Weighting Factors

Instruction _____ Professional Activity _____ Service _____

Performance Evaluation

(5=Excellent, 4= Exceeds Expectations, 3= Meets Expectations, 2= Needs Improvement, 1=Unsatisfactory)

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service	Overall Evaluation
Faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____
Director	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dean	_____	_____	_____	_____
Vice President	_____	_____	_____	_____

_____	_____
Faculty	Date
_____	_____
Director	Date
_____	_____
Dean	Date
_____	_____
Vice President	Date
_____	_____
President (if appropriate)	Date

Overall 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

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW
For Calendar Years _____ through _____

Purpose of Review (check all that apply) Promotion ___; Tenure ___; Post Tenure Review ___; Personal Request ___.

PART I: Evaluatee Information

Name _____

College _____ School/Department _____

Rank _____ Date of Last Promotion _____ Date Tenured at UNC _____

Complete next 2 items if applying for tenure and/or promotion. Date hired at UNC in a tenure track position _____

Prior service credit toward tenure and/or promotion? Yes ___ No ___ (If yes, attach your first contract agreement.)

Member of the graduate faculty? Yes ___ No ___ Doctoral research endorsement? Yes ___ No ___ Date last appointed _____

Graduate program responsibilities? (Check all that apply) Teaching _____ Advising ___ Supervision of research
MA ___ Doc _____

PART II: Annual Performance Evaluation

Weighting Factors

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service
Year _____	_____	_____	_____

Annual Performance Evaluation

(5=Excellent, 4= Exceeds Expectations, 3= Meets Expectations, 2= Needs Improvement, 1=Unsatisfactory)

				Overall Evaluation
Faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dean	_____	_____	_____	_____
Vice President	_____	_____	_____	_____

PART III: Comprehensive Evaluation

Weighting Factors (Average for Comprehensive Review Period)

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service
	_____	_____	_____

Comprehensive Performance Evaluation

				Overall Evaluation
Faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dean	_____	_____	_____	_____
Vice President	_____	_____	_____	_____

Part IV: Post Tenure Review Decision

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Faculty	_____	_____	_____
Dean	_____	_____	_____

ECC (if required) Indicate satisfactory, needs improvement, unsatisfactory.
Dean _____

Vice President's Recommendation _____

Performance plan required? _____

President's Decision _____

Part V: Voting Record for Promotion

	# Faculty Eligible to Vote	# Voting	# For	# Against	# Abstain
Faculty	# Tenured	# Tenured			
	# Tenure Track	# Tenure Track			
Dean					
ECC (if required)	Indicate Vote (Yes or No)*		Dean _____		
Vice President					
President					

Part VI: Voting Record for Tenure

	# Faculty Eligible to Vote	# Voting	# For	# Against	# Abstain
Faculty	# Tenured	# Tenured			
	# Tenure Track	# Tenure Track			
Dean					
ECC (if required)	Indicate Vote (Yes or No)*		Dean _____		
Vice President					
President					

Faculty Date

Dean Date

Vice President Date

President Date

Overall 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

Comprehensive Review Process and Guidelines College of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Northern Colorado

Section 1. Comprehensive Review Guidelines for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences

1. Faculty evaluation in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences will conform to the Board of Trustees current policy.
2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to review the document entitled "Faculty Evaluation in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences" on the HSS share drive in its entirety and review any questions or concerns with the Program Area Manager as soon as possible.
3. Comprehensive review includes evaluation in the three areas of instruction, professional activity, and service. Faculty evaluation involves professional and disciplinary based judgments in instruction, professional activity and service. Board of Trustee policy also provides guidelines related to the faculty member's "obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars..." (2-3-602).
4. School Directors are strongly encouraged to meet at least once annually with faculty on the path to promotion and/or tenure to discuss the results of annual reviews and assess the candidate's progress toward realizing a successful comprehensive review.
5. In some cases faculty members may be engaged in activities that have direct application to two or even three areas of their appointment (i.e., Instruction, Professional Activity, and Service). Among the activities that might fall into more than one area are the following: consulting; supervision of graduate research; serving on editorial boards; grants, depending on their nature e.g., whether they are pedagogical or content research). It is incumbent upon the candidate to select and defend the selected area(s). For example, a single project may involve publication of original data (Professional Activity), leading workshops for teachers related to that project (Instruction), and serving on a regional, national, or international board that coordinates research efforts within that particular project (Service). In such cases, though, the faculty member must justify in detail why a particular activity should be allotted to more than one area.
6. Program Areas will prepare comprehensive review guidelines which include expectations for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. The guidelines for comprehensive review should reflect the nature of instruction, professional activity, and service valued by the discipline. In designing guidelines Program Areas may include all, some, or none of the items listed below and, of course, may include guidelines not listed. The dean must review and approve Program Area guidelines. Once approved, the Program Area guidelines will be used by the Program Area, School Director and the dean in all comprehensive reviews. The college guidelines will be applicable to all Program Areas which do not have approved guidelines in place.

