



Comprehensive Review, Promotion, and Tenure Review Information Packet

| Contents: | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Frequently Asked Questions | 2 |
| 2. Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee and Dossier Information | 4 |
| 3. CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 1022: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review | 9 |
| 4. Board of Regents Policy 5.D.: Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion | 22 |

Frequently Asked Questions: Comprehensive Review, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews

When Do Comprehensive Reviews, Promotion, or Tenure Reviews (CRPT) Happen?

- **Comprehensive Review:** After three years of service, during the fourth year
- **Tenure Review:** After six years of service, during the seventh year
- **Promotion to Full:** Post-tenure, when the candidate has “1. a record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; 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.” ¹

What Should I Do to Prepare for My Review?

- Review department bylaws (i.e., CRPT guidelines)
- Review college/school guidelines for CRPT
- Review CU Boulder policies
- Review CU System policies (“administrative policy statement”) and Board of Regents laws and policies
- In the semester prior to the review, meet with chair/dean to discuss unit process and plan for the first level of review
- Know academic unit and office of faculty affairs deadlines
- Put together candidate’s portion of dossier:
 - CV
 - Statements on scholarly and creative work, teaching or librarianship, leadership and service
 - Multiple means of teaching evaluation (at least 3)
 - Scholarly/creative work samples (typically 3; e.g. publications, artwork, videos, recordings, multimedia, etc.)
 - Provide suggestions for external reviewers to chair/PUEC (for tenure/promotion; at least 6 needed, total)

What Does the Review Process Look Like?

- The “Levels of Review:”
 - First level: Academic unit
 - As applicable—department/program, college/school, dean’s advisory committee, dean
 - Second level: Boulder campus
 - Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee
 - Provost
 - Chancellor
 - Third level: CU System (for tenure only)
 - President
 - Board of Regents

What Is the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee?

- A key body for peer review and faculty governance. More specifically:
 - The role of the VCAC includes reviewing hire with tenure, comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion cases forwarded to it by the deans of the multiple colleges and schools. Its deliberations result in a vote, which is reported in the form of a recommendation to the provost.
- Membership: approximately 16 full professors representing many academic units across campus; serve 3-year terms, members selected by Provost (usually in consultation with deans and Boulder Faculty Assembly)

¹ CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 1022.

- VCAC members are selected in large part based upon their national reputation in their discipline, and because of their broad understanding of the standards and practices of public research universities
- Provost is *ex officio* member
- Chaired by neutral, non-voting member (i.e., Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs)
- VCAC usually meets weekly during the spring term.

How Is Each Review Distinct?

- Similar processes
- Tenure and Promotion reviews include external reviewers as well
- Candidates need to demonstrate that they have met the standards for research/scholarship/creative work, teaching/librarianship, and service/leadership: i.e., the standards for “excellence” in either scholarly and creative work or teaching; at least “meritorious” in the other, and “meritorious” in leadership and service

| | Comprehensive Review | Tenure Review | Promotion to Full Review |
|------------------|------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Mandatory Timing | • During year 4 | • During year 7 | • Not mandatory |
| Standard | • On track toward tenure | • “Excellent” in Scholarly and Creative Work or Teaching/Librarianship, “Meritorious” in the other 2 categories | • Excellent as a whole |
| Dossier | • No external letters needed | • Minimum of 6 external letters | • Minimum of 6 external letters |

What Resources Are There for Faculty?

- The Office of Faculty Affairs
<https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/career-milestones/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure>
- Leadership Education for Advancement and Promotion (LEAP)
<https://www.colorado.edu/fds/leadership-development/leadership-education-advancement-and-promotion>
- Faculty Relations
<https://www.colorado.edu/facultyrelations/>
- Boulder Faculty Assembly
<https://www.colorado.edu/bfa/>
- Center for Teaching and Learning
<https://www.colorado.edu/center/teaching-learning/>
- Ombuds Office
<https://www.colorado.edu/ombuds/>
- Faculty-Staff Assistance Program
<https://www.colorado.edu/fsap>
- Employee Services (HR and Benefits)
<https://www.cu.edu/employee-services>
- CU Board of Regents Laws and Policies
<https://www.cu.edu/regents/regent-laws>
<https://www.cu.edu/regents/regent-policy-0>
- Regent Law, Article 5 regarding Faculty:
<https://www.cu.edu/regents/laws-and-policies/regent-laws/article-5-faculty>
- CU System Administrative Policy Statements (APS), specifically APS 1022:
<https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022>



VCAC CHECKLIST

Use for Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion to Associate, & Promotion to Full Cases
Please Place in Front of Dossier*

Candidate's Name:

Department/Primary Unit:

☐ Comprehensive Review: Reappointment

☐ Comprehensive Review: Feedback Only

☐ Tenure

☐ Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor

☐ Promotional to Full Professor

☐ **1. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae**

☐ **2. Dean's Recommendation** (minimum 500 words)**

Deans should offer their independent assessment of the scholarly and creative work, teaching/ librarianship, and leadership and service records, based on the primary unit criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This letter should also provide the dean's recommendation with clear and substantive justifications, referring to the PUEC Summary paragraph rather than repeating the candidate's specific biographical facts and details such as education, past academic experience, and tenure clock that already were included in the PUEC Report.

☐ **3. Dean's Review Committee (DRC) Recommendation** (minimum 500 words)**

The DRC should offer its independent assessment of the scholarly and creative work, teaching/librarianship, and leadership and service records, based on the primary unit criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This report should also provide a recommendation with clear and substantive justifications, and report the DRC vote (with explanation for any dissenting votes and for differences between the committee and the primary unit, if any), referring to the PUEC Summary paragraph rather than repeating the candidate's specific biographical facts and details such as education, past academic experience, and tenure clock that already were included in the PUEC Report.

☐ **4. Chair's Report** (add Institute Director's letter for institute-rostered candidates)**

The chair should report on the discussion and vote taken by the primary unit. The Chair's Report should refer to the PUEC Summary paragraph rather than repeating the candidate's specific biographical facts and details such as education, past academic experience, and tenure clock that already were included in the PUEC Report. Include reasons for the recommendation, an explanation for any dissenting opinion as expressed in the vote, and the number of votes taken in the primary unit. (Note: Minimum size of the voting membership of the primary unit is five. In small units without five eligible voting members, the dean's office must be consulted regarding supplementation of the primary unit for purposes of the review.) Please include a description of the review and voting process that was followed. If the faculty member is rostered in an institute, the institute director also should provide a letter with input on reappointment, tenure or promotion, as specified in the MOU put in place at hire. The institute's role here is not to vote on the candidate's reappointment, tenure, or promotion, but to provide input to the tenure home department, which conducts the primary unit vote.

☐ **5. Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) Report**

This key report should include the following: 1) an introductory PUEC Summary paragraph that provides relevant details about the faculty member (e.g., degrees, experience, tenure clock, scholarly and creative expertise, etc.); 2) a description of the review process; 3) substantive descriptions and evaluations of the faculty member's (a) Teaching or Librarianship, (b) Scholarly and Creative Work, and (c) Leadership and Service (to the university, profession, and the public) based on the primary unit criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion; and 4) the PUEC's recommendation with clear and substantive justifications. For institute-rostered faculty, the institute and department typically form a combined PUEC and conduct one review.

