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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:** After six years of service, during the seventh year
- **Promotion to Full:** Post-tenure, when the candidate has a “record, since receiving tenure…that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, leadership and service, and other applicable areas”.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”)
- Review 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 research/creative work, teaching/librarianship, service
  - Multiple measures of teaching (at least 3)
  - Scholarly/creative work samples (at least 3; e.g. publications, artwork, videos, recordings, multimedia, etc.)
  - External letters (for tenure/promotion; at least 6)

What Does the Review Process Look Like?

- The “Levels of Review:"
  - First level: Academic unit
    - As applicable—department, college/school, dean’s level review, 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, work during spring and summer semesters; members selected by Provost (usually in consultation with deans) and subject to Boulder Faculty Assembly approval

¹ CU System Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 1022, Section X. “Promotion”
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 (e.g., Vice Provost 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 research/creative work or teaching; at least “meritorious” in the other, and “meritorious” in service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comprehensive Review</th>
<th>Tenure Review</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Timing</td>
<td>During year 4</td>
<td>During year 7</td>
<td>Not mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Making adequate progress toward tenure</td>
<td>“Excellent” in Research/Creative Work or Teaching/Librarianship, “Meritorious” in the other 2 categories</td>
<td>Overall = Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier</td>
<td>No external letters needed</td>
<td>Minimum of 6 external letters</td>
<td>Minimum of 6 external letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/leap/
- 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/hr/faculty-staff-assistance-program
- Employee Services (HR and Benefits) https://www.cu.edu/employee-services
- CU Board of Regents Laws and Policies https://www.cu.edu/regents/laws-and-policies
- 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
Please Place In Front of Dossier
Use for: Comprehensive Review; Tenure and Promotion to Associate; and Promotion to Full Cases

Candidate's Name  School/Department

☐ Comprehensive Review: Reappointment  ☐ Comprehensive Review: Feedback only
☐ Tenure  ☐ Tenure and Promotion to Assoc. Professor  ☐ Promotion to Full Professor

1. Dean's Recommendation
2. Statement of Dean's Review/College Personnel Committee
4. Institute Director’s letter (if the faculty member is rostered in an institute)
5. Statement of Primary Unit Review Committee
6. Current Curriculum Vitae
7. Faculty Statement on Research/Creative Work
8. Faculty Statement on Teaching or Librarianship
9. Faculty Statement on Service
10. Comprehensive Review Letters from the Dean’s Review Committee, Dean, and VCAC (include for T&P to Associate cases only)
11. Multiple Measures of Teaching
   a. FCQ Instructor Summary
   b. FCQ Summary for each course taught
   c. Two or more of the following:
      • Peer reviews of teaching
      • Report of class interviews
      • Confidential letters/interviews from randomly solicited students
      • Course materials (e.g., syllabi, exams)
      • Other materials as defined by the candidate or unit
12. One copy of the letter soliciting external letters of evaluation
13. Six External, Confidential Letters of Evaluation
   a. External Reviewer Key
14. One copy of your unit’s policy and procedures document on review for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion, and its criteria for CRPT
15. Three publications/works

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

The dossier must be complete prior to the dossier being submitted to VCAC for review.
DESCRIPTION OF VCAC CHECKLIST REQUIREMENTS

**1. DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION.** Deans are encouraged to offer their independent assessment of the research/creative work, teaching/librarianship, and service records.

**Where there is a disagreement in the recommendation between these three reviews, the case must return to the prior reviewer for reconsideration, and a revote. Please include a letter describing the outcome of the reconsideration and revote. If, upon reconsideration there is still a disagreement between review levels, the case shall proceed forward; reviewers are required to reconsider the case only one time.

**2. DEAN'S REVIEW COMMITTEE STATEMENT.** Briefly summarize the committee's evaluation and recommendation, reporting the specific votes and explanation for any dissenting votes and for differences between the committee and the primary unit, if any.

**3. CHAIR'S REPORT OF PRIMARY UNIT EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION.** The chair, and institute directors in cases where the faculty member is rostered in an institute, should report the actions taken by the primary unit. Please include reasons for the recommendation, an explanation for any dissenting opinion as expressed in the vote, plus the number of votes taken in the primary unit. 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. A description of the review and voting process that was followed should be included.

4. STATEMENT OF PRIMARY UNIT EVALUATION/REVIEW COMMITTEE (PUEC). This statement (usually a maximum of 4,000 words) should include a description of the findings of the committee with regards to (a) Teaching/Librarianship, (b) Scholarly and Creative Work, and (c) University and Public Service and Leadership. If not included in the preceding letter, a description of the review process that was followed should be included. In cases where the faculty member is rostered in an institute, the institute and department form a combined PUEC and conduct a review. A summary of the external evaluations that is included as part of the dossier, will be shared in writing with the candidate.

5. CURRENT CURRICULUM VITAE.

6. FACULTY STATEMENT ON RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK. This narrative, usually a maximum of 1,500 words, is an opportunity for the candidate to speak directly to the review committee membership, highlighting their major contributions, describing the originality, independence, and impact of their research/creative work, or any unique aspects of the record.

