

1
2 **GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS**
3
4 **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION**
5

6
7 **Adopted by Resolution of the**
8 **GSPA Faculty Council**
9 **March 8, 2006**
10

11
12 This document describes the policies and procedures adopted by the Graduate School of
13 Public Affairs to implement those portions of the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook and
14 UCDHSC-DDC (hereinafter, “campus”) policies related to the periodic review of faculty
15 performance for the purposes of School decision making on questions of reappointment, tenure,
16 and promotion. It also sets forth procedures for annual performance review (including peer
17 review) for the purpose of decision making on questions of faculty remuneration.

18 Section 1 sets forth the School’s Mission Statement and Goals. Section 2 describes in
19 general terms the criteria for evaluating faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and
20 community service; what constitutes acceptable and appropriate evidence of attainment of these
21 criteria; and what standards will be applied in the determination of how well faculty members are
22 adhering to the general criteria at the time of periodic review (i.e., pre-tenure, tenure, promotion to
23 full professor, post-tenure) and annual performance reviews. Section 3 of this document then
24 describes the procedures (including decision structures) to be used in making decisions concerning
25 these criteria, evidence, and standards in individual cases.

26 The GSPA Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (hereinafter, “RTP”) Committee and
27 the Faculty Council make every reasonable effort to assure that these policies and procedures
28 remain contemporaneous with general policies and subject-specific administrative policy

29 statements on RTP matters emanating from the offices of campus and university system-wide
30 administrators, as well as with the text of current editions of the University of Colorado Faculty
31 Handbook and the Laws of the Regents. However, whenever clear conflicts are found to exist
32 between the School’s policies and procedures and those of controlling sources of authority
33 superior to and external to the School, the latter shall be understood to prevail.

34

35 **1. Mission and Goals.**

36

37 The Graduate School of Public Affairs’ mission is to improve the quality of public life in
38 our state, region, and nation. To achieve this mission, the School has set the following objectives:

- 39 • Build educational and research excellence, establishing GSPA as the best school of public
40 affairs in its region and a top-ranked, nationally recognized school;
- 41 • Focus on solving pressing public problems, both by developing students’ problem-solving
42 skills and by engaging the School’s community in research and action that addresses
43 important societal issues;
- 44 • Strengthen GSPA’s contribution to successful student career development;
- 45 • Serve all of Colorado, the mountain West, and the global community.

46

47 Given its mission and goals, GSPA requires a faculty representing a substantial range of
48 disciplines and experience. Likewise, it calls for an integration of theory and practice, of model
49 building and experience, in the study of public affairs.¹

50

¹For the purposes of this document, “public affairs” shall be understood as a collective term for the disciplines featured in GSPA degree programs: Criminal Justice, Public Administration, Public Management, and Public Policy.

51 **2. Criteria, Evidence, and Standards for Faculty Evaluation.**

52
53 **2.1. Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching and Evidence of Attainment.**

54 **2.1.1. Criteria for Assessing Teaching Performance.**

- 55 • Effective classroom instruction and assessment, such that students obtain
56 knowledge and skills needed to perform effectively in their careers based on
57 current knowledge, theory, research, and practice;
58
59 • Effective guidance and instruction to enhance students' knowledge and
60 professional growth outside of classroom settings (for example: advising;
61 participation on advanced seminar projects, theses, or dissertations; enhancing
62 student learning through research and community service projects, internships,
63 facilitation of student participation in actual policy or management processes.)
64

65
66 **2.1.2. Evidence of Attainment.** Below is a list of possible examples of evidence of the
67 attainment of teaching that would be deemed meritorious or excellent. It is not expected that all
68 faculty will have generated all these different forms of evidence during a given review period.

