

College of Humanities & Social Sciences

Policies & Procedures Manual

**Bringing
education
to life.**

Adopted Spring 2006

Comprehensive Revision – Fall 2011

UNIVERSITY of
NORTHERN COLORADO

Bringing
education
to life.

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

Table of Contents

Section I

HSS Standing Committees..... 7

Section II

HSS Faculty Search and Interview Processes..... 11

Section III

Sabbatical Leaves..... 12

Section IV

HSS Policy for Interim and Summer Session..... 17

Section V

Faculty Professional Development Funding..... 20

Section VI

Academic Program Review and Assessment..... 21

Section VII

Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines..... 29

Section VIII

Chairs, Directors, and Deans Evaluation Guidelines..... 45

Section IX

Office Space Usage and Assignment..... 47

Section X

Research Incentive Funding..... 49

Forms Appendices

Appendices Table of Contents.....52

College of Humanities and Social Sciences Policies and Procedures Manual

Table of Revisions

Section I HSS Standing Committees– Revisions

- Awards Committee structure revised February 8, 2013

Section II HSS Faculty Search and Interview Processes - Revisions

Section III Sabbatical Leaves - Revisions

- Board Policy references updated September 26, 2013

Section IV HSS Policy for Interim and Summer Sessions – Revisions

- Edits throughout section and table revised May 8, 2012
- University Regulations references updated September 26, 2013

Section V Faculty Professional Development Funding – Revisions

- Section added February 24, 2012
- Funding Pool B modified March 23, 2012
- Major changes throughout section October 12, 2012

Section VI Academic Program Review and Assessment – Revisions

- Section renumbered February 24, 2012
- Minor changes to Annual Progress Report section April 23, 2012

Section VII Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines - Revisions

- Section renumbered February 24, 2012
- Rubric heading correction March 13, 2012
- Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor March 13, 2012
- Rescind page 43, “Preface to College Faculty Evaluation Guidelines” April 26, 2013
- Part C, Section 2, College criteria for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecture added, September 27, 2013
- Part C, Section 2 (6) minor change to language
- Part C, replace reproduction of Board Policy & University Regulations highest level reference and links to documents, October 25, 2013
- Part C, minor change, November 8, 2013
- Part A, revisions and reformatting to Annual Evaluation form, January 24, 2014
- Part C, revisions and reformatting to Comprehensive Review form, January 24, 2014
- Part A, revisions and reformatting to Annual Evaluation form, September 12, 2014
- Part C, revisions and reformatting to Comprehensive Review form, January 23, 2015
- Part A, revisions to Annual Evaluation form, January 23, 2015

Section VIII Chairs, Directors and Deans Evaluation Guidelines - Revisions

- Section renumbered February 24, 2012
- Duties and Evaluations of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators add – January 23, 2015

Section IX Office Space Usage and Assignment - Revisions

- Section added February 22, 2013

-

Section X Research Incentive Funding - Revisions


- Section added February 14, 2014

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.

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 annual progress reports and assessment plans from the various programs in the college. In addition, committee members will review 5 year comprehensive 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 including the following: Teaching Excellence; College Scholar; Excellence in Advising and Service and Excellence in Academic Leadership and select winners in each category each fall. The committee will also review applications for the Faculty Reassigned Time Awards for Research, Scholarship and Creative Works and determine those who will receive the awards. In addition, members review undergraduate student papers each spring for the outstanding student research paper awards.

The Committee will develop and/ or review written criteria for each of the awards. These criteria will be made available to all members of the college

The committee shall consist of five members, drawn from the voting faculty of the college and elected at large by the college voting faculty with no more than one representative from any program area. Each member shall serve a three year term. In the initial election, however, two of the terms will be for only two years. Thereafter, all terms will be for three years.

College Leadership Council

This committee consists of all school directors, department chairs 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, promote development, 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 of the proposals; their anticipated contribution to the curriculum of the college and the college mission; and the integration of the proposed curriculum into existing curriculum.

Budget and Planning Committee

Functions of the budget and planning committee 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. Committee membership is elected on an at large basis in the college. No more than thirty percent (30%) of the membership of any one of the committees listed in this paragraph may share the same department/school affiliation. 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 Director of Development with development goals for the college. The Development Committee will be convened by the Director of Development or by the Dean. The committee will consist of the college's Director of Development, the Dean, department chairs and school directors. Individual members will work with the college's Director of Development and Dean on an as-needed basis for purposes of cultivating donors and maintaining contact with identified donors and potential donors. The Development Committee will meet as a subset of the College Leadership Council during certain regularly scheduled meetings of that body, as determined by the Director of Development or by the Dean, and at other times when coordination of development activities is needed, The Director of Development and the Dean will report to the committee on development goals, activities, and progress with respect to advancement efforts.

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); 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, or initiatives, and to provide information for any diversity reports requested of the college by university officials or by internal or external bodies. . 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 and Equity, student organizations, and municipal or governmental personnel with job duties related to diversity.

Undergraduate Success Committee

Constituency: Membership will consist of elected faculty representatives. The committee will also include one undergraduate or graduate student with a major in an HSS discipline. The student member may be recommended to the committee chair by the HSS College Student Council or may be an individual invited by the Dean in consultation with the committee chair. The committee will select its chair from among the committee's members. [The Associate Dean will continue to act as HSS liaison to the UNC Recruitment and Retention group.]

Description: The committee will study and evaluate conditions or circumstances that affect undergraduate success, including student support services, academic and co-curricular programming, and other areas of interface between the college and students. The committee

may recommend specific changes to existing practices or develop and propose new ideas that would have a positive impact on the quality of the undergraduate experience.

SECTION II HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES FACULTY SEARCH AND INTERVIEW PROCESSES

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

A faculty member from the program area of the hire, in accordance with the department/school/program area policy, will direct and organize the search process. All information regarding the search will be made available to department chair, school director, dean, and AA/EO coordinator of the search. In accordance with university hiring procedures as determined by Human Resource Services, application materials from candidates will be sent electronically and will be posted in a central electronic repository that is accessible to the search committee, AA/EO coordinator, department chair or school director, associate dean, dean, and to administrative assistants who are charged with supporting the search. Any information not available electronically (for example letters of recommendation, transcripts, etc.) shall be stored in a secure location by the hiring department/school/program/college as appropriate to the stage of the search until the search is completed.

Candidates interviewing on campus will meet with the dean or associate dean during the visit. There is an expectation that candidates will make a presentation while on campus. Examples include but are not limited to a forum for presenting and discussing research and/or a classroom teaching demonstration. The dean and/or associate dean will be invited to the candidate's presentation(s).

SECTION III SABBATICAL LEAVES

Basic Components of the Sabbatical Leave Proposal

The following elements should be described or addressed. Sabbatical leave awards are competitive and the limited number will be awarded, based, in part, upon the following elements in the proposal. Use as many extra sheets as necessary (two to 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.

Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used by faculty to report sabbatical leave activity. sabbatical leave reports are due within one academic year from completion of the leave. In accordance with Board of Trustees Policy, faculty who do not submit a sabbatical leave report within the required time frame will not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences Sabbatical Leave Report

Name: _____

Department / School _____

Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: _____ Year: _____

Date by which Sabbatical Leave Report is Due: _____ (within one academic year from completion of leave).

Date of Sabbatical Leave Report: _____

Each department / school will determine the method by which faculty will evaluate sabbatical leave reports. The chair / director is responsible for recording and reporting the results and, where appropriate, for providing the faculty member with a written notification of non-acceptance by the faculty. The protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports will be submitted to the dean for approval. At minimum, the sabbatical report will be evaluated considering the following criteria:

- (1) Whether the report is complete and explicitly addresses each of the required elements (see below)
- (2) Whether the sabbatical leave met its objectives as outlined in the proposal or, if applicable, as revised.

In order to complete the sabbatical leave report, use this form as a cover sheet for the following:

1. Provide a copy of your approved sabbatical leave proposal.
2. Provide your sabbatical leave report. In your report, please address each of the following:
 - a. Summarize the key activities undertaken.
 - b. Comment on what was accomplished during the leave, particularly with reference to goals articulated in your proposal.
 - c. Explain how the sabbatical has contributed to your own professional development, to the academic program(s) in which you teach, and to the university.

Submit this cover sheet and the above materials to the appropriate department / school faculty representative in accordance with the department's / school's approved procedure for evaluation.

Board of Trustees Policy stipulates the following expectations, requirements, and conditions regarding sabbatical leaves and sabbatical leave reports:

2-3-1001(3) Appropriate Use of Sabbatical Leaves. [See also 3-3-1001(1) Sabbatical Proposals].