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 the review committee membership, highlighting their major teaching activities, the innovative aspects of their teaching, successes in graduate training and individualized instruction, or any unique aspects of the record.

8. FACULTY STATEMENT ON SERVICE/OUTREACH. This narrative, usually a maximum of 1,500 words, is an opportunity for the candidate to speak directly to the review committee membership, highlighting their major contributions or activities in the areas of service or leadership to the University, to their field, and to the public.
9. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW LETTERS FROM THE DEAN’S REVIEW COMMITTEE, DEAN, AND VCAC. When dossiers for candidates seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor are submitted, three additional documents are required. These are the letters of evaluation and recommendation authored by the Dean’s Review Committee, Dean, and VCAC from the time of comprehensive review. The purpose of these required documents is to provide to 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.

10. MULTIPLE MEASURES OF TEACHING. Submit the complete record of faculty course questionnaire summaries of each course taught and instructor summaries compiled by the Office of Data Analytics. In addition to these required documents, submit two or more additional forms of teaching assessment. Suggested forms of assessment are included on the checklist; however, candidates and units are urged to 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 reviews, confidential student interviews, etc.) should be for at least 3 courses. Review committee chairs and candidates should consult the VCAC advisory document on multiple measures of teaching, available at: https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/faculty/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/related-policy-information/multiple-measures-of-teaching


11. ONE COPY OF THE LETTER OF SOLICITATION.

A. The template for letters of solicitation to external reviewers is available at: https://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/node/416/attachment

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 would be promoted, or receive tenure at their institution.

C. External reviewers should be asked to state what their relationship is to the candidate.

12. A minimum of SIX EXTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION are required for tenure and promotion reviews. These are confidential and should 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 and close collaborators are strongly discouraged.

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. Please make every effort to ensure that your external reviewers answer the question as to whether or not the candidate would be promoted, or receive tenure at their institution.

E. All external review letters received must be submitted with the dossier, along with a CV for each external reviewer from whom a letter was received.

F. Please include an EXTERNAL REVIEWER KEY with the following information:
   - Name and affiliation of the reviewer
   - Who recommended the reviewer (PUEC or Candidate)
   - How the reviewer is labeled in the PUEC, primary unit, and dean’s review committee letters, for example, A, B… or 1, 2… The campus review letters should refer to the external reviewer in a consistent manner.
   - 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…)
   - If you need an example of an external reviewer key, please contact Carolyn Tir in the Office of Faculty Affairs (carolyn.tir@colorado.edu).

13. ONE COPY OF YOUR UNIT’S POLICY AND PROCEDURES DOCUMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW, TENURE AND PROMOTION AND ITS CRITERIA FOR CRPT.
This document describes the procedures, criteria, and evidence that the primary unit has agreed upon for evaluating comprehensive review, tenure and promotion cases. 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) which may be consulted at https://www.cu.edu/sites/default/files/1022.pdf.

14. EXAMPLES OF PUBLICATIONS. In most cases, three representative examples of scholarly work are sufficient. When photographs, videos, recordings, or other multimedia works are appropriate records of scholarly or creative work, candidates are urged to submit examples.

Please place the VCAC Checklist in front of the dossier and review its contents carefully to be sure it is complete. Incomplete dossiers cannot go forward to the VCAC.

If a candidate wishes to review their dossier once it has been submitted to VCAC, please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs, at 303-492-5491, as external letters and letters solicited from students will first need to be removed.

Once the VCAC makes a recommendation on a personnel case, the dossier, which includes a voting history from each level of review, is forwarded to the Provost and Chancellor for their evaluation and recommendation. The Chancellor is responsible for making the decision on comprehensive review and promotion to full professor cases. In questions of tenure, 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.
Boulder Campus Guidelines for the Gathering of Information on Teaching for Comprehensive Review, Promotion, and Tenure

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 each semester. 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.

Classroom Interviews and Student Interviews:

The Office of Faculty Affairs has found that classroom interviews or interviews of groups of students are often a helpful way to gather information about a candidate’s performance as a teacher, as faculty interviewers can acquire focused information about a candidate from a statistically relevant number of current students. OFA recommends that units use this form of gathering student response wherever possible.

Student Letters:

Student letters may become part of the file in a variety of ways: the unit may solicit confidential 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.

The dossier should make clear which letters fall into each of the three categories mentioned above; it is best to have clearly marked sections for each kind of letter. Solicited student letters are confidential and may not be shared with the candidate.

If the unit collects signed letters from students (this includes emails indicating the name of the student), these letters should be kept in a separate confidential file, not available to the candidate. Graduate students, post-docs, and former students should all be considered as students. A summary of these letters should be prepared by the primary unit evaluation committee and included in the dossier; this summary is available to the candidate. 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 backs of FCQ forms provide another source of anonymous student comments. If the faculty member decides to include these forms in the file, all the forms from a course, whether or not they include comments, should be submitted to the PUEC, which in turn certifies that all the forms were submitted for their analysis.
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. Teaching portfolios included in dossiers should be brief, highlighting representative teaching documents.