☐ **6. Faculty Statement on Scholarly/Creative Work**

This narrative, usually a maximum of 1,500 words, is an opportunity for the candidate to speak directly to review committee members, highlighting major contributions, describing the originality, independence, and impact of research/scholarly/creative work, and noting any unique aspects of the record. For comprehensive review and review for tenure, the focus is on the probationary period. For promotion to full professor, the focus is on the time period since the award of tenure. Please write for an audience of intelligent non-experts.

☐ **7. Faculty Statement on Teaching/Librarianship**

This narrative, usually a maximum of 1,500 words, is an opportunity for the candidate to speak directly to review committee members, highlighting major teaching and mentoring activities, innovative aspects of their teaching, successes in graduate training and individualized instruction, challenges overcome, professional development pursued, and any unique aspects of the record. For comprehensive review and review for tenure, the focus is on the probationary period. For promotion to full professor, the focus is on the time period since the award of tenure.

☐ **8. Faculty Statement on Leadership and Service**

This narrative, usually a maximum of 1,500 words, is an opportunity for the candidate to speak directly to review committee members, highlighting major contributions or activities in the areas of service or leadership to the university, profession, and the public. For comprehensive review and review for tenure, the focus is on the probationary period. For promotion to full professor, the focus is on the time period since the award of tenure.

☐ **9. Faculty Work Impact Statement (optional)**

Faculty members may choose to include a Work Impact Statement to provide additional contextual information about how their scholarly and creative work or their teaching or librarianship may have been affected by factors related to recent changes and disruptions in the federal education and research and creative work landscape including (but not limited to) external funding; work stoppages; political concerns; work travel or visa restrictions; availability of data, collaborators, or needed research

materials; changes to federal agencies, libraries, archives, laboratories, venues, museums, or other facilities; challenges to curriculum content or topics of study.

- ☐ **10. Comprehensive Review Letters from the PUEC, Dean, and VCAC** (include for Tenure cases only)
Three additional documents are required in tenure dossiers: the letters/reports from the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee, Dean, and VCAC from the time of comprehensive review. The purpose of including these documents in the dossier is to provide review committees some indication of the assessment of the candidate at the time of comprehensive review, and to evaluate the candidate's progress since that time relative to any advice that was provided in these three documents.
- ☐ **11. Memorandum of Understanding that accompanied initial offer letter** (only for faculty members rostered in a unit outside of the tenure home department, such as the museum or an institute).
- ☐ **12. Multiple Measures of Teaching*****
 - A. FCQ Summaries for each course taught (including student comments)
 - B. At least two of the following:
 - i. Peer observations of teaching
 - ii. Report of class interviews
 - iii. Confidential *redacted* letters/interviews/surveys from randomly solicited students**
 - iv. Course materials (e.g., syllabi, exams)
 - v. Other materials as defined by candidate or unit

Submit the complete record of faculty course questionnaire (FCQ) summaries for each course taught, as compiled by the Office of Data Analytics. In addition to these FCQ documents, which are required by CU System policy, submit at least two (preferably more) additional forms of teaching assessment. Suggested forms of assessment are included on the checklist; however, candidates and units may use whatever form of assessment is most appropriate for the type of instruction. Do not overlook assessment of individualized and graduate instruction, as these are often important components of teaching activity. Documentation (peer observations, student interviews, etc.) should be for at least 3 distinct courses taught during the review period. If the faculty member has not yet taught three distinct courses, documentation should be for each distinct course they have taught. Review committee chairs and candidates should consult the VCAC advisory document on multiple measures of teaching. Please also consult the CU System Administrative Policy Statement 1009 titled *Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation*. Use this suggested template for soliciting student feedback. Units should make sure students know that their evaluation should focus on the faculty's member's teaching and advising; if students choose to provide information or allegations that are related to misconduct, for example, the policies addressed by Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance (OIEC), this information cannot be kept confidential by the department or unit and must be disclosed to the OIEC or other appropriate university body. Students will receive direct outreach from the OIEC, though they are not required to respond. However, the OIEC may not be able to take additional action if students choose not to speak to them. Students may report any concerns directly to the OIEC by emailing cureport@colorado.edu or through the online reporting form.
- ☐ **13. External Reviewer Solicitation Letter**** and External Reviewer Key** (include justification if any are Associate Professors)
 - A. Use this template for letters of solicitation to external reviewers. Primary units wishing to make substantive changes to the letter should seek permission from the Office of Faculty Affairs.
 - B. External reviewers should be asked to specify clearly if the candidate should be promoted, or receive tenure at *CU Boulder*.
 - C. External reviewers should be asked to state what their relationship is to the candidate.
- ☐ **14. External Letters of Evaluation****** (minimum of 6)
CU Boulder requires at least 6 letters for tenure and promotion reviews; they are confidential and must not be shared with the candidate.
 - A. External letters must be submitted from professional colleagues not affiliated with the University of Colorado. Letters from mentors or close collaborators are not appropriate.
 - B. External reviewers must be selected by the Primary Unit and chosen to avoid any known or apparent biases, either positive or negative.
 - C. Candidates may not select their own external reviewers, but may recommend names to the primary unit.
 - D. All external review letters received must be submitted with the dossier and numbered 1-6, along with an abridged CV for each external reviewer from whom a letter was received.
 - E. Please include an external reviewer key with the following information:
 - i. Name and affiliation of the reviewer
 - ii. Who recommended the reviewer (PUEC or Candidate)
 - iii. How the reviewer is labeled in the PUEC, primary unit, and dean's review committee letters, 1-6. The campus review letters should refer to the external reviewer in a consistent manner.
 - iv. At the end of the key, please list individuals who were contacted but not able to provide a review, and include why they were unable to provide one (e.g., too busy, too close to candidate, etc.)
 - F. If you need an example of an external reviewer key, please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs (facultyaffairs@colorado.edu).
- ☐ **15. The Primary Unit Criteria** for Meeting the University of Colorado System's Standards for Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion
This document describes the procedures, criteria, and evidence that the primary unit has agreed upon for evaluating comprehensive review, tenure and promotion cases. The document must include the date it was approved by the unit and specify whether the criteria used were those in place at the time of hire, or, if they have been revised since then, at the time of this review. This document is mandated and defined in Administrative Policy Statement 1022, Standards Processes and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents).
- ☐ **16. Examples of Publications/Creative Work** (3 only)
Three representative examples of scholarly and creative work are sufficient. When photographs, recordings, or other multimedia works are appropriate records of scholarly or creative work, candidates should submit examples.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- Please place the VCAC Checklist in front of the main dossier and review its contents carefully to be sure it is complete. Incomplete dossiers cannot go forward to the VCAC. Please note that the student letters/surveys/interviews and the external review letters are confidential materials and should comprise the “Supplement to the Dossier,” which is a *separate* PDF submitted along with the main dossier. Student names should be redacted from each letter.
- Candidates are allowed to add items to their dossier up until the end of the review process. Items that may be added include but are not limited to the following: updated CV, clarifications of fact, rebuttal statements in response to letters/reports written by the various reviewers, etc.
- If any of the review or evaluation letters and materials include information about a candidate that include allegations of misconduct, the allegations need to be reported to the appropriate university body (e.g., the Office of Institutional Equity & Compliance, Standing Committee on Research Misconduct, Campus Controller, Department of Internal Audit, or University Counsel). Such specific issues are to be handled by the appropriate campus experts and processes, as the tenure and promotion process is handled separately.
- Once the VCAC makes a recommendation on a personnel case, the dossier, which includes a voting history from each review body, is forwarded to the Provost and Chancellor for their evaluation and recommendation. The Chancellor makes the final decision on comprehensive review and promotion to full professor cases. For tenure cases, the Chancellor makes a recommendation to the President of the University of Colorado system, with final submission to the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents has final authority in cases of tenure and usually votes at their summer meetings.

