

College Criteria for Comprehensive Review, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty

College of Engineering and Applied Science
University of Colorado Boulder
June 16, 2023

The following sections of [Regent Policy 5](#) provide the basis for this document. The University of Colorado Board of Regents set the *standards* for earning reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and is ultimately responsible for awarding tenure. Primary academic units set the *criteria* for meeting the university standards. College criteria are advisory to the primary units and provide consistency across the College of Engineering and Applied Science.

Regent Standards for Tenure (Policy 5 Section 5.D.2) [excerpts]

- 1) As stated in [Regent Policy 5 Section D: Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#), Section 5.D.2(A) states that “Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (to the university, profession and/or public); and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work.”
- 2) Section 5.D.2(B) states that “A recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution. A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.”

Primary Unit Criteria for Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion (Policy 5 Section 5.D.3) [quoted]

- (A) Primary units develop criteria that define the teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service expectations for faculty, such as expectations for publications, grants for scholarly/creative work, measures of clinical excellence, etc., in terms of their scholarly field(s). These primary unit criteria are reviewed for rigor, fairness, and consistency with regent requirements and are not effective until approved by the dean and provost. In those cases where the primary unit has requested and received Board of Regents approval of specific alternative or additional criteria, those criteria shall be applied in appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.
 - (1) If new or revised primary unit criteria have been adopted during a faculty member’s tenure probationary period, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated for tenure based on the new criteria or the criteria in place at the time of appointment. When a faculty member is evaluated for promotion to full professor, the current primary unit criteria shall apply. See the corresponding administrative policy statement ([APS 1022](#)).
- (B) The merit of the candidate is the only consideration in recommendations for awarding tenure. The program requirements of the primary unit shall be considered only at the time of appointment and reappointment.
- (C) To be promoted to the rank of Professor (also referred to as “Full Professor”), an individual should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and:
 - (1) A record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; and
 - (2) A record of significant contribution to graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and

- (3) A record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service.” [Regent Policy 5.D.3.(C)]

Additional Guidance

Regent Policy 5, Section 5.C.2(E) states that “The process leading to the award of tenure is an evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative performance and is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual performance evaluation.”

CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) [1022](#) Section VII C. specifies that “For cases involving reappointment at comprehensive review, faculty and review committees at each level of review vote on whether the candidate is either: (1) on track for tenure; (2) not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or (3) not on track for tenure.” However, Boulder campus practice is to seek a determination based on a single vote on the question of whether the candidate is on track to meet tenure standards at the time of tenure review.

CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) [1022](#) Section IX discusses post-tenure review (PTR).

- A. Post-tenure review (PTR) is a summative evaluation over a five-year review period. The purposes of PTR are to facilitate continued faculty development and to ensure professional accountability to the university community, the Board of Regents, and the public.
- B. Each campus shall have procedures for appropriate peer evaluation during PTR and for appeals of the PTR evaluation. Primary units shall have written guidelines that conform to the campus procedures and this APS.

The College expectation is that faculty will demonstrate continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service after they are awarded tenure. The specific criteria for meeting expectations during PTR are set by the primary unit.

A. College of Engineering & Applied Science Criteria for Reappointment

Per CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) [1022](#), the outcome of comprehensive review for reappointment is a determination of “whether the candidate is either: (1) on track for tenure; (2) not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections; or (3) not on track for tenure.” The college defines the criterion for reappointment as whether the candidate is on track to meet the excellence standard in teaching and/or scholarly/creative work as shown in the tenure section below.

Specifically, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of the development of an independent, innovative, and high-impact research career that will have an impact beyond the institution. An independent research program is defined as one that includes intellectual contributions that go beyond the work conducted with the candidate’s doctoral and (if applicable) post-doctoral advisor(s) and mentors. Dissemination of work is expected, can vary by discipline and subdiscipline, and consequently can take forms including, for example, peer-reviewed scholarly journal or journal-equivalent conference papers, books, book chapters, monographs, peer-reviewed conference papers, scientific/technical reports, software, datasets, publicly available technical, provisional, and awarded patents, other entrepreneurial activities, or direct impact on government policy and/or professional practice. The candidate’s graduate student advisees and co-advisees are involved in research and are on track to be co-authors or lead authors on multiple publications. The candidate is working on problems recognized as significant by experts in the field. The candidate’s scholarly/creative work shows considerable evidence of innovation, broader impact, and growth. The candidate is on track to have sufficient external funding to support their research, mentoring of students, and research-related activities at a level that would be considered a vigorous research program as defined by the candidate’s unit. External funding at the time of tenure evaluation typically includes grants on which the candidate is PI or co-PI.