Process:

The Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences reviews all materials submitted by Program Areas in the candidate's dossier (vita, statement/narrative, and supporting documents), Program Area faculty vote/evaluation, School Director's evaluation/recommendation as defined and limited in University Policy Manual (2-3-801). In addition the candidate may provide a list of all supporting materials.

In some instances the dean may request additional information from the candidate, through interview or request for additional documentation, to gain a more complete understanding of the application. In addition, the dean may seek information from other sources, which may include, but are not limited to, interviews with the School Director, communication with Department Chairs or equivalent from appropriate peer group institutions or Program Area-selected reviewers external to UNC, communication with journal editors, or information available in the Michener Library or available through the internet. All information gained from this process will be presented and discussed in the dean's evaluation memo.

Section 2. Dean's Comprehensive Review Evaluations and Recommendations in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Basis for the Recommendation:

For promotion to Associate and Professor, an earned doctorate in the discipline or other terminal degree specified by the Program Area is required in addition to the following:

Tenure: Level IV or V rating for instruction or professional activity and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other two areas. Assistant professors may only be granted tenure if promoted to associate professor at the same time.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Level IV or V rating for instruction or professional activity and Level III, IV, or V rating for the other two areas.

Promotion to Professor: Level IV or V rating in instruction and professional activity and level III, IV, or V in service.

Post-tenure Review: A faculty member is evaluated on assigned workload over the five-year period. A satisfactory performance results from a Level III, IV, or V overall rating, which must include a Level III, IV, or V rating in instruction.

Content of the Recommendation:

The memo from the dean summarizes personnel data for the candidate and communicates the dean's recommendation relative to the proposed action. The dean's recommendation need not restate candidate accomplishments or outcomes that are already described in the dossier. However, the dean's recommendation should highlight accomplishments and evaluate performance as necessary to justify the performance ratings and to suggest areas for improvement (if applicable). All dean's level evaluations and recommendations are made using approved Program Area guidelines.

Program Area guidelines should reflect the nature of instruction that is valued in the discipline.

The following are expected of all instructors: to keep adequate office hours, meet classes regularly, return assignments in a timely manner, submit grades, and provide student evaluations.

INSTRUCTION

	Unsatisfactory/ Needs Improvement (I and II)	Meets Expectations (III)	Exceeds Expectations (IV)	Excellent (V)
Teaching Methods	Uses teaching methods that fail to impart course content and/or develop appropriate skills.	Uses teaching methods that impart course content and/or develop appropriate skills.	Uses highly effective teaching methods to impart course content and appropriate skills.	Uses exceptionally effective, creative and innovative teaching methods to impart course content and appropriate skills.
Course Design	Course design is not appropriate to the content or level of the course; and/or does not consistently articulate or uphold appropriate expectations.	Course design is appropriate to the content or level of the course and consistently articulates and upholds appropriate expectations.	Uses highly effective course design (technical or non-technical) in delivery of course material and articulating and upholding course expectations.	Creates exceptionally effective, creative and innovative course design (technical or non-technical) in delivery of course material and/or articulating and upholding course expectations.
Course Content	Consistently fails to deal with course content.	Competently presents relevant course content.	Highly effective selection of course content.	Exceptionally effective, creative and innovative selection of course content.
Knowledge in the Field	Fails to develop or maintain basic depth and breadth of knowledge in the subject fields	Maintains currency of knowledge in the subject fields.	Maintains up-to-date depth and breadth of knowledge in the subject fields.	Introduces and integrates relevant material from diverse subject areas.
Learning Environment	Creates a climate/environment hostile to student learning.	Creates a climate/environment conducive to student learning.	Creates a climate/ environment highly conducive to student learning,	Creates a climate/environment exceptionally conducive to autonomous student learning.
Course/ Curriculum Development	Failure to update courses or implement revised curriculum appropriately.	Appropriately revises and updates own courses to keep them consistent with curricular developments in the program.	Develops and implements new and revised courses and curriculum that meet programmatic needs.	Directs or takes major responsibility for course or curriculum development having a significant impact on the academic program.
Teaching Beyond the Classroom (If Applicable)	Fails to supervise assigned directed studies, performances, creative endeavors, internships, field studies, and student research, and student teachers.	Adequately supervises directed studies, performances, creative endeavors, internships, field studies, student research, and student teachers.	Offers high quality supervision of directed studies, creative endeavors, internships, field studies, student research, and student teachers.	Offers extraordinary commitment to instruction beyond the classroom.

