



Campus Administrative Policy

Policy Title: Post-Tenure Review

Policy Number: 1050 Functional Area: Academic and Faculty Affairs

Effective: July 1, 2020
Date Last Amended/Reviewed: June 23, 2020
Date Scheduled for Review: July 1, 2027
Supersedes: Post-Tenure Review Campus Policy and Procedures (July 1, 2015)

Approved by: Donald M. Elliman, Jr.
Chancellor, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus
Dorothy A. Horrell
Chancellor, University of Colorado Denver

Prepared by: Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs
Reviewing Office: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Responsible Officer: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Applies to: CU Anschutz
CU Denver

A. INTRODUCTION

Tenure is granted with the expectation of continued professional growth and ongoing productivity in teaching, scholarly/creative work, clinical activity (if applicable), and leadership and service. Every tenured faculty member has a duty to maintain professional competence. Post-tenure Review (PTR) helps to ensure this occurs. As stated in Regent Policy 5.C.2(H) and University of Colorado APS 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review, the purposes of PTR are to facilitate continued faculty development, and to ensure professional accountability to the university community, the Board of Regents, and the public.

As is required by APS 1022, this document describes the University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus procedures for peer evaluation during PTR and for appeals of the PTR evaluation.

B. POLICY STATEMENT

1. As required by APS 1022, after the award of tenure, a faculty member must be evaluated in a comprehensive manner every five years, unless interrupted by promotion review or leave. Promotion re-starts the PTR clock. Per APS 5016, post-tenure review may also be waived if stipulated in an approved retirement agreement.
 - a. Members of the faculty with full-time administrative appointments are not subject to post-tenure review. If the full-time administrative appointment ends, a post-tenure evaluation is required five years after the end date.
2. PTR evaluations will be conducted by appropriate faculty peers—either the primary unit faculty or the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee.¹ Each school and college, and the Auraria Library, must have written guidelines that describe how the primary unit or a different college personnel review committee will be constituted for PTR evaluations. Faculty members may not serve on this committee during the year in which they are undergoing post-tenure review.
3. Primary unit PTR guidelines must state the criteria that will be used to evaluate faculty for post-tenure review and indicate the level of performance required for a faculty member to be considered as “meeting expectations” in each of the areas of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit, e.g. clinical activities). “Meeting expectations” is the minimum standard of acceptable professional performance. PTR guidelines and criteria must be approved by the dean of the school/college/library and reviewed by the provost. The guidelines must be incorporated into the primary unit’s written criteria for tenure and promotion, or into the unit’s bylaws or other policy document.

C. PROCEDURES

1. The PTR evaluation committee will ensure the faculty member under review provides:
 - a. An updated curriculum vitae;
 - b. Their five previous annual performance evaluation reports, including students’ evaluations of teaching, peer reviews of teaching, and, if desired, other types of teaching evaluation data;
 - c. Copies of recent publications, and evidence about research and/or creative work and any related funding;
 - d. Evidence of university and public leadership/service; and,
 - e. If applicable, evidence of clinical activity.
2. If the faculty member has a Professional Plan, the committee will also review the plan as part of the PTR process. More information regarding the Professional Plan

¹ In a small primary unit, tenured faculty from other units may help conduct PTR evaluations, as specified in school/college/library PTR guidelines.

is provided in Appendix B of APS 1022.

3. The committee may (but is not required to) request written evaluations from respected peers within or outside the faculty member's department and school or college (or library).
4. The PTR evaluation committee will prepare a written report summarizing the faculty member's academic accomplishments. The committee must rate the faculty member's performance in each of the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as either "outstanding," "exceeding expectations," "meeting expectations," "below expectations" or "failing to meet expectations." The report must include these ratings and an explanation of the evaluation.
5. The chair of the PTR evaluation committee shall submit the committee's written report to the department chair, who will forward it to the dean. (In schools and colleges without departments, the committee chair will forward the report directly to the dean; or in the case of the Auraria Library, the report will be forwarded to the library director). The department chair may elect to attach a letter of concurrence or non-concurrence. A copy of the PTR report will be given to the faculty member and a copy placed in the faculty member's departmental (or school/college/library) personnel file.
6. If a faculty member receives a PTR summary rating of "below expectations" or "fails to meet expectations," in *any* of the evaluated areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, the faculty member must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA). If the goals of the PIA are not met, an extensive review will be conducted, and a development plan will be written. (See University of Colorado APS 5008 for information and procedures relating to PIAs and extensive review).
7. Early in the fall semester, the deans will provide a summary report on the results of all PTRs conducted during the previous year in their school/college/library, as well as copies of the individual reports, to the Provost's Office.