**The dossier must be complete prior to being submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs for VCAC review.*

***Where there is a disagreement in the recommendation between these 3 reviews (dean, DRC, & primary unit), the case returns to the prior reviewer for reconsideration and revote. Include a letter describing the outcome of the reconsideration and revote. If there remains a disagreement between review levels, the case proceeds forward; reconsiderations in the 1st Level of Review are required only once.*

****Use this suggested template for soliciting student feedback. These materials are confidential and should comprise the “Supplement to the dossier,” which is a separate PDF submitted along with the dossier. Student names should be redacted from each letter.*

*****Include for tenure and promotion to associate and promotion to full cases only.*

Boulder Campus Guidelines for the Gathering of Information on Teaching for Comprehensive Review, Promotion, and Tenure

Multiple Measures of Teaching:

Dossiers for comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion must include multiple measures of teaching. The gathering of these multiple measures is a joint responsibility of the candidate and the unit; the candidate should make sure that they have in place all the multiple measures they find appropriate, and the unit should make sure that the measures it deems necessary for the evaluation of teaching on a regular basis are included. In order to clarify some issues around the gathering of such information, the Office of Faculty Affairs offers the following guidelines.

Peer Evaluation of Classroom Instruction:

The most commonly used form of evaluation, peer reviews of teaching are an important part of a candidate's teaching dossier.

We consider it a best practice that candidates and units work together to insure that there is at least one peer evaluation per year the candidate under review has taught; larger units may be able to do reviews on a semester basis. A few letters solicited during the final semester of the probationary period are not sufficient to give a sense of the candidate's teaching and development as a teacher.

Student Survey Responses and Letters:

Student survey responses letters may become part of the file in a variety of ways: the unit may email students a survey/questionnaire or solicit letters, the candidate may solicit letters or include letters they have received from students, and students may send unsolicited letters to the unit. In most cases, the letters solicited by the unit carry the most weight. There are concerns on campus about the statistical validity of small sets of student letters, and units should keep this in mind as they gather materials for the teaching dossier. [Use this suggested template for soliciting student feedback.](#)

The dossier should make clear which letters fall into each of the categories mentioned above; it is best to have clearly marked sections for each kind of letter/comment.

Please note that the student letters/surveys/interviews are considered to be confidential materials and should be part of the "supplement to the dossier," which is a *separate* PDF submitted along with the main dossier. **Student names should be redacted from each letter.** Undergraduate and graduate students, post-docs, and former students should all be considered as students (or trainees). A summary of these letters should be prepared by the primary unit evaluation committee and included in the primary unit evaluation committee letter; this letter is available to the candidate. While an attempt will be made to keep these letters confidential during the review process, students solicited for comment should be made aware that their anonymity cannot be protected completely in the last instance. Unsigned letters or other forms of anonymous information gathered from students may be included in the dossier and may be seen by the candidate. The comment section of FCQ forms provide another source of anonymous student comments. All the forms from each course, including the student comments, should be submitted to the PUEC, which in turn certifies that all the forms were submitted for their analysis.

Units should make sure students know that their evaluation should focus on the faculty's member's teaching and advising; if students choose to provide information or allegations that are related to misconduct, for example, [the policies addressed by Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance](#) (OIEC), this information

cannot be kept confidential by the department or unit and must be disclosed to OIEC or other appropriate university body. Students will receive a direct outreach from OIEC, though they are not required to respond. However, OIEC may not be able to take additional action if students choose not to speak to them. Students may report any concerns directly to OIEC by emailing cureport@colorado.edu or through the [online reporting form](#).

If any of the review or evaluation letters and materials include information about a candidate that include allegations of misconduct, the allegations need to be reported to the appropriate university body (e.g., the Office of Institutional Equity & Compliance, Standing Committee on Research Misconduct, Campus Controller, Department of Internal Audit, or University Counsel). Such specific issues are to be handled by the appropriate campus experts and processes, as the tenure and promotion process is handled separately.

Teaching Portfolios:

Candidates may ask that their teaching portfolio be included in the dossier. Such a portfolio can provide a cross-section of a candidate's work as a teacher. As AVC Gleeson wisely stated in 1998, "Candidates are strongly encouraged to be highly selective and concise in what is included in the dossier. Only the most representative examples should be included. Candidates who overwhelm the dossier with portfolio material have the same effect on review committees that students who submit 40-page term papers have on instructors who made 15 page assignments."

Pedagogical Publications:

Some faculty publish on pedagogy in their field. Such publications can be an important part of a file, particularly if a candidate is being considered for "excellence" in teaching. Candidates should consider carefully whether such publications should be counted in their research/scholarship/creative work portion of their dossier or in the teaching portion. In most cases, such items cannot be counted in two places, though they may be part of a description of work in two areas.

Assessment of Non-classroom Teaching and Other Contributions to Teaching:

A great deal of education takes place outside the classroom; the mentoring of graduate students and undergraduate individualized instruction are particularly noteworthy. Faculty also contribute to the education of our students by developing new courses, creating special learning experiences, and so on. Candidates should be sure to document such efforts clearly in their dossiers. Units wishing to argue for "excellence" in teaching should note such efforts in making such a case.

Civic Engagement:

The campus's strategic plan, Flagship 2030, advances as one of its goals civic engagement by faculty, staff, and students. Teaching is one area in which the faculty can stress civic engagement, which includes service-learning pedagogy. Faculty who employ service-learning pedagogy or focus on civic engagement as an important part of one or more courses are encouraged to speak to these efforts in building their teaching dossier. Such efforts speak not only to a faculty member's commitment and dedication to a core campus goal but also indicate that a faculty member is drawing on research literature on innovative teaching methodologies.

External Reviews of Teaching Material:

Departments may wish to give candidates the option to have teaching materials (portfolios, FCQs, peer review letters, etc.) reviewed by recognized excellent teachers in the field. This option has not often been used, but it may provide important information, particularly when a candidate is being considered for "excellence" in teaching. Such reports from external reviewers would be held as confidential.

Other Measures:

This is not an exhaustive list. Candidates and units should include whatever measures of teaching they found useful and convincing.



ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY STATEMENT

Policy Title: Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

APS Number: 1022

APS Functional Area: **ACADEMIC/RESEARCH**

| | |
|--|--|
| Brief Description: | This policy outlines the standards, processes, and procedures for the reappointment, tenure and promotion of tenure-track faculty members and the promotion and post-tenure review of tenured faculty members. |
| Effective: | July 1, 2020 |
| Approved by: | President Mark R. Kennedy |
| Responsible University Officer: | Vice President for Academic Affairs Responsible |
| Office: | Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs |
| Policy Contact: | Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs |
| Supersedes: | July 1, 2014, Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review and Promotion |
| Last Reviewed/Updated: | July 1, 2020 |
| Applies to: | Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty on All Campuses |

Reason for Policy: Provides procedures for implementing Regent Laws and Policies on the reappointment, tenure, and promotion of tenure-track faculty members and the promotion and post-tenure review of tenured faculty members.

I. INTRODUCTION

This Administrative Policy Statement (APS) states the standards of performance for tenure and outlines the process of evaluating a tenure-track faculty member for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, evaluating a tenured faculty member for promotion, and conducting post-tenure reviews. The integrity of the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process depends upon the consistent and knowledgeable application of university processes by the faculty and academic administrators. Participants are expected to have no conflict of interest in the case and to keep the deliberations of the proceedings confidential.

II. POLICY STATEMENT

- A. The performance of a tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated according to the standards established in [Regent Policy 5.D – Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#) and this administrative policy statement.
- B. As stated in [Regent Policy 5.D – Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#), criteria for evaluating faculty performance shall be established by the primary unit.
- C. Every primary unit (described in Section VII.A) and reviewing body or person making recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion, or participating in the post-tenure review process, shall strictly apply the

procedures and standards described herein.¹ Failure to adhere to these procedures and standards may lead to the imposition of sanctions. Questions about proper processes and procedures should be directed to the dean, faculty affairs office, or provost.

- D. In accordance with subsection (H) of [Regent Policy 5.C.2 – Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments](#), tenured faculty shall be reviewed in a comprehensive manner every five years.

III. TENURE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

- A. A recommendation on tenure shall be made after a probationary period of continuous full-time service as a professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. (See exceptions in section III.E) The probationary period shall not exceed seven years, unless an extension has been approved by the dean and chancellor or the chancellor's designee. If an individual's professional accomplishments warrant, the probationary period may be waived and tenure may be recommended upon hire.
1. If a faculty member utilizes family medical leave or parental leave during the tenure probationary period, and the leave period is of sufficient length that the faculty member's performance cannot be appropriately evaluated during that period, the faculty member shall be granted a one-year extension of the tenure probationary period. A faculty member may irrevocably elect, no later than six months following their return to full-time service, to have the leave time count as part of the tenure probationary period. Such an election shall be made in writing and is subject to approval by the dean and the chancellor.
 2. A faculty member may apply for leave for reasons other than family medical leave or parental leave during their probationary period. If the faculty member requests leave, with or without a requested extension of the probationary period, the request shall be reviewed by the chair and dean and the dean will issue a recommendation to the provost. The request is subject to provost approval. Any change to the probationary period because of leave shall be in increments of one year.
 3. If a one-year extension to the probationary period is provided, a one year extension also applies to all personnel actions (comprehensive review or tenure review) scheduled to occur after the leave period.
- B. The tenure probationary period shall begin when the faculty member is first appointed to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank.
- C. Typically, up to three years of full-time service in the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at other institutions may be included in the probationary period.
- D. Each tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner at least once during the tenure probationary period apart from the review for award of tenure. The comprehensive review typically occurs during the fourth year of full-time service.
1. The comprehensive review is a critical appraisal designed to identify a candidate's strengths and weaknesses in sufficient time to allow promising candidates to improve their records before the evaluation for tenure.
 2. The review may include evaluation by external reviewers, as determined by campus, school/college, or library policy.
 3. Candidates may also request additional feedback from the primary unit head in the second year of their appointment and any subsequent year prior to the tenure and/or promotion decision (except the academic year in which the comprehensive review is undertaken).
 - a. In this additional feedback process, the primary unit head shall examine evidence provided by the candidate of the candidate's teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit), and make suggestions for

¹ Comprehensive review and reappointment policies and practices may differ at the Anschutz Medical Campus; faculty should consult school/college/departments policy.

improvement in those areas in which the record of the candidate should be stronger in order to meet primary unit criteria.

- b. Suggestions provided by the primary unit head are not intended to provide the level of specific formal feedback that is provided through the comprehensive review. The primary unit head may recommend advising sessions where the candidate can work with senior faculty members and/or with a campus office of faculty development.
 - c. If the candidate elects these advising sessions, the candidate shall report this fact in the annual report of professional activity (e.g., FRPA), but the content of these consultations shall remain confidential unless the candidate elects otherwise.
 4. The faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the comprehensive review, which is one of two outcomes:
 - a. the faculty member is reappointed to a tenure-track position, or
 - b. the faculty member is informed that they will be given a one-year terminal appointment and the tenure-track appointment will not be continued.
- E. In the Schools of Medicine, Pharmacy, and Public Health, promotion and tenure are separate processes, but may occur concurrently.
 1. Unless waived by the faculty member and approved by the dean and chancellor, a decision regarding promotion to associate professor shall be made after a maximum probationary period of seven years of continuous full-time service at the rank of assistant professor (or its prorated equivalent). Normally, the promotion review of a faculty member will commence at the beginning of the seventh year of service.
 2. School of Medicine, Pharmacy, and Public Health tenure-track faculty members in the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible for consideration for tenure. There is no maximum time limit for the award of tenure; however, the faculty member who is turned down for tenure may not be reconsidered for three years.

IV. STANDARDS FOR TENURE

- A. As stated in [Regent Policy 5.D – Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#), tenure may be awarded only to faculty members who have demonstrated, at a minimum, 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 librarianship), or scholarly/creative work.

Additionally:

1. In the School of Medicine, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with national and international reputations for academic excellence who are among the best in their field of academic endeavor and who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship and demonstrated excellence in, and dedication to, teaching (as further defined in the rules of the School of Medicine).

Professional/administrative leadership and service and/or clinical activities should be weighed into any decision regarding tenure, but such activities in the absence of significant accomplishments in both teaching and scholarship are not an adequate basis for tenure.
2. In its tenure recommendations, the Colorado School of Public Health may consider public health practice/clinical activity and scholarship, as further defined in school policy.
3. In the School of Pharmacy, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship and demonstrated excellence in, and dedication to, teaching (as further defined in the appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure policy of the School of Pharmacy).
4. Candidates at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs may also be evaluated on professional practice, in which case they shall also demonstrate at least meritorious performance in that area to be recommended for

tenure. A faculty member cannot be tenured based on excellence in professional practice without excellence in scholarly/creative work or teaching.

- 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 that furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting.
 - 1. For the School of Medicine and the School of Pharmacy, which require excellence in both teaching and scholarship, at least one area, as specified in the primary unit criteria, must show evidence of impact beyond the institution.
- C. Effort or promise of performance shall not be a criterion for excellence or meritorious performance. Demonstrated performance and outcomes are required for tenure.
- D. All faculty members within a unit, no matter when they are considered for tenure, are held to the same standards. Department chairs and mentors have a responsibility to counsel tenure-track faculty on the wisdom of coming up for early promotion or tenure. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock.