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. Such items should not 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.

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 relevant.
Comprehensive Review, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure Rank Faculty

Faculty initially appointed to the regular professorial rank (assistant professor, associate professor, or professor) are usually reviewed during the last year of the reappointment period.

Overview

The criteria for evaluation of regular professorial ranks are defined by the terms of the initial contract. The standard tenure-track annual merit formula is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service (Note: University Library and Museum faculty typically have different workload assignments). Upon successful comprehensive review, normal reappointment for tenure-track faculty is for three years. The mandatory tenure and promotion evaluation for tenure track faculty occurs during the seventh year of the probationary period and considers work during the entire probationary period.

The comprehensive review (normally in the fourth year) of pre-tenure professors focuses on whether the candidate is making normal progress towards meeting or exceeding the tenure standard. The mandatory promotion and tenure review (usually in the seventh year of appointment) focuses on whether the candidate has attained the tenure standard.

Criteria for a rating of "meritorious" or "excellent" are discipline specific. Each college or school may also have examples of criteria that it employs. Regent policy requires that each primary unit have available upon request a document that describes the standards and procedures for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion in that unit. In general, the University seeks multiple measures for each of the three areas of responsibility. Scholarly work is measured by assessment of the quality and volume of published work or performances and the venues in which they occur, the national stature of the work as measured by external recognition such as by the award of competitive grants, awards, and published reviews. Opinions of scholarly quality, solicited from external reviewers, are a mandatory component of tenure and promotion reviews. Reviewers are selected by the primary unit from a list that the unit compiles after consulting the candidate for nominees. Teaching quality is measured by the success of the candidate in the classroom as measured by, for example, student assessment, student interviews, peer reviews, and teaching awards. Teaching also is evaluated by the amount of activity and the success of the candidate with individualized instruction at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Service and leadership activities that are weighed include those service assignments within the primary unit, college and University, as well as community service and service to the field.

Each primary unit is required to maintain on file a current copy of its Policy and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Promotion, and Tenure document. This policy document guides the department in its faculty personnel decisions. In many units, this document is incorporated into the unit's bylaws. Any changes to the bylaws and/or the procedures document must be approved by the appropriate dean's office and the Provost. A copy should be given to each new faculty member, and a copy must accompany each comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion dossier.

Each new faculty member is advised to become familiar with the promotion standards, criteria, and practices within their unit and the university. They also are advised to begin to assemble a portfolio that documents teaching, scholarly work, and service activities beginning in their first year, so that dossier assembly (discussed below) at the time of comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion is simplified.
**Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor**

There is no standard or typical time at which this promotion consideration occurs. Regardless of the period between promotions, the standard applied is always the same. The Regents specify the following criteria for promotion to professor:

Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate for their field or its equivalent and (A) a record, which, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or department circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other, and (C), a record since tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.

Review for promotion to full professor is conducted in the same manner as the tenure and promotion review, including the solicitation of external review letters.

**Tenure-Track Evaluation Process**

Each college and school has a review process that differs in subtle ways from that in other colleges or schools. These procedures are described in a procedure document specific to each college or school, and a copy can be obtained from your dean's office. Features of the evaluation process common to all colleges and schools include:

**First Level Review**

**Primary Unit Review/Evaluation Committee**

This group from within the primary unit is elected or appointed as specified in the unit's bylaws. In small units, the primary unit evaluation committee (PUEC) and the primary unit may be one and the same. The PUEC is responsible for assisting the candidate in assembling their dossier, soliciting opinions from external reviewers, and providing a written and often oral summary of the candidate's dossier to the membership of the primary unit. In general, external evaluators should be drawn from different institutions. In some units, the PUEC makes a recommendation or reports a vote. In other units, the role of the PUEC is limited to compiling and summarizing the dossier. The written report of the PUEC becomes part of the dossier.

**Primary Unit**

The primary unit is composed of the faculty members of a department, program, division, school, or college authorized to vote on matters of appointment, comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion. Unless the dean and the Provost agree otherwise, only members of equal or higher rank are authorized to vote on personnel cases. All units must have a minimum voting membership of at least five eligible faculty members. Supplementing the voting membership of the primary unit requires the review and approval of the dean. In addition, recorded votes on cases of tenure must include not only the overall vote on the award of continuous tenure, but also a vote breakdown of whether tenure should be awarded on the basis of “excellent”, “meritorious”, or “less than meritorious” accomplishment in the areas of research/creative work, teaching/librarianship, and service. In cases where the candidate is being reviewed for promotion to associate professor, a vote on promotion to associate professor must be taken. The primary unit is charged with evaluating the record as contained within the dossier and making a recommendation to the next level of review. The vote of the primary unit and any accompanying summary or explanation also becomes part of the dossier.
Report of the Chair

In some units, the department chair, division chair, or program faculty director provides a written explanation of the primary unit vote and offers their own opinion of the merits of the case. In other units, the chair’s report is simply a written communication to the dean that reports the vote and discussion of the primary unit. This report becomes a part of the dossier.