The activities undertaken during sabbatical leave must be related to the individual's on-campus responsibilities. The proposal must specify the effect on professional growth, development of knowledge in the discipline, influence on the students' educational experience, and the enhancement of the University's reputation. Once the goals and plan are approved, the faculty member is obligated to fulfill them, unless amended [See also 2-3-1001(5), Approval Procedures].

- (a) Examples of acceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:
 - (I) The pursuit of research or study at an institution of higher education or similar entity where improvement of oneself as a teacher-scholar is the focus.
 - (II) The pursuit of research projects or creative endeavors within a faculty member's specialty to advance knowledge, improve the —state of the art, or to produce material for publication.
 - (III) The acquisition of practical experience that will directly enhance the individual's capacity to meet University responsibilities.
 - (IV) The pursuit of special studies or projects for the purpose of expanding institutional-related services beyond the faculty member's obligations.
- (b) Examples of unacceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:
 - (I) Study at an institution of higher education, the primary purpose of which is to gain a degree in an area or discipline not related to current University responsibilities.
 - (II) Travel that is not directly related to University responsibilities. (A significant distinction is made herein between travel to improve oneself as a teacher-scholar and travel in and of itself.)
 - (III) Any sabbatical request within the faculty member's current obligations to the University. (Examples include rewriting of course materials, course development, and the like.)
 - (IV) Activities or research not related to current University responsibilities.

2-3-1001(5) Approval Procedures.

Approval of a leave request will be based upon the merits of the proposal communicated by the specific goals and plan for achievement outlined in the proposal.

- (a) Sabbatical Proposal Submission. Individual sabbatical leave proposals shall first be submitted to the department chair/school director, who will then call a meeting of the faculty. (See 3-3-1001(1) Sabbatical Leave Application Procedures.) After due consideration, this group will either recommend approval or disapproval of the proposal based on protocols developed by the department/school faculty in consultation with the chair/director and approved by the dean. This decision shall be based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/ or staffing issues.
- (b) Proposals recommended by the faculty for approval will be forwarded to the department chair/school director who will make recommendations based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/or staffing issues. Proposals not approved by the faculty for reasons of academic merit are disapproved and go no further in the process except for reporting purposes as specified in section (c) below. Proposals not recommended for approval by the faculty for reasons of resources and/or staffing issues will be forwarded to the department chair/school director who will make recommendations based upon the merits of the proposal according to the standards of the academic discipline as well as resource and/or staffing issues. The recommendations of the faculty and the department chair/school director will be forwarded to the dean who will make his/her recommendations based solely on resource and/or staffing issues, and on whether the proposal clearly addresses how it meets one or more of the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified 2-3-1001(3). The recommendations of the faculty, the department chair/school director and the dean will be forwarded to the CAO who will make the final decision and report such decision to the President and to the BOT. The applicant will be informed of the recommendations and will be afforded an opportunity to respond at each level of the review process up to the CAO, whose decision is final.
- (c) All proposals that are not recommended for approval, with the exception of those withdrawn by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the department chair/school director, dean, and CAO for reporting purposes.
- (d) All sabbatical leave proposals approved by the CAO will be presumed to be of equal merit. If for any reason in a given year the University cannot support all of the sabbatical leaves that have been approved, the CAO or his or her designee(s) will prioritize the proposals in the following manner:
 - (I) Sabbatical leave proposals that are time sensitive will take precedence over proposals that are not time sensitive. A proposal will be deemed time sensitive if it cannot be completed at all if postponed beyond the proposed dates. Information relevant to making this determination must accompany the sabbatical leave proposal (See 3-3-1001(2) for required information.)
 - (II) Within each group of proposals ordered as in paragraph (I), any proposals that have already been postponed in favor of more time sensitive proposals will take precedence over proposals that have not been so postponed. Notes of any previous postponements must accompany the proposal.
 - (III) Within each group ordered by the above principles, proposals from faculty members for whom the period of time since last sabbatical leave has been longest take precedence over those for whom the period since the last sabbatical has been shorter. Proposals will contain an indication of the period of time since the last sabbatical leave or, in the case of a first sabbatical leave, since the time of hire.

When a leave is postponed for the above reasons, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.

- (e) Delay of Leave by Faculty Member. Faculty members who apply for and are granted a sabbatical leave, and who, for any reason, are unable to take the leave at the time specified, may request postponement of the leave for up to one year. Postponement requires the recommendation of the department chair/school director and dean. If in this time the individual has not begun the leave, the leave is null and void and the individual must submit a new application. When a leave is postponed, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.
- (f) Delay of Leave by the Dean. The dean for the affected unit has the right to change the effective dates of the leave. The dean may not postpone the leave for more than one year from the requested beginning date, unless the affected faculty member agrees. When a leave is thus postponed, eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred.
- (g) Proposal Revisions. Revisions of approved leave plans must be approved by the department chair/school director and dean. The applicant will be informed of the recommendations and, if the revised proposal is not approved, will be afforded an opportunity to provide additional information.

2-3-1001(8) Faculty Report Obligation.

In accepting a sabbatical leave, the faculty member agrees to provide to the department/school faculty a written report of the activities, the goals attained, and the benefits derived during the course of the leave. Upon approval of the faculty, the report will be forwarded to the department chair/school director and the dean. The department

chair/school director and the dean will review the report to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in 2-3-1001(3). If the department chair/school faculty or dean finds the report unacceptable, the faculty member will be notified in writing and will have the opportunity to respond. Once the report has been accepted, copies will be forwarded to the CAO. Faculty members who do not submit an acceptable report within one academic year of completion of the leave shall not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

2-3-1001(9) Institutional Accountability.

(a) All sabbatical leave records and approved and disapproved plans, will be available for inspection, upon request, by the Joint Budget Committee, the Education Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Withdrawn plans will not be included in the records and will be returned to the faculty members.

(b) Final sabbatical reports are not considered a part of personnel files and become open record for public disclosure pursuant to the Colorado Open Records Statute (C.R.S. 24-72-204).

The complete Board of Trustees Policy, including other provisions related to sabbatical leaves, is available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf . University Regulations related to sabbatical leaves are available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf

Evaluation of Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used for evaluation of a faculty sabbatical leave report:

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Evaluation of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report

This form is to be completed by the faculty evaluation representative, school director or department chair, and dean and copied to the faculty member who has submitted a sabbatical leave report. It is intended to record evaluative responses and recommendations concerning the sabbatical leave report. It is the responsibility of the department chair or school director to ensure that approved protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports is followed and, along with the dean, to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). Additional pages of comments may be attached as needed. Under BOT Policy 2-3-1001(8) faculty and dean have the responsibility for assessing the acceptability or non-acceptability of the sabbatical leave report.

Faculty Member: _____ Department /
School _____
Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: _____ Year: _____
Date of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report: _____ First Report _____
Second Report

1. Faculty Evaluation: Indicate the faculty's approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report. Include the means by which the determination was reached according to approved protocol for the academic unit. Attach comments as needed. If the approved protocol of the unit includes voting, indicate the faculty vote concerning the sabbatical leave report*:

SECTION IV HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES POLICY FOR INTERIM AND SUMMER SESSIONS

Summer course offerings should be planned with the goal of providing opportunities for UNC students to fulfill graduation requirements and academic objectives, to meet student demand or to promote other university goals. All courses offered must conform to the university's summer session and block time schedules unless special permission is granted through the dean's office.

The following guidelines for summer and interim enrollment and compensation were implemented university-wide after provost approval for summer 2012. After a one-year period of data collection, the college will review the enrollment and compensation model for subsequent summer and interim sessions.

Teaching Load

For the purposes of Interim and Summer sessions, all instructional modes and venues are governed by the same rules with respect to maximum teaching load. Faculty may teach no more than six credit hours during Interim session. A maximum of 12 hours of instruction are allowed during Summer, with six and nine credit hour maxima for short and long summer sessions, respectively.

Compensation

Section 3-3-702(2) of the University Regulations indicates that full compensation will be provided to instructors with undergraduate enrollments of 15 or more students or graduate enrollments of ten or more after the drop date. Enrollments that fall below those thresholds will result in prorated compensation as indicated on the chart below. Faculty scheduled for an undergraduate course with pre-term enrollment of fewer than 15 will be given an option to offer the course for reduced pay or may elect to cancel the course. Similarly, for a graduate course with enrollment under 10 students, a faculty member will be given the option for prorated payment or course cancellation. A minimum floor of \$1500 for a three credit hour class has been established.

Compensation for all full time based funded faculty for all modes of instruction is set at 1/36th of the academic year salary per credit hour of instruction for courses that meet the course size guidelines with respect to compensation (see table below).