V. PRIMARY UNIT CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

- A. Primary units shall develop criteria that define the teaching (or librarianship), 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).
- B. The primary unit shall review its criteria at least every seven years (or more frequently if directed by the dean or provost) for rigor, fairness, and consistency with regent requirements. Criteria are effective when 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 standards (e.g., professional practice, clinical activity), those standards shall be reflected in the primary unit criteria.
- C. All primary unit criteria shall be in writing and shall be included in the candidate's dossier or made available electronically to individuals and committees involved in the review process. They must be used by the primary unit and by all other bodies or persons in their evaluation of the candidate.
- D. [Regent Law 5.C – Faculty Appointments and Tenure](#), [Regent Policy 5.D – Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#), this administrative policy statement, and the primary unit criteria and procedures shall be made available by the head of the primary unit to each tenured and tenure-track faculty member at the time of initial hiring/appointment.
- E. The primary unit criteria shall include a description of the level of achievement that warrants the designations “meritorious” and “excellent” performance in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as well as other activities relevant to the specific unit. However, reducing the inherent complexity of faculty activities to a strict formula is discouraged.
- F. The primary unit criteria shall also provide a description of the types of evidence that will be used to evaluate the candidate against the performance standards. Examples of criteria that might be considered in evaluating teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service are included in [Appendix A](#).
- G. 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 reappointment or tenure based on the new criteria or the criteria in place at the time of appointment. The choice must be made before the next personnel action that follows implementation of the new criteria. When a faculty member is evaluated for promotion to full professor, the current primary unit criteria shall apply.
 - 1. Faculty members on the Anschutz Medical Campus who are evaluated for promotion to associate professor without a coincident evaluation of tenure may choose to be evaluated for promotion based on the primary unit criteria at the time of appointment or the current primary unit criteria.

- H.** When joint or split appointments are made, the affected faculty member must be informed in writing, prior to the appointment, of: (1) the duties and expectations as agreed upon by all primary units involved; and (2) which primary unit will be responsible for such personnel recommendations as reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary.
- I.** Tenure and promotion decisions are based on summative evaluations of a faculty member's cumulative performance according to primary unit criteria. These processes and criteria are separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation.
- J.** 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.
- K.** 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;
 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.

VI. MENTORING

- A.** A considerable amount of time and resources is invested in hiring tenure-track faculty; therefore, the university has a significant stake in their success. While it is the individual faculty member's responsibility to develop the teaching and research skills and a work plan that produce the quality and quantity of professional activity needed to warrant reappointment, tenure and/or promotion, the unit and the administration have certain obligations to mentor tenure-track faculty and to help them navigate the review processes. In addition to published policies and guidelines, schools and colleges shall provide their faculty members reasonable opportunities for training and information sessions on the tenure and promotion process.
 1. Primary units shall ensure that reasonable mentoring opportunities are available for faculty members during their probationary period. However, in some cases, it may make more sense for the campus's faculty development office or a school or college to take responsibility for providing mentoring opportunities.
 2. Department chairs/unit heads have the responsibility to assist any faculty member who requests a mentor during their probationary period to locate an appropriate mentor on the campus. In some units, it may be helpful to identify an external mentor from another CU campus or from outside the university. External assistance, however, cannot be assured. If the mentoring program is formal, the frequency and general subjects of the mentoring sessions should be documented.
 3. Faculty members who serve as mentors should be able to count mentoring activities in the annual merit evaluation process.
- B.** During the probationary period, candidates are expected to proactively seek and take advantage of available mentoring and advising programs.
- C.** Faculty members who believe they are not getting adequate mentoring are responsible for bringing their situation to the attention of the unit head. If they are not satisfied with the mentoring opportunities the unit head provides, they should bring this concern to the attention of the dean or the provost's office.

VII. REVIEW PROCESS

- A. The Primary Unit. The primary unit is composed of professional colleagues most directly involved with the candidate and having authority to make recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In schools and colleges with departmental organizations, each department will usually constitute a primary unit. In a school or college without such organization, all tenured and tenure-track faculty members have the responsibility for developing the terms of the working structure whereby the primary unit is defined. The primary unit may be a division, or may be the school or college as a whole. In some instances, the primary unit may involve faculty from cognate departments or institutes.
- B. The Candidate Dossier. Each candidate for reappointment, tenure or promotion, assisted by the head of the primary unit making the recommendation, shall prepare a comprehensive dossier for evaluation. Faculty members should include copies of their published materials, as well as supporting data and electronic communications documenting their professional activities. The School of Medicine has different standards for the dossier and campuses may have requirements in addition to those listed below. The primary unit or the dean should provide templates or models of good dossiers to guide candidates in dossier preparation. The dossier submitted by the candidate shall include the following materials:
1. A current curriculum vitae.
 2. Evidence concerning the teaching ability of the candidate, including results of learner evaluations. (See [APS 1009 - Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation](#) for examples of the types of evaluative material that may be used.) Each candidate should submit an organized teacher's portfolio that highlights accomplishments in teaching (for example, development of new instructional materials or methods, educational scholarship, receipt of teaching awards or other evidence of success as a teacher, course syllabi; and normed student feedback, e.g., Faculty Course Questionnaires, which are required when available). This section may also include evaluations by the candidate's students, colleagues or other qualified individuals who may have observed the candidate's teaching in classroom, laboratory, clinical or other settings. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
 3. Documents supporting the candidate's research, scholarly/creative work, or other activities relevant to their specific unit. This section may include articles, book reviews, research data and grants, receipt of awards, electronic communications, letters, and other evidence of success. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
 4. Documents supporting the candidate's leadership and service to the university, profession and community. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
 5. Any other information the candidate believes will assure adequate consideration and evaluation during the review process.
 6. Documents to be added by the primary unit following receipt of the dossier from the candidate include:
 - a. A copy of the primary unit criteria;
 - b. Previous reappointment, tenure and/or promotion letters if required by the campus, primary unit, school/college or library; and/or
 - c. Evaluation letters received from external reviewers.
 - i. The primary unit requests written evaluations by experts from outside the university who are qualified to judge the candidate, using a solicitation letter following the college-approved format.
 - ii. Such outside evaluations are mandatory in cases of recommendations for tenure and promotion. Comprehensive reviews may also include external evaluations, as determined by the campus/school/college/library policy.
 - iii. Selection of external evaluators shall be undertaken by the primary unit; the candidate shall be given the opportunity to suggest possible evaluators and/or indicate specific scholars whom the candidate feels should be excluded from consideration. Primary unit review procedures shall describe the process used

in the primary unit for the selection of external evaluators. Care must be taken to exclude any evaluators whose evaluations may constitute a conflict of interest, such as a dissertation director.

- If a candidate for tenure is a new hire, and at the time the letter of offer was issued, the individual held a tenured position at another institution, the letter(s) of recommendation for hire may be used in the tenure evaluation process in place of the external evaluation letters typically required. If necessary, additional letters may be requested in the tenure evaluation process.
- iv. A minimum of three external letters shall be added to the file; however, campuses, schools/colleges/libraries may require more than three letters. All letters that are received must be included in the candidate's promotion or tenure dossier.
- v. External letters solicited by the primary unit must be treated as confidential; they shall not be shared with the candidate.
- vi. The primary unit may offer external evaluators a modest stipend for their work.
- vii. Primary unit letters should include summaries of key comments by evaluators, with all identifiers removed to preserve confidentiality.