Report of the Dean’s Level Review Committee

Dean’s level review is provided by the dean’s advisory committee. This committee is a faculty committee that advises the dean on matters of promotion, tenure, and comprehensive review. The composition of the committee is defined by the bylaws of the college or school and is generally composed of full professors representing the disciplinary breadth of the college or school. The minimum size of the dean’s level review committee is three members eligible to vote in each case. Membership of the dean’s level review committee shall be the same for all cases considered by that college or school in a given year. Dean’s level review committees must meet as a group to discuss each case, and must record a vote recommending an action on the case to the dean. Recorded votes on cases of tenure must include not only the overall vote on the award of continuous tenure, but also the vote breakdown of whether tenure should be awarded on the basis of “excellent”, “meritorious”, or “less than meritorious” accomplishment in the areas of research/creative work, teaching, and service. In cases where the candidate is being reviewed for promotion to associate professor, a vote on promotion to associate professor must be taken. The purpose of this committee review is to provide an independent assessment of the dossier to the dean and to calibrate the standards of the primary unit to those of the college or school as a whole. The dean’s level review committee provides a written assessment and records its vote. Both items become part of the dossier.

Report of the Dean

The dean, after considering the recommendation of the dean’s level review committee, then makes their own written recommendation to the Provost. This letter, and the rest of the dossier, are then forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs, usually by the end of the fall term in the year in which a review takes place. The candidate is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the dean’s level review and of the recommendation by the dean.

Second Level Review

Second level review is conducted at the campus level by the Chancellor, Provost, and the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC). The VCAC is a faculty committee of full professors drawn from across the University community. It advises the Provost on the merits of all personnel cases that are forwarded from the colleges and schools. The VCAC also reviews new faculty appointments whenever tenure is being offered as part of the hiring. The members of VCAC hold the rank of full professor and are appointed for three year terms of service. The work of the VCAC is managed out of the Office of Faculty Affairs and is chaired by the Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs. Each case is summarized to the committee orally by a primary reader and a secondary reader, followed by committee discussion. A vote by show of hands is then taken on the question of whether to recommend comprehensive review, tenure, and/or promotion. Occasionally, the VCAC may vote to table the case and return the dossier to the dean or department for supplemental material or explanation. Whenever the VCAC disagrees with the dean's recommendation, it automatically returns the case to the dean for their reconsideration. The VCAC members then discuss and vote on the case a second time. A written summary of the VCAC recommendation, along with its vote, is communicated to the Provost, and is also communicated to the candidate, chair, and dean.
Recommendation of the Provost

The Provost considers the contents of the dossier and the recommendation of the VCAC and makes an affirmative or negative recommendation to the Chancellor.

Recommendation of the Chancellor

The Chancellor is responsible for making the decision on comprehensive review and promotion to associate professor and full professor cases. In questions of tenure, the Chancellor makes a recommendation to the President of the University of Colorado system.

Third Level Review

In tenure cases, third level review is conducted at the CU system level by the President and the Board of Regents, who have final authority in cases of tenure.

The President of the University of Colorado system maintains a faculty advisory committee which can be consulted whenever the President wishes to reconsider the recommendation of the Chancellor, or in cases of appeals. The appeals process is described in detail in the guidelines on Tenure and Promotion Appeals.
I. INTRODUCTION

This Administrative Policy Statement (APS) outlines the process of evaluating a tenure-track faculty member for comprehensive review, tenure, post-tenure review and promotion and suggests effective practices for faculty members preparing for these reviews. During the pre-tenure evaluation period candidates are expected to take advantage of available mentoring and advising programs and to seek advice from their primary unit, department chair, mentors and others regarding their progress toward promotion or tenure. The APS also describes additional responsibilities of the school, department, candidate and committee members, as well as policies governing tenure and promotion processes for librarians.

II. POLICY STATEMENT

Every primary unit (described below) and reviewing body or person making recommendations concerning comprehensive review, tenure and promotion shall strictly follow and apply the procedures and standards described herein. 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.

III. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR TENURE

Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research or creative work, and leadership and service to the University and the faculty member’s profession, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research/creative work. Candidates at the University of Colorado Colorado
Springs (UCCS) may also be evaluated on professional practice, in which case they must also demonstrate meritorious performance in that area. Faculty members in health science fields may be required by their respective schools or colleges to demonstrate meritorious performance in clinical activity/clinical care, public health practice, or other professional areas as appropriate. Librarians must demonstrate meritorious performance in librarianship and curators in curatorial activities. In addition, faculty members in the School of Medicine, School of Pharmacy and the Colorado School of Public Health must meet the standards of the School that were approved by the Board of Regents. 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, as well as excellence in, and dedication to teaching (as further defined in the rules of the School of Medicine). Public Health may consider in its tenure recommendations public health practice/clinical activity and scholarly activity, as further defined by its bylaws. 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. 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.

IV. THE TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

The primary unit is composed of professional colleagues most directly involved with the candidate and having authority to make recommendations concerning comprehensive review, 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.