Professional activity can take many forms, including the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application and of teaching. Professional activity aims at publication. Program Area guidelines should reflect the nature of the professional activity valued in the discipline. In particular, the Program Area guidelines for those disciplines valuing the sustained, in depth scholarship represented by scholarly books and monographs should determine how work in progress on such projects are to be documented and what limits, if any, should be placed on the period of time for which work in progress may continue to meet expectations.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

	Unsatisfactory/Needs Improvement (I and II)	Meets Expectations (III)	Exceeds Expectations (IV)	Excellent (V)
Author. Co-Author & Publishing	No evidence of research activity or work in progress.	Authors or co-authors and publishes discipline-related refereed scholarly and/or creative work appropriate to the author's area(s) of expertise. Authors or co-authors of other published professional materials (e.g., study guide, instruction manual, software). Documented completion of one or more chapters of a manuscript for a book or monograph in the review period.	Authors or co-authors and publishes a body of high quality, discipline-related refereed scholarly work and/or creative work appropriate to the author's area(s). Serves as primary author of professional materials that are used widely and have an impact on the discipline.	Authors and publishes a significant body of high quality scholarly and/or creative work appropriate to the author's area of expertise that makes a significant contribution to the field.
Grants (If Applicable)	Failure to meet obligations of an awarded grant.	Serves as principal or co-principal investigator for unfunded grant proposals that receive positive reviews upon submission to external agencies or receives an internal grant.	Serves as principal investigator or co-principal investigator for a funded external grant.	Serves as principal investigator for funded external grants that make a major contribution to the discipline or have a significant impact on major programs.
Professional Conferences	NA	Makes refereed scholarly presentations at professional conferences. Organizes scholarly panels or symposia for professional conferences.	Makes refereed scholarly presentations which make a well-recognized contribution to the discipline at professional conferences. Serves as the program chair or in a similar function for conferences.	Is widely recognized for expertise in the field which results in such activities as keynote or other invited addresses for national organizations and/or such honors as significant awards or recognitions for scholarly activity or creative work.
Scholarly Publications	NA	Serves as peer reviewer for scholarly publications.	Serves as a member of the editorial board for scholarly publication.	Serves as editor of a recognized professional journal.

Each faculty member is expected to perform service at both the Program Area level and beyond the Program Area. However, under unusual circumstances, a Program Area may choose to make exceptions for certain individuals.

SERVICE & ADVISING

	Unsatisfactory/Needs Improvement (I and II)	Meets Expectations (III)	Exceeds Expectations (IV)	Excellent (V)
School/Program	Fails to discharge assigned school/program service & advising responsibilities.	Adequately meets assigned school/program service & advising responsibilities.	Makes significant contributions to assigned school/program service & advising responsibilities.	Makes exceptional contributions to assigned school/program service & advising responsibilities.
College	Committee member, but not active contributor.	Participates in committee service to college.	Provides leadership in committee service to college.	Provides exceptional leadership in committee service to college.
University	Assumes minimal or no service responsibilities.	Participate in university governance through service on governance committees or related bodies.	Takes major responsibility for internal planning, development, and governance activities that demonstrably enhance quality, vitality, or mission of the University.	Takes exceptional responsibility for internal planning, development, and governance activities that demonstrably enhance quality, vitality, or mission of the University.
Community Service (If Applicable)	NA	Uses disciplinary expertise to participate in service that contributes to the quality and vitality of the community or society.	Uses disciplinary expertise to provide leadership that contributes to the quality and vitality of the community or society.	Uses disciplinary expertise to provide exceptional leadership that contributes to the quality and vitality of the community or society.
Service to Profession (If Applicable)	NA	Serves in administrative capacity in professional organizations, etc.	Provides important leadership in administrative capacity in professional organizations, etc.	Provides exceptional leadership in administrative capacity in professional organizations, etc.