69 Performance in classroom instruction and assessment may be demonstrated by:

- 70 • Course syllabi reflecting current knowledge, concepts, and principles in the
71 relevant subject area;
72 • Course evaluations, in particular items indicating students' assessment of their
73 learning;
74 • Assessment measures or assignments given in the classroom and examples of
75 student performance;
76 • Innovative course activities or exercises designed to help students' attain specified
77 learning outcomes;
78 • A pattern of course standards, assessments, and grading that reflects appropriate
79 standards for the course level being taught;
80 • Evaluation of classroom performance by outside observers, e.g., other faculty, staff
81 from the Center for Faculty Development;
82 • Recognitions or awards for distinguished teaching;
83 • Surveys, letters, or other documents from former students or alumni.
84

85 Effective guidance and instruction to students outside of the traditional classroom setting may be
86 demonstrated by:
87

- 88 • Effective performance as a chair or reader on advanced seminar, thesis, and
89 dissertation committees and/or supervision of independent studies, or internships
90 as indicated by numbers of such activities and the quality of final products;
91
- 92 • Student advising;
93
- 94 • Organizing or actively participating in other activities that encourage student
95 learning, e.g., working with students on research or community-related projects,
96 mentoring Ph.D. students for research, organizing student activities for
97 professional growth such as attendance at conferences or organizing student
98 seminars or guest speakers
99

100 Participation in GSPA curriculum design and policies regarding teaching and student
101 learning may be demonstrated by:
102

- 103 • Documents reflecting participation in program planning and curriculum design,
104 including participation in the planning and teaching of core courses in the degree
105 program(s) within which the faculty member teaches;
106
- 107 • Positive judgments by colleagues on curriculum committees, task forces, etc. on
108 the candidate's contribution to committee work (e.g., letters of support
109 documenting type and nature of contribution);
110
- 111 • Collaboration or sharing of teaching approaches and materials with other faculty;
112
- 113 • New course syllabi that address identified needs of students.
114

115 **2.2. Criteria for the Evaluation of Research and Evidence of Attainment.**

116 The learning community of faculty and students of the Graduate School of Public Affairs assumes
117 that all faculty members have an active, compelling, and coherent research agenda, the collective
118 effect of which is (1) to assure the School's national prominence in contributions to knowledge
119 relevant to public affairs; and (2) to create a learning laboratory for students. Although faculty will
120 develop individualized approaches to the generation of a well-regarded record of research-based
121 scholarship, all faculty are expected to make a significant, original contribution to knowledge in
122 their chosen field(s) of specialization, and to publish those contributions in authoritative venues
123 appropriate to their disciplines. Consistent with campus-wide and CU system-wide guidelines, the

124 most significant evidence of research proficiency is authorship of scholarly books, book chapters,
125 and journal articles the text of which are subject to peer review. Faculty members are encouraged
126 to submit at least some of their research writings for publication to academic venues that are
127 widely read and highly regarded in the field of public affairs.

128 Funded research is critical to building excellence at the school. Faculty members are expected
129 to pursue significant funding opportunities that support their own research whenever possible,
130 including graduate student assistance in the performance of that research.

131

132 **2.2.1 Criteria for Assessing Research Activities**

- 133 • Productivity (sufficient quantity of published writing)
- 134 • Quality (noteworthy intellectual achievement, conceptual/methodological rigor)
- 135 • Impact (significant effect on the relevant field of study)

136

137 **2.2.2 Evidence of Attainment of Criteria for Research Evaluation.** In the evaluation of
138 research efforts, evidence of attainment of criteria can include:

139 **2.2.2.1. Productivity.** Evidence of productivity is fundamentally quantitative: that is, how
140 many written products have been generated. These products may include (in
141 general order of significance):

- 142 • books and book chapters (subject to some form of peer review)
- 143 • research articles and reflective essays (subject to some form of peer review)
- 144 • non-refereed publications of a scholarly nature or in publications targeted at
145 practitioners
- 146 • government documents and monographs (e.g., contract research reports)
- 147 • working papers
- 148 • papers delivered at scholarly and/or professional meetings
- 149 • proposals for research funding and research funding secured

150 • the conveyance of knowledge in non-academic venues such as editorials in
151 newspapers. Publication may include dissemination in CD-ROM, video, or
152 other non-print media.