The tenure and promotion decisions are based on summary evaluations of a faculty member’s cumulative performance. These processes are separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation that begins at the level of the primary unit. In making comprehensive review, tenure, and/or promotion recommendations, all primary units shall evaluate the candidate's performance in the required areas, and shall also take into account other factors that have a material bearing on a comprehensive review, tenure, or promotion recommendation in that unit. The program requirements of the unit shall be considered at the time of the comprehensive review, but they may not be considered in recommendations for the award of tenure.

Every candidate for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion shall consult with and be advised by the chair of the primary unit (or her or his designee) regarding the areas of performance that will be examined, other factors that have a material bearing on the decision, the standards of performance that must be met, and the primary unit criteria that the unit uses in reaching a decision about the candidate's performance.

Joint or Split Appointments: When joint or split appointments are made, the affected faculty member must be informed in writing, prior to the appointment, of:

- The duties and expectations as agreed upon by all primary units involved.
- Which primary unit will be responsible for such personnel recommendations as tenure, reappointment, promotion, and salary.

V. THE DOSSIER

Each candidate for comprehensive review, 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 the ones 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 Information with “material bearing,” such as formal disciplinary action, should only be included if it affects whether or not the candidate meets the primary unit criteria for teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity or leadership and service.
• A current curriculum vitae.
• Evidence concerning the teaching ability of the candidate, including results of learner evaluations. (See the administrative policy statement “Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation” for examples of the types of evaluative material that can be used). Each candidate should submit an organized teacher’s portfolio that highlights her/his 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 Faculty Course Questionnaires, which are required). 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.
• Documents supporting the candidate’s research, scholarly or creative work, clinical activity and professional practice. This section may include articles, book reviews, research data and grants, receipt of awards, electronic communications, unsolicited letters and other evidence of success. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
• Documents supporting the candidate’s leadership and service to the university, profession and community. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
• Any other information the candidate believes will assure adequate consideration and evaluation during her/his comprehensive review, tenure review, or promotion review.

Documents to be added by the primary unit following receipt of the dossier from the candidate include:

• A copy of the primary unit criteria;
• Previous reappointment, tenure and/or promotion (RTP) letters if required by the campus, primary unit, school/college or library; and/or
• Evaluation letters received from External Reviewers.

VI. EVALUATIONS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

The primary unit requests evaluations in writing by scholars from outside the University and from various locations who are qualified to judge the candidate, using a solicitation letter following the college-approved format. 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/college/school/library policy. 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 bylaws will 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. A minimum of three external letters shall be added to the file; however, campuses, schools/colleges/libraries may require a greater number of letters. All letters that are received must be included in the candidate’s promotion or tenure dossier. These letters must be treated as confidential; they shall not be shared with the candidate. The primary unit may offer external evaluators a modest stipend for their work. Primary unit letters should include summaries of key comments by evaluators, with all identifiers removed to preserve confidentiality.

VII. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Primary Unit Criteria and Procedures: Each primary unit shall develop specific written criteria and procedures for measuring the performance of candidates in the primary unit that are consistent with the standards herein. These approved criteria, called the "primary unit criteria," shall be subject to periodic review and approval by the dean and provost. 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 higher levels of review. They must be used by the primary unit and by all other bodies or persons as part of their evaluation of the candidate. Regent Law 5-B, Regent Policy 5-M, this administrative policy statement, and the primary unit criteria and procedures shall be made available by the head of the primary unit to each faculty member at the time of initial hiring/appointment. The primary unit criteria shall include a description of the level of achievement that warrants the designations “meritorious” and “excellent” performance in teaching, research or creative work, and leadership and service as well as in other applicable evaluation areas. It will also provide a description of the types of evidence that will be used to evaluate the candidate against the performance standards. Examples of criteria to be considered in evaluating teaching, research or creative work, and leadership and service are included in Appendix A.
Early Tenure – The standards of performance that apply to faculty members on the seven-year tenure clock apply to faculty members who come up for early tenure. They must have a record of achievement in teaching, research or creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service that is equal to the record expected of a faculty member coming up in the seventh year. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure. 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.

VIII. LEVELS OF REVIEW

At each level, the committees will vote on the teaching, research/creative work, and leadership and service (and, where indicated in primary unit criteria, the clinical activity, public health practice or professional practice) of the candidate as “not meritorious,” “meritorious,” or “excellent.” The committee will then vote on whether to recommend promotion or tenure, and will forward the result of all votes, together with the dossier, to the next level. Committee members at every level shall maintain the confidentiality of the deliberations.

The First-Level Review is at the college, library, or school level; it includes review by the primary unit and the chair, the dean’s review committee and the dean.

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee is the group within the primary unit responsible for initially reviewing the qualifications of candidates for comprehensive review, tenure, and/or promotion. In a small primary unit, all members of the unit may constitute such a committee. Only members of the primary unit holding tenure may vote on decisions relating to tenure. No individual may participate in more than one stage of the review process. 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.

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee’s recommendation includes:

- A description and evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly and creative work, research, teaching, clinical activity, professional practice, public health practice, and leadership and service to the University or the community, as required by primary unit criteria;
- A statement describing the procedures followed and actions taken by the unit making the recommendation, including the reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements from the recommendation (this statement must include the results of any vote taken);
- Salient points of the external reviewers’ analyses, with care taken to maintain confidentiality;
- If required by the individual school, college or library, the findings of the comprehensive review.