C. Levels of Review.² The case for reappointment, tenure and promotion of a tenure-track faculty member and promotion of a tenured faculty member is evaluated at multiple levels. The expertise of the primary unit is balanced by the broader perspective introduced at other levels of review. At each level of the review process, the candidate should be informed of the outcome as expeditiously as possible. The primary unit criteria shall be used at every level of the review.

For tenure and promotion cases, faculty and review committees at each level of review vote on the teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit) of the candidate as “not meritorious,” “meritorious,” or “excellent.” The faculty and review committees then vote on whether to recommend tenure, and/or promotion (detailed review procedures are provided in the subsections below).

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. A determination shall be made for each of the areas of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service, (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit). Based on this evaluation, the faculty and review committees shall issue a recommendation regarding reappointment.

The result of all votes, together with the dossier, are forwarded to the next level of review. If errors are discovered during the process, they should be remedied, if possible, before the dossier moves to the next level of review. No individual may vote in more than one stage of the review process. Participants at every level of the review process shall maintain the confidentiality of the deliberations. Participation includes being present for any discussion of the review or providing information or opinions to any individuals who will be discussing the candidate's application.

1. The First-Level Review is at the school/college/library/department level; it includes review by the primary unit and the chair, the dean's review committee and the dean.
 - a. The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) is the group within the primary unit responsible for initially reviewing the qualifications of a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. In a small primary unit, all members of the unit may constitute such a committee and additional members may be added from other units. The PUEC issues a recommendation that includes:
 - i. A description and evaluation of the candidate's teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, leadership and service to the university, profession, and/or public, and other activities relevant to specific units, as required by primary unit criteria;
 - ii. Salient points of external reviewers' analyses, with care taken to maintain confidentiality;
 - iii. A statement describing the procedures followed, perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, and the committee vote.

² At the School of Medicine, Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, and Colorado School of Public Health, review procedures differ in many respects from those described in this APS. Faculty members should consult their school's tenure and promotion policies.

- b. Following the PUEC recommendation, a vote is held by the faculty of the primary unit. The faculty vote shall address the candidate's performance in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit) and shall include a positive or negative recommendation for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.
 - i. Only members of the primary unit holding tenure may vote on decisions relating to reappointment or tenure.
 - ii. Only members of the primary unit with the rank of full professor may vote on decisions to promote a faculty member to the rank of full professor or hire a faculty member at the rank of full professor.
 - iii. PUEC members may participate in these votes.

Deviation from these procedures is allowed when primary unit size and/or requirements for non-duplicative voting warrant an alternative process; however, any deviation from the stated procedures must be voted on and approved by the faculty of the primary unit.

- c. In units with a department structure, the chair shall also issue a recommendation on reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. (If the chair is a member of the PUEC, a separate recommendation letter is not required.)
 - d. The PUEC recommendation, results of the faculty vote, and chair recommendation are forwarded to the Dean's Advisory or Review Committee (DRC). The DRC will review the dossier and all prior action on the case, conduct a vote, and issue a recommendation to the dean.
 - i. The DRC is typically composed of full professors in the candidate's school/college. Members of the committee who are faculty within the candidate's primary unit are ineligible to vote.
 - ii. When necessary due to the size or structure of the school/college, the DRC may include faculty from other schools or colleges.
 - iii. The dean shall determine whether the committee is elected or appointed.
 - e. Should either the DRC or the dean disagree with the recommendation of the primary unit (based on the faculty vote), the dean shall communicate in writing the nature of this disagreement with the head of the primary unit.
 - i. The primary unit shall then reconsider its original recommendation and return its reconsidered judgment, including the results of any additional votes, to the dean. The dean may then ask the DRC to reconsider its original recommendation and cast a new vote.
 - ii. The recommendation of the dean, the results of all votes of the primary unit and the DRC, and the candidate dossier shall be forwarded together to the provost.
 - iii. Where differences of opinion between the primary unit, the DRC, and/or the dean have occurred and have not been resolved, each party in the disagreement shall submit a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation in that context.
2. The Second-Level Review is at the campus level; it includes review by the vice chancellor for academic affairs advisory committee (VCAC), the provost, and the chancellor. However, at the Anschutz Medical Campus, promotions without dissenting votes from the first-level review are not subject to a second-level review except for the approval of the provost and chancellor.
- a. The provost on each campus shall have an advisory committee of faculty members (VCAC) to assist in the review of recommendations submitted by the dean. The provost shall determine whether the committee is elected or appointed.
 - b. Following its review, the VCAC shall conduct a vote and issue a recommendation to the provost. Members of the VCAC who are faculty within the candidate's department are ineligible to vote.
 - c. Should the VCAC or provost disagree with the recommendation of the dean or primary unit faculty, the provost shall transmit to the dean of the school or college the nature of the disagreement.
 - i. If the VCAC disagrees with the recommendation of the primary unit faculty or the primary unit faculty and the dean, the case shall be returned to the faculty for reconsideration, and then, in turn, the case shall go back to the dean for reconsideration.

- ii. If the VCAC agrees with the primary unit faculty recommendation, but disagrees with the dean's recommendation, the case shall be returned to the dean for reconsideration.
 - iii. The reconsidered judgment(s), including the results of any additional votes, shall be forwarded to the provost.
 - iv. As needed, the dean may seek additional input from the primary unit as part of this reconsideration.
 - v. After receiving the reconsidered judgment from the dean, the provost may ask the VCAC to review its original recommendation and cast a new vote.
- d. If the provost finds significant procedural errors may have affected the outcome of the case, the provost may return the case to the primary unit and other levels of the campus review to repeat the process. The provost may appoint a responsible party to oversee the process to ensure procedural integrity and fairness to the candidate. If it is determined that the repetition of the process will carry forward into the next academic year, the provost may extend the contract of the candidate by one year. The re-evaluation process shall focus on the record as it existed at the time of the first review.
- e. The provost shall make a recommendation to the chancellor.
- f. For cases involving reappointment decisions, the program requirements of the primary unit may be considered by the chair, dean, provost, or chancellor when issuing a recommendation.
- g. A candidate for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure shall be informed in writing of the final determination of the chancellor as expeditiously as possible.
 - i. All positive recommendations for tenure shall be forwarded to the president.
 - ii. Decisions not to recommend tenure are not forwarded to the president. A decision by the chancellor to deny tenure may be appealed according to the terms of section VIII of this APS.
 - iii. Non-reappointment is not subject to administrative appeal. See section VIII of this APS for faculty grievance rights.
 - iv. Denial of promotion is not subject to administrative appeal unless it coincides with a denial of tenure. See section VIII of this APS for faculty grievance rights.
- 3. The Third-Level Review is at the presidential level; it refers to either: (1) the review by the president of a positive recommendation for tenure or (2) an appeal of a negative decision for tenure or promotion. (Promotion may be appealed only in accordance with section VII.C.2.g.iv).
 - a. All positive recommendations for tenure shall be forwarded to the president for review prior to submission to the Board of Regents. The role of the president's office in faculty personnel decisions is to ensure that appropriate and established procedures are followed, and that university standards for tenure and promotion are upheld at each campus. The primary responsibility for making personnel recommendations rests with the chancellors.
 - b. An appeal of a negative decision for tenure shall follow the procedures specified in section VIII.A.
- 4. The Board of Regents makes the final decision on the award of tenure. Only the board has the authority to award tenure.