153

154 **2.2.2.2. Quality.** Evidence of quality is primarily achieved through review of scholarly
155 work by peers and public. Review may occur in many ways, and it is the
156 responsibility of the faculty member to show that his/her work has undergone
157 appropriate review.

158 • Publication in journals or by presses that employ a process of blind peer review

159 • Publication in journals to which many manuscripts are submitted and for which
160 few are chosen (thus indicating the esteem in which they are held by
161 professionals in a particular field)

162 • Publication in books for which chapters are peer-reviewed or reviewed by
163 respected editors (but where the author's name is known to the reviewers)

164 • Funding of grant proposals (indicating that the granting authority is giving a
165 favorable review)

166 • Book reviews of one's work or discussion of one's work in textbooks

167 • Reprinting of one's work in anthologies

168 • Honors and awards

169 • Positive judgments by academic and professional peers such as external
170 reviewers solicited during review for tenure and/or promotion.

171

172 **2.2.2.3. Impact.** Evidence of impact is shown through the effect the work has on research
173 and/or practice in the relevant field. Such evidence may include:

174 • articles about the faculty member's work in professional or
175 practitioner-oriented journals or magazines

176 • reviews of the faculty member's work by other scholars in the field

177 • evidence that policy or administrative practice makes use of theory or findings
178 generated by a faculty member's research.

179 • Citations in publications such as the Social Science Citation Index.

180

181

182 **2.3. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service and Evidence of Attainment.**

183 GSPA’s mission is built on public service, and all faculty, particularly after the award of tenure,
184 are expected to provide meaningful service to the university community, Colorado, and their own
185 national professional communities.

186 **2.3.1 Criteria for Assessing Service Activities.** In keeping with the general policies of
187 the University of Colorado, criteria for the evaluation of services activities shall include
188 contributions of professional expertise to the School, campus, university, community, and
189 professional societies and organizations. Given the mission of GSPA, they shall also include
190 activities that link academic and practitioner realms, featuring contributions of professional
191 expertise to governmental institutions and non-profit organizations. Likewise, they should include
192 the impact of contributions to the university, professional recognition brought to GSPA and the
193 Denver campus by the faculty member’s service, activities which build public support for the
194 School, and the impact of the faculty member’s activities on policy and practice.

195

196 **2.3.2. Evidence of Service Activities.**

- 197 • Membership on/leadership of committees and task forces at the School, campus,
198 and university level.
- 199
- 200 • Participation in professional societies as an office holder, chairperson, committee
201 member, editor, panelist, or convener.
- 202
- 203 • Awards from campus, university, or external organizations in recognition of
204 service contributions.
- 205
- 206 • Assistance to students or community members involved in community problem
207 solving.
- 208
- 209 • Participation in task forces, committees, special research teams or advisory groups
210 providing services to relevant local, state, regional, national, or international

211 agencies or institutions on issues of public policy, administrative reorganization,
212 service delivery, or related activities.

- 213
- 214 • Advising public or non-profit agencies or community interest groups in the role of
215 analyst or expert in the public policy process or otherwise assisting such
216 organizations in the accomplishment of their objectives. Specify whether
217 remunerated or volunteer. The latter may include expense reimbursement. Both
218 forms of service merit recognition, but some portion should be pro bono.
- 219
- 220 • Public addresses, newspaper columns, and presentations on issues relevant to the
221 missions of GSPA.
- 222
- 223

224 **2.4. Standards for the Measurement of Attainment and Their Relationship to Professional**
225 **Development Plans.**

226 **2.4.1. Pre-tenure Professional Development.** By the end of the first year of service of
227 any newly hired pre-tenure, tenure-track professor on the GSPA faculty, the professor shall, in
228 consultation with the RTP Chair and one or more tenured members of the faculty, prepare a
229 professional development plan. The plan should:

- 230 • identify existing courses in the GSPA curriculum that need coverage and in which
231 the professor wishes to be prepared to teach;
- 232
- 233 • identify new courses and other curricular development activities in which the
234 professor wishes to be engaged;
- 235
- 236 • describe clear and coherent research themes the professor wishes to explore;
- 237
- 238 • discuss possible sources of financial support for the professor's research agenda
239 and plans for acquiring such support;
- 240
- 241 • discuss possible forms for the dissemination of research findings (e.g., journal
242 articles, books and book chapters, CD ROM production, Internet posting) and
243 possible specific venues for such publication;
- 244
- 245 • identify, at the professor's discretion, one or more tenured members of the GSPA
246 faculty to advise in further development and implementation of the plan;
- 247
- 248 • suggest areas of service at the School, campus, and community levels in which the
249 professor wishes to specialize;

- 250
- 251 • identify professional societies and organizations the professor may already belong
- 252 to or may be planning to join, including plans for participation at annual meetings
- 253 or other sponsored activities of such associations; and
- 254
- 255 • identify, at the professor’s discretion, sources of institutional support (at the
- 256 School, campus, or university level) which may be sought to assist in implementing
- 257 the plan.
- 258

259 The professor may amend the plan in response to experience with its implementation, or

260 should areas of interest and desired activities change over time.

261

262 **2.4.2. Pre-tenure Comprehensive Review.** Relative progress toward attainment of the

263 goals established in the professional development plan will constitute the primary measure of

264 performance at the pre-tenure level. For instance, by the beginning of the third year of service the

265 candidate for review should have begun to demonstrate both promise and productivity in amassing

266 evidence of the sort listed in sections 2.1.2., 2.2.2., and 2.3.2 of this document, with a predominant

267 emphasis on teaching and research.

268 By the beginning of the fourth year of membership on the faculty, during which the first

269 comprehensive external review of the assistant professor’s record is conducted by the GSPA and

270 UCDHSC-Denver Campus RTP Committees, the candidate for review should be able to produce

271 evidence of continuing progress toward achievement of the goals in the plan, as verified by

272 external (as well as internal) scholarly review; that is, a development trajectory progressing

273 toward a tenurable record. At this stage of development, evidence should include:

- 274
- 275 • multiple (that is, a minimum of two) articles in academic or professional journals,
- 276 and/or book chapters the contents of which are subject to some form of peer
- 277 review, and some of which should be sole-authored or lead-authored (as a
- 278 demonstration of the professor’s capacity for independent research and writing), as

279 well as additional such work at various stages of preparation and external review
280 for publication;

- 281
- 282 • an indication of improved teaching performance in the event that previous teaching
283 evaluations had indicated areas in which significant improvement was warranted;
284
- 285 • a record of continuing service to the School, campus, governmental institutions
286 and/or community-based organizations, and professional societies and
287 organizations.
288

289 **2.4.3. Review for Tenure (simultaneous with promotion to Associate Professor, and**

290 **based on the same standards).** Up to and including review for tenure, the Professional

291 Development Plan (as amended, if necessary) will continue to be the primary framework for

292 measuring attainment of individualized professional development goals. Tenure will be awarded

293 only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of

294 teaching, research, and service; and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research. To

295 secure tenure in GSPA will require a faculty member to reflect:

- 296 • **Significant research contributions and publications:** The faculty member must
297 have initiated and successfully completed varied research assignments,
298 assignments that according to diverse independent scholars and practitioners,
299 further knowledge concerning public affairs theory and practice. Judgments
300 concerning research performance shall be guided by the quantity and quality of
301 publications and their significance and impact as a body of scholarly work.
302
- 303 • **An exemplary teaching record.** The faculty member must be able to illustrate an
304 ability to impart knowledge to students concerning theory and/or practice, and must
305 view teaching as an important element of his or her responsibilities. The faculty
306 member should be able to demonstrate meritorious proficiency or sustained
307 improvement to the level of meritorious teaching performance (including advising)
308 during the pre-tenure period; as reflected in the evidence described in § 2.1.2. of
309 this document.
310
- 311 • **A contribution to GSPA, the Downtown Denver Campus, the University of**
312 **Colorado system, and the Community.** The faculty member must demonstrate
313 sustained service to GSPA, the campus, and the community, and/or relevant
314 analogous experience. Service shall entail but shall not be limited to service
315 contributions on university and GSPA committees, and advice and/or consultation