Faculty members are expected to notify their chairs/directors/coordinators prior to May 1st (first 6-week and 12- week sessions), June 1st (second 6-week session) and December 1st (winter interim session), or at least twenty (20) days prior to the beginning of any other session, if they do not wish to teach their assigned courses at a reduced rate.

Student enrollment at the course drop date is used for the purpose of determining level of faculty compensation.

The following chart indicates prorated percentages for courses with enrollments that fall below the target course sizes.

Undergraduate Class Size	Undergraduate Prorated Rate	Graduate Class Size	Graduate Prorated Rate
15+	100%	10+	100%
14	94%	9	90%
13	87%	8	80%
12	80%	7	80%
11	80%	6	80%
10	80%	5	80%
9	80%	4	40%
8	80%	3	30%
7	80%	2	20%
6	40%	1	10%
5	33%		
4	27%		
3	20%		
2	13%		
1	7%		

At the Dean's discretion there are some circumstances under which full payment to a faculty member might be approved without reaching the target enrollment numbers in a particular class. Such exceptions may be granted if the average enrollment in the unit's interim and/or combined summer sessions reaches 20 and 15, for undergraduate and graduate courses, respectively.

University Regulations 3-3-702 Summer and Interim Session Compensation and Workload Policy

3-3-702(1) Workload.

(a) The maximum credit hours of instruction for summer including all modes of delivery for both on campus and off campus courses will be at 12 credit hours with 6 credit hours and 9 credit hours maximum each for short and long summer sessions respectively.

(b) The maximum credit hours of instruction for Interim session will be at 6 credit hours.

3-3-702(2) Compensation

(a) The compensation for both Extended Studies and all summer and interim courses regardless of location, method of course delivery, or funding source, for all faculty holding the rank of lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor will be at 1/36th of the faculty member's academic year salary if the faculty member is on a full-time contract. In the case of non-full-time faculty, holding one of the above ranks, the compensation will be 1/36th of what the salary would be if the faculty member were full-time.

(b) To allow flexibility for faculty and programs, the following compensation table will be utilized.

Undergraduate Class Size	Undergraduate Prorated Rate	Graduate Class Size	Graduate Prorated Rate
15+	100%	10+	100%
14	94%	9	90%
13	87%	8	80%
12	80%	7	80%
11	80%	6	80%
10	80%	5	80%
9	80%	4	40%
8	80%	3	30%
7	80%	2	20%
6	40%	1	10%
5	33%		
4	27%		
3	20%		
2	13%		
1	7%		

(c) The proposed pay scale for the summer and interim sessions does not apply to the overload instruction during regular semesters nor is it applicable to adjunct faculty.

(d) To insure an equitable treatment of those faculty whose 1/36th per credit compensation falls short of \$1500.00 per credit, a minimum floor of \$1500.00 at the class size of 15+ for undergraduate and 10+ for graduate for summer and interim session courses will be instituted. Authorization to offer multiple sections will reside with the responsible Dean given that maximum number of enrollment that is pedagogically feasible is reached.

(e) There might be some instances in which, with the approval of the Dean, a full payment to a faculty member without reaching the desired full compensation enrollment is warranted. Such exemptions can be made if the average enrollment of the program in the interim and combined summer sessions is reached at 20 and 15 for undergraduate and graduate courses respectively.

(f) In rare cases where undergraduate and graduate students are combined in one course, the compensation and corresponding adjusted pay table will revert to the appropriate prorated rate that corresponds to the majority cohort.

(g) In cases of limitations imposed by laboratory stations, accreditation requirements, clinical instruction, student teaching, and any other externally authorized constraints, the maximum number of enrollment will be limited to the sanctioned enrollment. Accordingly the rate of compensation will be set at \$1500.00 per credit or at the adjusted rate according to the 1/36 of the base compensation and proposed pay table, whichever will afford a higher level of compensation to the affected faculty.

3-3-702(3) Calendar

(a) The decision to teach a course at a regular and/or reduced compensation level resides with the faculty member. However, faculty members are expected to notify their chairs/directors prior to May 1st (first 6-week and 12-week sessions), June 1st (second 6-week session) and December 1st (winter interim session), or at least twenty (20) days prior to the beginning of any other session, if they do not wish to teach their assigned courses at a reduced rate.

SECTION V FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUNDING

The professional development funding distribution model for HSS is described below:

Initial Distribution of Funds: Department/School/Program Fund for Professional Development

All of the HSS College's total allocation for professional development will be available to eligible faculty. The primary purposes of these funds are: (1) to meet or offset travel expenses related to program participation in professional meetings; (2) to meet or offset the cost of professional training; and (3) to support scholarly research. Departments/school/programs shall develop criteria and procedures and define eligibility for distribution of these funds.

These funds will be distributed to the HSS Departments/School/Programs according to the number of base funded faculty rostered in them. All authorizations will be approved by department chair/director/program coordinator and, in case of travel, by the dean. Faculty receiving this funding remain eligible for other professional development funding sources at the university, e.g. through OSP and FRPB. The amount of funding available per faculty member will depend upon the amount of the overall allocation to the college and may vary from year to year.

Funds unspent by the end of the fiscal year will not rollover into the following year. Thus, by February 1, the chairs and directors will determine the amount of any unencumbered funds in their programs. Those funds will then be transferred to the College Pool described below by February 15.

By March 1st the departments/school/programs will be notified by the dean of the amount of funds available in the College Pool. Chairs/director/program coordinators shall consult with their faculty and submit requests with documentation to the dean requesting these funds for their faculty's use by March 14.

The College Pool for Professional Development:

The funds not encumbered by the departments/school/programs will provide additional funds for needs not met by the program allocations described above. The funds returned to the College from the departments/school/programs will be made available for use by eligible faculty. This pool will be administered by the dean and the dean is responsible for approving requests and the distribution of these funds among faculty who have needs related to travel for program participation, and/or needs for professional training, and/or scholarly research. On May 1 departments/school/programs shall return to the Dean's Office all funds that will not be spent by the unit by the end of the fiscal year.

In fall of 2013, this plan will be re-assessed jointly by the appropriate faculty governance body and the dean.

Added 2/2012
REV:3/12; 10/12/2012

SECTION VI

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

Program Review and assessment processes are designed to incorporate continuous improvement into academic programs. As a consequence, program evaluation and the assessment of student learning outcomes should occur on an ongoing basis. Both program review and assessment should result in outcomes that strengthen academic programs and directly benefit students. Program review and assessment support the university's mission to promote effective teaching and learning. In addition, the Higher Learning Commission (UNC's regional accreditor) and the State of Colorado (Department of Higher Education) expect program review and assessment of student learning to be incorporated into the practice of academic units.

This section of the Manual is divided into three parts: Part A addresses assessment of student learning; Part B describes the comprehensive program review process at UNC; and Part C is a glossary that contains commonly used terms in both assessment and program review.

Part A. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment of student learning is one component of the comprehensive program review process. Student learning outcomes (learning objectives; SLOs) describe what students will know and be able to do as a result of the courses, programs of study, and other activities associated with earning a degree. Making learning outcomes explicit addresses two ends: it provides faculty with goals against which to evaluate student progress, and ultimately the efficacy of the course/program; and it provides students with a set of stated expectations to help them to understand the structure of the course/program and their progress toward meeting course/program goals. In making learning objectives transparent and assessing progress toward meeting them, faculty can gather evidence about what is and is not working in current practice, and use that evidence to improve course/program quality.

Core elements of academic program area assessment strategy include:

1. Program level undergraduate and graduate student learning outcomes. At a minimum, an assessment plan must specify what it is that any student graduating with a particular degree should know and be able to do. A well developed assessment strategy will map individual course offerings to the larger program goals (see the entry for 'curriculum map' in Part C).
2. Methods of assessing student performance on each of the student outcomes. The methods must include consideration of direct evidence, and may include indirect evidence. Best practice includes multiple measures. Examples of both direct and indirect evidence for courses and programs are provided at the end of Part C.
3. A process that identifies, on a regular basis, the results of the assessment process and how these results will be used to develop programmatic improvements to address the areas in which outcomes are not being achieved or require additional support.

4. A centralized (at the unit level) electronic repository that contains the unit's assessment materials (including collected evidence, analysis and documentation of use of the results of assessment). The repository may be kept in TracDat (a software program used across the university for keeping track of assessment and program review data), although TracDat is not required¹. Assessment and program review recordkeeping should be supervised by a faculty member from the program area and should be updated at least annually.

Faculty members on the College of Humanities and Social Sciences Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) are available to serve as resources to answer questions and provide input on program area assessment plans. In addition, support is available from the Provost's Office of Assessment and the HSS Dean's Office.