The Dean’s Advisory or Review Committee aids in the evaluation of recommendations forwarded by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee. Where it is not possible for the review committee to consist of faculty members other than those in the primary unit, the dean will form a review committee that will include faculty from other schools or colleges. The dean shall determine whether the committee will be elected or appointed.

Should either the Review Committee or the dean disagree with the recommendation of the primary unit, the dean shall communicate the nature of this disagreement with the head of the primary unit. The primary unit shall then reconsider its original recommendation and return its reconsidered judgment to the dean for her/his consideration and that of the review committee. The recommendation of the dean, the results of the votes of the primary unit and the review committee, and the comprehensive dossier on the candidate shall be forwarded together to the provost. Where differences of opinion between the primary unit, the review committee, 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 School of Medicine’s (SOM) procedures differ in many respects from those described in this APS. Faculty members in that School should consult the School’s policy on tenure and promotion, available at http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/medicalschool/facultyAffairs/AppointmentsPromotions/Pages/PromotionsTenure.aspx. This is also true for the Colorado School of Public Health and the School of Pharmacy: that School’s Bylaws, Polices, Procedures, and Guidelines provide such information.
The **Second-Level Review** is at the campus level; it includes review by the vice chancellor for academic affairs’ advisory committee, the vice chancellor for academic affairs, hereafter referred to as 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/vice chancellor for academic affairs and chancellor.

The provost on each campus shall have an advisory committee of faculty members to assist her/him in the review of recommendations submitted by the dean. The provost shall determine whether the committee will be elected or appointed, and the committee will participate fully with the provost in the review of the recommendation from the first level. If the provost disagrees with the recommendation from the first-level review, he/she shall transmit to the dean of the school or college the nature of the disagreement. The dean and the review committee shall then reconsider their recommendation and return their reconsidered judgment(s) to the provost. At her/his discretion, the dean may seek additional input from the primary unit as part of this reconsideration. The provost shall make her/his final recommendation regarding tenure to the chancellor, who, if she/he agrees, forwards positive recommendations to the president of the University after the completion of this process. When the chancellor’s determination concerning reappointment or the award of tenure is negative, that decision is final unless the faculty member seeks a third-level review.

If the provost finds significant procedural errors that may have affected the outcome of the case, he/she may return the case to the primary unit and other levels of the campus review to repeat the process. The provost may, at her/his discretion, 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.

A candidate for comprehensive review, promotion and/or tenure shall be informed of the final determination of the chancellor in writing as expeditiously as possible. All positive recommendations for tenure shall be forwarded to the president. Decisions not to recommend tenure are not forwarded from the campus.

The **Third-Level Review** is at the presidential level; it refers either (1) to the review by the president of a positive recommendation for tenure or (2) to an appeal of a negative decision for comprehensive review or tenure by a candidate. Promotion decisions are completed at the second level of review and are not eligible for third-level review. If flawed by procedural errors, promotion decisions may be appealed to the Faculty Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

All positive recommendations for tenure shall be forwarded to the president for review and approval 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 decisions rests with the Chancellors.

In the case of a negative decision on tenure by the chancellor, the faculty member, within ten working days of receipt of written notice of denial for tenure from the chancellor, may request review by the president. The president may review, at the initiation of a faculty member, a negative decision of the campus chancellor regarding tenure. This request for review shall be made only on the grounds that the review contained either (1) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome, (2) substantive errors (such as a biased summary of student comments) of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome, or (3) prima facie evidence of discrimination, or some combination of these grounds. The president reviews the request and determines whether there are grounds for a third-level review. If there are grounds, the president shall convene a system-wide advisory committee of tenured faculty members chosen in consultation with faculty council to review the case. The advisory committee shall be provided with a complete dossier on each candidate referred to it by the president. After completing its review, the advisory committee will make its recommendation to the president.

After considering the advisory committee’s recommendation, and if he/she disagrees with a recommendation for tenure submitted by the chancellor, the president shall transmit to him or her the nature of the disagreement. The chancellor shall then reconsider her/his recommendation and return her/his reconsidered judgment to the president. The president shall make her/his final determination whether to deny tenure or to recommend tenure to the Board of Regents only upon completion of this process.

The **Board of Regents** makes the final decision on the award of tenure (including for outside hires with tenure). Only the Board has the power either to award tenure or to rescind a tenured appointment.
IX. **COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

Each tenure-track faculty member below the rank of associate professor and faculty members in the Law School hired at the rank of associate professor shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner, as outlined in the primary unit documents, at least once during the tenure probationary period (at the School of Medicine, School of Pharmacy and the Colorado School of Public Health, at least once during the promotion probationary period), apart from the review for promotion or the award of tenure. (Regent Laws Article 5.B.6.B.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. The review may include evaluation by external reviewers, as determined by the campus/school/college/library policy. Candidates for reappointment may receive specific advice about aspects of their performance that need improvement, although non-reappointment is also a possible result of the comprehensive review. If a candidate is not reappointed, he or she may request a third-level review, as described above. If not reappointed because of the outcome of the comprehensive review, he/she will have a terminal year before her/his appointment ends.