316 to relevant community and/or public sector groups. Judgments concerning service
317 performance will be guided by an active, demonstrated level of service contribution
318 to at least one internal organization (that may include the School, campus, or
319 university level), and at least one external organization (that may include local,
320 state, national, or international organizations, agencies, institutions, and
321 professional associations and societies).
322

323 **2.4.4. Review for Promotion to Full Professor.** Promotion to Full Professor requires a
324 record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record, since receiving tenure and
325 promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth,
326 development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative activity, and
327 service.

328 The record established following tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must reveal
329 not only continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching , research and service
330 activities, but represent the highest standards of professional performance. Judgments concerning
331 research performance will be guided by the quantity and quality of publications and their
332 significance and impact as a body of scholarly work. More specifically, a significant volume of
333 important books and/or articles published in journals (the contents of which are subject to peer
334 review) or book chapters recognized as contributing to the field of knowledge is essential to
335 promotion to Full Professor. Some of this work should be sole-authored, and preference will be
336 given to candidates who have authored at least one book.

337 Judgments concerning teaching performance will be guided by a sustained record of
338 outstanding course evaluations, strong curriculum development, pedagogical innovations, and
339 distinguished leadership. Judgments concerning service performance will be guided by a
340 significant level of service contributions with demonstrated leadership in a variety of areas, which
341 may include the School, campus, and university as well as contributions to local, state, national,

342 and international organizations, agencies, institutions, and professional associations and societies.
343 In employing standards concomitant with promotion to the highest academic rank conferred, the
344 RTP Committee shall apply the most rigorous criteria to performance outcomes.

345 Application for promotion to full professor will include preparation of a Continuing
346 Professional Development Plan, as described in § 2.4.5. below. A tenured associate professor at
347 GSPA may apply for promotion to full professor at any time; the normative minimum period for
348 such application is five years subsequent to promotion to associate professor.

349

350 **2.4.5. Post-tenure Review and Continuing Professional Development.** In accordance
351 with campus and university policies, tenured professors at GSPA will stand for review every five
352 years, as dated from the professor's most recent promotion. To assist in post-tenure review
353 primary unit committee deliberations, all candidates for post-tenure review will prepare and
354 present to the GSPA RTP Committee a Continuing Professional Development Plan. The plan will
355 include a reflective self-assessment of professional performance since the most recent review in
356 the areas of teaching, research, and service; and a statement of intended future activities in each of
357 these three areas during the upcoming 5-year period. If there has been any discernible decline in
358 performance in any of these areas since the last review, the plan will include a list of specific
359 measures the faculty member will take to restore performance to previous levels. This statement
360 may include a description of institutional support which may be sought to assist in making such
361 improvements. If the faculty member does not perceive a decline in performance to have occurred
362 but the RTP Committee does, in its written evaluation the Committee will recommend measures
363 which might be taken to restore performance.

364 Professors hired with tenure will prepare and present to the chair of the RTP Committee a
365 professional development plan within the first year of their appointment on the GSPA faculty. The
366 plan will contain the same elements as those called for in § 2.4.1. of this document, with the
367 exception that no mentoring relationship need be established.

368

369 **2.4.6. Annual Peer Review.** The Academic Personnel Committee shall, in advising the
370 Dean on the annual performance of GSPA faculty members, adhere to the same criteria and
371 evidence used by the RTP Committee for periodic evaluation, as described elsewhere in this
372 document. The Committee shall use both qualitative and quantitative measures of annual
373 performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

374 During the spring term of the academic year, the RTP Committee (or a representative
375 thereof) will meet individually with each assistant professor and the GSPA faculty member s/he
376 has chosen as a mentor or senior advisor, to review the professor's annual Faculty Report of
377 Professional Activities (hereinafter, "annual report"). The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the
378 faculty members' professional progress as it relates to tenure and promotion.