Part B. Comprehensive Program Review Process

The program review process consists of two main elements, the comprehensive review, typically completed every five years, and the annual progress report, undertaken on a yearly basis.

Guidelines for the comprehensive program review are available at the following URL: <http://www.unco.edu/assessment/programReview/index.html>. Comprehensive program review documents receive written feedback from the Program Review and Assessment Committee, the dean and the provost.

The Annual Progress Report is completed by each program area in order to summarize progress toward comprehensive program review goals and items identified for action in the dean's response and the provost's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The annual report is reviewed at the college level only.

HSS Format for Program Review Annual Progress Report

In addition to providing the dean with information useful in evaluating programs' annual progress, this format has been designed to provide programs with a tool that will be useful for the comprehensive review process. The categories of reporting outlined in Sections 1 and 2 are taken from the comprehensive review protocols. The report is due to the dean's office on October 1st of each year.

Section 1: Report Narrative

The narrative portion of the report should be no more than 5 pages.

- a. Discussion of progress toward goals. The program should discuss progress toward accomplishing its goals, providing a description of specific actions taken during the previous year related to these goals. If goals have changed, the program should describe why.

¹ See p. 3 of the UNC Program Review Policy for conditions to be met in opting out of TracDat.

- b. Discussion of Provost's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)² and the Dean's Recommendations. The program should provide an update on the status of actions outlined in the Provost's MOU and the Dean's recommendation letter.
- c. Discussion of program review data. The program should discuss any significant changes that occurred over the previous year. The discussion should address known or suspected reasons for these changes and how the program intends to respond to the changes.
- d. Discussion of resource needs. The program should briefly discuss any changes in resource needs resulting from its annual assessment and review of student learning outcomes, quality measures, program review data, and/or progress toward goals.

Section 2: Assessment Report

The assessment report consists of two tables and accompanying explanatory narrative, as needed. Assessment data, rubrics, and other related materials (such as that in TracDat or elsewhere) should be included as an attachment rather than as a link. The tables should contain five categories of information: (1) the outcome or quality measure being evaluated; (2) methods and evidence that are being used to evaluate the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) or Quality Measures (QM); (3) what was learned about the SLO or QM by virtue of undertaking the assessment; (4) evaluation of whether the results met, failed to meet, or exceeded expectations; and (5) what actions were or will be taken as a result of what was learned. The two tables below provide examples of the table formats and reportage. While it is not an expectation that each SLO and each QM be assessed each year, the unit should have in place a plan that provides for regular periodic evaluation of each articulated SLO and QM.

OUTCOME (Student Learning)	METHODS/ EVIDENCE	RESULTS (Describe results of assessment related to outcome specified)	STATUS (exceeded expectations, met expectations, did not meet expectations)	ACTIONS TAKEN (describe specific actions taken based on results of assessment)
Students are able to formulate a testable research hypothesis	Research project for capstone course includes hypothesis formulation	Only 60% of students were successfully able to formulate a testable hypothesis in the capstone course	Did not meet expectations	COUR 344, a prerequisite to capstone, will be reconfigured to focus more specifically on hypothesis formulation. Target for accomplishment:

² This section refers only to those who have completed a comprehensive review since the MOU process was implemented in 2008.

				spring 2012.
Students are able to develop an idea in writing through the use of concrete examples and specific details	Random sample of writing assignments from COUR 131, 223, and 389; blind reviews by two faculty members	Comparison of writing samples to evaluation rubric found that 84% of students achieved this outcome	Met expectations	None required. Will resample in fall 2011.

OUTCOME (Quality Measure)	METHODS/ EVIDENCE	RESULTS (Describe results of assessment related to outcome specified)	STATUS (exceeded expectations, met expectations, did not meet expectations)	ACTIONS TAKEN (describe specific actions taken based on results of assessment)
Each FT faculty member will present/publish one or more juried papers each year.	Professional meeting programs; journal tables of contents	Each FT faculty member had at least one juried paper/publication; several had two or more.	Exceeded expectations	None required. Will re-compile at end of spring 2012.
Graduating senior survey will show 90% or greater satisfaction with program quality	Senior survey contains two items asking about program quality, one closed-ended, the other open-ended	Likert scale item showed 95% of graduating seniors satisfied or very satisfied with program quality. Narrative responses overwhelmingly positive, with exception of 30% who suggested reordering COUR 245-COUR 287 course sequence.	Met expectations	Will explore feasibility/ advisability of reordering 245/287 sequence. Decision to be made by end of fall 2011.

*Note – Programs should save evidence used in the assessment process, annual progress reports and any written responses from the college program review team and dean in an electronic file to serve as resource documents for the comprehensive review. These documents

may be stored in TracDat using any standard file format, or may be compiled and stored electronically elsewhere.

Part C: Assessment and Program Review Glossary

Annual Progress Report: A report completed by each program area in order to summarize progress toward comprehensive program review goals and to report on progress toward meeting the recommendations in the dean's letter and the provost's MOU. The annual progress report is reviewed at the college level.

***Assessment Methods:** The discipline-appropriate collection and analysis of aggregate-level data that form the basis for evaluating program performance with respect to its defined student learning outcomes and quality measures. The strongest assessment relies on multiple types of data. Programs must include direct evidence of student learning outcomes and may also include indirect evidence as appropriate.

***Criterion:** The measure, performance indicator, or descriptor defined by the program against which program performance is assessed. Criteria may be aspirational or they may reflect the minimum standard of performance required without triggering a decision to make changes in one or more aspects of the program.

Curriculum Map: A matrix that cross-lists SLOs with courses in a program of study in order to explicitly describe how the courses contribute to ensuring that students achieve SLOs over the course of the program. Typically, the cells of the matrix will indicate whether a particular SLO is introduced, applied and/or mastered in the context of a given course.

Descriptor: A word or phrase used as a label to describe or classify how a particular piece or pieces of evidence demonstrate achievement of a particular SLO or QM.

Direct Evidence: Direct evidence includes student products or performances that demonstrate specific learning has taken place. Evidence differs from data or information in that it entails interpretation and reflection in addition to collection and analysis.

Formative Assessment: Assessment done on an ongoing basis to help determine whether changes should be made at the course, program or unit level. Formative assessment is most typically undertaken at the course level.

Indicator: (1) an indirect measurement of an outcome. For example, the proportion of graduates that are hired by employers in a particular field may be viewed as an indicator of the quality of the training that program graduates receive; **(2)** a composite measure that is composed of several pieces of evidence that point to a particular conclusion with respect to a QM or SLO.

Indirect Evidence: A form of data that relies on self-report, or reporting of others' perceptions, with respect to achieving standards or outcomes. Evidence differs from data or information in that it entails interpretation and reflection in addition to collection and analysis.

Measure/Measurement: (1) numerical information that quantifies outcomes. Measure most often refers to the results of performance on a particular dimension. For example, a measure might be a test score or the percentage of students who agree with an evaluative statement; (2) a general gloss used to refer to evidence collected and analyzed to assess SLO or QM

Program Review: A regularly recurring evaluation of an academic program that is intended to support, develop, and maintain high quality academic programs. The process involves collecting, synthesizing, evaluating and reporting information related to practices and outcomes within programs typically on a five year cycle. After the unit has completed its report, it is reviewed by PRAC, the dean and the provost.

Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC): Standing HSS committee that is charged with reviewing and responding to five year comprehensive program reviews. In addition, PRAC reviews annual progress reports and may offer assistance with assessment plans from the various programs in the college.

Quality Measures: Describes the standards programs have identified as necessary to achieve desired levels of quality in relation to program mission and goals. Quality measures may be phrased in reference to structure, productivity and/or activities.

Student Learning Outcomes: Program level SLOs describe what students will know or be able to do by the time they graduate. Another way of looking at program level SLOs is that they describe knowledge, skills and/or dispositions that students will demonstrate by the time they graduate. SLOs defined at the course level should describe what students will know or be able to do by the time they complete the course. Course level and program level SLOs should articulate (see curriculum map).

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Assessment Methods: discipline-appropriate collection and analysis of aggregate-level data that form the basis for evaluating student performance with respect to the defined SLOs.

Summative Assessment: methods that attempt to capture the end results of learning in a course or program of study.

*Indicates wording taken from the assessment council document.

