****

**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](https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/multiple-measures-teaching). Please also consult the CU System [Administrative Policy Statement 1009 titled *Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation*](https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1009). [Use this suggested template for soliciting student feedback.](https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/media/98) 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](https://www.colorado.edu/oiec/policies) (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](mailto:cureport@colorado.edu) or through the [online reporting form](https://cuboulder.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0PnqVK4kkIJIZnf). |
|  | **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](https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/media/92). 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](mailto: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)](https://www.cu.edu/ope/aps/1022). |
|  | **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.*](https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/media/98) *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.*