Regarding teaching, the candidate must be teaching courses following specific unit processes and expectations (e.g., a mixture of undergraduate and graduate courses of assorted sizes). In terms of the Teaching Quality Framework (TQF) rubric, the candidate must show progress towards becoming an effective teacher, as demonstrated by proficiency levels of at least basic (or the unit equivalent) for all dimensions using the TQF rubric for each unit. See the Teaching Evaluation section below for more details. Also, note that TQF framework rubrics may vary across primary units but must follow the principles laid out in this document. In cases where the candidate has struggled or has weaknesses in the classroom or mentoring research trainees, efforts must be underway to improve the candidate’s performance by involving mentors, the [Center for Teaching and Learning](#), or other appropriate internal or external support structures. Those efforts should be documented and discussed in the candidate’s teaching statement and/or report from the primary unit.

Lastly, the candidate must be actively providing internal or external service to at least one level of their professional community (e.g., program, department, institute, college, campus, professional organization, etc.).

B. College of Engineering & Applied Science Criteria for Tenure

In the following sections, the College of Engineering and Applied Science (CEAS) expectations are outlined for ratings of *meritorious* and *excellent* in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service/leadership. In all cases, a clear rationale for a specific action (i.e., excellence rating) must be provided in the dossier, via the candidate statements, and the report from the primary unit. Per **Regent Policy 5 Section 5.D.2.(B)**, “A recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution. A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.”

1. Evaluation of Teaching

The college uses seven dimensions to evaluate candidates’ teaching performance for reappointment, tenure, and promotion actions. These dimensions are part of the Teaching Quality Framework (TQF) that was developed jointly with input from all college units. These dimensions tie to specific criteria as described in rubrics developed by the college and units. An example of the rubric is shown [here](#), although units can have unique rubrics. These dimensions include (1) course goals and alignment; (2) course preparation; (3) teaching methods and practices; (4) presentation; (5) student outcomes; (6) mentorship/advising; and (7) professional reflection and development. There are opportunities to consider inclusive and equity-based practices throughout the TQF criteria. Unit TQF rubrics and criteria may vary slightly but are expected to cover similar content as these dimensions.

To meet the criteria for a “meritorious” rating for promotion and tenure, candidates must show evidence of sustained high-quality educational practice, typically, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In the context of the TQF dimensions described above, a rating of “meritorious” could be indicated by demonstrated proficiency levels of at least basic (or the unit equivalent) for all dimensions used in their unit’s TQF rubric. Note that any significant deficiency in any of the dimensions could result in a rating of “not meritorious”, depending on the severity of the deficiency. (See the [Professional Rights and Responsibilities](#) document Part II A.2. for examples of unacceptable conduct.) The candidate must be active and effective in research mentoring and supervision for all levels undertaken (e.g., primarily PhD students, but also undergraduate students, MS students, and post-doctoral researchers as appropriate). Candidates must show evidence of an active PhD student cohort at varying stages of progression toward graduation. Candidates are expected to demonstrate effective mentoring of doctoral students, primarily, unless individual circumstances can be shown to require a different emphasis (e.g., as could be the case for some candidates being hired with tenure from an institution without a significant doctoral program). Being an effective mentor means providing rigorous training, supporting their professional development as a researcher, and facilitating their engagement with their scholarly community. Evidence of training can vary and depends on subfield-specific scholarship and collaboration norms, as explained by the candidate’s Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC), but typically involves coauthored scholarly contributions, student presentations of research at professional meetings, and graduation.

To meet the expectations for an “excellent” rating for promotion and tenure, the candidate must meet all the criteria described above for a “meritorious” rating and demonstrate in the context of the TQF that they are teaching at an advanced level with demonstrated impact beyond their classroom (e.g., as indicated by demonstrating proficiency level ratings of at least intermediate/professional in all dimensions of the unit specific TQF rubric). In addition, per **Regent Policy 5 Section 5.D.2.(B)**, the candidate must demonstrate “achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level that furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond [the candidate’s] immediate instructional setting.”

2. Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Work

The college expectations for scholarly/creative work include that the candidate establishes an independent research program that is addressing significant issues with noticeable impact beyond the institution. An independent research program is defined as one that includes intellectual contributions that go beyond the work conducted with the candidate's doctoral and (if applicable) post-doctoral advisor(s) and mentors. Dissemination of work is expected, can vary by discipline and subdiscipline, and consequently can take forms including, for example, peer-reviewed scholarly journal or journal-equivalent conference papers, books, book chapters, monographs, peer-reviewed conference papers, scientific/technical reports, software, datasets, publicly available technical, provisional, and awarded patents, other entrepreneurial activities, or direct impact on government policy and/or professional practice. The support of postdoctoral researchers, as well as MS and BS students is valued, but the primary expectation is that the candidate's emphasis should be on advising and mentoring PhD students. The college has no specific expectations for external funding level (or expenditures from external sources), as funding can vary significantly between disciplines; however, a candidate must have sufficient external funding to support their research, mentoring of students, and research-related activities. The funding can come from sources such as federal agencies, private foundations, or industry with the faculty member typically serving as principal investigator (PI) or a co-PI. A primary focus in all areas is to show innovation and impact beyond the institution through scholarly/creative work as per the **Regent Policy 5 Section 5.D.2.(B)** standard that requires "A recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution."

To meet the criteria for a "meritorious" rating at promotion and tenure, candidates must show that their scholarly/creative work is disseminated in any discipline-specific appropriate manner (as listed previously), although not necessarily in the top venues within their field. The rate of publication is close to or below the candidate's peers (both internal and external) at the same career stage. Graduate students are involved in research, primarily as co-authors. The candidate is developing a notable scholarly reputation at other universities and/or in industry. The candidate's scholarly/creative work shows modest or limited evidence of innovation and broader impact, and/or may not show evidence of being independent of their doctoral or postdoctoral (if applicable) training. The candidate has applied for and may have received external funding, but not at a level sufficient to support a research group of an appropriate size necessary to maintain a vigorous research program as defined by their unit.

To meet the criteria for an "excellent" rating for promotion and tenure, the candidate demonstrates evidence of independent, innovative, and high-impact scholarly/creative work through the dissemination of their work in the top venues within their field, as clearly defined by their primary unit and based on their discipline/subdiscipline. The rate of publication compares favorably to the candidate's peers (internal and external) at the same career stage. Graduate students are involved in research and have appeared as authors (including as lead authors, as appropriate) on multiple publications. The candidate is working on problems recognized as significant by experts in the field and has developed a scholarly reputation at other universities and/or in industry. Recognized authorities outside the University acknowledge the candidate's national and international reputation and innovative contributions to scholarly accomplishment, and the candidate may have received internal and/or external awards related to scholarly work. The candidate possesses a reputation of primary association with a particular achievement or subject, providing compelling evidence of research leadership. The candidate's scholarly/creative work shows considerable evidence of innovation, broader impact, and sustained growth which can include entrepreneurship activities (such as patents), and/or policy that could guide industry or governmental efforts. The candidate has a sustained research program supported in part by external funding, including grants on which they are PI, and can support a vigorous research program as defined by their unit.

3. Evaluation of Leadership and Service

The evaluation of leadership and service is focused on overall contributions to the candidate's program, department, institute, college, campus, and/or professional organization(s) in the form of semester or year-long formal and informal activities that directly support our collective teaching and research missions. Standard forms of internal service are typically committee work, faculty peer mentoring, and significant administrative and/or leadership roles. Internal service also includes serving as a member of or chairing an ad hoc committee including faculty search committees. External service contributions take the form of service to scholarly communities through formal and informal activities that directly support that community's educational or scholarly/creative activities. Other common forms of external service focus on reviewing papers and proposals either as an ad hoc reviewer or a member of a program committee or other formal panel; helping to organize or leading a professional meeting, workshop, symposia, or conference; serving a professional society; or participating in outreach to the public (i.e., local, state, national, or international). Per **Regent Policy 5 Section 5.D.2.(A)**, a candidate's leadership and service performance must be at least "meritorious".