Some examples of Direct and Indirect Measures of Student Learning at the Course and Program Levels

	DIRECT MEASURES	INDIRECT MEASURES
Course Level	Exams and quizzes; pre/post tests; embedded questions on exams	Student course evaluations
	Standardized tests	"Muddiest points" and other in-class techniques
	Research papers and reports, case study analysis with direct and explicit links to learning objectives	Surveys of time of task, numbers of hours spent on homework, co-curricular activities
	Observations and ratings of field work, internship performance, service learning, clinical experiences	Quality of class participation
	Rubric scores for writing, oral presentations, and performances	
	Grades based on explicit performance criteria related to clear learning goals	
Program Level	Capstone projects, senior theses, exhibits, or performances with clear evaluation criteria linked to SLOs; portfolio of student work through the course of the program	Focus groups or exit interviews with graduating students, employers, alumni, faculty
	Pass rates or scores on licensure, certification, or subject area tests	Job placement
	Student publications or conference presentations	Employer, student, alumni surveys
	Employer and internship supervisor ratings of specific aspects of students' performance	Graduate school placement rates

	Analysis of student work products (e.g., essays, oral presentations, exams), particularly when these are undertaken by multiple observers with inter-rater reliability	Transcript studies that examine patterns of course selection and grading
--	--	--

SECTION VII

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

University Policies and Regulations that govern evaluation, post-tenure review, and the granting of promotion and tenure can be found at:

[Board Policy Manual](#) – 1-1-307, 2-3-part 8, and 2-3-part 9
[University Regulations](#) – 3-3-part 8, and 3-3-part 9

Candidates are expected to consult the above sections.

Faculty Evaluation Deadlines and Forms

Current deadlines for submission of faculty evaluation materials to the Dean's Office are available on the [HSS SharePoint](#) website calendar.. For program area specific dates, please consult with your program area chair, director or program coordinator.

Downloadable forms for annual and comprehensive evaluation are available on the HSS website at: http://hss.unco.edu/docs_forms.html or on the [HSS SharePoint Documents & Forms](#) site.

Part A - Annual Review & Evaluation of Faculty Process

HSS Principles and Procedures for Annual Review of Faculty

1. The following principles and procedures apply to annual reviews.
2. Departments/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. Departments/program areas forward their procedures/criteria to the dean for approval.
 - b. The department/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. Departments/program areas must develop criteria/indicators, etc., that distinguish between the levels of evaluation.
 - e. Departments/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 department/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 department/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 departments/program areas and may return the department/program area annual reviews (as a whole) to departments/program areas for reconsideration if they are not in accord with approved procedures and criteria. If, after reconsideration by the department/program area, the dean and the department/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.

ANNUAL/BIENNIAL EVALUATION For Calendar Year _____

PART I: Evaluatee Information

Name _____

College _____ Department/School/Program Area _____ Rank _____

Contract Status (check one) Tenured ___ Tenure Track ___ Contract Renewable ___

PART II: Annual/Biennial Performance Evaluation

Weighting Factors

Instruction Professional Activity Service Dept. Chair

Performance Evaluation

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

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service		Overall (Weighted Average)
			Non-Chair Service	Dept. Chair Service	
Program					
Area/Department					
Faculty					
Chair/Director/Other					
Dean (if applicable)					
Chief Academic Officer (if applicable)					

Faculty Representative

Date

Chair/Director/Other

Date

Dean (if applicable)

Date

Chief Academic Officer
(if applicable)

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

Part B – Pre-Tenure Review Process

Pre-Tenure Review

Tenure-track faculty in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences shall undergo pre-tenure review. Normally this shall occur during the third year of progress toward eligibility to apply for tenure. Year(s) of credit toward tenure which are granted upon hire affect this requirement in the following ways:

- One year of credit toward tenure: No change. Pre-tenure review occurs in the third year of tenure track.
- Two years of credit: Pre-tenure review occurs in the fourth year of tenure track. However, in instances where the faculty member's previous work experience was at UNC in the discipline in which tenure is sought, the faculty member, with the approval of the department chair or school director, may opt for pre-tenure review in the third year of tenure track.
- Three years of credit: Pre-tenure review is optional and not required.

The faculty applicant shall prepare an application in accordance with promotion and tenure guidelines and recommendations in the program area and college and submit a dossier for review by the faculty, chair or director, and dean. Results of the pre-tenure review shall be reported in the form of summary recommendations composed by faculty evaluation committee chair, department chair or school director, and dean. These reports will be shared with the faculty applicant and will serve as an indication of progress toward promotion and tenure. The pre-tenure review will indicate strong points that should be sustained, as well as aspects of faculty performance or of the application process that may need continued development or improvement. The department chair or school director will discuss the results of the pre-tenure review with the faculty applicant. Pre-tenure reviews are non-binding evaluations intended as professional development. The pre-tenure review and its outcome are independent of the promotion and tenure provisions of Board of Trustees Policy and do not indicate an institutional obligation for similar results in the tenure and promotion application. The requirement for pre-tenure review becomes effective fall semester 2010. The result or outcome of the pre-tenure review does not guarantee or preclude a successful tenure recommendation. For faculty in their third year of tenure track in Academic Year 2010-2011, the pre-tenure review is optional. For faculty whose progress on tenure track indicates pre-tenure review in Academic Year 2011-2012 and after, pre-tenure review is required.

Part C – Comprehensive Review Process & Guidelines

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 those sections pertaining to Comprehensive Review in the Policies and Procedures Manual, e.g. 'Faculty Evaluation Guidelines
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. Department chairs/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 criteria for both annual and comprehensive review. Comprehensive review criteria may differentiate among expectations for tenure and promotion to associate professor, promotion to professor, 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 or some of the items included in the following matrices and may include guidelines not listed in the following matrices. The dean must review and approve program area guidelines. Once approved, the program area guidelines will be used by the program area, department chair/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, and department chair/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 department chair/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: In all of the following cases, the indicated ratings are to be understood as both necessary and sufficient. That is, if the indicated ratings are not achieved, the recommendation is negative and if the indicated ratings are achieved the recommendation is positive. For example: If plurality of faculty in program area evaluate a candidate for promotion and tenure and rates meets expectation (III) in teaching and exceeds expectation (IV) in professional activity and meets expectation (III) in service this constitutes a positive recommendation for promotion and tenure from assistant to associate professor.

For promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, the college criteria are Level III or 'meets expectations' for all areas in workload and Level IV or 'exceeds expectation' in at least one area in the workload as a result of undergoing the comprehensive review process.

For promotion from contract-renewable Instructor to contract-renewable Assistant Professor (non-tenure track): Level IV or V rating in at least one area of evaluated activity (instruction, professional activity or service) and Level III rating or higher in the remaining two areas. These ratings apply to a four-year comprehensive review of activity undertaken in the rank of Instructor or its equivalent rank

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: [As noted in University Regulations 3-3-801(2)(b)] 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.

Evidence of Performance in Instruction

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 pedagogical ability, performance
- Awards for excellence in teaching
- Letters from students
- Student awards

- Student research presented
- Other evidence of effects on students
- Video of teaching
- Peer review of teaching
- Certification in Quality Matters for online instruction
- Chair review of teaching (dean mandates)
- Evidence of student learning assessment protocols, analysis and use of results

Evidence of Performance in Professional Activity: External Peer Review

All program area faculty evaluation criteria are under review during Academic Year 2011-12 with a goal of examining and/or revising criteria for, (re) approval by the dean, by the end of the academic year. As part of this process, program areas are asked to consider incorporating external peer review of professional activity into the promotion application process as described below. Program area faculty evaluation criteria and procedures that do not include external peer review of professional activity will be considered in deliberations between the dean or associate dean and individual program areas. Program areas requiring external peer review must do so for all faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure. The following policy and procedures are effective for all program areas implementing external peer review of professional activity as of 2011-12. Modifications to the procedures below used in external peer review must be approved by the appropriate faculty committee structure and the dean for college-wide application:

In addition to evidence of performance in professional activity determined by each program area in its approved evaluation criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure, and promotion to Professor, review of professional activity by two qualified academic peers external to the university shall be included in the application for promotion and/or tenure. External peer reviewers are asked to provide additional evaluative information about the promotion and/or tenure application for consideration by the faculty, department chair or school director, and dean. Reviews by external peer reviewers shall not constitute votes on the matter of promotion and tenure.