X. **PROMOTION**

All candidates for promotion to associate professor and professor must meet the University’s standards of performance as approved by the Board of Regents:

- **Associate professors** should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and increasing accomplishment in research, scholarship/creative activity or clinical service/professional practice, as articulated in the primary unit criteria.
- **Professors** should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (A) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both 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 (C) a record, since receiving tenure or promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, leadership and service, and other applicable areas.

XI. **POST-TENURE REVIEW**

The purposes of post-tenure review (PTR) are: (1) to facilitate continued faculty development, consistent with the academic needs and goals of the University and the most effective use of institutional resources; and (2) to ensure professional accountability by a regular, comprehensive evaluation of every tenured faculty member's performance. Each campus has developed procedures for appropriate peer evaluation during PTR and for appeals of the PTR evaluation. College or department level PTR procedures must conform to the campus procedures and this administrative policy statement. 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. This committee shall be called the post-tenure review committee. Other units may be consulted as appropriate.

The post-tenure review process begins at tenure with the first PTR occurring five years after the faculty member is continuously tenured and recurs at five year intervals unless interrupted by promotion review. Promotion serves to re-start the PTR clock. Faculty undergoing PTR shall not, in that year, serve on the PTR evaluation committee.

The primary unit's written standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion describe the nature and measures of achievement in teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service within the discipline that shall be employed in PTR evaluations. The written standards of primary units shall include guidelines/descriptions of "meeting expectations," the standard of acceptable professional performance. In a Regular Five-Year Review, the Post-Tenure Review committee examines the five previous annual performance evaluation reports, including the FCQs, peer review of teaching, and, if desired, other types of teaching evaluation, the curriculum vitae, and, if available, the faculty member's Professional Plan(s) from that PTR cycle and the forthcoming cycle. (See Appendix B for more information about the Professional Plan)

The PTR committee shall provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance as either outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, or below expectations in teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service, and shall provide a narrative explanation of that evaluation.
The PTR committee shall write a brief report stating whether the candidate is meeting expectations or not. The report is an opportunity to evaluate the faculty member's contributions over the past 5 years to the unit, the university, the community (where relevant) and the profession. The report shall summarize the unit's findings regarding the faculty member's adherence to the department's/primary unit's standards and conclusions about his/her productivity and contributions to the University in teaching, research/creative work, and leadership and service, and when appropriate, clinical work or professional practice. A copy of this 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 college/school. 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.

Faculty members who have achieved summary evaluations of "meeting expectations" or better on their annual merit evaluations (see the administrative policy statement “Performance Ratings for Faculty”) since the last PTR (or since receiving tenure if this is their first PTR) shall undergo Regular Review. Faculty members who receive a summary evaluation of “below expectations” at any time during a five-year PTR cycle must undertake a Performance Improvement Agreement (See APS on Performance Ratings for Faculty for more information on the Performance Improvement Agreement and Extensive Review).

Faculty members who fail to participate in any aspect of the post tenure review process, as required, may be subject to sanctions for insubordination and dereliction of duty.

XII. THE CANDIDATE’S PREROGATIVES

A candidate shall be entitled to submit any material or information that he/she believes will be helpful in evaluating her/his comprehensive review, promotion and/or tenure at the first-, second-, and third-level review stages. Materials provided at a higher level of the review stage shall also be provided to all other bodies reviewing the candidate, and they may respond as they deem appropriate.

Each faculty member shall have access to all performance evaluation documents in her/his own files. These documents shall include statements prepared by primary unit evaluation committees, by department or division chairs, or by administrative officers, but shall not include letters of recommendation solicited from outside the primary unit, which are to be treated as confidential. Each faculty member shall be informed orally and in writing by the head of the primary unit of the results of evaluations of the faculty member's performance.

If a candidate so requests, in a confidential conversation, the provost or her/his representative shall advise the candidate of the reasons that contributed to a recommendation not to grant tenure or promote. After the final decision, a candidate for reappointment, promotion or tenure shall be entitled to file a grievance with the Faculty Senate’s Privilege and Tenure Committee within the allowable time frame (see Regent Policy 5-H) if the candidate believes that the procedures described herein have not been observed at any stage of the recommending or review process. 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. Nor shall the Privilege and Tenure Committee substitute its judgment about an individual's merit for that of other committees and administrators. The committee shall promptly report any procedural deficiencies to the provost of the campus where the faculty member works.

A candidate who is denied tenure will have a terminal year before his/her appointment ends.
XIII. TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICIES SPECIFIC TO LIBRARY FACULTY MEMBERS

Librarians play a unique role in advancing the University’s educational mission. This APS reaffirms the status of all librarians as members of the faculty, while recognizing the diverse nature of faculty appointments for librarians throughout the University of Colorado system, where library faculty members may be tenured or tenure track, non-tenure-track promotion eligible, or non-tenure track.

