



Campus Administrative Policy

Policy Title: Faculty Annual Performance Review

Policy Number: 1028A Functional Area: Academic and Faculty Affairs

Effective: November 6, 2024

Approved by: Roderick Nairn, PhD
Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Applies to: CU Anschutz

A. Introduction

This policy establishes the requirements for the annual performance review of CU Anschutz faculty members. These requirements are consistent with Regent Policy 5.C.5 and CU System Administrative Policy (APS) 5008: Faculty Performance Evaluation.

B. Policy Statement

1. The schools, college and library on the CU Anschutz Medical Campus are responsible for ensuring annual performance reviews are conducted for all faculty, with the exceptions noted in section B.2.
2. Part-time and volunteer faculty with titles in the Clinical Track or lecturer or adjunct titles are not required to undergo annual performance reviews nor follow the review procedures outlined in this policy. However, the schools, college and library are expected to evaluate the contributions of these faculty on a regular basis and meet the relevant faculty evaluation requirements imposed by specialized accreditors.

3. Per Regent Policy 5.C.4(B), faculty shall be evaluated based on written performance standards developed by the faculty of the academic unit and any additional written expectations agreed to by the faculty member and the unit.

C. Annual performance Review Process

1. The annual merit evaluation matrix must align with a faculty member's assigned workload. Per APS 5008, a description of the annual performance evaluation process and the criteria to be used must be available, in writing, to each faculty member.
2. Each faculty member is expected to complete a report of professional activities to receive a full review and consideration of their work across all areas of assigned responsibility.
3. Each faculty member must be assigned an overall performance rating ranging from 1 (fails to meet expectations) to 5 (outstanding). See APS 5008.
 - a. The performance rating form is subject to disclosure under the Colorado Open Records Act.
 - b. Any written justification for the annual performance rating will not be disclosed to anyone other than the employee and university personnel with a demonstrated business need. Human resources offices are responsible for approving such access.
4. Per APS 5008, the faculty member must sign the rating form. A signature indicates the rating has been discussed with the faculty member and does not imply the faculty member agrees with the rating. The faculty member must be provided with a copy of the signed form. The process for appealing a rating is stated in section D.

D. Appeal Procedures

1. APS 5008 allows for faculty members who do not agree with their annual performance rating to request a peer review of their

annual performance record using the established primary unit process or a specific written process developed by the unit for this purpose.

2. The review process should be completed within six weeks or less from the date it is initiated by the faculty member, and no action will be taken to begin a Performance Improvement Agreement (see Section E) until this review process, if invoked, is completed.

E. Procedures to be Followed in the Event of Unsatisfactory Performance

1. Per APS 5008, a tenured or tenure-track/tenure-eligible faculty member who receives an annual performance rating of “below expectations” or “fails to meet expectations” (a 1 or 2 on the five-point scale) must participate in developing and implementing a performance improvement agreement (PIA). See APS 5008 for more information.
2. Per APS 5008, if a faculty member fails to meet the goals of PIA, or faculty member establishes a pattern of unsatisfactory performance, as evidenced by two evaluations of performance “below expectations” or “failing to meet expectations” in a five-year period, an extensive review must be conducted. This process includes designing a development plan. See APS 5008 for more information.
3. When a PIA or extensive review is required, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs will serve as an advisor or assign an appropriate advisor. The advisor will provide guidance to the faculty member and primary unit on best practices, models or templates for PIAs and development plans, benchmarks, and timelines. (See Appendix A: “Suggested Template for Performance Improvement Agreements and Development Plans.” This may be modified as appropriate.)
4. A faculty member who refuses to participate in developing and implementing a performance improvement agreement or participating in an extensive review process is subject to sanctions for neglect of duty.
5. Sanctions may also be imposed on faculty members who fail to meet

goals established in a PIA and/or development plan. In such cases, the dean of the faculty member's college or school shall refer the case to the appropriate faculty committee (e.g. personnel committee), which will review the materials submitted by the department and the faculty member. After a thorough review of all pertinent documents, the committee shall forward its findings, including any recommended sanctions, to the executive vice chancellor for academic and student affairs and chancellor. The chair and dean may be asked to provide input regarding potential sanctions. The chancellor makes the final decision regarding sanctions.

F. Appointment Status and annual Performance Evaluations

1. Strong annual performance review evaluations are not guarantees of continued employment.
2. Continuation of an at-will appointment or reappointment to/renewal of a limited (term) appointment depends upon the needs of the academic unit and resource availability, as well as satisfactory performance.
3. A performance improvement agreement or development plan does not alter the terms of appointment as stated in the letter of offer, including requirements for notice of nonrenewal.

Notes

1. History:

- April 5, 2008: Adopted by the Provost.
- January 1, 2012: Updated and amended.
- May 15, 2018: Format modified to reflect a 2018 Campus-wide effort to recast and revitalize various Campus policy sites into a standardized and more coherent set of chaptered policy statement organized around the several operational divisions of the university.
- December 21, 2018: Renewed, minimal changes. Approved by Chancellor.
- November 6, 2024: Policy 1028 was recast into separate policies for CU Anschutz (1028A) and CU Denver (1028D). 1028A was further revised to apply to all faculty (previous versions excluded tenured and tenure-track faculty) and provide additional information on review procedures.

2. Cross References/Appendix:

- [Regent Policy 5.C](#)
- CU System [Administrative Policy Statement 5008: Faculty Performance Evaluation](#)

3. Responsible Office: Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

Appendix A: Suggested Template for a Performance Improvement Agreement

Name:

Division Chief:

Dept. Chair:

Department:

School/College/Library:

Date:

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

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

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

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

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

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

- IV. Timeframe for the PIA/Development Plan:

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

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

VI. Signatures:

Faculty Member Date

Head of Primary Unit or College Personnel Review Committee Date

Dean Date