The candidate for promotion and/or tenure shall recommend to the department chair or school director the names, titles and contact information of three to four persons for this purpose. Candidates for external peer reviewer must not have a professional affiliation with the University of Northern Colorado and must affirm that no personal or professional conflict of interest exists regarding the review of the candidate who is applying for promotion and tenure. The department chair or school director may consult with faculty of the same discipline within the program area in order to identify additional candidates for external peer reviewer and may add names to the list provided by the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. The department chair or school director shall select at least one of the candidates for external peer reviewer. The faculty member applying for promotion and tenure shall also select at least one of the candidates for

external peer reviewer. The department chair or school director shall be the point of contact and communication for both external peer reviewers. No expectation of remuneration is associated with the appointment of external peer reviewers. However, any remuneration that is implemented shall be on a uniform basis, with an equal amount of compensation for all external peer reviewers utilized by the college. The department chair or school director will provide the external peer reviewers with a packet consisting of the following:

- the current *curriculum vitae* of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure,
- self-evaluation narrative from the comprehensive review dossier of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure,
- material from the dossier of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure that is relevant to Professional Activity, material in support of professional activities listed on the *curriculum vitae* that are relevant to performance in the area of Professional Activity, or links to that material online. Because faculty evaluators may require more supporting material from candidates for promotion and/or tenure than is required for submission to the dean, material submitted to the external peer reviewers may consist also of items that are not provided in the dossier that is forwarded from the department or school to the dean (e.g. galley proofs, books, copies of publications, texts of conference presentations, grant proposals, grant evaluations, etc.)

The department chair or school director shall copy the dean of the college on invitations to the proposed external reviewers and shall also provide the external reviewers with guidelines, deadlines, and instructional information for completing the requested task. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall have access to all evaluative letters provided by external peer reviewers, and potential external peer reviewers shall be made aware of this access at the time they are invited to participate.

The evaluative letters from external peer reviewers shall be sent directly to the department chair or school director and subsequently shared with the faculty candidate for promotion and/or tenure, with a copy retained by the department chair or school director. The evaluative letters should be included in the comprehensive review dossier of the faculty candidate prior to the review of the application for promotion and/or tenure by the faculty. External peer reviews of faculty professional activity must be solicited in a timely manner in order to accommodate faculty evaluation deadlines in the program area, school and college.

Where applicable, this policy shall take effect beginning Academic Year 2011-12 for candidates applying for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure and for promotion to Professor. In consultation with the dean the policy may be implemented at later dates by individual program areas.

Department and program guidelines should reflect the nature of instruction that is valued in the discipline. Schools, departments and programs should develop expectations for faculty office hours appropriate to the area. These are times during which instructors are physically present and available on campus in regular consultation sessions distributed throughout the semester. In addition, instructors are expected to provide for the required number of instructional minutes appropriate to the credit hour value for each course, to meet students on a regular basis (in classroom-based instruction), to return assignments and submit grades in a timely manner, and to provide student evaluations of teaching to the department chair or school director.

INSTRUCTION

	Unsatisfactory (I)	Needs Improvement (II)	Meets Expectations (III)	Exceeds Expectations (IV)	Excellent (V) A score of Excellent must be based on evidence beyond student
Teaching Methods	Teaching methods do not impart course content and/or develop appropriate student skills.	Teaching methods are inconsistent and/or only periodically effective in imparting course content and/or development of student 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.	Course design is not uniformly consistent with respect to appropriate course 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.	Course content is presented inconsistently.	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	Currency of knowledge in subject fields is incomplete or inconsistent.	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 that makes student learning uncomfortable.	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.	Revises and updates courses only sporadically or inconsistently.	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.	Inadequately or inconsistently supervises 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 and other forms of dissemination. Program area guidelines should reflect the nature of the professional activity valued in the discipline. In particular, the 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 (I)	Needs Improvement (II)	Meets Expectations (III)	Exceeds Expectations (IV)	Excellent (V)
Author. Co-Author & Publishing	No evidence of research activity or work in progress.	Some evidence of research or creative activity with no substantial progress since last review. Submission of work to refereed venues with repeated lack of acceptance. Long term work with no evidence of submission to external reviewed outlets.	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 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. No grant activity.	Inadequate or untimely responses to terms of 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. Obligations of granting agency acceptably met.	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	No engagement with professional peers.	Attends professional conferences without contribution to the program.	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	No engagement as reviewer, editor or consultant for scholarly outlets.	Occasional, inconsistent engagement with scholarly outlets.	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 unit level and beyond. However, under unusual circumstances, a program area may choose to make exceptions for certain individuals and assign a service load that departs from the expected distribution of service areas in order to meet special circumstances or needs on one or more levels.

SERVICE & ADVISING

	Unsatisfactory (I)	Needs Improvement (II)	Meets Expectations (III)	Exceeds Expectations (IV)	Excellent (V)
School/Program	Fails to discharge assigned school/program service & advising responsibilities.	Is inconsistent in discharging service and advising responsibilities. Fails to consistently provide competent advising counsel.	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	No engagement with college level service.	Committee member, but attends inconsistently or does not contribute actively.	Participates in committee service to college.	Provides leadership in committee service to college.	Provides exceptional leadership in committee service to college.
University	Assumes no university-wide service responsibilities.	Committee member, or otherwise engaged in university governance, but carries out duties only sporadically or inconsistently.	Participates 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)	None; no engagement outside the institution.	Participates in activities external to the university which have no or tenuous linkages to disciplinary expertise.	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)	None; no engagement with professional organizations or related activities.	Elected or appointed to professional service group, but is engaged only periodically or inconsistently.	Serves in administrative or leadership capacity in professional organizations, including at national and/or international levels	Provides important leadership in leadership or administrative capacity in professional organizations, including at national and/or international levels.	Provides exceptional leadership in administrative capacity in professional organizations, etc.

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Evaluation Period from _____ to _____

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

PART I: Evaluatee Information

Name _____

College _____ Department/School/Program Area _____

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/Biennial Performance Evaluation

Weighting Factors

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service
Year _____	_____	_____	_____

Annual/Biennial Performance Evaluation

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

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service Non- Chair	Chair	Overall (Weighted Average)
Program Area/Department Faculty					
Chair/Director/Other					
<i>Dean (if applicable)</i>					
Chief Academic Officer <i>(if applicable)</i>					

PART III: Comprehensive Evaluation

Weighting Factors (Average for Comprehensive Review Period)

Instruction Professional Activity Service
 _____ _____ _____

Comprehensive Performance Evaluation

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

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service		Overall (Weighted Average)
			Non-Chair	Chair	
Program Area/Department					
Faculty					
Chair/Director/Other					
Dean					
ECC** (if required)					
Chief Academic Officer					

Part IV: Post Tenure Review Result (based on Comprehensive Performance Evaluation)

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Program Area/Department Faculty			
Chair/Director/Other			
Dean			
ECC** (if required)			
Chief Academic Officer			
President			

Part V: Voting Record for Promotion

of Eligible Voting Faculty* (excludes unit leader) Tenured _____ Tenure Track _____

	For	Against	Abstain
# of Faculty Votes			
Chair/Director/Other			
Dean			
ECC** (if required)			
Chief Academic Officer			
President			

Part VI: Voting Record for Tenure

of Eligible Voting Faculty* (excludes unit leader) Tenured _____ Tenure Track _____

	For	Against	Abstain
# of Faculty Votes			
Chair/Director/Other			
Dean			
ECC** (if required)			
Chief Academic Officer			
President			

* Only Tenure and Tenure-Track faculty are eligible to vote

** ECC stands for Evaluation Conference Committee

Faculty Representative Date

Chair/Director/Other Date

Dean Date

Chief Academic Officer Date

President Date

<u>Overall Evaluation Scale</u>		
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

Section VIII

Chairs, Directors, and Deans Evaluation Guidelines

College of Humanities and Social Sciences Guidelines For the Selection of Chairs and Directors

The Chair and Director selection process shall be in accordance with University Policy.

Duties and Evaluations of Department Chairs and Program Coordinators

The College follows the University Policies for department chair evaluations (University Regulations 3-3-301(4)). Coordinators of free-standing programs shall be evaluated according to the University Policies for department chair evaluation. The following list is not prescriptive but offered to provide an overview of the kinds of responsibilities chairs and program coordinators may typically be expected to fulfill.

1. Provide a single point of contact between the department and both internal and external constituencies
2. Scheduling of classes
3. Facilitate the hiring and evaluation of program adjunct faculty in conjunction with program faculty.
4. Facilitate curriculum changes as per University Regulations Part 5:Curriculum
5. Prepare requests for contracts and all other paperwork
6. Review applications to the hiring pool
7. Schedule, convene, and chair faculty meetings
8. Fulfill the role assigned to the chair in the faculty evaluation process in University Regulations 3-3-803.
9. Prepare assessment reports and other similar required reports
10. Manage the departmental budget
11. Supervise classified staff
12. Relay information to and from the dean (concerning, for example, deadlines, new expectations, programmatic needs, staffing plans, etc.)
13. Help resolve student and faculty complaints
14. Participate in "Leadership Council"
15. Support fund raising and advancement for the department
16. Manage work load assignments within the department
17. Implement College policies and procedures
18. Enrollment management

19. Facilitate work of department committees
20. Execute duties assigned to department chairs
21. Summer administrative duties
22. Advocate for the goals of the department.
23. Other duties arising from unforeseen circumstances

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. Evaluation of school directors will be consistent with Board of Trustees Policy and the Provost’s memoranda of December 9, 2009 and May 5, 2010.