Librarians on University of Colorado campuses where library faculty are eligible for tenure-track appointments and who are appointed or promoted to the rank of assistant professor will be on the tenure track, and the tenure probationary period will begin when they achieve that rank. Evaluation procedures and standards of performance for reappointment, tenure, and promotion for library faculty members are the same as those for other faculty members. The criteria for librarians will include activities in the teaching and/or practice of librarianship. Primary unit criteria, as described above, articulate the requirements for tenure and promotion.

XIV. RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, FORMS, GUIDELINES, AND OTHER RESOURCES

A. Administrative Policy Statements (APS) and Other Policies

Regent Policy 5 M

University APS: Justification for Appointment with Tenure Outside Hire with Tenure

University APS: Mentoring for Tenure-Track and Tenure-Eligible Faculty

University APS: Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation

University APS: Performance Ratings for Faculty
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XVI. KEY WORDS

Evaluation
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.  RESEARCH/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, research/creative work, and leadership and service goals and explains how these goals support the needs of the primary unit and the college/school. 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.
Introduction

The quality of the faculty is the key to the success of the university and its students. The hiring and retention of high quality faculty members depend in part upon an open, clear, fair and rigorous process. Adherence to established processes and policies, found in Regent Laws, Regent Policies and administrative policy statements, ensures the fair and impartial treatment of all candidates and is vital to the integrity of the tenure and promotion process.

Levels of Review

The reappointment, tenure or promotion of a tenure-track faculty member is evaluated at multiple levels. The expertise of the primary unit is balanced by the broader perspective and commitment to excellence for the whole institution of the school/college, library, and campus levels of review.

The First Level Review is at the college, library, or school level; it includes review by the primary unit and the chair, the dean’s review committee and the dean.

The Second Level Review is at the campuswide level; it includes review by the vice chancellor for academic affairs’ advisory committee, the vice chancellor for academic affairs and the chancellor.

The Third Level Review is at the presidential level; it refers to review by the president of the university for both a positive recommendation for tenure to the Board of Regents and for an appeal of a negative decision for reappointment or tenure by a candidate. Promotion decisions are completed at the second level.

The final decision on the award of tenure (including outside hires with tenure) is made by the Board of Regents. Only the board has the power either to award tenure or to rescind a tenured appointment.

Standards of Performance

Regent Law requires that all candidates for tenure demonstrate meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research/creative work, and leadership and service (to the university, profession and public), and that candidates in health science fields demonstrate meritorious performance in clinical activity/clinical care, as well. Candidates at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs may also be evaluated on professional
practice, in which case they must also demonstrate meritorious performance in that area. In addition, candidates must demonstrate excellence in either teaching or research/creative work, except that faculty in the School of Medicine and the Colorado School of Public Health must meet the standards of the school approved by the Board of Regents.

Aided by the primary unit head, the candidate prepares a dossier containing relevant information on which the evaluation committee will base its decision.

Primary units develop criteria that explicate the teaching, research and leadership and service expectations for faculty, such as expectations for articles, books, and/or research grants, measures of clinical excellence, etc., in terms of their scholarly field. These primary unit criteria, once reviewed for rigor, fairness and consistency with regent requirements and approved by the dean and vice chancellor for academic affairs, are included in the candidate’s dossier and shall guide evaluation at every level of review.

Candidates are entitled to see review committees’ letters of evaluation but may not see letters from external evaluators, which are treated as confidential. Upon the completion of the review process, the candidate should be informed of the outcome as expeditiously as possible.

**Integrity of the Process**

Participants in the evaluation process shall familiarize themselves with and follow its policies and procedures. The integrity of reappointment, tenure, and promotion depend 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. If errors are discovered during the process, they should be remedied, if possible, before the dossier moves to the next level of review.

**Mentoring**

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 (comprehensive review, reappointment, tenure and promotion). Mentoring opportunities will be provided by primary units and/or colleges/schools.

**Appeals**

A candidate denied reappointment to a tenure-track position or tenure may request a review, within 10 working days of receipt of the denial, by the president only on the grounds of: (1) procedural errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; (2) substantive errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the outcome; or (3) prima facie evidence of discrimination; or some combination of these grounds. If the president finds that there have been such errors, he/she will convene a systemwide advisory board of faculty members to review the case. This third level review committee will advise the president, who makes the final decision.

A candidate for reappointment or tenure who is not granted a third level review or whose third level review results in the president upholding the chancellor’s/Chief Academic Officer’s
recommendation against tenure and still believes that there have been serious procedural errors in the review of her/his case, may file a grievance with the Faculty Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T). (See Regent Policy 5-H.) P&T will advise the chancellor of its findings and recommendations. The chancellor informs the president of P&T’s findings and recommendations and her/his response to those findings and recommendations. The president makes the final decision. Only positive decisions are forwarded to the Board of Regents for approval.

Similarly, a candidate who is denied promotion and believes that there have been serious procedural errors in the review of her/his case may submit a grievance to the Faculty Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure. P&T will advise the chancellor of its findings and recommendations. The chancellor makes the final decision.
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