379 They may consult the faculty member's Professional Development Plan submitted during
380 the first year of appointment to the faculty, and the Annual Endorsement to the plan to assist in
381 providing evaluative recommendations for continued professional development. The RTP
382 Committee or its representative will convey the results of these annual consultations with assistant
383 professors to the RTP chair and the Dean, and will do so prior to the Dean receiving the annual
384 faculty performance evaluations from the Academic Personnel Committee.

385 Annual performance review of tenured faculty will be conducted by the Dean, on advice
386 from the Academic Personnel Committee. Campus and university policies concerning
387 performance ratings and the remedial consequences of substandard ones shall be observed.

388 **2.4.7. Differential Workload.** Unless by prior written agreement between the
389 faculty member being reviewed and the Dean, the standard university practice shall be followed of
390 basing the evaluation of a faculty member's professional performance 40% on research activities,
391 40% on teaching, and 20% on service.

392

393 **3. Structures and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation.**

394 **3.1. Committee Structures and Committee Leadership.** The successful implementation of the
395 criteria and standards described in § 2. above requires decision structures and procedures that the
396 faculty deem to be both fair and capable of achieving an accurate determination in individual
397 cases. The principal structures for this purpose are (1) the GSPA Reappointment, Tenure, and
398 Promotion (RTP) Committee (the "primary unit" committee); (2) the Dean's Review Committee;
399 and (3) the Academic Personnel Committee.

400 The RTP Committee plays two roles: (a) a developmental role with faculty to clarify
401 GSPA expectations and standards and to advise faculty in appropriate methods for meeting those
402 standards; and (b) a judgment role in determining whether tenure and promotion are granted. The
403 Dean's Review Committee determines whether, in its view, the RTP Committee fairly and
404 accurately applied this document's standards to evaluation of a faculty member's record. The
405 Academic Personnel Committee advises the Dean on faculty performance ratings to be made by
406 the Dean, with regard to the contents of faculty members' annual report of professional activities.

407 The RTP Committee Chair will be a tenured full professor on the GSPA faculty, and will
408 be appointed by the Dean, upon a vote of the faculty at the April faculty meeting of the spring term,
409 to serve for the upcoming academic year. The RTP Chair shall serve no more than two
410 consecutive one-year terms. The chair of the Dean’s Review Committee shall be a tenured GSPA
411 faculty member at or above the rank of faculty subject to review. The chair of the Academic
412 Personnel Committee shall be a tenured GSPA faculty member.

413

414 **3.2. Procedures for and Scheduling of Periodic Reviews.**

415 **3.2.1. Office of the Dean.** No later than the end of April, in the spring semester prior to the
416 academic year in which a GSPA faculty member becomes a candidate for periodic review, s/he
417 shall be so informed by the Dean in a letter which also includes a timetable for the review process.
418 To ensure that all faculty scheduled for review in an upcoming academic year are given adequate
419 notice, the Office of the Dean shall maintain a continuously updated database indicating when all
420 tenure-track faculty are scheduled for what form of periodic review, and when.

421 By the end of the academic year preceding the review year, the RTP Committee – in
422 consultation with the Dean and having solicited reviewer suggestions from each candidate for
423 review – shall prepare a list of potential external reviewers for each candidate for review for whom
424 external review is required. By the end of the academic year preceding the review year, the RTP
425 chair will also inform all candidates for periodic review of what materials and supporting
426 documentation they must provide to the RTP Committee, including deadlines for the production of
427 such materials and documentation in the fall of the upcoming academic year. [See Table 3.2.,
428 appended to this document, for a listing of the annual RTP schedule of activities.]

429

430 **3.2.2. Composition of the RTP Committee.** In consultation with all candidates for
431 review in the upcoming academic year and with the Faculty Council, by the end of April of the
432 spring term preceding the upcoming academic year, the Dean will appoint three additional
433 members of the RTP Committee for the year. In confidential consultation with the Dean, the
434 candidate for review may request recusal from participation in the RTP process a faculty member
435 the candidate has reasonable cause to believe would not be capable of fairly evaluating his or her
436 record.

