



FACULTY PERFORMANCE RATING APPEAL POLICY

Background

Consistent with Regent laws and policies and Administrative Policy Statement [APS 5008](#) (Faculty Performance Evaluation, January 1, 2021), the performance of all faculty members will be evaluated and rated annually.

The narrative performance evaluation (a substantive, written evaluation conducted using PRiSM) provides the basis for merit and other pay adjustments, although additional factors may be used in setting final compensation. The narrative performance evaluation also provides the basis for an individual *performance rating*. The performance rating is the numerical (1-5) summary of the faculty member's overall performance; this numeric performance rating constitutes the public record, which is subject to disclosure in accordance with the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA). The supporting narratives, summaries, and additional reviewer comments are part of a faculty member's personnel file and are confidential.

APS 5008 provides that "faculty members, except those on leave, must provide written evidence of their annual performance... Faculty members who fail to provide such evidence will be evaluated as below expectations." Further, "failure to provide the annual performance report will be viewed as neglect of duty and will be the basis for disciplinary action."

APS 5008 provides that a faculty member who receives a rating of "below expectations" or "fails to meet expectations" must participate in developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA). Additionally, a faculty member "has the right to append a response to the annual performance rating [in PRiSM] if they so desire."

APS 5008 provides that "Faculty members who believe that the [department's] evaluation is mistaken may appeal the rating through established grievance procedures in the college or school." This appeal 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 PIA until this appeal process, if invoked, is completed.

Appeal Process for the School of Medicine

1. A faculty member who disagrees with their assigned performance rating of "below expectations" or "fails to meet expectations" and wishes to appeal shall indicate such when signing their PRiSM review, or by informing the Office for Faculty Affairs (OFA) via email (som.ofa@cuanschutz.edu) within 5 business days of receiving their rating. The faculty member will then receive an email from the OFA to provide guidance and assist in the process and outline available options. They will be required to confirm their intent to appeal in writing to the department chair and OFA within 10 business days after receiving the email.
2. The department chair and faculty member shall meet, in order to review the reasons why the chair selected a "below expectations" or "fails to meet expectations" rating and the reasons why the faculty member feels the rating is mistaken, in an attempt to resolve their differences. This meeting must take place within 10 business days after the chair is notified of the faculty member's intent to appeal.
3. If the chair and faculty member cannot reach an agreement on the performance rating, then the faculty member shall prepare a written statement, outlining why they believe the performance rating is not

accurate and shall submit this document to the OFA. The faculty member must submit this written statement within 5 business days after meeting with their chair.

4. The OFA shall forward the faculty member's written appeal to the department chair, who shall respond, in writing, within 10 business days. The OFA shall provide a copy of the department chair's response to the faculty member.
5. Once the Dean (or designee) has reviewed the written statements of the faculty member and the chair, the Dean may: a) Ask that the faculty member and department chair meet again to reconsider their positions regarding the performance rating; b) Decide in favor of the faculty member or the department chair; or c) Submit both documents to an ad hoc committee, which shall review the documents and make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean shall uphold the chair's decision, unless there is clear evidence that the chair failed to consider all relevant information, failed to follow departmental and School of Medicine policies, or that the performance rating assigned to the faculty member was biased or arbitrary.
6. Once the Dean has issued a final decision, if it is in favor of the department chair, a PIA must be developed and implemented in accordance with SOM procedures. If the final decision is in favor of the faculty member, the performance rating in PRISM must be changed and the chair and faculty member must sign the finalized annual evaluation.