D. Candidates Prerogatives

- 1. At any stage in the review process, a candidate shall be entitled to submit any material or information that they believe will be helpful in evaluating their case. Materials provided at a higher level of the review shall also be provided to all other bodies reviewing the candidate, and they may respond as they deem appropriate.
- 2. With the exception of letters provided by external evaluators, each candidate shall have access to all evaluative documents in their file. These documents shall include statements prepared by primary unit evaluation committees, by the primary unit chair, or by administrative officers. Evaluation letters solicited from outside the university are to be treated as confidential and not shared with the candidate. Any letters provided by students must be de-identified before sharing with the candidate.

3. If a candidate so requests, in a confidential conversation, the provost or the provost's designee shall advise the candidate of the reasons that contributed to a recommendation not to grant tenure or promotion.
4. At any point in the process prior to the decision by the chancellor, a candidate may withdraw the case from consideration.

VIII. APPEAL AND GRIEVANCE RIGHTS

A. Administrative Appeal of Decisions Regarding Tenure

1. Within 10 business days of receipt of notification, a candidate denied tenure by the chancellor may request a third-level review by the president. The only grounds for a presidential review are: (1) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; (2) factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; (3) the material violation of the Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy; or (4) some combination of these grounds.
2. The president may determine there are no grounds for appeal and uphold the chancellor's decision. In this circumstance, the case is closed.
3. If the president determines there are grounds for an appeal:
 - a. The president may remand the case to the campus to rectify errors and require the chancellor to then revise or reaffirm the original recommendation.
 - b. The president may overrule the campus decision and recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.
 - c. The president may convene a faculty advisory committee to review the case. The committee may issue a recommendation on tenure or recommend action to rectify errors. If the committee makes a recommendation on tenure, it shall base its recommendation on the dossier available to the chancellor at the time the chancellor issued a decision. Ultimately, the president shall either make the final decision to uphold the chancellor's decision to deny tenure or shall recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.

B. Grievance Rights

1. If a candidate is denied reappointment, promotion, or tenure and believes that there have been serious procedural or factual errors in the case, or the denial occurred through the material violation of the Laws of the Regents or Regent Policy, the candidate may submit a grievance to the Faculty Senate grievance committee in accordance with [Regent Policy 5.G – Faculty Grievance](#).
2. A grievance may not be filed until all available administrative appeals have been exhausted.
3. While procedural errors per se may entitle the candidate to proper reconsideration as herein provided, such errors may not be used as the justification for personnel recommendations not otherwise justified on the basis of performance.
4. The faculty governance grievance committee shall not substitute its judgment about an individual's merit for that of other committees and administrators.

IX. POST-TENURE REVIEW

- 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 administrative policy statement.

1. A primary unit's PTR guidelines shall describe the criteria that will be used to evaluate faculty and shall indicate what level of performance is required for a faculty member to be considered "meeting expectations" in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit). They shall also consider differentiated workloads. The primary unit PTR guidelines and criteria must be approved by the dean of the school/college/library and provost.
 2. The PTR evaluation shall be conducted by appropriate faculty peers within the campus, either the primary unit faculty or the faculty of the appropriate college personnel review committee. Other units may be consulted as appropriate.
 3. Consistent with campus or primary unit policy, the faculty member under review may prepare and submit a professional plan to the committee that evaluates PTR. If a plan is submitted, the committee shall consider the plan in its evaluation. See [Appendix B](#) for more information on the professional plan.
- C. The initial post-tenure review process occurs five years after the faculty member is granted tenure and recurs at five- year intervals unless interrupted by promotion review or leave. Promotion serves to re-start the PTR clock. Faculty undergoing PTR shall not, in that year, serve on the committee that evaluates PTR
- D. The committee that evaluates PTR shall provide an evaluation of the faculty member's performance as either outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, below expectations, or fails to meet expectations in each of the areas of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit), and shall provide a narrative explanation of that evaluation.
- E. Faculty members who receive a summative evaluation of "below expectations" in any of the evaluated areas, must agree to a performance improvement agreement (see [APS 5008 - Faculty Performance Evaluations](#) for more information on the performance improvement agreement and extensive review).
- F. A copy of the committee's report will be given to the faculty member by the department chair or dean, depending on whether the PTR is undertaken by the primary unit or school/college. A copy of the PTR report will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The reports will be forwarded to the dean, who will provide a summary report and copies of the individual reports to the provost on the results of all the post-tenure reviews in the school/college. Annually, the provosts will provide a summary report on post-tenure review to the System Office of Academic Affairs, who will forward the campus summary reports to the president and the Board of Regents.
- G. Faculty members who fail to participate in any aspect of the post tenure review process, as required, may be subject to sanctions for neglect of duty, which may include reduction in salary, reassignment of duties, unpaid suspension, or dismissal for cause.

X. RELATED POLICIES

- [Regent Policy 5.D – Reappointment \(to a tenure-track position\), Tenure, and Promotion](#)
- [Regent Policy 5.C – Faculty Appointments](#)
- [Regent Law 5.C – Faculty Appointments and Tenure](#)
- [APS 1009 – Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [APS 5008 – Faculty Performance Evaluations](#)

XI. HISTORY

- Adopted: July 1, 2007; Content previously stated in Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents (Appendix A rescinded January 2009).
- Revised: January 1, 2011; Non-substantive revision on May 1, 2011; The term "service" was replaced with the term "leadership and service" to reflect a change in regent laws and policies, effective April 30, 2014; July 1, 2014; Non-substantive revision on October 19, 2016; Approved March 18, 2020, became effective July 1, 2020, with the rollout of the new regent article and policy 5 regarding faculty.
- Last Reviewed: July 1, 2020.

APPENDIX A: Examples of Appropriate Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

A. Teaching

1. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness by students, graduate trainees or other learners
2. Teaching awards and other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
3. Peer evaluation of teaching
4. Alumni evaluation
5. Quality of Doctoral dissertation and Master's thesis supervision
6. Student advising and mentoring
7. Innovations in teaching
8. Clinical supervision
9. Participation in teaching
10. Performance of students, graduate trainees or other learners in higher-level courses or levels of training
11. Performance of learners on Standard Professional Examinations
12. Preparation of course materials
13. Teaching scholarship (for example, external grant funding or published research related to teaching)

B. Scholarly/Creative Work

1. Publications, including peer-reviewed manuscripts, books, book chapters, monographs and electronic publications
2. Other products of scholarship as broadly defined, including the scholarship of discovery, education, application or integration in which the candidate is a lead investigator
3. Recognition by other scholars of research and publications
4. Creative work (performance, poetry, drama, competitions, paintings)
5. Grants and contracts (sponsored research)
6. Un-sponsored research
7. Professional reputation (both inside and outside the university)
8. Evidence of capacity for future achievements

C. Leadership and Service

1. University committees and administrative leadership and service
2. Leadership and service to profession and discipline (state, national, international level)
3. Consultation and public leadership and service
4. Skill and devotion in the care of patients

APPENDIX B: The Professional Plan

The professional plan is a highly recommended individually prepared blueprint that aids in evaluating performance, during both annual review and post-tenure review. Academic units or schools/colleges may require faculty members to prepare and maintain a professional plan after their award of tenure.