D. APPEALS OF PTR EVALUATIONS

Faculty members who wish to dispute the results of their PTR evaluation may appeal their ratings through the established grievance procedures of their school/college/library. Each school and college, and the Auraria Library, must maintain a grievance procedure. A written document must detail the composition of the grievance committee for the school/college/library, as well as procedures to be used to review the grievance. Faculty members who wish to appeal their rating must submit their appeal, in writing, to the dean of the college, school or library within two weeks of the receipt of the PTR results.

E. ADVICE FOR PIA

At the Denver Campus, the Associate Vice chancellor for Faculty Affairs will serve as the advisor and resource person for the university. At the Anschutz Medical Campus, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs will serve as an advisor or assign an appropriate advisor. The advisor will provide guidance to the faculty member,

primary unit and the PTR committee on best practices, models or templates for PIAs and development plans, benchmarks, and timelines. (See Exhibit A: “Suggested Template for Performance Improvement Agreements and Development Plans.”)

F. SANCTIONS

Per University of Colorado APS 1022, tenured faculty members who fail to participate in the PTR process may be subject to sanctions for neglect of duty.

Sanctions may also be imposed on faculty members who fail to meet goals established in a PIA and/or development plan. In such cases, the dean of the faculty member’s college or school shall refer the case to the appropriate faculty committee (e.g. personnel committee), which will review the materials submitted by the department and the faculty member. After a thorough review of all pertinent documents, the committee shall forward its findings, including any recommended sanctions, to the provost and chancellor. The chair and dean may be asked to provide input regarding potential sanctions. The chancellor makes the final decision regarding sanctions.

Notes

1. Dates of official enactment and amendments:
October 1, 2009: Adopted by Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs
July 1, 2015: Amended
May 8, 2018: Modified
July 1, 2020: Revised and adopted by the Chancellors.
2. History:
May 8, 2018: Modified to reflect a Campus-wide effort to recast and revitalize various Campus policy sites into a standardized and more coherent set of chaptered policy statements organized around the several operational divisions of the university.
July 1, 2020: Revised to reflect changes to APS 1022, Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review.
September 27, 2022: Added language to section B.1 and added subsection B.1(a) to indicate situations in which post-tenure review is not required (consistent with policy and long-standing practice). Revised section E to reflect changes in administrative structure and responsibilities.
3. Initial Policy Effective Date: October 1, 2009
4. Cross References/Appendix:
 - [CU Administrative Policy Statement 1022, Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review](#)
 - [CU Administrative Policy Statement 5008, Performance Ratings for Faculty](#)
 - [Exhibit A, Suggested Template for Performance Improvement Agreements and Development Plans](#)

Exhibit A

See APS 5008 for more information on the implementation of Performance Improvement Agreements and Development Plans. These documents are to be developed by the faculty member in collaboration with the head of the primary unit and the appropriate faculty committee (as determined by primary unit policy).

Suggested Template for Performance Improvement Agreements and Development Plans

Name:

Dept. Chair:

Department:

School/College/Library:

Date:

I. Statement of general deficiencies warranting the Performance Improvement Agreement/Extensive Review and the Development Plan:

II. Specific deficiencies (list for each area, if applicable):

- Scholarly/creative work:
- Teaching:
- Leadership and service:
- Clinical activity:
- Other areas of professional responsibility:

III. Goals and actions designed to address the deficiencies identified in the PIA/Extensive Review process.

Where applicable, include goals for teaching, scholarly/creative work, clinical activities, and service assignments to be achieved during the agreement/plan period. For each goal, indicate:

- Action plan or strategies for improvement;
- Timeline (expected date by which the goal will be met);
- Benchmarks or indicators of success; and
- Date(s) for periodic progress reviews.

IV. Timeframe for the PIA/Development Plan:

- Start date:
- Duration: (specify either one or two years; cannot exceed two years)
- Date for assessment of progress:

V. Routing: The original, signed copy of the PIA/Development Plan should be kept in the dean's office. Copies of the signed PIA/Development Plan go to: the faculty member, the head of the primary unit or the school/college/library personnel review committee, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs.

VI. Signatures:

Faculty Member

Date

Head of Primary Unit or College Personnel Review Committee

Date

Dean

Date