437 Each candidate for review will then recommend to the Dean appointment of a fifth member
438 of the committee for the purpose of that candidate's evaluation. This person may be a member of
439 the GSPA faculty (at or above the level of review being applied for), or may be a member of
440 another School or department on campus or elsewhere in the university system (at or above the
441 level of review being applied for) who has subject matter expertise in one or more subject areas in
442 which the candidate has declared competency for review purposes. The level of scholarly
443 achievement of an external appointee shall be commensurate with that of a GSPA faculty member;
444 and such appointments are subject to the approval both of the Dean and the chair of the RTP
445 Committee.

446 The RTP Chair will assist the candidate in the preparation of materials for pre-meeting
447 committee review. For purposes of comprehensive pre-tenure review, review for promotion to
448 associate professor with tenure, and promotion to professor, external evaluations of the candidate
449 shall be obtained by the RTP Committee, the number of external reviewers being not less than the
450 minimum required for such review by Denver campus and CU system guidelines. Additional
451 letters may be sought at the RTP Committee's discretion.

452 External reviewers will be selected by the RTP Committee. For the purposes of
453 comprehensive review, one such reviewer shall be chosen from a list of not less than four names
454 submitted to the RTP chair by the candidate for review. For the purposes of application for
455 promotion to associate professor with tenure, the applicant shall submit a list of no less than six
456 possible external reviewers, from which two shall be chosen. The identities of external reviewers
457 shall not be disclosed to the candidate for review.

458 To the extent legally permissible, the identities of all reviewers will be held in confidence
459 by the committee. The committee will review the candidate's materials as presented in keeping
460 with the criteria, evidence, and standards described in § 2 of this document, and will then vote a
461 recommendation on the candidate's record to the Dean. Deliberations conducted by the RTP
462 Committee, all correspondence between Committee members regarding the capabilities of
463 candidates for review, and all external evaluations obtained by the Committee in support of those
464 deliberations are of a confidential nature; and campus policies and procedures regarding the
465 handling of confidential personnel material shall apply.

466 For the purpose of post-tenure review and in consultation with candidates for such review
467 and the RTP Chair, the Dean will adjust the membership of the RTP Committee to ensure that all
468 members are at or above the rank of the candidate for review. In some instances (and in
469 consultation with the candidate and the RTP Chair), this may include senior faculty external to the
470 School, which it shall be the prerogative of the faculty member being reviewed to nominate,
471 appointment subject to the assent of the Dean and Chair of the RTP Committee.

472 For the purpose of reviewing applications for promotion to associate professor with tenure,
473 the RTP chair and the Dean will invite all tenured GSPA faculty members who wish to do so to
474 participate in advising the RTP Committee on the tenure decision. Tenured faculty participating in

475 this regard will be organized into subcommittees to review and evaluate, respectively, the
476 applicant for promotion's teaching, research, and service records. Upon such review and
477 evaluation, these advisory subcommittees will then advise the RTP Committee as to whether – in
478 their view – the applicant's record meets the standards for promotion set forth in this document.
479 The RTP Committee will take notice of these subcommittee reports in crafting its recommendation
480 to the Dean on the application for promotion.

481
482 **3.2.3. Dean's Review Committee.** In consultation with the Faculty Council, at the
483 beginning of the academic year the Dean will also appoint a Dean's Review Committee, at least
484 one member of which shall be from outside the school. This committee will review all
485 recommendations made to the Dean by the RTP Committee, to assure that such recommendations
486 were made fairly and accurately (i.e., in keeping with § 2 of this document). Any appeal submitted
487 by a candidate to the Dean of a letter of recommendation made by the RTP Committee will be
488 referred to the Dean's Review Committee. The Dean's Review Committee will limit its
489 consideration on individual cases to the question of whether the RTP Committee's
490 recommendation was arrived at fairly and accurately, and will thus not conduct a *de novo* review
491 of each case. At its discretion, the Dean's Review Committee may consult with faculty elsewhere
492 on campus in making this determination, either on its own initiative or at the request of a candidate
493 for review.