The professional plan communicates the faculty member's teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service goals and explains how these goals support the needs of the primary unit and the school/college. Projections made in the plan, when compared to the faculty member's progress and achievements, can provide one basis for evaluating the faculty member's professional performance. If the plan calls for a distribution of effort different from the primary unit's standard assignment, a differentiated workload agreement should be included.

At the time of annual merit evaluation and during post-tenure review (or extensive review), the primary unit evaluation committee may review the professional plan (and any revisions or updates to the plan) and compare its goals to the actual achievements of the faculty member to date.

Regent Policy 5

Policy 5.D.: Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion ^[1]

5.D.1 Tenure Probationary Period

- (A) A recommendation on tenure shall be made after a probationary period of continuous full-time or full-time equivalent service as a professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. The probationary period shall not exceed seven years, unless an extension has been approved by the dean and chancellor or the chancellor's designee. If an individual's professional accomplishments warrant, the probationary period may be waived and tenure may be recommended upon hire.
- (1) A faculty member may apply for leave during their probationary period. The Provost shall decide whether the leave is granted and whether it affects the probationary period (except in the case of Parental Leave, see section 5.D.1(A)(2)). Any change to the probationary period because of leave will be in increments of one year.
- (2) A faculty member who utilizes parental leave during the tenure probationary period will be granted a one-year extension of the tenure probationary period. A faculty member may irrevocably elect, no later than six months following their return to full-time service, to have the leave time count as part of the tenure probationary period. Such an election shall be made in writing and must be approved by the dean and the chancellor.
- (B) Each tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner at least once during the tenure probationary period apart from the review for award of tenure. The comprehensive review typically occurs during the fourth year of full-time service. The comprehensive review results in one of two outcomes:
- (1) the faculty member is reappointed to a tenure-track position, or
- (2) the faculty member is informed that they will be given a one-year terminal appointment and the tenure-track appointment will not be continued.
- The faculty member shall be informed in writing of the results of the comprehensive review.
- (C) In the Schools of Medicine, Pharmacy and Public Health, promotion and tenure are separate processes, but may occur concurrently.
- (1) Unless waived by the faculty member and approved by the dean and chancellor, a decision regarding promotion to associate professor shall be made after a maximum probationary period of seven years of continuous full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. Normally, the promotion review of a faculty member will commence at the beginning of the seventh year of service.
- (2) School of Medicine, Pharmacy and Public Health tenure-track faculty members in the rank of associate professor or professor are eligible for consideration for tenure. There will be no maximum time limit for the award of tenure; however, the faculty member who is turned down for tenure may not be reconsidered for three years.

5.D.2 Standards for Tenure

- (A) 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.

Additionally:

- (1) In the School of Medicine, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with national and international reputations for academic excellence who are among the best in their field of academic endeavor and who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship and demonstrated excellence in, and dedication to, teaching (as further defined in the rules of the School of Medicine).

Professional/administrative leadership and service and/or clinical activities should be weighed into any decision regarding tenure, but such activities in the absence of significant accomplishments in both teaching and scholarship are not an adequate basis for tenure.

- (2) In its tenure recommendations, the Colorado School of Public Health may consider public health practice/clinical activity and scholarship, as further defined in its bylaws.
 - (3) In the School of Pharmacy, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members who have demonstrated excellence in scholarship and demonstrated excellence in, and dedication to, teaching (as further defined in the appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure policy of the School of Pharmacy).
 - (4) Candidates at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs may also be evaluated on professional practice, in which case they shall also demonstrate meritorious performance in that area.
- (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) For the School of Medicine and the School of Pharmacy, which require excellence in both teaching and scholarship, at least one area, as specified in the primary unit criteria, must show evidence of impact beyond the institution.
- (C) Effort or promise of performance shall not be a criterion for excellence or meritorious performance. Demonstrated performance and outcomes are required for tenure.

5.D.3 Primary Unit Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

- (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.

- (a) Faculty members on the Anschutz Medical Campus who are evaluated for promotion to associate professor without a coincident evaluation of tenure may choose to be evaluated for promotion based on the primary unit criteria at the time of appointment or the current primary unit criteria (if revisions have been adopted since the date of appointment).
- (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.

5.D.4 Mentoring

- (A) While the candidate is responsible for developing a professional record that warrants tenure, the department/unit and administration have certain obligations to mentor tenure-track faculty and to help them navigate the processes of review (reappointment, tenure and promotion). Mentoring opportunities will be provided by primary units and/or colleges/schools.

5.D.5 Review Process

- (A) The case for reappointment, tenure and promotion of a tenure-track faculty member and promotion of a tenured faculty member is evaluated at multiple levels. The expertise of the primary unit is balanced by the broader perspective introduced at other levels of review. At each stage of the review process, the candidate should be informed of the outcome as expeditiously as possible. Detailed review procedures are provided in the corresponding administrative policy statement.
 - (1) The primary unit criteria shall be used at every level of the review process and the criteria shall be included in the candidate’s dossier.
 - (2) A decision on reappointment or promotion shall be issued by the chancellor. The chancellor’s decision is final, unless a denial of promotion coincides with a denial of tenure, in which case both decisions can be appealed in accordance with section 5.D.6.
 - (3) A decision to recommend or deny tenure shall be issued by the chancellor. The chancellor’s decision on tenure is final if the decision is negative. (See section 5.D.6 for information on the appeals process.) The chancellor shall forward positive tenure decisions to the president for review.
 - (a) If the president concurs with a recommendation to award tenure, a positive

recommendation is issued to the Board of Regents.

- (b) If the president does not concur, the president's decision not to award tenure is final. (See section 5.D.7 for grievance rights.)

5.D.6 Appeal of Decisions Regarding Tenure

- (A) Within 10 business days of receipt of notification, a candidate denied tenure by the chancellor may request a review by the president. The only grounds for a presidential review are: (1) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; (2) factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; or (3) the material violation of the laws of the regents or regent policy; or some combination of these grounds.
 - (1) The president may determine there are no grounds for appeal and uphold the decision to deny tenure. In this circumstance, the case is closed.
 - (2) If the president determines there are grounds for an appeal:
 - (a) The president may remand the case to the campus to rectify errors and require the chancellor to then revise or reaffirm the original recommendation.
 - (b) The president may overrule the campus decision and recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.
 - (c) The president may convene a faculty advisory committee to review the case and issue a recommendation. Ultimately, the president will either make the final decision to deny tenure or will recommend tenure to the Board of Regents.

5.D.7 Grievance Rights

- (A) If a candidate is denied reappointment, promotion, or tenure and believes that there have been serious procedural or factual errors in the case, or the denial occurred through the material violation of the laws of the regents or regent policy, the candidate may submit a grievance to the Faculty Senate grievance committee in accordance with regent policy 5.G. A grievance may not be filed until all available administrative appeals have been exhausted.

History:

- Adopted: September 14, 2018 (Moved from the old article 5.B, 5.C and policy 5.M); Became effective July 1, 2020.
- Revised: N/A.
- Last Reviewed: September 14, 2018.

Source URL: <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>

Links

[1] <https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy/5>