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

SECTION IX

Office Space Usage and Assignment

The primary responsibility for the management of office space lies with unit leaders, although the ultimate responsibility for assignment of office space to a unit resides with the dean. Office space should be used for the maximum benefit of the College mission in support of instruction, student advising, scholarship, and professional activity. It is desirable that all full-time HSS faculty members and individuals who provide essential administrative and support functions have office space adequate to performing these tasks. It is also expected that part-time faculty and graduate students have access to on-campus space, as available, to support their activities.

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance for assignment of office space in the College. It is recognized that relocation of offices is a significant imposition and all reasonable efforts will be made to minimize moves among continuing personnel.

Each full-time faculty member should have one private office to facilitate meeting with students and conducting professional activities. Adjunct faculty will typically share an office with at least one other adjunct faculty member or with a teaching or graduate assistant that has a demonstrated need for office space. Where possible, graduate students without an office should have access to a common study area with desks and/or meeting tables. To the maximum extent possible, storage space between and within units should be consolidated in order to open up additional office space. Storage space that is office-sized should be used as an office whenever possible. The dean's office will assist in finding alternative storage space. The dean in consultation with the unit will identify convertible spaces.

In the event that a department has a vacant base-funded faculty line, the office allocated for that vacant position shall remain within the unit, as long as approval for filling the position exists. If approval for filling the position is withdrawn, the allocated office shall revert to the pool of office space available for other departments that have demonstrated needs. The dean's office will manage this pool of available space until such time as it is reallocated to a unit.

The Dean's Office will conduct an inventory of all office, storage, and department library space as needed.

The following policy will be implemented when academic units are unable to meet their office space needs within their assigned space, taking into consideration all office, storage, and department library spaces within their unit.

1. Additional office space requests will be submitted to the Dean's Office and will address the basis of need and current occupancy using the priority ranking below.
 - a. Unit leaders and essential unit support staff
 - b. Full-time faculty
 - c. Part-time faculty
 - d. Graduate teaching assistants and other graduate assistants
 - e. Emeritus faculty

2. Requests for office space will be handled on a case-by-case basis by the Dean's Office, understanding that the dean's office has the ability only to assign unassigned office space.

SECTION X

Research Incentive Funding

The Research Advisory Council at UNC put out a Research Plan in April 2012 entitled "Enhancement of Research, Scholarship, Creative Works, and Grant Activity: 2012-2015." This document outlines the many goals and strategies of UNC to promote scholarship for faculty, students and staff. (http://www.unco.edu/osp/news/UNCResearchPlan_2012-15.pdf)

The overarching objective for the use of Research Incentive dollars in HSS is to promote and support the goals outlined in the above document by investing resources in Research Scholarship and Creative Works (RSCW) and helping PIs/PDs overcome financial and other barriers related to research.

To accomplish these goals as of fall 2014, HSS will follow the structure of distributing F&A costs to HSS schools/departments/programs outlined below:

- If administrative support is provided within a unit, 25% of the distribution (83% of the 30% returned to the college) would go to the unit and 5% (17% of the 30% returned to the college) would remain with the Dean's office.
 - Beyond this distribution the unit should have a written policy that outlines how decide how to further allocate the funds to the PI/PD.
- If administrative support is not provided within a unit, the full 30% of the distribution would remain with the Dean's office to cover the additional administrative expenses necessary to support the PI/PD.
 - A percentage could potentially be negotiated back to the PI/PD for discretionary funding. Negotiation for the percentage to be returned to the PI/PD should take place between the Dean and the PI/PD at the time the grant proposal is being submitted.

Possible Items to Fund with Research Incentive Dollars

Following is a (non-exhaustive) list of items related to RSCW for which research incentive money might be used:

- Fees associated with publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals
- Book publishing fees
- Honorariums/official functions for faculty to give talks, poetry readings, etc. at UNC as a community wide event (to include faculty, students, staff and community)
- Time
 - Faculty reassigned time or course releases for adjunct faculty
- Materials, supplies and equipment related to RSCW
- Service & maintenance agreements for instrumentation
- Specialized needs not covered by unit
 - Recording devices for conducting interviews
 - Rental fees for rooms for community based programs
 - Specialized software (supported by IM&T)
 - Travel visas required to undertake research
- Cost sharing for grant applications
- Entrance fees to archives/museums for research
- Cost of shipping research equipment to a site

- Translators
- Transcribers
- Students to do data entry, technicians, technical writing editors
- Grant training workshops
- Support for undergraduate and graduate students in making presentations and publishing papers
 - Travel
 - Printing
 - Publishing fees

If there are questions about an item that is not included in the above list, please contact the HSS Dean's Office.

Other Resources Available for Research at UNC

Other internal resources available for research at UNC are outlined on the website of the Office of Research <http://www.unco.edu/research/support.html>. This website outlines all the different internal awards available to faculty, including Research, Dissemination, & Faculty Development Awards (RDFD), Provost Awards for Travel (PAT), Faculty & Research Publications Board New Project Awards (FRPB), Annual Scholarly Activity Travel Grants (ASATS), Summer Support Initiative (SSI), and others.

College of Humanities & Social Sciences

Policies & Procedures Manual

Forms Appendices



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

Appendices Table of Contents

Appendix I

Sabbatical Leave Report..... 53

Appendix II

Evaluation of Sabbatical Leave Report..... 55

Appendix III

Annual Faculty Evaluation Form.....56

Appendix IV

Faculty Comprehensive Review Form.....57

Appendix V

Letter of Instruction for Peer Reviewers.....60

Appendix I

Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used by faculty to report sabbatical leave activity. sabbatical leave reports are due within one academic year from completion of the leave. In accordance with Board of Trustees Policy, faculty who do not submit a sabbatical leave report within the required time frame will not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences Sabbatical Leave Report

Name: _____

Department / School _____

Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: _____ Year: _____

Date by which Sabbatical Leave Report is Due: _____ (within one academic year from completion of leave).

Date of Sabbatical Leave Report: _____

Each department /school will determine the method by which faculty will evaluate sabbatical leave reports. The chair/director who is responsible for recording and reporting the results and, where appropriate, for providing the faculty member with a written notification of non-acceptance by the faculty. The protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports will be submitted to the dean for approval. At minimum, the sabbatical report will be evaluated considering the following criteria:

- (1) Whether the report is complete and explicitly addresses each of the required elements (see below)
- (2) Whether the sabbatical leave met its objectives as outlined in the proposal or, if applicable, as revised.

In order to complete the sabbatical leave report, use this form as a cover sheet for the following:

1. Provide a copy of your approved sabbatical leave proposal.
2. Provide your sabbatical leave report. In your report, please address each of the following:
 - a. Summarize the key activities undertaken.
 - b. Comment on what was accomplished during the leave, particularly with reference to goals articulated in your proposal.
 - c. Explain how the sabbatical has contributed to your own professional development, to the academic program(s) in which you teach, and to the university.

Submit this cover sheet and the above materials to the appropriate department / school faculty representative in accordance with the department's / school's approved procedure for evaluation.

APPENDIX

Board of Trustees Policy stipulates the following expectations, requirements, and conditions regarding sabbatical leaves and sabbatical leave reports:

2-3-1001(3) Appropriate Use of Sabbatical Leaves. [See also 3-3-1001(1) Sabbatical Proposals]. The activities undertaken during sabbatical leave must be related to the individual's on-campus responsibilities. The proposal must specify the effect on professional growth, development of knowledge in the discipline, influence on the students' educational experience, and the enhancement of the University's reputation. Once the goals and plan are approved, the faculty member is obligated to fulfill them, unless amended [See also 2-3-1001(5), Approval Procedures].

(a) Examples of acceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:

(I) The pursuit of research or study at an institution of higher education or similar entity where improvement of oneself as a teacher-scholar is the focus.

(II) The pursuit of research projects or creative endeavors within a faculty member's specialty to advance knowledge, improve the —state of the art, or to produce material for publication.

(III) The acquisition of practical experience that will directly enhance the individual's capacity to meet University responsibilities.

(IV) The pursuit of special studies or projects for the purpose of expanding institutional-related services beyond the faculty member's obligations.

(b) Examples of unacceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:

(I) Study at an institution of higher education, the primary purpose of which is to gain a degree in an area or discipline not related to current University responsibilities.