494
495 **3.2.4. Final Action.** The Dean's Review Committee will report to the Dean on each case
496 forwarded to it, either upholding the RTP Committee's decision or recommending other action. If
497 the recommendations of the Dean's Review Committee differ with those of the RTP Committee,

498 the case shall be remanded to the RTP Committee for reconsideration and resubmission of
499 recommendations to the Dean’s Review Committee. Final action on all academic personnel
500 matters in the Graduate School of Public Affairs rests with the Dean of the School.

501
502 **3.2.5. Academic Personnel Committee.** Upon recommendation of the Faculty Council,
503 the Dean shall also annually appoint a three-member Academic Personnel Committee, one
504 member of which will also be one of the four standing members of the RTP Committee. The
505 primary purpose of the Academic Personnel Committee will be to perform the peer review
506 function of the annual faculty performance evaluation process. The Academic Personnel
507 Committee shall include one assistant professor, one associate professor, and one full professor.

508
509 **3.3. Annual Performance Review.** University policy requires that annual performance review,
510 conducted both for the purpose of assuring continuous faculty accountability and to provide a basis
511 for decisions on salary adjustments, include peer review of faculty performance. To implement
512 this policy, the Academic Personnel Committee will conduct annual peer review of faculty
513 performance, in keeping with § 2.4.6. of this document and using evaluation procedures
514 recommended by the Faculty Council. The Committee will report its performance assessment of
515 all full-time GSPA faculty members to the Dean in a form usable for the computation of salary
516 adjustments, but will not make specific salary recommendations.

517 Annual peer review of faculty performance is to be coordinated between the Academic
518 Personnel Committee (APC), which provides performance assessments to the Dean for purposes
519 of salary adjustment; and the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, which is to work

520 with the APC to ensure that all faculty members receive annual evaluations consistent with the
521 standards for periodic review.

522

523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567

Table 3.2.

Annual Schedule for RTP Activities

<i>Date</i>	<i>Action</i>
January	1. Candidates for post-tenure review prepare dossiers, submit to Dean's office by start of Spring semester.
February-March	1. RTP Committee conducts post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty scheduled for such review; reports recommendations to Dean.
April	1. RTP Committee or representative thereof meets with all pre-tenure faculty to discuss relationship between annual report of professional activities and professional plan; fashion work plan or amend professional plan if divergences are discovered. 2. Dean's office identifies all faculty due for periodic review (pre-tenure comprehensive review, review for tenure and promotion, post-tenure review, and review for promotion to professor) and so informs them in writing. 3. Faculty Council and Dean choose RTP chair for upcoming academic year. 4. Dean appoints RTP Committee for upcoming academic year.
April-May	1. In consultation with RTP Committee members and candidates for review, RTP Chair identifies and solicits agreement to participate of external reviewers. 2. RTP Chair transmits to candidates for review (1) latest instructions from UCDHSC-DDC administration regarding procedures for review and contents of dossiers, and (2) GSPA RTP Policies and Procedures; offers counsel regarding compliance.
May-August	Candidates for review compile dossiers and supporting documentation; submit materials to Dean's office by start of Fall semester.

568	August	RTP Chair transmits candidates for review's (1) teaching,
569		research, and service essays and (2) research dossiers and
570		supporting documentation to external reviewers.
571		
572	September	External reviewers evaluate candidates' materials, transmit
573		review letters to RTP Chair.
574		
575	October-November	RTP Committee evaluates completed files of candidates for
576		review, reports recommendations to the Dean.
577		
578	November	Dean's Review Committee reviews reports of RTP
579		Committee, makes recommendations to the Dean.
580		
581	November-December	Dean prepares letters of recommendation to UCDHSC
582		Chancellor.
583		