



University of Colorado
Anschutz Medical Campus

School of Medicine

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE FACULTY POLICY

Effective: March 1, 2014; Revised: March 1, 2022

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 (the 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 the individual *performance rating*. The performance rating is the overall, numerical (1-5) summary of the faculty member's performance; the numeric performance rating, but not the substantive and supporting narratives and summaries, constitute the public record, which is subject to disclosure in accordance with the Colorado Open Records Act.

APS 5008 provides that "faculty members, except those on leave, must provide written evidence of their annual performance, using an appropriate format for reporting scholarly and other activities...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." The next section of this memorandum outlines the SOM appeals process, which is in addition to any appeals procedure provided by an individual department, division or section.

Appeal Process for the School of Medicine

1. A faculty member who disagrees with their assigned performance rating and wishes to appeal shall notify, in writing, the department chair and the Dean of the School of Medicine. The faculty member must notify the department chair and the Dean within 5 business days after receiving notice of the performance rating assigned by the department chair or the chair's designee.
2. The department chair and faculty member shall meet, in order to review the reasons why the chair selected a "below expectations" or "failed to meet expectations" rating and the reasons why the faculty member feels the rating is mistaken, in an attempt to resolve their differences. This constitutes the first step in the appeal process. This meeting must take place within 7 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 the performance rating is not accurate; the faculty

member shall submit this document to the Dean of the School of Medicine (or the Dean's designee). The faculty member must submit this written statement within 7 business days after meeting with their chair.

4. The Dean shall forward the faculty member's written appeal to the department chair. The department chair shall respond, in writing, within 7 business days. The Dean (or designee) 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.