To meet the criteria for a "meritorious" rating at the time of promotion and tenure review, the candidate must have served on one or more departmental committees and may be involved in college-level or campus committees, primarily as a participant. The candidate may have held some leadership responsibilities within the department (or program or institute), for example, leading a graduate student recruiting committee or organizing a departmental seminar series. The candidate actively participates in department functions including faculty hiring processes, voting (as appropriate), mentoring other faculty within their department, and attending department meetings. The candidate actively participates in activities intended to broaden inclusion in their department/unit. The candidate participates in external professional activities intended to promote their field's development. Activities may include, for example, chairing sessions at conferences, workshops, and/or symposia; serving on program boards or review panels; reviewing papers and proposals; and/or professional activities, with a focus on broadening the participation of underrepresented and non-traditional groups in science and engineering. Outreach efforts to broaden participation in science and engineering are encouraged.

To meet the criteria for an "excellent" rating typically requires substantial leadership positions and/or significant impact in the department, institute, college, campus, or society. Given that a rating of "excellent" in leadership and service is neither required nor sufficient for tenure, candidates are encouraged to focus on achieving a rating of "excellent" in creative/scholarly work and/or teaching instead.

C. College of Engineering & Applied Science Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

In the following sections, the College of Engineering and Applied Science (CEAS) expectations are outlined for promotion to full professor. **Regent Policy 5.D.3.(C) states the standard**, “To be promoted to the rank of Professor (also referred to as ‘Full Professor’), an individual should have: A record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and a record since receiving tenure or promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service.”

The evaluation for promotion to full professor encompasses the candidate’s whole record (as opposed to the record solely during the tenure probationary period, as is the case for promotion and tenure review). Note that overall excellence does not require an individual evaluation of each component as is the case for tenure.

1. A Record of Significant Contribution to Education

The college expects candidates for promotion to full professor to have shown commitment to undergraduate and graduate education, including efforts toward continuous improvement. The college expects candidates at this stage to meet at least some of the criteria described above for excellence in teaching during tenure review. In terms of the TQF rubric, the college expects that the candidate has achieved at least basic proficiency levels, with occasional professional and advanced proficiency in some criteria using their unit’s TQF rubric. The candidate must continue to be active and effective in PhD research mentoring and supervision, and in MS and undergraduate student and postdoctoral research mentoring if that is expected by their unit. Candidates must show evidence of an active PhD student cohort at varying stages of progression toward graduation. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to have graduated multiple PhD students over their academic career.

2. A Record of Significant Contribution to Creative/Scholarly Work

The college expects that candidates at this stage continue to meet the same criteria as what is described above for excellence in scholarly/creative works during tenure review. Specifically, the candidate continues to disseminate their work in venues appropriate for their discipline and subdiscipline as described above for tenure. The candidate’s graduate students are involved in research and have appeared as authors on multiple publications since tenure. The candidate is working on problems recognized as significant by experts in the field and has maintained a scholarly reputation of leadership. Recognized authorities outside the University acknowledge the candidate’s national and international reputation and innovative contributions in scholarly accomplishment, and the candidate may have received both internal and external awards related to research. The candidate possesses a reputation of primary association with a particular achievement or subject, providing compelling evidence of scholarly leadership. The candidate’s scholarly/creative work shows considerable evidence of innovation, broader impact, and sustained growth, which can include entrepreneurship activities (such as patents) and/or direct impact on government policy and/or professional practice. The candidate has a sustained research program fully supported by external funding including grants on which they are PI and is supporting a vigorous research program as defined by their unit, including funding their PhD students through graduation.

3. A Record of Significant Leadership and Service

The college expects that candidates for promotion to full professor have taken on substantial leadership positions and/or demonstrated significant impact in the department, institute, college, campus, professional organization, or society.

4. Substantial, Significant, and Continued Growth Since Tenure

The college expects that candidates for promotion to full professor have demonstrated substantial, significant, and continued growth since tenure in all aspects of their professional endeavors. At this stage, the college expects that candidates would have continued or increased the rate and/or breadth of dissemination of their scholarly work; maintained a history of effective student and, possibly, faculty peer mentoring; and have been involved in leadership and service activities at multiple levels as appropriate, etc.