(II) Travel that is not directly related to University responsibilities. (A significant distinction is made herein between travel to improve oneself as a teacher-scholar and travel in and of itself.)

(III) Any sabbatical request within the faculty member's current obligations to the University. (Examples include rewriting of course materials, course development, and the like.)

(IV) Activities or research not related to current University responsibilities.

2-3-1001(5) Approval Procedures.

Approval of a leave request will be based upon the merits of the proposal communicated by the specific goals and plan for achievement outlined in the proposal.

...

(g) Proposal Revisions. Revisions of approved leave plans must be approved by the school director or his or her designee in the program area and dean. The applicant will be informed of the recommendations and, if the revised proposal is not approved, will be afforded an opportunity to provide additional information.

2-3-1001(8) Faculty Report Obligation. In accepting a sabbatical leave, the faculty member agrees to provide to the program area faculty a written report of the activities, the goals attained, and the benefits derived during the course of the leave. Upon approval of the program area faculty, the report will be forwarded to the school director and the dean. The school director and the dean will review the report to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in 2-3-1001(3). If the program area faculty or dean find the report unacceptable, the faculty member will be notified in writing and will have the opportunity to respond. Once the report has been accepted, copies will be forwarded to the CAO. Faculty who do not submit an acceptable report within one academic year of completion of the leave shall not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

2-3-1001(9) Institutional Accountability.

(a) All sabbatical leave records and approved and disapproved plans, will be available for inspection, upon request, by the Joint Budget Committee, the Education Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Withdrawn plans will not be included in the records and will be returned to the faculty members.

(b) Final sabbatical reports are not considered a part of personnel files and become open record for public disclosure pursuant to the Colorado Open Records Statute (C.R.S. 24-72-204).

The complete Board of Trustees Policy, including other provisions related to sabbatical leaves, is available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf. University Regulations related to sabbatical leaves are available at http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf

Appendix II

Evaluation of Sabbatical Leave Report

The following materials and procedure will be used for evaluation of a faculty sabbatical leave report:

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Evaluation of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report

This form is to be completed by the faculty evaluation representative, school director or department chair, and dean and copied to the faculty member who has submitted a sabbatical leave report. It is intended to record evaluative responses and recommendations concerning the sabbatical leave report. It is the responsibility of the department chair or school director to ensure that approved protocol for evaluation of sabbatical leave reports is followed and, along with the dean, to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). Additional pages of comments may be attached as needed. Under BOT Policy 2-3-1001(8) faculty and dean have the responsibility for assessing the acceptability or non-acceptability of the sabbatical leave report.

Faculty Member: _____ Department / School _____

Date of Sabbatical Leave: Semester: _____ Year: _____

Date of Faculty Sabbatical Leave Report: _____ First Report _____ Second Report _____

1. Faculty Evaluation: Indicate the faculty's approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report. Include the means by which the determination was reached according to approved protocol for the academic unit. Attach comments as needed. If the approved protocol of the unit includes voting, indicate the faculty vote concerning the sabbatical leave report*:

_____ Approve: acceptable

_____ Disapprove: not acceptable*

Faculty representative

Date

2. Review by Department Chair / School Director:

This sabbatical leave report _____ does _____ does not* clearly address how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in BOT Policy 2-3-1001(3). (See Appendix.)

Department Chair / School Director

Date

3. Determination of Dean: _____ Approve: acceptable _____ Disapprove: not acceptable*

Dean

Date

*If the sabbatical leave report is found unacceptable or in non-compliance with BOT Policy by the faculty, chair/director, or dean, a written notification must be provided to the faculty member from the level(s) of evaluation which did not approve the report. Attach and submit to the faculty member notifications of non-acceptance together with this form. In cases where the original faculty report has been found unacceptable, the faculty member may submit a second report to the faculty representative for consideration and evaluation. In such cases, this form will be used for responses by faculty, chair/director, and dean for second responses and recommendations. The second response by the dean is the final determination of approval or non-approval of the sabbatical leave report.

APPENDIX III

ANNUAL/BIENNIAL EVALUATION For Calendar Year _____

PART I: Evaluatee Information

Name _____

College _____ Department/School/Program Area _____ Rank _____

Contract Status (check one) Tenured ___ Tenure Track ___ Contract Renewable ___

PART II: Annual/Biennial Performance Evaluation

Weighting Factors

Instruction Professional Activity Service Dept. Chair
 _____ _____ _____ _____

Performance Evaluation

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

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service		Overall (Weighted Average)
			Non-Chair Service	Dept. Chair Service	
Program Area/Department Faculty					
Chair/Director/Other					
Dean (if applicable)					
Chief Academic Officer (if applicable)					

Faculty Representative

Date

Chair/Director/Other

Date

Dean (if applicable)

Date

Chief Academic Officer
(if applicable)

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

APPENDIX IV

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Evaluation Period from _____ to _____

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

PART I: Evaluatee Information

Name _____

College _____ Department/School/Program Area _____

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/Biennial Performance Evaluation

Weighting Factors

Year _____ Instruction _____ Professional Activity _____ Service _____

Annual/Biennial Performance Evaluation

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

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service		Overall (Weighted Average)
			Non-Chair Service	Dept. Chair Service	
Program Area/Department Faculty					
Chair/Director/Other					
Dean (if applicable)					
Chief Academic Officer (if applicable)					

PART III: Comprehensive Evaluation

Weighting Factors (Average for Comprehensive Review Period)

Instruction Professional Activity Service
 _____ _____ _____

Comprehensive Performance Evaluation

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

	Instruction	Professional Activity	Service		Overall (Weighted Average)
			Non-Chair	Chair	
Program Area/Department Faculty					
Chair/Director/Other					
Dean					
ECC** (if required)					
Chief Academic Officer					

Part IV: Post Tenure Review Result (based on Comprehensive Performance Evaluation)

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Program Area/Department Faculty			
Chair/Director/Other			
Dean			
ECC** (if required)			
Chief Academic Officer			
President			

Part V: Voting Record for Promotion

of Eligible Voting Faculty* (excludes unit leader) Tenured _____ Tenure Track _____

	For	Against	Abstain
# of Faculty Votes			
Chair/Director/Other			
Dean			
ECC** (if required)			
Chief Academic Officer			
President			

Part VI: Voting Record for Tenure

of Eligible Voting Faculty* (excludes unit leader) Tenured _____ Tenure Track _____

	For	Against	Abstain
# of Faculty Votes			
Chair/Director/Other			
Dean			
ECC** (if required)			
Chief Academic Officer			
President			

* Only Tenure and Tenure-Track faculty are eligible to vote

** ECC stands for Evaluation Conference Committee

Faculty Representative Date

Chair/Director/Other Date

Dean Date

Chief Academic Officer Date

President Date

<u>Overall Evaluation Scale</u>		
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

APPENDIX V

LETTER OF INSTRUCTION FOR PEER REVIEWERS

Unless otherwise approved by the dean, the following format should be used for letters of instruction for individuals who have agreed to serve as external peer reviewers in the faculty evaluation process provided in Section VI.

[Department Chair's or School Director's name and contact information]

[date]

Dear *[peer reviewer's name]*:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external peer reviewer for *[faculty evaluatee's name]*, who is undergoing review for *[specify appropriate rank and tenure application if applicable]*. In the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, the accomplishments in professional activity by all candidates for promotion and/or tenure are subject to evaluation by at least two peer reviewers. I appreciate your willingness to assume this important responsibility. This letter provides guidance for your review, which I ask that you provide to *[chair's or director's name]* at the following address: *[chair's or director's address]* by no later than *[specify date – normally no less than one month]*.

I request that you supply, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier, an evaluative letter that addresses *[faculty evaluatee's name]*'s scholarship and professional activity. Particularly useful will be your assessment of the quality, significance, and impact of *[his/her]* scholarly contributions to date, as well as *[his/her]* potential to sustain and expand upon them in the future. In this review, please consider the candidate's accomplishments referred to in the enclosed materials

I request that you begin your letter by listing your current position and institutional affiliation and providing a statement of the nature and duration of your acquaintance with the candidate, if any. Please also include a statement affirming that no personal or professional conflict of interest exists with regard to your review of the candidate's work. Please be aware that it is the practice of the College to permit a candidate to view external letters of review that are received as part of his or her faculty evaluation.

Please contact me at *[phone number and e-mail address]* if you have any questions about these instructions or about the review process. Once again, thank you for your service as an external peer reviewer. Your contributions to our faculty evaluation process are much appreciated.

[Closing]

Enclosures:

Candidate's *curriculum vitae*

Candidate's narrative statement of professional activity for the period under review

[list any other enclosures here]